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1. Introduction

Acknowledged as one of the most studied research stream in the marketing literature (Pharr, 2005), country of origin (COO) has received great recognition since its beginning. COO is established as a notion that countries’ origin have a significant impact on consumers’ evaluations and preferences of a particular brand (Demirbag et al., 2010; Phau and Chao, 2008; Sharma, 2011). Accordingly, consumers’ brand image and perception of a brand is strongly influenced by a brand’s origin (Pappu et al., 2006; Yasin et al., 2007). This becomes evident when brands like Volkswagen emphasize the german heritage in their advertising, such as including the slogan “Das Auto” and a German-accent narrator (Hwang et al., 2015; Magnusson et al., 2011a). Take this into consideration, managers face a challenge to understand when a foreign branding strategy is successful, in particular when the COO refers to another than the correct origin (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b).

Notwithstanding that COO seems to play a significant role in consumers’ minds, the academic field has in the recent years become under scrutiny. Some scholars (e.g. Samiee et al., 2005; Usunier, 2006; Samiee, 2010; 2011) have recently started to question its relevance, pointing at consumers only modest levels of correct origin classification rates, thereby leading some authors (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2008; Hwang et al., 2015; Samiee, 2005; Usunier, 2006) to suggest that consumers either have limited knowledge of brands’ origin or find such information unimportant. On the contrary, Magnusson et al. (2011a) claims that consumers’ perceived COO of a brand matters, regardless whether consumers can correctly identify the brand’s origin or not. This is explained by the notion that consumers are believed to implicitly in one way or another possess a belief of a what a brand’s origin is, which according to Josiassen and Harzing (2008) act as one of the driving forces that some firms deliberately launch foreign branding strategies to make consumers perceive the quality of the brand in another light.

Although that COO has been subject to numerous studies in the marketing literature, it is acknowledged that its effects have been inflated and grossly exaggerated (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2008; Samiee, 2010, 2011; Usunier 2006, 2011). Not until recently has a lively debate evolved in the COO literature where it exist two different schools (Hwang et al., 2015). According to the COO proponents, COO still has a significant effect on consumers’ purchase evaluations and intentions (Josiassen and Harzing, 2008; Magnusson et al. 2011a). On the flip side, COO skeptics (Samiee, 2011; Usunier, 2011) points at low accuracy rates by consumers where
studies identifies the correct origin of brands to be only 35% of the times (Samiee et al., 2005), respectively 27% (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2008).

To further fuel this debate, Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) notes that the vast majority of the academic field of COO rely on consumers’ responses and purchase intentions by direct questioning through interviews and surveys. At first glance, questionnaire-based surveys only capture rational and verbally aspects by the consumers’ response, leading emotional and nonverbally aspects remain undetected (Koll et al., 2010). And the truth is, however, that academics and practitioners in the marketing field in general have adopted a research method that measure emotions relying on self-reports, leading to bias towards cognitive processing (Zambardino and Goodfellow, 2007). This is noteworthy since literature (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b) notes that country-specific associations (CSA) consumers draw can be both rational and emotional. These CSAs are associations consumers make when showing support for COO influence, in which rational CSAs serves as obvious COO influence (country name, map, flag). On the other hand, emotional CSAs are believed to be more implicitly expressed trough an indirect approach (e.g. Statue of Liberty that refers to the US) (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b).

Yet, extant research has only put emphasis on the verbal elements (Koll et al., 2010). Roth and Diamantopoulos (2009) conclude this by noting that the affective component has been overlooked in the literature, which is not adequate since consumers simultaneously both consciously and unconsciously thinking about brands that affects their brand attitude (Koll et al., 2010). Taken together, literature (Roth and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b) notes the need for further research that pay more attention to the affective component, whose research should emphasize the symbolic and emotional aspects of COO (Verlegh and Steenkamp, 1999). Additionally, Verlegh and Steenkamp (1999) notes that COO is not just another cognitively quality cue, rather it also includes affective and normative dimensions as well.

Prior research has also evoked divergence by two different schools in the brand origin recognition accuracy (BORA) context. This notion refers to the ability for a customer to identify the correct COO for a given brand (Samiee et al., 2005). In spite of that, the scholars (e.g. Usunier; 2011; Westjohn and Magnusson, 2011) seems to reach consensus on further research directions. In this sense, they both argue that the research stream needs to shift its focus from BORA and rather examine how consumers create brand origin perceptions and associations. More specifically, studies
note the need for additional research how accurate, but even more importantly, how inaccurate perceptions are created (Westjohn and Magnusson, 2011). Usunier (2011) explains this by meaning that accuracy and favorability both matter, given that brands that either are non-classified or incorrectly classified may be represented as having unfavorable association, meaning that some brands and managers may be at risk.

Therefore, Usunier (2011) notes that further research calls for studies that examine when, why and how accurately consumers assign a certain origin to a particular brand, but also what kind of associations consumers make when they are exposed to linguistic cues. On the right track, a study by Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) rather took another research approach than those used in extant research. By shifting focus from the cognitive aspect as used in the vast majority, they approached an affective aspect in form of projective technique in order to see whether consumers communicate differently in relation to CSAs. The findings show that COO still plays as an important cue in consumers’ minds, meaning that extant research has not necessarily overestimated the COO effect, but rather misestimated them. In their study, Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) also showed that emotional thinking by the consumer has a greater possibility to correctly classify brands’ origin, as well as being predictive of brand ownership.

While this type of research method might be an area worthy of further research (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b), it is acknowledged that the whole research stream of COO in general would benefit by studies drawing from a linguistic and a visual approach (Usunier, 2011). Given this, literature (Zambardino and Goodfellow, 2007) acknowledges the call for research that adopt non-direct methods such as qualitative projective techniques. This is in particular useful in advertising context, given that extant research has mostly been evaluating this by drawing from quantitative research. Meanwhile, Zambardino and Goodfellow (2007) also adds that the literature field of understanding affective process remains limited and hard to measure.

Taken all this together, the purpose in this article is to break from traditional research and its accompanying cognitive research methods in order to advance the COO field from a more accurate perspective that also involves an affective dimension as well. This is along the same lines as Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b), which advancement of our study becomes apparent and needed since it lately has evolved a research call in the literature to go back to its origin to determine the real effects of COO today. In order to this, the research design should not solely rely on consumers as
dealing with cognitive processing, but rather approach it from an affective dimension as well. This calls for a qualitative research design that seeks to understand consumers from a profoundly perspective. Pioneers in the COO field, Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) are to the best of our knowledge the first researchers to adopt both collage technique and semi-structured interviews in order to examine the real effects of COO. Bearing this in mind, this is a new research area within the COO field that not until recently has come to light. In order to account for reliability and validity issues that qualitative studies such as projective technique entails, it is a fruitful avenue to rely on the research methodology and findings by Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) to further elaborate in this academic field. This should then give some robustness to the findings in this study as the credibility enhances.

Providing the research methodology by Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) as ground for this study, we account for avoid bias and develop a research methodology that is of ecological nature that do not expose the brand’s correct origin as conveyed in most prior research (see Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2008; Josiassen et al., 2008; Laroche et al., 2005; Samiee, 2005). In this sense, Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b, p. 97) notes that prior research often reveal the brand’s correct origin in a non ecological way when informing participants that "product A is made in country X" or that "brand B comes from country Y". Therefore, the lack of ecological research methods is clearly a research gap in the COO literature that needs to be overcome and advanced where participants are not revealed to the study’s aim. In order to account for this, it is of great concern to critically distinguish CSAs as either rational or emotional, in which dual-coding theory (DCT) will be reviewed since this is a theory that opens up new perspectives of both affective and cognitive dimensions working simultaneously (Paivio,1991). Furthermore, in addition to the research gap about ecological research methods, little is known about COO in the advertising context. Therefore, this research gap will be examined in further detail when providing a more practical research methodology.

1.1 Research question

In what way makes the implementation of a more ecological research method contributes to the COO field?
2. Literature review

Drawing from prior research, scholars acknowledge that COO effects have been overestimated in the vast majority of studies (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2008; Samiee, 2010, 2011; Usunier 2006, 2011). By exposing the brands origin for consumers in extant research, Samiee (2010) notes that it has evoked contrived circumstances where the respondents are ”forced” to make an association with an already predetermined COO. Consequently, the study validity is put at risk (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b) and that calls for further research of more ecological nature where the respondents are not disclosed of the brand’s origin (Samiee, 2010). On the right track, a study by Magnusson et al. (2011a) compared the brand attitude of respondents before and after their evaluation of brands, in order to see whether they had a more (less) favorable attitude after knowing the correct origin. Yet, COO skeptics (e.g. Samiee, 2011; Usunier, 2011) argue that the research method has some shortcomings in regard to its validity and ability to extrapolate their results.

In order to overcome for validity problems, Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) showed in their study how to account for both rational and emotional held thoughts by the consumer. By shifting focus from quantitative survey-based research methods that measure emotions relying on self-reports, the findings of the applied collage technique showed how some respondents only seemed to be influenced of COO cues when communicating CSAs nonverbally, which makes the relation between COO cues and CSAs strongly connected since a CSA indirectly refers to respondents being susceptible to COO influence. Therefore, from this point they are going to be referred alternately since they affect each other, as also acknowledged in (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b).

Notwithstanding the relatedness between COO cues and CSAs, Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) showed how some respondents were only influenced of COO in the collage technique when making emotional CSAs, thereby showing support that most of the quantitative studies have bias towards cognitive processing (see also Roth and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Koll et al., 2010; Zambardino and Goodfellow, 2007). Accordingly, literature (e.g. Roth and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b) notes the need for further research that pay more attention to the affective component, whose research should stress the symbolic and emotional aspects of COO (Verlegh and Steenkamp, 1999).
**Dual coding theory**

Drawing from current COO literature, the vast majority deals with the cognitive aspect. Not until recently have studies started to approach the affective component, which is explained by the fact that COO effects cannot solely be explained by rational product attributes such as quality (Verlegh and Steenkamp, 1999). This becomes clear when existing research stream (e.g. Kousta et al., 2011; Paivio, 1991) has established that the human mind consist of two distinct interconnected memory systems divided into verbal and nonverbal information. In these information systems, cues are stored, encoded and processed for subsequent use in either a cognitive or emotional way (Paivio, 1991). Furthermore, although Paivio (1991) notes that the memory system is separately but interconnected, both system can work and operate the human mind independently at the same time.

To extend this view, the literature also speaks about a third interacting component, known as the normative aspect of COO. Combined with the cognitive and the affective aspects, this provides the basis for “three-component” view that is forming attitudes (Roth and Diamantopoulos, 2009). Together are these components contributing to fuzzy boundaries between the explanations behind COO effects (Verlegh and Steenkamp, 1999), which are to be seen as causally related rather than independent of each other.

In the light of trying to distinguish these three components, extant research notes the line between verbal and nonverbal information. Here it is acknowledged that the verbal system is more likely to create rational associations, whilst the nonverbal system is more likely to process emotional associations (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b). In addition, rational associations are specialized for the processing and dealing with rational content and languages, both visually and auditory (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b). On the other hand, the nonverbal system, explicitly attributes emotions and non linguistic objects and events (visual objects, sounds, taste, memories, experiences) by creating mental images in a synchronous and holistic way (Paivio, 1991).

By applying this way of thinking, called the dual coding theory (DCT), in the context of COO, Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) notes that when consumers associate a specific brand to a country, the consumers creates associations either verbally or nonverbally, or both simultaneously. These associations are further called country-specific associations (CSA), which are, to clarify, if a person make associations to a specific country when asked to communicate associations towards a specific brand, classified as CSAs (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b). Furthermore, these associations are linked to consumers’ knowledge and memory and consist of either rational or emotional CSAs,
depending whether the verbal or nonverbal system becomes retrieved. Moreover, in this study, the concepts of country-specific associations (CSA) and country of origin (COO) will be largely applied and processed alongside each other. Therefore, for the remainder of the paper it is important to keep the distinction between the two concepts in mind in order not to confuse them.

In the context of COO, the emotional CSAs are linking a brand to a country in the consumer's mind based on their negative or positive feelings about a specific country, often based on personal experiences and memories (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b). More specifically, Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) showed in their study that consumers expressed emotional feelings such as summer, pizza and holiday when associating and thinking affective about the car brand Alfa Romeo. Thus, personal experience and holiday memories were evoked, in which some of them were directly linked to a specific country (CSA). Those findings by Herz and Diamantopoulos, (2013b) shows a consumer's emotional CSA towards a brand and its product. In addition, Paivio (1986) claims that emotional associations are more likely to be evoked than rational associations when being exposed to objects or pictures as stimuli.

On the other hand, rational CSAs are different and based on stored knowledge and beliefs consumers possess about the specific country to a specific brand. These rational stored knowledge associations consist of both country facts (economy, culture, politics, technology) and people facts (labor, education, competence, creativity) (Papadopoulos and Heslop, 1993). Therefore, rational associations are more likely to be recalled when word works as stimuli and explicitly when it demands verbal processing and verbal description (Paivio, 1986). Applying rational CSAs in the context of COO, Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) showed in their study that respondents made parallels to Germany and its quality, punctuality and reliability when thinking about the automobile brand BMW.

To sum up, literature (e.g. Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b; Paivio, 1986) acknowledges that the verbal system activates and dominates creation of cognitive associations when a person is exposed to verbal stimulus (e.g. interviews, questionnaires). On the contrary, the nonverbal system of the human mind is activated and dominating when nonverbal stimulus are presented (e.g. painting pictures, creating a collage). Furthermore, as previously mentioned, the verbal and the nonverbal system can work independently but also work together when creating associations, meaning that a nonverbal method might be more appropriate to reveal both rational and emotional associations.
simultaneously. As such, Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) further claims that individuals might express rational and emotional associations in exclusion of the other, but these might work simultaneously also, given previous stored knowledge and experience.

**Brand origin recognition accuracy (BORA)**

According to extant literature (Samiee et al., 2005), brand origin recognition accuracy (BORA) refers to the ability for a customer to identify the correct COO for a given brand. Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) regards this as of great concern since prior research (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2011) notes the danger of misclassification and non classification of a brand’s COO, which mostly will have undesirable consequences when consumer are making assumptions to a country with weaker country image then the actual COO. For example, a brand like Hinari that refers to be an Eastern brand, but in fact originates from UK, was shown to generate a less favorable brand image in all instances when misclassified. Therefore, also resulting in lower purchase intentions (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2011). Along the same lines, Magnusson et al. (2011a) showed in their study how people that incorrectly classified brands’ origin, still showed great COO influence when mistaking a certain brand’s origin. For example, respondents showed great difference in brand attitude change after being informed of the correct origin. More specifically, a brand like Philips was perceived in better light when being misperceived as a domestic US brand for American respondents, rather than its correct origin Netherlands (Hwang et al., 2015). Therefore, according to this view, Magnusson et al. (2011a, p. 468) claims that: "consumers’ perception of brand origin, regardless of accuracy, significantly affects brand attitude.” In the light of our study, we will from this point refer this to the "BORA view of Magnusson et al.”.

By approaching a research design that embraces DCT, Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) showed in their study how respondents were more prone to reveal rational CSAs through verbal-based tasks as carried out in interviews. In contrast, respondents were more prone to reveal emotional CSAs through nonverbal-based tasks when using collage technique. In the context of BORA, this showed that both rational and emotional CSAs had a positive impact on consumers’ ability to correctly classify brands’ origin. This is noteworthy since prior research (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos 2008; Martin and Cervino, 2011) shows that country image has no impact on consumers’ ability to correctly classify brands’ origin. This might be explained by the notion that the research methods used in the mainstream COO research only captures consumers’ verbal responses, thereby leading emotional CSAs to be uncovered (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b). Furthermore, although Herz
and Diamantopoulos (2013b) showed that both rational and emotional CSAs had a positive impact on BORA, it was shown that the emotional aspect generated the highest BORA score. In concrete terms, the more emotional CSAs the consumers have towards a specific brand, the greater a respondent increase the probability to correctly classify the brand’s origin (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b). Bearing this in mind, the research methods used in prior BORA research stream should be inconsistent, given that authors been trying to reach high classification rates as possible (e.g. Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2008; Hwang et al., 2015; Samiee et al., 2005). As such, it remains unclear whether prior research and its accompanying survey-based research method is possible to detect consumers emotional CSA (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013; Hwang et al., 2015).

**Brand ownership**

In addition to the findings that emotional CSAs lead to higher BORA rates by the consumers, Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) also showed in their result that emotional CSAs can be predictive of brand ownership. Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) further suggested, that by adopting emotional advertising it should be possible to reach the consumer segment that only express their emotional CSAs, which appears to be positively connected with the usage rate of the consumer. These findings should be regarded as of great concern since the study by Balabanis and Diamantopoulos (2011) broadly showed that the higher the BORA rate by the consumer, the greater the tendency for the consumer to evaluate the brand in better light, thus leading to higher purchase intentions. As such, the findings by Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) claims to be of great importance since it is acknowledged that emotional CSAs are not likely to be revealed through sole reliance on consumers verbal responses, as the mainstream of COO research field examines. As a result, this further point out the importance of designing research studies conducted through a nonverbal way to reveal the true emotional CSAs in relation to brand ownership.

**Advertising**

In prior research about consumer memory, it has almost exclusively been taken for granted that consumers store and rationalise brand information in a linguistically way (Koll et al., 2010). However, this is not completely adequate since Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) point out the managerial importance to emphasize both rational and emotional CSAs in consumers’ mind through brand communication. This is explained by the notion that the market is getting more global and
products becomes increasingly homogenized, therefore are managers left with the task to increase their emotional CSA stimuli (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b). In addition, extant literature in advertising notes that emotions can result in stronger reactions by the consumers, instead of relying solely on the cognitive aspects (e.g. Aylesworth and MacKenzie, 1998). Accordingly, by adopting emotional advertising it should then be possible to reach the nonverbal consumers that in general are harder to target than the verbal (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b). Furthermore, by increasing the emotional CSA stimulation in emotional advertising, it is also suggested by Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) that it strengthens the consumer’s emotional connection towards the brand.

**Hedonic and utilitarian products**

Drawing from existing literature, it is acknowledged that the idea of using foreign brand names influences consumers’ evaluation of a product in different ways depending on its characteristics (Melnyk et al., 2012). By referring to favourable country images, literature (Leclere et al., 1994) suggests that a French brand name increases the hedonic perception of products, whilst products with a German brand name evoke utilitarian associations (Heslop and Papadopoulos, 1993). Bearing this in mind, prior research (Chernev, 2004; Chitturi et al., 2008) notes that consumers have different set of intentions when considering purchasing either utilitarian products or hedonic products, which by then affects consumers’ systematic way of processing information and their product evaluation. More specifically, literature (Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982; Strahilevitz and Myers, 1998) acknowledges that consumers buying utilitarian products have functional related goals, whilst consumers buying hedonic products have pleasure related intentions.

Given that consumers’ systematically elaborate different ways of processing information whether it is a hedonic or utilitarian product, literature (Sengupta et al., 1997) notes that the attention consumers pay to COO cues differs. As such, consumers purchasing utilitarian products are more likely to be engaged into deeper cognitive elaboration and subsequently ignore irrelevant information such as extrinsic cues like COO since it has no meaning for them to enable their goal (Babin et al., 1994; Homburg et al. 2006). Rather, consumers are more likely to pay attention to the product’s individual attributes and to accomplish a functional or a practical task (Babin et al., 1994). On the other hand, hedonic products are driven by the satisfaction from consumers’ evaluation and holistic image provided by the product, meaning that consumers are by nature less likely to deeply process a cognitive elaboration or take product attributes into account (Chernev, 2004). Therefore,
consumers will tend to process information more holistically and affective, thereby increasing the possibility of including COO cues in their evaluation (Giirhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 2000).

3. Conceptual framework

To sum up the literature review, Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) acknowledges that the verbal system is more likely to create rational associations (languages, text), whilst the nonverbal system is more likely to process emotional associations (sounds, memories, experiences) (Paivio, 1991). Furthermore, in order to connect rational and emotional associations in the context of COO, the literature has established that emotional CSAs is based on consumers’ negative or positive feelings about a specific country (memories, experiences). On the other hand, rational associations are based on stored knowledge and beliefs on country facts (economy, culture, politics, technology) and people facts (labor, education, competence, creativity). Subsequently, literature (e.g. Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b; Paivio, 1986) acknowledges that the verbal system activates and dominates when a person is exposed to verbal stimulus (e.g. interviews, questionnaires). On the contrary, the nonverbal system of the human mind is activated and dominates when nonverbal stimulus are presented (e.g. painting pictures, creating a collage).

Bearing in mind that the vast majority of the literature is almost exclusively based on verbal collected data, this study rather advance the literature through both a nonverbal and verbal-task study design with the aim to be suggestive as possible for further studies. In order to account for this, some assumptions have been drawn to be tested in a similarly way like the pioneering study of (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b).

In the context of BORA, Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) showed that both rational and emotional CSAs had a positive impact on consumers’ ability to correctly classify brands’ origin. This was contradicting findings since prior research (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos 2008; Martin and Cervino, 2011) showed that country image has no impact on consumers’ ability to correctly classify brands’ origin. One possible explanation to this might be the inability to detect consumers’ affective responses in cognitive research methods, since Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) showed how respondents were more prone to reveal rational CSAs through verbal-based tasks as carried out in interviews, whilst respondents were more prone to reveal emotional CSAs through nonverbal-based tasks when using collage technique. Given this, we argue, first, that people tend to
communicate CSAs more rationally in verbal based-tasks, whilst communicating more emotional CSAs in nonverbal-based tasks, but also that rational and emotional CSAs has a positive impact on the BORA score. Thus:

Assumption 1: Consumers tend to communicate more rationally in verbal-based tasks, while they tend to communicate more emotionally in nonverbal-based tasks.

Assumption 2: Consumers who knows the brand origin tend to make more emotional and rational CSAs in a research design of more ecological nature.

Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) also showed in their result that only emotional CSAs seem to be predictive of consumers’ brand ownership. Therefore, we argue that people with higher usage rate, also tend to communicate more emotional CSAs. Thus:

Assumption 3. Consumers with brand ownership tend to make more emotional CSAs than rational in a research design of more ecological nature.

Literature (e.g. Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982; Strahilevitz and Myers, 1998) acknowledges that consumers buying utilitarian products have functional related goals, whilst consumers buying hedonic products have pleasure related intentions. Consequently, consumers purchasing utilitarian products are more likely to be engaged into deeper cognitive elaboration and subsequently ignore irrelevant information such as extrinsic cues like COO (Babin et. al., 1994; Homburg et al. 2006). On the other hand, hedonic products are driven by the satisfaction from consumers’ evaluation and holistic image provided by the product, in which consumers will tend to process information more holistically and affective. Consequently, it will increase the possibility of including COO cues in their evaluation (Chernev, 2004; Giirhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 2000). Therefore, we argue that hedonic brands evoke more emotional CSAs since it is related to strong feelings. On the contrary, we argue that utilitarian products evoke more rational CSAs since it is related to functional and practical goals. Thus:

Assumption 4: Consumers processing hedonic (utilitarian) products are more likely to communicate emotional (rational) CSAs.
Considering these four stated assumptions from the literature, the Model 1. was created in the attempt to connect the assumptions and their effect on detecting CSAs from the consumers. The model suggests whether a consumer is linking a brand to a country or not, is based on the associations a consumer has towards the brand. Furthermore, these are associations the consumers have about a brand and consequently if there are associations to a specific country depends on multiple factors. In this study, the affecting factors that will be investigated are: BORA, brand ownership and utilitarian vs hedonic brand. In more concrete terms, the models displays if consumers know the country of the origin, if (s)he has brand ownership and whether it is a utilitarian or hedonic product, which later determine to what degree they will associate the brand with CSAs and further account for how the distribution of rational and emotional CSAs will outlines.

**Model 1. Conceptual Framework**
4. Research methodology

4.1 Main study

Since the main aim of this study is to break from the traditional COO research stream and its accompanying research methods, the research methodology followed in this study is exploratory in its nature. Bearing in mind that prior research in its field has received criticism toward its bias and contrived circumstances that cognitive research methods result in (e.g. Samiee, 2010; Usunier, 2011), this study also includes an affective and emotional perspective in order to reveal the real effect of brands’ origin on consumers’ brand associations. In order to achieve this, the study was designed in a three-step data collection, following the same implementation as conducted in Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b). Therefore, both collage technique and semi-structured interviews were applied, which first accounted for undirected interviews, subsequently followed by a directed interview. These stages in turn built on each other, meaning that respondents were in the two initial stages not exposed to any COO cues at all as a mean to avoid bias (Samiee, 2010) and account for reliability and validity. Therefore, all the respondents consequently participated in all three stages and jointly was to declare in the data collection if they communicated any COO cues, here known as country-specific associations (CSA). As a later step, it was also crucial to categorize these CSAs as either rational or emotional. An overview of the three stages can be seen in figure 1.

Figure 1. Main Study Design Chart

The three stages of the data collection.

Stage 1.
Consist of two parts.
1. Creating of collage.
2. Explaining of all elements in the collage.

Stage 2.
Undirected interview
Open-endend questions.
Without any COO cues.

Stage 3.
Directed interview
Open-ended questions regarding COO.
In stage 1, collage technique was chosen since it is acknowledged as an research method that allows the respondents to reveal information they normally do not admit or express in many situations (Boddy, 2005). This becomes apparent when collage technique is established as a mean for researchers to break from the traditional research methods that emphasizes the verbal and written thoughts, which then gain deeper and often unexplored meanings by the respondent’s creation of pictures (Butler-Kisber and Poldma, 2010). Accordingly, scholars like Zaltman (1995) notes the useful insights that nonverbal communication such as collage technique provides in gaining deep knowledge about consumers thoughts, feelings, associations and behaviors. Moreover, it is only by then possible to detect new understanding that otherwise should remain tacit (Butler-Kisber, 2008). After the collage was made, the respondents were told to explain the meaning with it. This is particularly valuable in this context, given that literature (Koll et al., 2010) acknowledges it as a viable approach to conduct after creating the collages to generate more in-depth information and give respondents the opportunity to explain the collage more in detail.

In addition to get as rich and deep data as possible, semi-structured interviews were carried out in stage 2. In this sense, the interviewer ask predetermined questions but at the same time also allows for flexibility (Rubin and Rubin, 2005). In the light of our study, the respondents were in a first and undirected interview exposed to different questions without mentioning COO, in order to see if they reveal any COO influence. Subsequently, the respondents were in a later step participating in a directed interview that only contained questions about COO.

**Sample and stimuli**

The chosen sample (N=12) for the three data collection methods was made by a convenience sample based on Swedish university students, with an age range between 20-27 and with an even distribution between the genders. In order to conduct this study as flawless as possible and avoid bias, it was of major importance that the participants had no prior information of the study’s aim or topic. As such, this was in turn checked before any respondent participated. When choosing the stimuli brands to be implemented, it was critical to avoid any bias since several scholars in the literature claims that COO researchers often suffer from contrived circumstances whether which brands to implement in each study (Samiee, 2011; Usunier, 2011). In order to increase and insure the credibility of the study’s implementation of brands, a pretest was conducted where respondents had to determine which six brands to include.

**Pretest**
In the selection of stimuli brands, it is acknowledged that Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) accounted for products in general as fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG). In contrast, this study rather took another approach when examining hedonic vs. utilitarian products more in detail. Although these both product categories is a widely researched area in the COO field (e.g. Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2011; Melnyk et al., 2012), it might still be of relevance given that the vast majority of the COO field rely on quantitative survey-based research. As such, understanding the relationship between them both product categories is still of interest to adopt in qualitative studies, in particular those involving something novel as collage technique as applied in this study. Bearing in mind that this study has different product categories than those applied in Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b), the brand stimuli selection also differs. In this study, we conducted a pretest with qualitative interviews where the respondents (N=25) applied the top-of-mind awareness theory when choosing hedonic and utilitarian brands.

However, although consumers characterize some products as primarily hedonic and others as primarily utilitarian, it is worth noting that the distinction between hedonic and utilitarian products remains fuzzy. Rather, literature (Dhar and Wertenbroch, 2000) notes that it is common practice that some products can act for both product categories at the same time depending on special conditions and functions how they are being used. Therefore, as an initial step it was critical to make the distinction as clear as possible between the both product categories before implementing them in the study. Considering this, we first relied on a definition of both hedonic and utilitarian products from the literature. Utilitarian products are defined as: “products associated with functional, practical, and tangible attributes that are consumed and evaluated primarily on the basis of functional, instrumental, and practical benefits.” (Melnyk et al. 2012, p. 23) Conversely, hedonic products are defined as: “products that are associated with sensory, experiential, and enjoyment-related attributes and are consumed and evaluated primarily on the basis of benefits related to enjoyment, taste, aesthetics, and symbolic meaning” (Melnyk et al., 2012, p. 23).

After making it clear what separates hedonic and utilitarian products apart, it was necessary to make the distinction as comprehensible as possible for the respondents in the pretest. Therefore, instead of asking respondents to name a utilitarian brand as an initial step, they were told to: “name one brand each from the three given product categories (car, pasta, shampoo) they associated and consumed with its functional and practical function”. On the contrary, respondents were for the hedonic brands told to: “name one brand each from the three given product categories (fashion, beer,
chocolate) they relate to sensory and enjoyment related attributes, of which they also consume accordingly”. The choice of the specific utilitarian and hedonic product categories derives from the literature (Chan and Mukhopadhyay, 2010; Chitturi, et al., 2007; Dhar and Wertenbroch, 2000), which has established that the above mentioned product categories mirrors its product characteristics in regard of utilitarian or hedonic aspects.

This resulted in that all respondents (N=25) specifically named three utilitarian brands (one for each product category) and thus three hedonic brands (one for each product category). The pretest then provided a broad spectrum of brands within the different product categories (see Appendix 1). By conducting this pretest, the study ensured that only well-known brands were included that people actually have associations, desire, remember or do own, which by then should make the collage creation task simplified as the brands included are of relevance (Koll et al., 2010). Furthermore, Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) also notes that it is of major importance to not include brands that mention or hint any about their COO in the brand name since this could make the whole study bias. Therefore, the suggested brands from the pretest that included obvious COO cues were excluded, similarly as in the study of Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b). Given this, following brands were excluded: Prada (fashion), Carlsberg (beer) and Brooklyn (beer), since their origin often appears in their brand logo, or with the latter also refers to a city area in New York.

Additionally, Swedish brands were also excluded since previous studies (Magnusson et al., 2011a; Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b) has showed that the involvement of domestic brands in the researched country clearly differs towards foreign brands in regard of higher BORA scores and COO influence, which might be considered as bias. Considering this, additionally three Swedish brands were excluded: Marabou (chocolate), Cloetta (chocolate) and Volvo (cars). After excluding aforementioned brands, the implemented utilitarian brands were: Volkswagen (cars), Barilla (pasta) and Head and Shoulders (shampoo). On the contrary, the three hedonic brands implemented were: Hugo Boss (fashion), Corona (beer) and Toblerone (chocolate). Furthermore, in order to increase the credibility, the respondents that were participating in the pretest were also applied in the college technique and semi-structured interviews to ensure that they would be as like-minded as possible. In addition, the respondents were also from an even gender distribution to avoid a gender bias.

**Study design**
Stage one: Collage technique

During the first stage, the respondents were exposed to the collage technique. This stage was divided into two parts, whereof the first part was the creation of a collage and the second part the explanation of the collage by the respondent. In order to let the respondents provide as much associations as possible, they were provided with an A3-sized paper and identical handicraft materials (color crayons, highlighter pen, scissors, glue). By also providing the respondents with a large amount of magazines and newspapers from different categories (e.g., business, sport, food, lifestyle, fashion, travel), we secured a wide range of images and text elements for input and creativity in their collages. In addition, participants were also allowed to write, draw and use both pictures and cut-out text for the magazines. This whole procedure is along the same lines as carried out in Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b), but also from a study using collage technique in a different context than COO (Koll et al., 2010). Subsequently, the first stage started by instructing all the participants in the same manner and randomly assigns either a hedonic or utilitarian brand to them, with not being revealed to any COO cues. However, it is worth noting that the collage creation was made individually to show their own personal associations toward the brand, whereof the participants were under silence and not provided with input or collaboration with other participants (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b). Respondents were further not subjects to any time pressure, instead they were given all the time they needed until they felt satisfied with what they been creating. All the collages were then photographed and are presented in Appendix 2.

After completing their collage, the participants were then in part two separately asked to briefly explain their collage in another room to not disrupt or affect the participants that still were working on their collages. During this stage, we further insured the credibility and enabled the respondents to explain the meanings and associations of each element in the collage in their own words (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b). By following this approach, it is established that respondents gives the opportunity to explain the collage more in detail for every association and at the same time also reduce interpretation bias by the interviewer when understanding the collage in detail properly (Koll et al., 2010).

By letting the respondents explain the meaning with their associations, we were able to categorize all the elements appeared in the collages as either a CSA or not. This is the most critical part of this study since literature (Soley, 2010) notes that the most frequently methodological criticism of
projective techniques is that studies often lacks in both reliability and validity. Considering this, the research methodology as used in Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) becomes particularly suitable to adopt. Therefore, the categorization was following already established content analysis guidelines (Krippendorff, 2004), which allowed to systematically analyze the symbolic meanings and verbal expressions communicated in the collage elements. Similarly to Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b), we refer CSAs as either verbally (languages and text) or nonverbally (images) associations respondents communicate when they refer to a country based on the associations provided by the brand. See Model 2.

Given this, literature (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b) notes that CSAs are either communicated rationally (e.g. country name, flag, map) or emotionally (e.g. with references that connects a brand to a specific country). To provide further dichotomous between this critical classification, rational CSAs can be observed as directly communicated content pointing to obvious COO processing by the consumer. On the contrary, emotional CSAs serves as indirectly communicated content that needs to be explained in order to understand its meaning (e.g. Statue of Liberty that refers to the US) (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b). Bearing this critical categorization in mind, the content analysis was following a strict coding schedule (Model 2). First, the elements are divided into either rational or emotional associations based on its content, whereof in a subsequent step divided as either verbal or nonverbal associations (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b).

**Stage two: Undirected interview**

In the second stage, same respondents as participated in the collage stage took part in the semi-structured interviews. They were in stage exposed to several open-ended questions, but still without disclosing any COO cues in order to ascertain whether the respondents communicate any CSAs or not (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b). In order to account for the study’s reliability and validity, same interview questionnaire as used in Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) was applied. As such, the respondents were asked to: (1) describe the brand, (2) name all associations with regard to the brand that came to mind, (3) differentiate the brand from the main competitors, (4) tell personal stories in connection with the brand, and (5) mention all relevant factors they believed would affect their brand image perceptions and purchase decisions in that focal product category (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b). However, in contrast to Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) that let the respondents choose an optional brand to evaluate in the semi-structured interview, we let the respondents evaluate the same brand as conveyed in the collage. This in order to account for BORA
and seek more consistent findings. Notwithstanding some adjustments to Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b), the bottom line of these questions in stage two were to reveal if any CSAs could be observed that otherwise remains undetected by rational thinking in the respondent’s mind. By doing this, it should become apparent whether respondents are taking the brands’ COO into account and what value it adds for their brand attitude (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b).

Modell 2. Coding schedule

Encoding of collage and undirected interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements in collage/ Statement in interview</th>
<th>Rational</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Nonverbal</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CSA</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>No CSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational CSA that needs to be explained.</td>
<td>Rational CSA no need of explanation.</td>
<td>Emotional CSA that needs to be explained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage three: Directed interview

In the third stage of the data collection, the respondents were now for the first time explicitly introduced to COO cues by the interviewer in a directed interview. The respondents were at this
stage asked to directly take COO cues in evaluation when answering the last questions. Applying the open-ended questions as anchored in Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b), it was now of interest to reveal if the respondents cared about the actual COO. Therefore, same respondents as participated in stage one and two were asked the following questions: (1) whether they care about the COO of the brand, (2) whether the COO affects their brand image perceptions, (3) whether COO is a relevant factor when choosing among brands in the product category concerned, and (4) the relative importance of COO versus other considerations (e.g., price, brand name). In a subsequent stage, (6) participants were also asked whether they had knowledge about the particular brand’s origin, but also (7) their ownership of the brand (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b). Therefore, in line with Kirmani et al. (1999), all consumers are in this study divided into either owners or non owners based upon if they are consuming and using the brand on regular basis or not, which former accounts for people that are more likely to have greater familiarity and knowledge of a specific brand. In spite of that, by applying this research methodology, the study did not disclose its objectives and can thus not be subject to bias (Samiee, 2010, 2011; Usunier, 2011).

To sum up, in all three stages of data collection the aim was to detect if the consumer communicate any CSAs when creating the collage or talking about the specific brand in the semi-structured interview. If this holds, it was also critically to see in what stage they mentioned CSAs and whether it was rationally or emotionally held thoughts. Lastly, all the semi-structured interviews were recorded to not bypass important data, which enabled the interviewer to listen to the interviews repeatedly. The creating of the collage lasted between 15-50 minutes per respondent and the interviews in stage two and three together lasted for about 8-15 minutes.

4.2 Follow up study

Given the findings provided by the three-step data collection, a follow up study was conducted through semi-structured interviews where another qualitative research design was used in form of ad copy technique. By applying this technique in a semi-structured interview, we ensured a rich and reliable data collection since the interviewer ask predetermined questions but at the same time also allows for flexibility (Rubin and Rubin, 2005). In this stage, respondents (N=12) were exposed to six different advertisement banners and was following the same procedure as implemented with the semi-structured interviews in the three data collection method, meaning that first we had an undirected interview and after that a directed interview. As a result, we ensured to avoid bias since
the respondents were as previously in an initial step not exposed of any COO cues (Samiee, 2010). Additionally, it was possible to see whether people differ in their rational and emotional processing when being influenced of COO cues in advertising context.

Ad copy technique, or copy testing, is established as a research method for advertisers and researchers to first test their advertising campaign before launching it and evaluate its successful rate (Keon, 1983). In order to account for a well-implemented ad copy testing, Singh and Cole (1988) acknowledge two things that researchers need to consider: 1) advertising objectives, and 2) characteristics of the method(s). These should both be dependent on each other in order to account for what is measured and accomplish what the objective is with the ad copy test. As such, when choosing a suitable copy testing method it is critical to not solely rely on the communication goals the advertising should accomplish, but also critically chose a research method that actually measure what the objective is with the research design (Singh and Cole, 1988).

Bearing in mind that advertising objectives and research methods should be well connected, literature (Arnold and Bird, 1982) notes that the research method chosen should depend on reliability and validity. In the context of ad copy technique, this normally refers to the ability for an ad copy test to generate similar results when repeated under similar conditions (Arnold and Bird, 1982). Elaborating on research methods and account for validity and reliability at the same time, there exist two prominent research methods of learning based when using ad copy technique: recall and recognition (Ostlund, 1978). Drawing from literature (Brown, 1976), it as acknowledged that the both methods are confusing since they both refer to memory processes, in which Singh and Cole (1988) notes that that the relation between them becomes unclear when they are mental processes involved in each. In an attempt to distinguish these in the advertising context, Du Plessis (1994) notes that recognition refers to the exposure of commercial for the respondent, whilst recall is a verbal prompt.

However, since there is no clear adherence established yet between the difference, a recent stream suggest that the distinction between them is not of relevance, meaning that what actually matters is what people think about the brand after being exposed to the advertisement (Du Plessis, 1994). In addition, there exist no evidence that different research methods access different memories stored in the brain, whereof Du Plessis (1994) acknowledges that what is of importance is rather that different methodologies yield different outcomes depending on the richness of cueing material the
respondent are provided with. In the light of our study, we approach the ad copy technique as conveyed by most researchers and advertisers, namely, visually (Du Plessis, 1994). Therefore, if we take a stand we emphasize the recognition method, although we do not neglect the recall completely given that both methods retrieve mental processes almost simultaneously. Furthermore, in order to account for a well-implemented ad copy technique, we follow the guidelines by Singh and Cole (1988) and begin with establishing advertising objectives. Since the aim is to examine if the results showed in the main study has some relevance and can be applied in the advertising context, our advertising objective is to see whether people actually act as suggested in the three step data collection, namely, if people that make more rational and emotional CSAs also tend to be more likely to correctly classify brands’ origin (BORA). Therefore, the ad copy technique was similarly conducted in the same manner as previous. In this sense, we account for bias and do not reveal any COO cues in an undirected interview before directly asking respondents whether they are susceptible to COO influence (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b).

**Sample and stimuli**

In the creation of ad copy technique, the same 12 brands as used in the three step data collection was chosen as stimulus in order to provide consistent results and see similarities or differences. However, in order for this study to be as suggestive as possible for further research directions, the sample included 12 different respondents than those applied in the previous study. Furthermore, since the findings in the three step data collection showed that people seems to think different in relation to emotionally and rationally when processing COO cues, the design of ad copy testing was aimed to reflect this.

Therefore, when applying copy testing for every brand both a typical rational and a typical emotional advertisement banner was designed that emphasized their respective appeal. In order to account for this, literature (Moore et al., 1995) has established that rational appeals typically refers to detailed information that highlights the functional parts, whilst emotional appeals normally seeks to evoke consumers’ emotional response. Therefore, when designing a rational advertisement banner we emphasized the product’s superior quality and reliability, while designing a emotional advertisement we emphasized the product’s ability to evoke peoples’ positive feelings such as adventure, romance and status (Cutler and Javalgi, 1993). In the light of our study, when designing a rational advertisement for e.g. Toblerone, the superior quality and its fine ingredients were highlighted. On the contrary, when designing a emotional advertisement for Toblerone, the goal was
to let the respondents think more emotionally and highlighting an idyllic setting that fits with the brand. Although the advertisements were self-made, it is worth noting that we sought inspiration from real advertisements made by the brands themselves, in order to design an advertisement adapted to reality and account for reliability and validity issues. Notably, however, is that we excluded obvious COO cues for some brands (e.g. "das Auto" of Volkswagen and the text "Mexico" on the label of the Corona bottle). This would otherwise be regarded as biased and affect the outcome of the study.

Furthermore, given that this study involves both hedonic and utilitarian products, it was necessary to see how respondents respond to congruent and incongruent advertising. According to literature (Ruiz and Sicilia, 2004), a congruent advertisement is when an advertisement is thematically associated with the consumers’ idea of a brand, thus making an incongruent advertisement to not be thematically associated (e.g. a hedonic brand such as Corona that rather emphasize practical and functional needs than emotional appeals as joy and positive feelings). Ruiz and Sicilia (2004) further shows that when respondents were exposed to congruent advertising with their own processing styles, higher advertising effectiveness was obtained. Considering this, Moorman et al. (2002) argues that marketers should select elements in their advertisements that are thematically congruent with the brand. Considering this study, it means that hedonic products should refer to emotional associations (pictures, either alone or with information) and rational associations (text, information) for utilitarian products (Ruiz and Sicilia, 2004; Moorman et. al 2002). Moreover, the technique of congruent and incongruent advertising has successfully been tested in prior research in the COO field (e.g. Melnyk et al., 2012), showing support that using text in advertisements might alter the respondents’ cognitive elaboration as it discourages consumers to draw hedonic brand associations. Therefore, when providing both a rational and emotional advertisement for all brands, we wanted to see in which condition people are more likely to be influenced of COO, and also correctly classify the brand’s origin (BORA).
Study design

In order to see whether people differ in their rational and emotional processing when being influenced of COO cues, the respondents were as previously mentioned exposed to six different advertisement banners in a semi-structured interview. As a first step, the respondents participated in an undirected interview, subsequently followed by directed interview, thus avoiding bias and direct questioning (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b). Consequently, this would as in the previous three data collection method detect if they communicated any COO cues when mention CSAs, which categorization just as previously followed already established content analysis guidelines (Krippendorff, 2004), as carried out in Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) when acknowledging CSAs as either communicated rationally (e.g. country name, flag, map) or emotionally (e.g. with references that connects a brand to a specific country). This is, as already acknowledged, a very critical stage in order to correctly categorize information cues as CSAs or not.

Stage one: Undirected interview

Since every brand both had a rational and emotional advertisement, the respondent was only subject to one of them. In more concrete terms, six respondents were exposed to the rational advertisement of a certain brand (e.g. Barilla), whereas six other respondents were exposed to the emotional advertisement of the brand. This was made in order to account for reliability and validity since it would have been meaningless for the same respondent to be exposed to the same brand with two different advertisements (both rational and emotional), which probably would have been bias and put the whole outcome at stake in regard of reliability and validity. Bearing in mind that one respondent was only exposed to one advertisement of the brand (rational or emotional), it was critical that respondents were shown an equivalent stimuli. More specifically, given that one respondent were exposed to six advertisements, three of these were rational and the remaining three emotional. This would strengthen the study’s reliability and validity since it provides a more reliable result since one respondent might be more prone to reveal emotional CSAs or vice versa (Aylesworth and MacKenzie, 1998; Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b). Therefore, in order to make it more clear we divided 12 people into two groups (six respondents in each) and they were exposed to different advertisements of the same brand alternately given that we designed two different advertisements of each brand (both rational and emotional). For detailed information, see Appendix 5 and Appendix 6.
In the interview itself, the interviewer started to expose the advertisement banners one by one and each respondent was told to describe the associations toward the advertisement banners. And as previously in the main study, we accounted for the study’s reliability and thus followed the same interview guideline as in the undirected interview (see also Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b). Therefore, all the respondents were told to: (1) describe the brand, (2) name all associations with regard to the brand that came to mind, (3) differentiate the brand from the main competitors, (4) tell personal stories in connection with the brand, and (5) mention all relevant factors they believed would affect their brand image perceptions and purchase decisions in that focal product category (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b). In summary, the procedure aimed in a similar as in the main study to see if respondents made any CSAs and thus be susceptible to COO influence.

**Stage two: Directed interview**

In this stage, respondents were once again exposed to the same advertising banner as seen before and this time directly asked whether they care about the specific brand’s origin. However, since the ad copy technique applied in this study is acknowledged as a mean to further examine the findings in the main study in more detail, the interview guidelines for the directed interview as provided in Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013) (and applied in the main study), are not strictly followed. Rather, the directed interview accounted for: (1) whether they care about the COO of the brand (2) whether they had knowledge about the particular brand’s origin, but also (3) their ownership of the brand. This becomes apparent when all these three notions is what the ad copy technique aims to examine in further details. To sum up, in both two stages the data collection aimed to detect if people communicated any CSAs when being exposed to advertising, whether it was an emotional or rational held thought and if it is connected to BORA and brand ownership, or not communicating any CSAs at all.
5. Findings Main Study

Given that the research method as follow in this study aims to investigate whether the respondents make CSAs or not, it was shown in all three data collections (collage, undirected interviews and directed interviews) that COO was mentioned among 9 of 12 respondents (75% of the time). Contributing to existing theory, COO may have a significant impact as acknowledged in prior research. However, since this study aims to break from traditional research and its accompanying directed research design that rely on self-reported answers in questionnaire-based surveys, the research method as outlined in this study rather approach COO effects from both a cognitive and an affective aspect. Considering this, it could be identified that in the nonverbal stage (collage), the estimate of the number of respondents that revealed CSAs were rather 7 than 9 (58%) as mentioned before.

Furthermore, in the undirected interview the number of respondents decreased further when only 6 out of 12 (50%) made CSAs. Finally, as a last step, the directed interview showed that the number of respondents that been subjects of COO effects were increased again when 8 respondents (67%) revealed CSAs. More specifically, the data collection method showed that two respondents that claimed to not been subjects of COO effects neither the collage nor the undirected interview, made its impact only visible in the directed interview. When being asked directly about brands’ origin and its impact, both respondents claimed that COO has an impact on the brands concerned (Hugo Boss and Head & Shoulders). These findings are noteworthy and corroborate the argument that most prior research has bias towards cognitive processing since questionnaire-based surveys only capture rational and verbally aspects by the consumers’ response (Koll et al., 2010; Zambardino and Goodfellow, 2007).

To further show its robustness in argumentation, it was shown that no respondent revealed any emotional CSAs during the directed interview, meaning that those effects are absent when being asked directly and whose questionnaire-based survey may fall short to capture respondents actual proportions in power. Applying this to the COO field, this support the argument that its effects have been inflated and grossly exaggerated as noted by the COO skeptics (e.g. Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2008; Samiee 2010, 2011; Samiee et al., 2005; Usunier 2006, 2011).
Table 1. CSAs by brand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Brand Origin</th>
<th>Rational</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hedonic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo Boss</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corona</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toblerone</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilitarian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkswagen</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barilla</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head &amp; Shoulders</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Brands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hedonic and Utilitarian products**

Since the study aims to be as suggestive as possible for further research, it was necessary to investigate products in more detail to see differences between product categories. More specifically, it was tested whether hedonic and utilitarian products contribute to different outcomes in relation to thinking emotionally or rationally in the COO context. At first glance, when speaking about its effects in relation to number of respondents, it was not an impact of magnitude between these two product categories. In the collage stage, it was shown in both the hedonic and utilitarian section that two respondents simultaneously made emotional and rational CSAs. The only part where they differed was in relation to make emotional or rational associations exclusively. In the utilitarian section, two respondents made only rational CSAs, whilst in the hedonic section one respondent made only emotional CSAs. Although both product categories generated similar results in the following verbal stage (undirected and directed interview), it was possible to discern that people that was assigned a utilitarian brand were more likely to think rationally than emotionally.
In order to make this finding more apparent, a content analysis was made that categorized respondents CSAs as either emotional or rational. By following strict guidelines, the aim was to establish how many CSAs respondents actually did during all three data collection methods. In the hedonic product category, a total of 35 CSAs were found, in which 11 were rational (31%) and 24 emotional (69%). In the utilitarian product category, 32 CSAs were found after which 22 were rational (69%) and 10 emotional (31%). Consequently, a reverse effect applies for them both product categories where it might be suggested that consumers evaluate hedonic products more in favor of emotional appealing when making CSAs. Conversely, consumers evaluate utilitarian products more rationally when making associations to brands’ origin. Furthermore, it was also shown in the collage stage that a total of 44 CSAs were made for both hedonic and utilitarian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Collage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSAs</strong></td>
<td><strong>CSAs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undirected Interview</th>
<th>Undirected Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSAs</strong></td>
<td><strong>CSAs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directed Interview</th>
<th>Directed Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSAs</strong></td>
<td><strong>CSAs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total CSAs</th>
<th>Total CSAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rational</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rational</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional</strong></td>
<td><strong>Emotional</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three stages of data collection were country specific associations were revealed, divided by hedonic and utilitarian.
brands, which 29 of these were emotional (66%). As such, people tend to communicate more emotionally in nonverbal-based tasks.

Table 3. Hedonic and Utilitarian Totally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Collage</th>
<th>Undirected Interview</th>
<th>Total CSAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSAs</td>
<td>CSAs</td>
<td>CSAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three stages of data collection were country specific associations were revealed, divided by hedonic and utilitarian.

Brand Origin Recognition Accuracy (BORA)

In prior research (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2011), it is noted that misclassification and non-classification of a COO mostly will have undesirable consequences when consumer are making assumptions to a country with weaker country image then the actual COO. Bearing this in mind, it was of managerial importance to investigate how and when consumers make the correct classification of brands’ origin. Drawing from the distinction between rational and emotional CSAs, all three data collection methods showed that respondents are not only more prone to make more CSAs in general, they are also predictive to be more emotional for hedonic brands when they can correctly classify the brand’s origin. In particular, the hedonic brands showed a high tendency to make emotional CSAs, given that a total of CSAs were 12, of which 10 (83%) of these were emotional. On the contrary, the utilitarian brands provided a total of 30 CSAs, of which 20 (67%) were rational and 10 (33%) emotional. On the flip side, respondents that were not able to correctly classify utilitarian brands’ origin showed a tendency to make more rational CSAs. In this group, hedonic brands still generated most emotional CSAs, although to a lesser extent (61%). For the
utilitarian products, not a single emotional CSA were made during all three data collection methods, which meant that only rational associations were made (100%) see Table 4.

**Table 4. Brand Origin Accuracy (BORA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th>Rational</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSAs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
<th>CSAs</th>
<th>Rational</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSAs</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedonic and Utilitarian</th>
<th>CSAs</th>
<th>Rational</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSAs</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Country specific associations made by respondents that correctly classify brand origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th>Rational</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSAs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
<th>CSAs</th>
<th>Rational</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSAs</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedonic and Utilitarian</th>
<th>CSAs</th>
<th>Rational</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSAs</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Country-specific associations of respondents who do not properly classified the brand origin.

However, although BORA refers to the ability to correctly classify brands’ origin (Samiee et al, 2005), it is worth noting that this research field should benefit to approach it from another perspective as well. We could, namely, in all three data collection methods discern two respondents that showed strongly rational and emotional CSAs, although it was to another country than the
correct one. This is along the same lines as found in the study by Magnusson et al. (2011a) study, where it is suggested that consumers’ perceived COO of a brand, regardless of accuracy, matters.

Regarding our study, one respondent claimed Hugo Boss to be Italian (instead of German) and thus showed both strong rational and emotional CSAs. Similarly, another respondent made CSAs to summer vacations when thinking about Corona originating from Spain (instead of Mexico). As such, elaborate on the findings by Magnusson et al. (2011) could make the outcome of respondents’ accuracy look in another light. In this case, we therefore decide to involve the respondents in the BORA group. By doing this, the rational and emotional held thoughts by the consumers makes the hedonic product category almost look the same as before, but also the hedonic and utilitarian product categories combined. However, by excluding the respondent from the group that cannot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th></th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSAs</td>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedonic and Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th></th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSAs</td>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedonic and Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Country specific associations made by respondents in the view of Magnusson et.al.

Table 5. BORA View of Magnusson et. al.
correctly classify brands’ origin or even made any advances to mention it in the collages or undirected interviews, the data becomes even more apparent. Now it is possible to discern that of five brands, not a single respondent made any rational, or emotional, CSA during the collage or undirected interview. The only stage any COO cues are mentioned is in the directed interviews, which by nature are of rational processing. For more detailed information, see Table 5.

**Brand ownership**

In this study, it was also of interest to see whether brand ownership has any significant impact on consumers rational or emotional CSAs they make. As laid out in a previous study by Herz & Diamantopoulos (2013b), emotional CSAs seemed to have a significant impact on brand ownership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSAs</strong></td>
<td><strong>CSAs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 %</td>
<td>52 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 %</td>
<td>48 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedonic and Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSAs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Country specific associations made by respondents with brand ownership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSAs</strong></td>
<td><strong>CSAs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedonic and Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSAs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Country-specific associations of respondents who do not had any brand ownership.
This is reinforced by the findings in this study, showing that for four brands that respondents had no brand ownership, no emotional CSAs were made. Rather, only a total of 12 rational CSAs were made, which 11 of these were for utilitarian products. And taking this one step further, it could be identified that for hedonic products where the respondents had brand ownership, a total of 34 CSAs were made. Out of these, 24 (71%) were emotional and 10 (29%) rational. On the contrary, utilitarian products with brand ownership resulted in a fairly even result (52% for rational and 48% for emotional). Further, by combining both the product categories of brand ownership gives a result where emotional CSAs have an advantage of 62% compared to 38% as with rational CSAs. See table 6.

Evidence on Research Assumptions

Assumption 1: Consumers tend to communicate more rationally in verbal-based tasks, while they tend to communicate more emotionally in nonverbal-based tasks. Drawing from the findings, we could discern that for all brands, 66% of the communicated CSAs in the nonverbal-based task were emotional. On the other hand, when communicating in the verbal-based tasks in the semi-structured interview, rational CSAs had an advantage of (58%) compared to emotional CSAs (42%). Furthermore, when being directly asked in the directed interview, the respondents exclusively made rational CSAs (100%). Therefore, this corroborate the argument that people tend to communicate more rationally in verbal-based tasks, while they make more emotional CSAs in the nonverbal-based tasks.

Assumption 2: Consumers who knows the brand origin tend to make more emotional and rational CSAs in a research design of more ecological nature. As shown in the findings, a total of 42 CSAs (59%) were made for those respondents who correctly classified their brand’s origin, compared to 29 CSAs made for those respondents who were not able to correctly classify the brand’s origin (41%). However, it was also shown that two respondents showed strong COO influence when communicating CSAs to another country than the correct origin. If we include these in the group that correctly classify the brand’s origin, the CSAs made are rather 64 (96%), compared to 3 CSAs (4%) made for those who could not correctly classify brand’s origin. Therefore, the assumption might show strong evidence.

Assumption 3. Consumers with brand ownership tend to make more emotional CSAs than rational in a research design of more ecological nature. Consistent with our assumption on brand
ownership, it was demonstrated that respondents with no brand ownership did not communicate any emotional CSAs, which in turn generated a total amount of 34 emotional CSAs by the respondents with brand ownership. Further consistent with our assumption, the respondents with brand ownership associated more emotionally (62%) than rationally (38%), which can be seen in Table 6.

Assumption 4: Consumers processing hedonic (utilitarian) products are more likely to communicate emotional (rational) CSAs. Drawing from the Table 2, it is clear how respondents made CSAs and in which stage it was emotional or rational. In line with the assumption, it is acknowledged in the total score for hedonic associations that respondents are more prone to show emotional (69%) CSAs, whilst respondents processing utilitarian products showed the same result (69%) for rational CSAs. This might suggest our assumption holds, which calls for further research.

5.1 Discussion Main Study

Following in the footsteps of Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b), we contribute to literature in many ways. By shifting focus from the traditional research methodology in the COO field, we respond to the criticism toward bias in prior research and embracing a research design of more creative and ecological nature that do not “force” respondents to make associations with an already predetermined COO. In order to account for this, our research design adopts Dual Coding Theory (DCT) as a mean to act for both rational and affective dimensions, rather than only account for COO as a cognitive extrinsic cue as conveyed in the traditional research stream. Similarly to Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b), we discern that people are more likely to reveal rational CSAs when being asked verbally about brands, such as quality concerns. On the contrary, people are more likely to reveal emotional CSAs toward brands when communicating nonverbally, such as affective and personal experiences toward the country.

Drawing from the findings by Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b), it is acknowledged that COO effects are not necessarily overestimated, but rather misestimated. Adding to existing literature, we show similarly how some people are more prone to reveal CSAs when being asked in a directed manner, whilst some people are only prone to reveal CSAs in the collage stage. Therefore, measuring COO effects by using a directed questionnaire-based survey may fall short to capture respondents actual proportions in power when emotional CSA remains undetected, which then should support the argument that COO effects have been inflated and grossly exaggerated as noted.
by the COO skeptics (e.g. Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2008; Samiee 2010, 2011; Samiee et al., 2005; Usunier 2006, 2011). Nevertheless, these findings should also corroborate the argument that most prior research in the marketing field in general has bias towards cognitive processing since questionnaire-based surveys almost only capture rational and verbally aspects by the consumers’ response (Koll et al., 2010; Zambardino and Goodfellow, 2007).

Furthermore, we add to recent literature in several ways when examining hedonic vs. utilitarian products. When viewed together, hedonic and utilitarian products result in similar amount of CSAs. However, when considered rational and emotional CSAs separately, there is a clear difference between the two product categories in regard to consumers systematic way of processing information cues. Therefore, this adds to existing literature that consumers have different set of intentions when purchasing either hedonic or utilitarian products (Chernev, 2004; Chitturi, et. al. 2008). In this sense, it becomes evident that people tend to make more emotional CSAs when processing hedonic products. In contrast, people that process utilitarian products tend to make more rational CSAs. Bearing this in mind, prior research that has been scrutinising the distinction of hedonic vs utilitarian products in verbal research designs may not fully capture its accurate scope.

Continuing with the distinction between hedonic and utilitarian brands, existing literature (Babin et al., 1994; Homburg et al. 2006) notes that consumers purchasing utilitarian products are less prone to bear in mind extrinsic cues like COO due to deeper cognitive elaboration. In contrast, consumers purchasing hedonic products are more driven by a holistic image and therefore take COO cues in mind when evaluating products as a shortcut (Chernev, 2004; Giirhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 2000). Regarding our findings, these do not at first glance confirm these findings. Rather, our result shows similar outcome when comparing hedonic vs. utilitarian products, both when one takes into consideration the number of people and the actual amount of CSAs made. This could either suggest that the present findings might be at odds with prior research or the brand stimuli selection in this study of hedonic and utilitarian brands do not mirror what is actually intended. In that case, the latter adds to existing literature (Dhar and Wertenbroch, 2000) that the distinction between the categories is indeed fuzzy and that some hedonic products can be utilitarian or vice versa, depending on special conditions and functions how they are being used. In spite of that, as noted above, the product categories only differ in terms of consumers systematic way of processing information cues. Considering this, it shows support that hedonic products evokes an affective processing, whilst utilitarian products evokes rational processing.
Adding to existing literature on BORA, we could discern that rational and emotional CSAs plays a significant role whether people can accurately assign a correct origin to a brand. More specifically, when dividing respondents into two groups, one that either has the knowledge of the brand’s origin or a group that does not, it became clear that people that accurately assign the correct origin to a brand seemingly also makes more CSAs. This corroborates the findings by Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) and are important findings since it is acknowledged to be at odds with prior research (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos 2008; Martin and Cervino, 2011) that showed country image to have no impact on consumers ability to correctly classify brands’ origin. Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) suspects this inconsistency be due to the lack of affective aspects of COO influence as conveyed in the most cognitive research methodologies in the COO field. We support this notion, given that both the present findings in this study and Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) observed that the vast majority of emotional CSAs were captured in the collage stage. Accordingly, this would once again raise the question whether prior research has measured consumers’ COO influence in an accurate way.

Notwithstanding that prior research seems to be cognitively biased when capturing consumers’ COO influence, we make an effort to further take decisive steps in the COO field. Bearing in mind that literature (Usunier; 2011; Westjohn and Magnusson, 2011) calls for studies that shift its focus from correct accuracy rates and rather examine how consumers create brand origin perceptions, we elaborate on the above discussion when linking both rational and emotional CSAs to BORA. As we already mentioned earlier in the findings, we could discern two respondents that showed strong CSAs in both the collage and the undirected interview, although it was to another country than the correct one. Accordingly, this should shed some light on the view of Magnusson et al. (2011a) that strongly claims that consumers’ perceived COO of a brand matters, regardless whether consumers can correctly identify the brand’s origin or not. Therefore, take this into account, we take the present findings a step further since we chose to include these two respondents that make strong CSAs to incorrect origin in the group that can correctly classify brands’ origin. By doing this, it is significant that people that have the ability to correctly classify brands’ origins also seems to make more CSAs in general, whilst people that does not have the knowledge of brands’ origin only make rational CSAs.

Furthermore, in order to contribute to new knowledge we are also linking hedonic and utilitarian products to BORA. To begin, if we start with the actual group that could correctly classify brands’
origin, the respondents making CSAs to hedonic products were almost exclusively emotional, whilst utilitarian products rather showed a slightly higher result for emotional CSAs. However, if we follow the outline by Magnusson et al. (2011a) that consumers’ perceived COO of a brand matters, we also as previously include the two respondents that showed incorrect CSAs. By doing this, the distinction between hedonic and utilitarian products becomes increasingly apparent. More specifically, people showed not a single rational or emotional CSA for utilitarian products neither in the collage stage nor the undirected interview. Only in the directed interview was rational CSAs made. Furthermore, when speaking broadly about the respondents that correctly classified brands origin, or at least showed intentions to be susceptible to COO influence, the result is similar for hedonic and utilitarian brands. Separating them apart, however, shows that people tend to make more emotional CSAs for hedonic brands, whilst rational CSAs dominates for the utilitarian brands.

Our findings also add to the notion that CSAs might be predictive of brand ownership. More specifically, in their findings did Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) show that only emotional CSAs are significantly related to brand ownership, whilst rational CSAs appear to not be. We replicate these findings since we observed that people that actually own the brand seems to be more likely process COO cues emotionally, in particular for hedonic products. On the contrary, people that have no brand ownership rather only revealed rational CSAs. Therefore, once again, given that CSAs just as well be emotional stresses the importance to also include and pay attention to an affective aspect in COO research (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b; Roth and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Verlegh and Steenkamp, 1999).

6. Findings Follow up Study

Following the same outline in the main study, were we observed in stage one and two (undirected interview and directed interview) that all 12 respondents (100%) communicated any CSAs at least one occasion. However, this is misleading data that do not reflect the respondents’ actual COO influence in two aspects. First, compared to the main study where respondents only processed one brand, this follow up study rather accounted for six brands. In other words, where respondents may be susceptible to COO influence, they might not be it the second time, or even a third. Therefore, in order to show a more accurate result, it is determined that out of 12 people that processed six brands, they were given a total of 72 occasions to communicate any CSAs. Bearing this in mind, only during 25 (35%) occasions were CSAs communicated, which becomes apparent when a brand
like Head and Shoulders did not reveal any CSAs at all. Furthermore, when being directly asked about COO influence in the second stage, the CSAs communicated rather increased to occur during 41 (57%) advertisements. This replicates the findings in the main study that prior research has bias when directly ask respondents about COO influence.

**Congruent and incongruent advertisings**

Notwithstanding that the respondents actual COO influence might be misestimated, we shift the focus of this follow up study and show some important findings regarding suitable advertisements for certain product categories. More specifically, the ad copy technique provided a basis to discern when a hedonic or utilitarian product might benefit from a rational or emotional advertisement in relation to BORA. But first, considering an overall view, it was observed that out of 12 respondents that processed either a rational or emotional advertisement for a hedonic product, the majority of the respondents showed an emotional systematic way of processing information. On the other hand, the majority of the respondents showed a rational systematic way of processing information for utilitarian products. In order to provide consistency with previous findings in the main study, we categorized CSAs as either emotional or rational by following the same content analysis and strict guidelines as applied before (Herz and Diamantopoulos, 2013b; Krippendorff, 2004). In this sense, we can establish how many CSAs respondents actually did during the both data collection methods. This showed that 60% of the respondents revealed emotional CSAs when processing a hedonic brand with either a congruent (emotional) or incongruent (rational) advertising. On the contrary, respondents processing a utilitarian brand showed an advance of rational thinking (77%) with two different advertisements. This result also holds for them separately. See Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSAs</td>
<td>CSAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSAs</td>
<td>CSAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 %</td>
<td>77 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 %</td>
<td>23 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In contrast, the congruent (rational) advertising for utilitarian products generated a large proportion of rational CSAs (92%), whilst incongruent (emotional) advertising showed similar results where rational CSAs were estimated to 56% compared to 44% emotional CSAs. Combined, this yield an advantage of 77% rational CSAs compared to 23% emotional CSAs.

Table 8. Congruent and Incongruent Advertising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congruent Advertising</th>
<th>Incongruent Advertising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSAs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congruent Advertising Hedonic</th>
<th>Incongruent Advertising Hedonic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSAs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congruent Advertising Utilitarian</th>
<th>Incongruent Advertising Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSAs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, emotional advertising combined for all brands showed a fairly similar result, 47% for rational CSAs compared to 53% for emotional CSAs. Elaborating on this, we wanted to see how congruent advertising holds for both the hedonic and utilitarian product categories. When combining both the congruent advertisements for utilitarian products and hedonic products, it was observed that 71% of the communicated CSAs were rational, whilst 29% emotional. Additionally, in the context of BORA, the respondents that could correctly classify the brands’ origin were estimated to 75%. In contrast, incongruent advertising for both hedonic and utilitarian products showed the same results, when generating 50% each and a BORA estimate to 58%. As such, congruent advertising for utilitarian products received the highest BORA score (83%), whilst incongruent advertising of utilitarian products generated a slightly lower result (72%). On the flip
side, both congruent and incongruent advertisements of hedonic brands received lower BORA scores when respondents classified the brand’s origin by 28% of the times for congruent, respectively 22% for incongruent.

Table 9. BORA Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertising</th>
<th>Correctly Classification of Brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congruent Hedonic</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruent Utilitarian</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congruent Combined</strong></td>
<td><strong>75%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incongruent Hedonic</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incongruent Utilitarian</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incongruent Combined</strong></td>
<td><strong>58%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notwithstanding that utilitarian products received greater BORA score, it is worth noting that the utilitarian brands Volkswagen and Barilla received 100% correct classification, regardless of a congruent or incongruent advertisement. In contrast, hedonic brands like Corona and Toblerone both received greater BORA score when respondents were exposed to congruent advertising. More specifically for Corona, respondents that were exposed to a rational advertisement showed a BORA score of 83%, while all six respondents that were exposed to the emotional advertisement correctly classified Corona’s origin (100%).

In addition, the incongruent advertisement for Toblerone showed a BORA score of 33%, while the congruent advertisement generated a BORA score of 83%. Furthermore, it also worth noting that a brand like Volkswagen only generated rational CSAs in both interview stages, although it decreased by half for emotional advertisement compared to rational. Along the same lines, Barilla showed a 80% advantage of rational CSAs in the congruent advertisement, while the incongruent displays the contrary when emotional CSAs had an advantage of 80%. Notwithstanding these findings, it was also a brand (Head and Shoulders) that showed no CSAs at all in both interview stages.
6.1 Discussion Follow up Study

Elaborating on prior research within the COO field, the ad copy technique applied contributes to the literature in many ways. First, we could discern that people exposed to rational or emotional advertisements that either emphasise utilitarian or hedonic needs, indeed as acknowledged in literature (Chernev, 2004; Chitturi, et. al. 2008) show differences in their systematic way of processing information. More specifically, people that were exposed to rational advertisements with utilitarian brands showed higher tendency to think rationally. On the other hand, people being exposed to emotional advertisements seem to think more emotionally. This is not pioneering findings, given that literature (Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982; Strahilevitz and Myers, 1998) has established for a long time that people might have functional related goals when buying utilitarian products, whilst consumers buying hedonic products have pleasure related intentions. Rather, these are findings that demonstrating that the advertisements were correctly designed, thereby strengthen the study’s reliability and validity since the ad copy technique applied actually measured what was intended.

Notwithstanding that the ad copy technique seems to account for reliability and validity, the methodology rather aimed to elaborate on the findings as observed in the main study. Bearing in mind that some respondents only seem to be susceptible to COO influence when being directly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Revealing CSAs Undirected</th>
<th>Revealing CSAs Directed</th>
<th>BORA</th>
<th>BrandOwnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barilla</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkswagen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corona</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toblerone</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo Boss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head &amp; Shoulders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>35%</strong></td>
<td><strong>57%</strong></td>
<td><strong>72%</strong></td>
<td><strong>61%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Ad Copy
asked, this follow up study similarly shows the same findings. In this case, only 35% of the respondents communicated any CSAs of the total 72 occasions in the undirected interview, thereby showing support for COO influence. However, when being asked directly about COO influence in the directed interview, the estimate increased significantly to 57%. Taken together, this replicates the findings in the main study, as well as Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b), that some people are only prone to reveal CSAs when being asked directly about their COO influence. Consequently, this once again showing support to some of the COO skeptics notion that its effects have been inflated and grossly exaggerated (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2008; Samiee 2010, 2011; Samiee et al., 2005; Usunier 2006, 2011).

However, if we shift the focus from the follow up study and rather examine the findings in the main study in more detail, we linking CSAs to BORA from a hedonic vs utilitarian perspective when an advertisement is either congruent or incongruent. In this sense, it was observed as previously that the better the BORA score, also the more CSAs people tend to make. This is along the same lines as discovered in Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b), even though the applied ad copy technique takes this even a step further since it also accounts for hedonic and utilitarian brands. More specifically, the follow up study shows that congruent advertising for utilitarian products shows by far the highest BORA score (83%), compared to congruent advertising for hedonic brands (67%). This is to the best of our knowledge a new finding in regard of BORA. We could, namely, see that congruent advertisement for either a hedonic or utilitarian brand provides the best BORA score. In spite of that, incongruent advertising for utilitarian brands shows similar results (72%) compared to congruent, whilst incongruent advertisements for hedonic brands (44%). At first glance, this might suggest that people have better knowledge about utilitarian brands’ origin, but also that COO has a bigger impact in this product category. These findings seems to be at odds with recent literature that has established that the same results apply to the reverse since consumers purchasing utilitarian products are more likely to be engaged into deeper cognitive elaboration, whilst consumers process information more holistically when purchasing hedonic products (Babin et al., 1994; Giiirhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 2000; Homburg et al. 2006).

There might exist different explanations for the inconsistency with the results in the follow up study and prior research about consumers’ attention to COO cues. One logical explanation might stem from the brand stimuli selection, which might not fully capture a superior hedonic or utilitarian brand in their category. For example, all 12 respondents had knowledge of Volkswagen and
Barilla’s origin, as well claimed to be influenced of COO in both cases. Although literature has established that the opposite holds, these findings might not be surprisingly given that both brands’ marketing communication represents a large part when referring to their origin. However, it also worth noting that a brand like Head and Shoulders not generated a single CSA and only one respondent claimed to have COO influence when being directly asked,. This might hint that same might apply for similar personal care products. Therefore, one could also argue to exclude Volkswagen and Barilla from the brand stimuli selection and have other utilitarian brands, which probably would affect the study’s outcome.

7. General Discussion

In this study we break from traditional research and cognitive survey-based research methods. In both the main study and follow up study we show that COO effects might have been misestimated, in which directed interviews serves as a contrived circumstance where only some people seems to be susceptible to COO influence when being directly asked. Along the same lines as Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b), we show that some people’s COO influence can only be detected in a nonverbal stage in form of collage technique. These are by nature more likely to communicate CSAs emotionally than rationally, whilst both the main study and follow up study shows that people tend to process information more rationally in verbal stages. This should then support the findings in Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b). In addition, these are important findings that should shed some light on the criticism toward the COO field (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2008; Samiee 2010, 2011; Samiee et al., 2005; Usunier 2006, 2011).

Furthermore, elaborating on the criticism toward the COO field, it is noteworthy that the respondents COO influence in the follow up study was significantly lower than the main study. More specifically, 50% of the respondents in the main study communicated any CSAs in the undirected interview, compared to 35% in the follow up study. In contrast, same undirected interview in Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) yielded a total of 23.5% communicated CSAs. These observed differences might have different logical explanations, where it in light of our study might be suggested that the follow up study provides more accurate result due to a larger sample. In more concrete terms, given that respondents only accounted for one brand in the main study through all three stages (collage, undirected and directed interview), the respondents in the follow up study rather accounted for six brands through the two stages (undirected and directed interview). This
might have impact since it was shown in the follow up study that some respondents only communicated any CSAs toward certain brands, meaning that where one might expect people to be susceptible to COO influence, they might not be it a second time when being exposed to another brand.

The focal aim with the follow up study was to establish whether the findings in the main study holds for other instances, such as the advertising context. In the main study it was observed that peoples’ brand origin recognition accuracy (BORA) score were predictive of respondents CSAs, in which the hedonic brands accounted for more emotional CSAs and utilitarian brands showed a similar result between rational and emotional CSAs. However, in the light of Magnusson et al. (2011a) when including the two respondents that showed strong CSAs in the BORA group, people seemed to exclusively communicate CSAs rationally about utilitarian brands (100%), and emotional CSAs about hedonic brands (71%). Elaborating on this, the findings in the follow up study partially confirm this. More specifically, when being exposed to congruent advertisement for utilitarian brands, it was almost exclusively rational CSAs made (92%). On the contrary, congruent advertisement for hedonic brands generated a majority of emotional CSAs (63%). This almost replicates the findings in the main study, even though Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) mean that people are more prone to show emotional CSAs in nonverbal- tasks such as collage.

Moreover, it is interesting that a brand like Volkswagen managed to not generate a single emotional CSA in both studies. This adds strong evidence to literature (Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982; Strahilevitz and Myers, 1998) that consumers buying utilitarian products have functional related goals. It might also suggest that a country like Germany is so anchored to rational held thoughts as quality concerns, that people do not seem to consider other aspects such as affective influence. On the flip side, in both studies it was also shown that Italy was anchored to strong food culture, which, as a matter of fact, generated strong emotional CSAs. Consequently, it may be argued that these both two countries are mutually exclusive in the aspect of country stereotypes.
8. Conclusion

Returning to the research question, this study has many contributions regarding in what way the implementation of a more ecological research method contributes to the COO field. First, given that some people only seems to be susceptible to COO influence when being either indirectly asked in a nonverbal-task or directly asked in a verbal-task, makes prior research methods indeed misestimated. Consequently, its effects might also be somewhat overestimated, which should shed some light on the criticism toward prior research in the COO field. Second, when conducting semi-structured interviews we account for underlying factors that explains peoples’ COO influence, in which a qualitative research design is rare in the academic field these days. More specifically, by linking peoples’ rational and emotional CSAs to brand origin recognition accuracy (BORA) and brand ownership, we discern that both of them are strongly related. Third, we are also linking emotional and rational CSAs to hedonic and utilitarian brands in order to account for discrepancies between them. This is new knowledge within projective technique in the COO field that corroborate prior research that consumers have different systematic way of processing information. Fourth, we are to the best of our knowledge the first study to encapsulate both collage technique and ad copy technique in the academic field of COO. The latter accounts for a follow up study that seeks to confirm the directions as provided in the main study in the advertising context. In order to achieve this, congruent and incongruent advertising on hedonic and utilitarian brands is provided as basis to discern under which conditions COO influence might have an impact and its prediction of BORA. In summary, congruent advertising for both hedonic and utilitarian brands seems to be positively related when one wants to yield a high BORA score.

Managerial implications

Drawing from the findings of this study, there are suggestions for managers to consider. Given that the follow up study of using ad copy technique is very practical designed and applicable in its nature, we could discern that congruent advertising for either a hedonic or utilitarian brand is the most fruitful avenue for managers in regard of receive high brand origin recognition accuracy (BORA) scores by people. In more concrete terms, a brand that wants it origin to be correctly classified should bear in mind the product’s attributes and design a suitable marketing communication strategy that fits, which becomes evident when literature (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2011) notes that almost all brands are disadvantaged when being misclassified. In addition, given the study’s nature of encapsulating an affective dimension as well, managers should
not solely rely on a cognitive design when designing a proper marketing communication strategy. Rather, we show the importance of emotional country-specific associations (CSA) as well that refers to positive feelings such as joy and personal experiences.

We also have some important findings regarding which products people are influenced of COO. According to existing literature (Babin et al., 1994; Giirhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 2000; Homburg et al. 2006), people are more likely to find COO cues irrelevant for utilitarian products. Given the present findings, it might not be completely accurate since we showed the opposite. For example, both utilitarian brands like Volkswagen and Barilla showed 100% BORA score in the ad copy testing, as well as 100% of COO influence in the directed interview. Therefore, what might be an appropriate marketing communication strategy for, let say, a utilitarian brand, might not be a suitable strategy to adopt for others. This becomes apparent when people seems to be highly influenced of country stereotypes, in which Volkswagen served as the only brand that not generated any emotional CSAs at all during both two studies. This might suggest the superior of referring to Germany as COO if one wants to highly emphasize quality and reliable products. Notwithstanding that COO seems to serve as a salient cue in consumers’ minds, it is noteworthy that some people are not influenced of COO at all and thus not possible to target, regardless emotional or rational advertisements that stresses the brand’s origin.

**Limitations and further research**

As with the most research studies, this study has some limitations to consider that might provide guidance for further research. Since the study is exploratory in its nature and aims to be as suggestive as possible, the findings provided should be treated with caution. Therefore, bearing in mind that Herz and Diamantopoulos (2013b) and this study is some of the first studies to advance the COO field by adopting qualitative projective techniques, it might be an unwise action to extrapolate the findings before more research is done. Notwithstanding the novelty of the research field, one logical direction for further research might be to actually examine under which conditions consumers prefer a congruent or incongruent advertisement in the light of appealing COO. This type of research methodology could for instance comprise an ad copy technique used with a collage technique at the same time where respondents have to make a suitable advertisement campaign in regard of COO. In more concrete terms, we believe that the COO field would benefit for even more qualitative methodologies under ecological conditions where respondents are not ”forced” to make
any associations with an already predetermined COO (see also Magnusson et al., 2011a; Samiee, 2010).

Furthermore, this study once again emphasizes the importance of a proper brand stimuli selection (see also Samiee, 2011; Usunier, 2011). Surprisingly, the outcome did not appear as first thought when utilitarian brands’ COO seemed to be of most importance, thereby providing contradicting result to prior research. However, a brand like Volkswagen that received one of the highest BORA score and COO influence, was also a brand that people considered as a middle class car for ordinary people. This should then strengthen its practical and functional attributes that utilitarian brands provides. As such, the brand stimuli selection might not per se be incorrect or bias, even though some other hedonic or utilitarian brands implemented in this study might have resulted in a completely different outcome. Bearing this in mind, it once again emphasize how hard it is to manage a proper brand stimuli selection for COO studies (see Samiee, 2011, Usunier, 2011). Lastly, it is also noteworthy that a brand like Volkswagen was the only brand that received no emotional CSAs at all during both the main study and follow up study, which then should shed some lights on further directions to investigate.
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## Appendix 1. Pretest Determining Brands

**Question 1. Utilitarian Products**
The respondent were asked to name one brand from the three given product categories (car, pasta, shampoo) they associated and consumed with its functional and practical function.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Category</th>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Respondents (N=25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Car</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volvo</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volkswagen</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiat</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAAB</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMW</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toyota</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KIA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pasta</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barilla</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garant</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ica</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZETA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kungsörnen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FiberPasta</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shampoo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head &amp; Shoulders</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L'Oréal Elvital</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wella</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dubbel Dusch</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Axe</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SYSSOS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schwarzkopf</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bad Head</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Choose brands:**
Volkswagen, Barilla, Head & Shoulders.

**Excluded:**
Volkswagen (Swedish).
Question 2. Hedonic Products
The respondent were asked to name one brand from the three given product categories (fashion, beer, chocolate) they relate to sensory and enjoyment related attributes, of which they also consume accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Category</th>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Respondents (N=25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fashion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prada</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hugo Boss</td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gucci</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chanel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louis Vuitton</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dior</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marc Jacobs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calvin Klein</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burberry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giorgio Armani</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlsberg</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corona</td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heineken</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budweiser</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norlands Guld</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Falcon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guinness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Becks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red Stripes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ÅBRO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chocolate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marabou</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cloetta</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toblerone</td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lindt</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthon Berg</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M&amp;M’S</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Choose brands:**
Hugo Boss, Corona, Toblerone.

**Excluded:**
Prada, Carlsberg (origin in logo), Marabou, Cloetta (Swedish), Brooklyn (city area New York).
Appendix 2. Collage

Brand: Hugo Boss, (1/2). No CSA communicator.

This respondent showed no CSA at all, neither in the collage nor during the undirected interview. On direct questions about the COO, the respondents didn't know the origin but thought the brand was from USA. Further, the respondent stated that COO served as an important attribute for this brand. Additionally, since the respondent thought the origin was USA it positive affected the judgement of the brand, given that USA was in the mind of the respondent equal to quality.

No CSA was communicated in the collage and nor during the undirected interview.
This respondent showed both rational and emotional CSA in the collage and during the undirected interview. The respondent claimed immediately that it was an Italian brand and that it was revealing associations to mode (image), karriär (image), wine (image), and business clothes (image) which all became CSAs. Even the text Italien (image) was cute out and showed rational CSA.

In the directed interview, only rational CSA was further repeated when the respondent repeated the parallels between Italy and expensive suits, which was something said to be of importance. In addition, the respondent showed strong influence of rational CSA during directed interviews when it was claimed that: “a suit from China or Lithuania wouldn’t be a big shot, compared to a suit from, let’s say, Italy”.

Rational CSA (4): Italy, Italien (Italy), mode (fashion), karriär (career).
Emotional CSA (7): Wine x3, business clothes x4
This respondent made in the collage and undirected interview a lot of both rational and emotional CSA. Rational CSA was shown by cutting out the Italian flag (image) and country (image), painting the Italian flag (image) and writing Italien (image) and ”Mycket italiensk mat och vin” (lot of Italian food and wine). In the undirected interview the respondent was linking the pictures of wine (image), grapes (image), olives (image), vineyard (image), serranoham (image) and a sunburn man (image) to be associated with Italy and therefore become emotional CSA. Further, in the undirected interview the respondents keep on making both rational and emotional CSA stating that Barilla makes real Italian quality pasta and showing that the respondent have high brand ownership. In the direct interview the respondent further associates both rational and emotional, and claims that the COO for Barilla is of great importance.

Rational CSA (5): Italian flag, Italian map, Italien, mycket italiensk mat och vin, real Italian quality pasta.
Emotional CSA (7): Wine, grapes, olives, vineyard, serranoham, sunburned man, countryside.
This respondent made both rational and emotional CSA in the collage by cutting out the Italienresan (image), cheese (image) and two pictures illustrating red wine (image). In the undirected Interview, rational and emotional CSA was mentioned when referring Italy as a country with good pasta, wine and cheese, meaning that the quality and that its history back in time is superior. Thereof, both the wine and cheeses becomes CSAs. Consequently, the respondent had a strong brand ownership and chose Barilla instead of other brands.

In the directed interview, the respondent clearly continues with CSAs and establishes that Italy makes the best pasta, whereof COO effects might have a big impact on food products.

Rational CSA (2): Italienresan (Italy trip), Italy.
This respondent revealed no rational or emotional CSA in the collage or nor in the undirected interview.
In the directed interview, the respondent did not know the COO and guessed on Finland. Further, the respondent clearly argued that the importance of COO depends on what kind of product it is, and this was not a product were the COO was of importance.

No CSA was communicated in the collage and nor during the undirected interview.
Appendix 2. Continued

Brand: Toblerone, (2/2). Verbal and nonverbal CSA communicator.

This respondent mentioned both rational and emotional CSA in the collage. The cut out text, Switzerland (image) and its accompanying alps (image) shows rational and emotional CSA. In the undirected interview, the first thing mentioned was the Swiss heritage. This would later made the respondent make associations to alps and mountains, thereby showing support for both rational and emotional CSA.

When being asked explicitly about COO in the directed interview, the respondent claimed to not be particularly susceptible of its effects, both in relation to Toblerone and products in general. Nevertheless, the respondent believed that the Swiss origin was a big part of Toblerone when speaking about quality, whereof it was mentioned that: "In the context of chocolate, It’ll probably work better to refer to Switzerland as COO, rather than not doing it at all". This indicates rational CSA.

Rational CSA (2): Switzerland, Swiss heritage.
This respondent revealed no rational or emotional CSA in the collage or nor in the undirected interview. Only in the direct interview the respondent started to be influenced by rational CSA but did not know the COO of the product and stated that the COO for this product was not relevant.

No CSA was communicated in the collage and nor during the undirected interview.
This respondent revealed no rational or emotional CSA in the collage or nor in the undirected interview. The only highlighted things were the benefits of using Head & Shoulders, compared to not doing it.

It was only in the directed interview the respondent was shown to be influenced of rational CSA when speaking about a brand that produces shampoo. For example: "If the shampoo was made in Romania, I’m not sure if I’d use it", thereby referring to quality concerns. Additionally, child labour was considered as being important when choosing shampoo brand and something that the respondent would not be a part of. This reinforces the rational CSA that were made.

No CSA was communicated in the collage and nor during the undirected interview.
This respondent revealed only rational CSA in the collage by the German sentence “Das Auto” (image). During the undirected interview the respondent pointed out it was a German car and did associations only rational focusing on the cars attributes and pointed out several times the importance of the German origin. The respondent was further in the undirected interview thoroughly demonstrated associations with quality, safety and reliability and said it a sign for German products therefore rational CSAs.
Further, during the directed interview the respondent once again pointed out the benefits the brand had by being German and that the German origin works as a quality insurance.

Rational CSA (5): Das Auto, German car, quality, safety, reliability.
Emotional CSA (0):
This respondent revealed only rational CSA in the collage in form of a German flag (image) and the advertising slogan of Audi in German; *Vorsprung durch Technik* (image). Roughly translates to: Advancement through technology. Further, it was only in the directed interview the respondent highlighted the benefits of the German COO, thereby sowing no CSA in the undirected interview. German origin was said to be of great advantage compared to cars from example China during the direct questions about the importance of COO.

Rational CSA (2): German flag, Vorsprung durch Technik (Advancement through technology).

Emotional CSA (0):
Brand: Corona, (1/2). Nonverbal CSA communicator.

This respondent revealed only emotional CSA, both in the collage and the interview. This in forms of sunset (image), Mexican village (image), beach (image), sea (image), wild fruits (image) and blue sky (drawing). This associations were made specific to (Mediterranean) and therefore become CSA. It also appeared in the undirected interview that associations were made to vacation in the Mediterranean. In the directed interview, the respondent did know the true Mexican COO but denied to be influenced of COO effects.

Rational CSA (0):
Emotional CSA (7): Sunset, Mexican village, beach, sea, wild fruits, blue sky, Mediterranean.
This respondent revealed both rational and emotional CSA during the collage and the undirected interview. At one hand, it was CSAs made to vacations in warmer countries around the mediterranean such as a boat in the sunset (image), a girl jumping into the water (image) and text that said; Resor (image). At the other hand, associations were made to ski trip in the collage, such as Bad Gastein (image), personal experiences of a specific hotel (image) in the alps and two pictures of skiers (images). However, only the former was reinforced by the undirected interview when the respondent made emotional CSA to trips and warmth when thinking about Corona as brand.

In the directed interview, the respondent claimed that COO was not a determining factor when drinking Corona. In addition, it is acknowledged that COO might only have effect when purchasing more expensive products, thereby showing support for rational CSA.

Rational CSA (2): Resor (travel), Bad Gastein.
Emotional CSA (7): Boat in the sunset, jumping into the water, hotel, skiing x2, vacation in Mediterranean, vacation in the alps.
Appendix 3. Questions Undirected and Directed Interviews

Undirected Interview Questions.

(1) Describe the brand.

(2) Name all associations with regard to the brand that came to mind.

(3) Differentiate the brand from the main competitors.

(4) Tell personal stories in connection with the brand.

(5) Mention all relevant factors they believed would affect their brand image perceptions and purchase decisions in that focal product category.

The purpose of this several open ended questions was to without any COO cues ascertain whether the respondents communicate any CSAs or not.

Directed Interview Questions.

(1) Whether they care about the COO of the brand.

(2) Whether the COO affects their brand image perceptions.

(3) Whether COO is a relevant factor when choosing among brands in the product category concerned.

(4) The relative importance of COO versus other considerations (e.g., price, brand name).

(5) Participants were also asked whether they had knowledge about the particular brand’s origin.

(6) Their ownership of the brand.

The purpose of this several open ended questions was to explicitly introduced the respondent for COO cues in order to see if the respondent really cared about the COO and also if the respondents had brand ownership and was able to correctly classify the origin of the brand.
Appendix 4. Undirected and Directed Interviews Answers

Brand: Hugo Boss, (1/2). Undirected Interview.

(1) The respondent was focusing about the attributes about the brand and was describing what kind of people using the brand. Further, the respondent was talking about business men, big cities and fashion.

(2) Was associating the brand with: Big cities, business men, meetings, watches, shoes, fashion, airports, suites and well-dressed people.

(3) The respondent thinks that Hugo Boss is focusing specially on men, but can't see any big difference compared to competitors.

(4) Respondent had no personal stories. Just that the father is frequently using it.

(5) The respondent was only focusing on quality as the affective factor for brand image perceptions.

Directed Interview.

(1) The respondent don't really care of the COO and didn't know the true origin, but was guessing on USA.

(2) Thinks that the believed American origin affects the brand image since it’s a sign for quality.

(3) The respondent see COO as a relevant factor for this brand. Thuns, other factors are more relevant then COO for this brand.

(4) In general has COO versus other considerations no importance and is not of great importance since other factors was more relevant, like quality and price.

(5) Thought the COO was USA. The true COO is Germany.

(6) Had no brand ownership at all.
Brand: Hugo Boss, (2/2). Undirected Interview.

(1) Describes the brand as an Italian high fashion brand with good quality, further focusing on their clothes and in particular suits.

(2) Was associating the brand with: Italy, suits, expensive fashion, wine, career, fashion and business clothes.

(3) On the question regarding what differentiate the brand for its competitors the respondent referred to the classic design of its products, specially suits.

(4) The respondent had no personal stories connected to the brand.

(5) The respondent had no special relevant factors would affect their brand image perceptions for this product.

Directed Interview.

(1) The respondent care about the COO and thinks the brand is from Italy.

(2) The respondent associate Hugo Boss with Italy and thus with expensive quality suits and fashion clothes. Given this, the respondent claims that its origin positively affects the brand image perceptions of this product.

(3) Thinks that COO is a highly relevant factor when choosing among brands in this product category. Further the respondent said; ”a suit from China or Lithuania wouldn’t be a big shot, compared to a suit from, let’s say, Italy”.

(4) Thinks that the COO is of importance when choosing between products.

(5) The respondent thought during the entire tre stage data collection that the COO was Italy. The real COO is Germany.

(6) Had low brand ownership.
Appendix 4. Continued

Brand: Barilla, (1/2). Undirected Interview.

(1) The respondents describe the brand as the real Italian pasta brand and that Barilla menas good quality pasta.

(2) Was associating the brand with: Italy, grandparents, big family, Italian food, olives, grapes, serranoham, sunburn man, vineyards, Italian flag and wine.

(3) The respondent point out that at the COO is of great importance since the respondent associate Barilla with the true Italian pasta. Further, the respondent thinks the brands origin differentiate the brand from the competitors and is an advantage to have a heritage form Italy.

(4) The respondent didn't have any special personal stories related to the brand.

(5) For the relevant factors towards the brand image perceptions the respondent was focusing on the price, taste and origin.

Directed Interview.

(1) COO is for this product is of great importance argues the respondent. But in generally, the importance of the COO depends on what kind of product it is.

(2) The respondent thinks that the Italian origin affects the brand image since it strengthens the brand perception and is important for this product. Additionally, also because it makes it feels like real pasta.

(3) The respondent said that the COO for this product is an important and relevant factor that highly affects the purchase intentions when choosing among brands.

(4) The respondent further point out the high importance of the COO relative versus other considerations, but also mentions price and availability.

(5) The respondent did know that the COO was Italy.

(6) The respondent had high brand ownership.
Appendix 4. Continued

Brand: Barilla, (2/2). Undirected Interview

(1) Describes Barilla as a famous brand for its pasta and is the respondents personal favorit among pasta brands.

(2) Was associating the brand with: Pasta, Italien, kitchen, cheese, wine, children, athletes, sport and student food.

(3) Cant point out any specific difference towards its main competitors.

(4) The respondent has no special personal story with the brand.

(5) According the relevant factors regarding brand image perceptions and purchase decisions, the respondent claimed to just pick Barilla because the respondent always have been using it.

Directed Interview

(1) The respondent said; “I do rather eat Italian pasta, since I associate pasta with Italy”. Given this statement, the respondent care about the COO for this product.

(2) Thinks that the Italian origin affects the brand image perceptions since the respondents claims that in generally you associate pasta with Italy and in Italy they make the best pasta.

(3) Thinks that the COO is a relevant factor when choosing among brands for this product category, and in general is of great importance for other products as well.

(4) The respondent thinks that the COO is of importance for brands, particularly for food.

(5) Did know that the COO was Italy.

(6) The respondent had a strong brand ownership and chose Barilla instead of other brands.
Appendix 4. Continued

Brand: Toblerone, (1/2). Undirected Interview.

(1) The respondent describe the brand as a sweet candy for young people that likes chocolate.

(2) Was associating the brand with: Children, childhood, picnic, friends and coffee breaks.

(3) As the different from the main competitors the respondent points out the design that is really typical for Toblerone and the special taste of the chocolate.

(4) The respondent didn't have any special personal stories related to the brand.

(5) According the relevant factors for the brand image perceptions, the respondent was focusing on the price, taste and design.

Directed Interview.

(1) The respondent didn't care about the origin of the brand and didn't even know the origin.

(2) The COO had no affect on the brand image perceptions for this product according to the respondent.

(3) The respondent said that the COO of this product was not a relevant factor when choosing among brands in the product category, but thinks that COO can be of great importance for other products.

(4) For the respondent, the taste and price was the most important considerations. Further, the respondent clearly stated that the COO was not important at all.

(5) The respondent dint know the COO, was guessing on Finland. The COO is Switzerland.

(6) The respondent had low brand ownership.
Brand: Toblerone, (2/2). Undirected Interview.

(1) When describing the brand, the focus was on the design of that package, the tasty chocolate and its classic history.

(2) Was associating the brand with: Dark and light chocolate, hidden bear in the logo, classic candy, Switzerland, both for children and adults and the special design on the package.

(3) When differentiate the brand from the main competitors, the respondent points out the design that reminds of mountains and Switzerland, but also that Toblerone is a classic candy.

(4) Tells personal stories about when winning a large Toblerone on amusement parks.

(5) Design and logo was the relevant factors that the respondent believed would affect the brand image perception.

Directed Interview.

(1) Knows that it's a Swiss brand, but don't think it's affects the respondent that much.

(2) The respondent claims that, “In the context of chocolate, It'll probably work better to refer to Switzerland as COO, rather than not doing it at all”. But further things it do not affects the brand image perception anything peculiar.

(3) Claims that the COO relevance depends on what kind of product it is, and for this product it do not have any significant relevance.

(4) Both price and taste was more important then the COO for the respondent.

(5) Did know the Swiss origin.

(6) The respondent had a high brand ownership and eating the chocolate frequently.
Appendix 4. Continued

Brand: Volkswagen, (1/2). Undirected Interview.

(1) Describes the brand as a good German quality brand. Puts a lot of focus on what the brand is and describes the attributes by the car.

(2) Was associating the brand with: Discreet, quality, good city car, safety, reliability, German car and family.

(3) To differentiate the brand from the main competitors the respondent focusing on the safety and quality associations. Additionally also mentions the German origin as an important factor.

(4) The respondent likes the brand and its products, but have no special stories related to the brand.

(5) For the relevant factors they believed would affect their brand image perceptions, the respondents points out; design, function and safety.

Directed Interview.

(1) The respondent said that the COO is highly relevant for this brand.

(2) The respondent thinks the COO affects the brand image positive, specially about the high quality assumptions.

(3) For the this product category, the respondent thinks the COO is of great importance. But the COO is not of relevance for all products and in general not of importance.

(4) The respondent state that COO is relative important and one of the top five considerations for a car.

(5) The respondent did know the German origin.

(6) Further, the respondent didn't had any brand ownership.
Brand: Volkswagen, (2/2). Undirected Interview

(1) A bit boring family and city car, that is a bit cheaper than the competitor.

(2) Was associating the brand with: Family, small basic cars, city cars and German flag.

(3) When differentiate the brand from the main competitors, the respondent was only focusing on the cars functions and attributes.

(4) Had no personal stories connected with the brand.

(5) During the question about the relevant factors the respondent believed would affect their brand image perceptions was the respondent once again only focusing on the cars functions and attributes.

Directed Interview

(1) The respondent thinks that the COO is of importance for the brand.

(2) On the question about the COO affects on brand image perceptions, the respondent states that German products are associated with high standard and quality.

(3) The respondent argues that the COO is important for this brand but for other product categories it might not be important at all.

(4) For this relatively expensive product the COO is of importance, but also the price, design and functions is equally important for the respondent.

(5) Did know the German COO.

(6) The respondent had no brand ownership.
Appendix 4. Continued

Brand: Head & Shoulders, (1/2). Undirected Interview

(1) When describing the brand, the respondent was focusing on describing what typical kind of persons using this product and focusing on the function of the product.

(2) Was associating the brand with: Boys, men, dandruff, clean, hair, shower and elegance.

(3) The respondent says that the difference towards other brands is that Head & Shoulders have targeting people with dandruff and specially men.

(4) Have no personal stories connected to the brand since the respondent never used it.

(5) According relevant factors they believed would affect their brand image perceptions and purchase decisions, the respondent was only focusing on the function by the product.

Directed Interview

(1) The COO has no relevance at all for the respondent.

(2) The COO of this product has according to the respondent no affect on the brand image of this brand.

(3) Thinks that COO can be of importance for some product categories, particularly food. But for this brand has the COO no relevance at all.

(4) The respondent once again said that the COO is of no importance for this brand but can be of importance for other brands and products.

(5) Did not know the COO of the brand. The COO is USA.

(6) The respondent had no brand ownership.
Brand: Head & Shoulders, (2/2). Undirected Interview

(1) Describes the product as a good product the respondent for years have been using. Respondent further focusing on the function and the result of the product.

(2) Was associating the brand with: Men, children, women, dandruff, hair, clean and good looking people.

(3) Cant point out any specific difference from the main competitors.

(4) Had no special stories related to the brand.

(5) The respondent was only focusing on one factor, namely the function.

Directed Interview

(1) The respondent did not care about the brands COO at all.

(2) On the question regarding if COO affects the brand image perceptions, the respondent responded: ”If the shampoo was made in Romania, I’m not sure if I’d use it”. Given this, the respondent thought that the COO could affect the brand image.

(3) For the respondent was COO not a relevant factor for this product category, but however the respondent thought that the COO can be relevant for other brands.

(4) According the most important consideration, the respondent only focusing on price and thinks that COO is of no relevance for this product.

(5) The respondent were not able to identify the right COO. The COO is USA.

(6) The respondent had a high brand ownership and was using the brand frequently.
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Brand: Corona, (1/2). Undirected Interview.

(1) The respondent associate the brand to emotional feelings with joy and vacations.

(2) Was associating the brand with: Vacation, sun, bath, youthful, fresh, relaxed, beaches, sun, summer, wild fruits and dance.

(3) During the question how the brand is differentiating from competitors. The respondent was only focusing on the taste of the beer.

(4) For personal stories, the respondent connected corona with beaches and fun in countries around Mediterranean (Spain, Italy).

(5) The respondent didn't had any answer regarding the relevant factors that would affect the brand image perceptions.

Directed Interview.

(1) The respondent didn't care that much about the origin and said it didn't played an important roll.

(2) Since the respondent didn't care about the COO, its not affecting the brand image for the respondent.

(3) Whether COO is a relevant factor or not. The respondents argues that it is all about what kind of products it is, and for some products its important. For this product was the COO not of importance.

(4) As previous claimed, the respondent didn't care about the COO. So all that matters for the respondent was the taste and price.

(5) The respondent know that the brand was from Mexico, but was still associating to Mediterranean countries (Spain, Italy) based on personal memories and experiences with the brand.

(6) The respondent had high brand ownership.
(1) The respondent was in general relating to different kind of experiences connected to the brand. This experiences was including Mediterranean with sun, swimming and heat, but on the other hand also skiing in the alps.

(2) Was associating the brand with: Spacetime, fun, beer; travel, swimming, sun, heat, food, skiing, Bad Gastein, Mediterranean, alps and hotell.

(3) When asking to differentiate the brand from the main competitors, the respondent talks only about the attributes of the brand, like the taste and the price.

(4) When asking about personal stories related to the brand, the respondent were relating to skiing vacation in the alps and to summer vacations in the Mediterranean.

(5) The taste, price, availability and design was relevant factors the respondent believed would affect the brand image perceptions.

Directed Interview

(1) The respondent did not care about the COO of the brand. Argues that it's not of importance.

(2) The respondent further thinks that the COO do not really have any affect on the brand image perception. The respondent claimed that the taste and price is the only important factors.

(3) For this brand is the COO not a relevant factor when choosing among brands according to the respondent. To be relevant it has to concern about expensive brands and products.

(4) Further, the respondent once again argues that the COO not is an important consideration and that taste, price, availability and design once again is more important. But claims that COO can be of great importance for other more exclusive and expensive brands.

(5) The respondent thought the COO to be Spanish. The true origin in Mexico.

(6) The respondent had a high brand ownership.
Appendix 5. Ad Copy 1


Great taste. Great food.

Picture 2: Corona, Rational.

The unmistakable color. The one-of-a-kind taste. The unparalleled flavor of relaxation.

There’s something about drinking a Corona Extra that’s different from drinking any other beer. Nothing else seems to set the same mood. Nothing else lets the conversation flow so easily between friends. Nothing else brings such a natural energy to an occasion.

From the beginning, Corona has been about connections - people coming together, strangers becoming friends.

Corona is more than just a beer. It represents a philosophy of living in the moment that has been embraced around the world. We try not to complicate things. That’s why we made Corona so easy to drink. It’s why we use a classic, see-through bottle. Because when you use only the finest ingredients, you’ve got nothing to hide.
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Picture 3. Head & Shoulders, Emotional.

Picture 4: Hugo Boss, Rational.
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Picture 5. Toblerone, Emotional.

![Toblerone Ad](image)

Picture 6: Volkswagen, Rational.

![Volkswagen Ad](image)

It’s here.
New Golf.

- Bi-Xenon headlights with LED DRLs
- Fender® Premium Audio Sound
- Touchscreen navigation
- Panoramic sunroof
- Adaptive airbags
- 18" alloy wheels

"Outstanding quality.
Top Gear

"World class engineering."
-LA Times

Point A. Point B.
All the performance in between.

- 170-hp turbocharged engine
- 45 hwy mpg with TDI® Clean Diesel engine
- V-Tex leatherette seating surfaces
- VW Car-Net® connected
- No-charge scheduled maintenance

Program taken on a whole new form. Versatility, innovation, and craftsmanship. All the qualities that make it a Golf are also what help make it Motor Trend’s 2015 Car of the Year™. When it comes to independent automotive journalists put together, the only thing they agreed upon was that the 2015 Golf and Golf GTI should be named North American Car of the Year™. Apparently, world-class engineering and meticulous craftsmanship pay off. From its sculpted exterior and engineering, the Golf surrounds you with quality and amenities not typically expected in a hatchback. And that’s exactly what makes it a Golf. With a standard turbocharged engine and an available torque-shift TDI® Clean Diesel, the Golf provides better performance and efficiency than ever before. Ease into one and it might boost your spirits too. Laser beam welding gives the Golf a solid feel while a host of advanced safety features help ensure the Golf provides safety that has your back. And your front and side tow. And with 16.7 cu. ft. of cargo space, the 2015 Golf offers even greater versatility.
Picture 7. Barilla, Rational.

“Must buy” - Jamie Oliver

“Astonishing” - Gordon Ramsay

Barilla ProteinPLUS™ is the delicious, wholesome pasta with protein and fiber to help keep you satisfied.

Cook Barilla ProteinPLUS™ in boiling water 11 minutes, then drain and serve according to the recipe directions. For more tender pasta, boil an additional minute. Due to its higher protein content ProteinPLUS™ takes several extra minutes to cook than traditional pasta.

ProteinPLUS™ pairs well with tomato-based sauces and sauces with lots of fresh vegetables. Oil-based sauces work well with all ProteinPLUS™ shapes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calorie</th>
<th>190</th>
<th>Vitamin A</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>Salt Fat 0.8g</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fat Cal</td>
<td>0g</td>
<td>Protein</td>
<td>10.0g</td>
<td>Trans Fat 0.0g</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protein</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sodium</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Polyunsaturated Fat</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Calcium</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Monounsaturated Fat</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It’s Possible with Barilla™

Picture 8: Corona, Emotional.

Find Your beach.

Log Off. Lime in.
Appendix 6. Continued

Picture 9. Head & Shoulders, Rational.

100% dandruff removal. 95 less hairfall.

Getting rid of dandruff
Get great looking hair
Soothing Itchy scalp
Dry scalp solutions

Today's Head & Shoulders formula is the result of 30 years of knowledge and thanks to all that know how it doesn't feel or smell anything like you might expect an anti-dandruff scalp treatment shampoo to feel and smell. Our scientists were the first to identify the causes of dandruff, and the first to use our active ingredient, Zinc Pyrithione (ZPT), in treating dandruff. We realised ZPT was effective, we just didn’t know why yet. Now, Head & Shoulders scientists have discovered how it works at a molecular level.

Picture 10: Hugo Boss, Emotional.
Appendix 6. Continued

Picture 11. Toblerone, Rational.

Our secret
Toblerone originates from the chocolatier’s family name “Tobler” combined with “torrone”, the Italian word for nougat. There are a great many legends about Toblerone triangular shape. Chocolate lovers around the world have always believed that Theodor Tobler took his inspiration from his mountainous homeland, and in particular the Matterhorn with its characteristic triangular shape.

Cocoa
Toblerone is made from a selection of cocoa beans from different parts of the world.

Milk
To produce chocolate, only the best milk is added.

Almond nougat
Almonds are mixed together with honey, sugar and egg white in our secret nougat recipe.

Honey
Honey is chosen because of its intense aroma giving the Toblerone honey-almond nougat its exquisite flavor.

Picture 12: Volkswagen, Emotional.

Point A. Point B.
All the performance in between.
Appendix 7. Predetermined Questions Ad Copy

Undirected Interview Questions.

(1) Describe the brand.

(2) Name all associations with regard to the brand that came to mind.

(3) Differentiate the brand from the main competitors.

(4) Tell personal stories in connection with the brand.

(5) Mention all relevant factors they believed would affect their brand image perceptions and purchase decisions in that focal product category.

The purpose of this several open ended questions was to without any COO cues ascertain whether the respondents communicate any CSAs or not.

Directed Interview Questions.

(6) Whether they care about the COO of the brand.

(7) Participants were also asked whether they had knowledge about the particular brand’s origin.

(8) If they had brand ownership.

The purpose of this open ended questions was to explicitly introduced the respondent for COO cues in order to see if the respondent really cared about the COO and also if the respondents had brand ownership and was able to correctly classify the origin of the brand.
Appendix 8. Undirected and Directed Interviews


**Respondent 1.**
Q1-5: This respondent acknowledged revealed strong emotional CSA when referring Barilla as typical Italian when eating pasta in idyllic settings as Toscana.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Italy
Q8: Yes.

**Respondent 2.**
Q1-5: This respondent revealed no CSAs, just acknowledging the quality of Barilla as brand in general.
Q6: Yes, originating from a culture with a lot of pasta.
Q7: Italy.
Q8: Yes.

**Respondent 3.**
Q1-5: This respondent showed only strong emotional CSA when claiming Barilla to be a pasta brand that is "typically not Italian"and pointing to its absence of positive feelings such as great food culture that Italy normally reflects.
Q6: No.
Q7: Italy, but said it also could be Germany, Denmark or Sweden as well due to its non-authentic impression.
Q8: No.

**Respondent 4.**
Q1-5: This respondent made only rational CSA when acknowledging its Italian origin and making quality references.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Italy.
Q8: Yes.
**Respondent 5.**
Q1-5: This respondent showed only emotional CSA when pointing out Barilla as a brand that provides authentic pasta that brings positive feelings.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Italy.
Q8: Yes.

**Respondent 6.**
Q1-5: This respondent showed only rational CSAs when highlighting the quality of Italian pasta.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Italy.
Q8: Yes.

**Respondent 7.**
Q1-5: This respondent made no CSAs when only referring Barilla as a brand that provides pasta.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Italy.
Q8: Yes.

**Respondent 8.**
Q1-5: This respondent made only rational CSA when claiming Italian’s quality of pasta to be superior in relation to other countries.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Italy.
Q8: No.

**Respondent 9.**
Q1-5: This respondent was pointing out the quality with Italian pasta, thereby only showing support for rational CSA.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Italy.
Q8: No.

**Respondent 10.**
Q1-5: This respondent showed no CSAs at all, only mentioned it as a brand more expensive than others
Q6: Yes, although the respondent was influenced of COO in a negatively way when disregarding Barilla instead of Swedish farmers and their pasta.
Q7: Italy.
Q8: No.

**Respondent 11.**
Q1-5: This respondent made both rational and emotional CSAs when mentioning that the Italy origin has a great rich history and culture, whereafter also the rational aspects as quality was acknowledged.
Q6: Ja.
Q7: Italy.
Q8: Yes.

**Respondent 12.**
Q1-5: This respondent only made rational CSAs when noting Italian pasta as the best in regard to quality.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Italy.
Q8: Yes.

Corona, Emotional. Picture 8.

**Respondent 7.**
Q1-5: This respondent showed no CSAs when talking about a typical summer beer when lying on the beach.
Q6: No.
Q7: Mexico.
Q8: Yes.
Respondent 8.
Q1-5: This respondent revealed no CSAs, although making associations to the beach and a beer that have a good taste.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Mexico, and also at the same time making parallels that COO is an importance cue in regard of food and wine culture where both Italy and France were named.
Q8: No.

Respondent 9.
Q1-5: This respondent made both rational and emotional CSAs when referring Corona as a beer when having a relaxed barbecue night in the summer, although the Mexican origin was claimed to not add quality.
Q6: No.
Q7: Mexico.
Q8: Yes.

Respondent 10.
Q1-5: This respondent revealed no CSAs when associating Corona as a beer suitable on the beach.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Mexico, which ”La cerveza” (spanish) on the beer bottle had influence on.
Q8: Yes.

Respondent 11.
Q1-5: This respondent made no CSAs when talking about Corona as a cool and breezy beer to enjoy on vacation.
Q6: Yes
Q7: Mexico.
Q8: Yes.

Respondent 12.
Q1-5: This respondent revealed strong emotional CSA when thinking about Corona as a Mexican brand that contributes to a tropical feeling with good weather.
Q6: Yes.
Respondent 1.
Q1-5: This respondent made no CSAs when talking about summer-feelings and drinking Corona at barbecues. In addition, the beer was acknowledged as easy to drink due to its light color.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Mexico.
Q8: Yes.

Respondent 2.
Q1-5: This respondent made no CSAs when thinking about summer-time and barbecues, in which Corona serves as social drink.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Mexico.
Q8: Yes.

Respondent 3.
Q1-5: This respondent showed no CSAs when only making associations to the great taste of Corona as beer.
Q6: Yes
Q7: Spain.
Q8: Yes.

Respondent 4.
Q1-5: This respondent made no CSAs when indicating Corona as a suitable beer for parties.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Mexico.
Q8: Yes.
Respondent 5.
Q1-5: No CSAs were made when thinking about Corona as a summer-drink that provides a fresh feeling.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Mexico.
Q8: Yes.

Respondent 6.
Q1-5: This respondent made only emotional CSA when mention the beer as giving vibes to Southern Europe.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Spain.
Q8: Yes.

Head & Shoulders, Emotional. Picture 3.

Respondent 1.
Q1-5: This respondent made no CSAs when acknowledging the benefits of Head & Shoulders since it combines both shampoo and shower (2 in 1), but also noting the influence of Henrik Lundqvist as front figur.
Q6: No.
Q7: Sweden, although the respondent claimed in the first stage it also could originate from USA.
Q8: Yes.

Respondent 2.
Q1-5: This respondent revealed no CSAs when acknowledging the benefits of Head and Shoulders as having good quality, but also making associations to front figures as Henrik Lundqvist and Alex Schulman.
Q6: No.
Q7: Germany.
Q8: Yes.
Respondent 3.
Q1-5: This respondent showed no CSAs when talking about the brand’s quality and their present in advertising.
Q6: No.
Q7: Sweden.
Q8: No.

Respondent 4.
Q1-5: This respondent made no CSAs when pointing out the benefits of Head and Shoulders toward dandruff, but also its non-expensive price, whereafter the advertising was suggested to not actually mirror the product in its accurate light.
Q6: No.
Q7: England.
Q8: No.

Respondent 5.
Q1-5: No CSAs were made when Head and Shoulders was acknowledged as a good shampoo which in addition makes the respondent draw associations to Henrik Lundqvist as a front figur.
Q6: No
Q7: USA.
Q8: No.

Respondent 6.
Q1-5: No CSAs were made when considering Head and Shoulders as a quality shampoo, in which the advertising campaigns with Henrik Lundqvist has been a contributing factor.
Q6: No.
Q7: Sweden.
Q8: Yes.
Respondent 7.
Q1-5: No CSAs were made when pointing out the benefits of Head and Shoulders when combined shampoo + shower (2 in 1).
Q6: No.
Q7: USA.
Q8: Yes.

Respondent 8.
Q1-5: In this case, no CSAs were made when the respondent associated the brand to something sterile and clinical.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: England.
Q8: Yes.

Respondent 9.
Q1-5: This respondents made no CSAs, only providing associations to quality and competence in general.
Q6: No.
Q7: USA.
Q8: Yes.

Respondent 10.
Q1-5: No CSAs were made when the brand was seen as something good since the respondent using it regularly.
Q6: No.
Q7: Sweden.
Q8: Yes.

Respondent 11.
Q1-5: In this case, no CSAs were made when making parallels to Henrik Lundqvist as front figur.
Q6: No.
Q7: USA.
Yes.

**Respondent 12.**

Q1-5: No CSAs were made when thinking about the brand’s good price and its presence in advertising campaigns with Henrik Lundqvist.
Q6: No.
Q7: USA.
Q8: Yes.

---


**Respondent 7.**

Q1-5: No CSAs were made then associating the brand with quality.
Q6: No.
Q7: USA.
Q8: Yes.

---

**Respondent 8.**

Q1-5: No CSAs were made when this brand was something believed to be outdated and thus inferior to other fashion brands in the same segment as Hugo Boss.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: USA, although it was something said to not be associated to fashion.
Q8: No.

---

**Respondent 9.**

Q1-5: This respondent made associations to professionalism and other expensive brands in the same price category, showing no support for COO influence.
Q6: No.
Q7: England.
Q8: No.
Respondent 10.
Q1-5: This respondent showed no CSAs when making associations to luxury fashion.
Q6: No.
Q7: Germany.
Q8: Yes.

Respondent 11.
Q1-5: This respondent revealed no CSAs when thinking about Hugo Boss as a classy and exclusive brand, that often provides a metropolitan atmosphere.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: USA.
Q8: No.

Respondent 12.
Q1-5: No CSAs were made, only drawing parallels to classy and successful business men.
Q6: No.
Q7: England.
Q8: Yes.


Respondent 1.
Q1-5: This respondent made no CSAs when noting the luxury and dressed up feeling that Hugo BOSS provides, which, however, is the similar as other brands in the same price category.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: France.
Q8: Yes.

Respondent 2.
Q1-5: This respondent made only rational CSA when referring Hugo Boss as a german brand that provides suits that last for many years.
Q6: No.
Q7: Germany.
Respondent 3.
Q1-5: This respondent made no CSAs when admitting that the quality of the brand is inferior to competitors.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Italy.
Q8: No.

Respondent 4.
Q1-5: In this case, no CSAs were made when the brand was believed to provide luxury fashion.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: England.
Q8: No.

Respondent 5.
Q1-5: No CSAs were made when mention Hugo Boss to provide clean design and quality.
Q6: No.
Q7: Italy.
Q8: Yes.

Respondent 6.
Q1-5: This respondent made no CSAs when highlighting the brand’s exclusive appeal.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: USA.
Q8: Yes.

Toblerone, Emotional. Picture 5.

Respondent 1.
Q1-5: This respondent revealed rational both rational and emotional CSAs when making references that Switzerland provides superior chocolate and making associations to alps and mountains as something of enhancing effect.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Switzerland.
Q8: Yes.

**Respondent 2.**

Q1-5: This respondent made only emotional CSA when referring Swiss chocolate as something nice that people normally give away as gifts.
Q6: No.
Q7: Schweiz.
Q8: Yes.

**Respondent 3.**

Q1-5: This respondent revealed no CSAs when referring it as a normal and non-exclusive chocolate that usually is common at amusement parks.
Q6: No.
Q7: Switzerland.
Q8: No.

**Respondent 4.**

Q1-5: This respondent showed both rational and emotional CSAs when pointing out the Swiss quality that the brand provides, but also referring to alps as something joyful.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Switzerland.
Q8: Yes.

**Respondent 5.**

Q1-5: This respondent showed no CSAs when claiming Toblerone to not provide such a strong brand in comparison to other chocolate brands.
Q6: No.
Q7: Switzerland.
Q8: No.
**Respondent 6.**
Q1-5: No CSAs were made when the respondent acknowledged it as a chocolate that typically belongs to airports and tax frees.
Q6: No.
Q7: Sweden.
Q8: No.

**Respondent 7.**
Q1-5: This respondent made no CSAs when showing personal experience to Toblerone as a chocolate brand that normally his family buys at Border shop in Germany/Denmark.
Q6: No.
Q7: Germany.
Q8: No.

**Respondent 8.**
Q1-5: This respondent showed both strong rational emotional CSAs when thinking about Toblerone as an intimate chocolate that is common to eat on an afterski in a country in the alps. In contrast, when thinking rationally the respondent also said the brand provided quality.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: France, ”or somewhere in the alps”.
Q8: Yes.

**Respondent 9.**
Q1-5: This respondent made only emotional CSA when pointing out the rich history of Swiss chocolate as something positive.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Switzerland.
Q8: No.
**Respondent 10.**
Q1-5: This respondent showed strong personal experience when associating Toblerone with ferries and airport tax frees, although no CSAs were made.
Q6: No.
Q7: France.
Q8: Yes.

**Respondent 11.**
Q1-5: No CSAs were made when thinking about Toblerone as a personal experience when eating the chocolate on vacation.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Austria.
Q8: Yes.

**Respondent 12.**
Q1-5: This respondent made only rational CSA when considering Swiss chocolate to have good quality.
Q6: No.
Q7: Switzerland.
Q8: Yes.

---

**Volkswagen, Emotional. Picture 12.**

**Respondent 7.**
Q1-5: This respondent made no CSAs nor any associations in general at all.
Q6: No.
Q7: Germany.
Q8: Yes.

**Respondent 8.**
Q1-5: This respondent showed only strong rational CSAs when thinking Volkswagen as a German brand that is practical and provides good quality. Furthermore, it was said to be a non-expensive car that was non-extraordinary in comparison to other German cars.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Germany.
Q8: No.

**Respondent 9.**
Q1-5: This respondent showed only rational CSAs when referring Volkswagen and German cars in general to provide high-class quality.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Germany.
Q8: Yes.

**Respondent 10.**
Q1-5: This respondent revealed no CSAs when talking about Volkswagen as a middle class car.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Germany.
Q8: No.

**Respondent 11.**
Q1-5: No CSAs were made when pointing out the brand’s benefits in safety and reliability.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Germany.
Q8: Yes.

**Respondent 12.**
Q1-5: No CSAs were revealed when the respondent mentioned Volkswagen as a quality brand.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Germany.
Q8: No.

**Respondent 1.**
Q1-5: This respondent only revealed rational CSA when making references to German and its quality as a strong automobile manufacturer, although it was acknowledged that other German cars such as Audi and Mercedes provides even better quality.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Germany.
Q8: Yes.

**Respondent 2.**
Q1-5: This respondent showed only rational CSAs when recognizing the automobile brand’s slogan “das auto”, after which the respondent in addition made it clear that Volkswagen is a car that works properly.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Germany.
Q8: No.

**Respondent 3.**
Q1-5: This respondent showed only rational CSA when referring it as a German brand that provides reliable cars.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Germany.
Q8: No.

**Respondent 4.**
Q1-5: This brand was considered as something in the middle segment, in which no CSAs were made.
Q6: No.
Q7: Germany.
Q8: No.
**Respondent 5.**
Q1-5: This respondent revealed only strong rational CSAs when referring it to a German automobile brand that provides robustness, quality and safety, which made same respondent also acknowledge the brand as having a ”boring personality” due to its origin and absence of ”alluding on emotions”.
Q6: No.
Q7: Germany.
Q8: Yes.

**Respondent 6.**
Q1-5: No CSAs were made when the respondent acknowledged the quality of Volkswagen cars.
Q6: Yes.
Q7: Germany.
Q8: No.