

# Country of Origin Effect in International Business

Strategic and Consumer Perspectives

**Edited by**  
**Marzanna K. Witek-Hajduk and**  
**Anna Grudecka**

First published 2024

ISBN: 978-1-032-53787-0 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-53790-0 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-41363-9 (ebk)

## **Introduction**

The Country-of-Origin (COO),  
Country-of-Origin (COO) Dimensions, and  
Country-of-Origin Effect (COE) – General  
Overview and Theoretical Approaches

*Marzanna K. Witek-Hajduk and Anna Grudecka*

(CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

The chapter DOI: 10.4324/9781003413639-1

The funder of the Open Access version of this chapter is  
SGH Warsaw School of Economics

# Introduction

## The Country-of-Origin (COO), Country-of-Origin (COO) Dimensions, and Country-of-Origin Effect (COE) – General Overview and Theoretical Approaches

*Marzanna K. Witek-Hajduk and Anna Grudecka*

### Introduction

Various tendencies in the global economy, such as intensifying internationalization of firms, ever-expanding international sourcing resulting in a growing number of hybrid products, and mergers and acquisitions (M&As) of foreign firms and brands, raise the question of whether place-of-origin, and especially national origin (country-of-origin – COO), country-of-origin image (COI), and country-of-origin effect (COE) still matter in contemporary international business (IB). Although some authors state that it is becoming less relevant (Andéhn, L'espoir Decosta, 2018, p. 889), in literature there is rather a consensus that it matters (De Nisco, Oduro, 2020), especially as new concepts related to it are emerging, e.g., country-of-origin ecological image (CEI) (Dekhili, Crouch, Moussawel, 2021), and all of these are evolving. Considering new, emerging dimensions of COO, the main focus should be on the country-of-operation (COOP) (Lee, Oh, Shu, 2017). Especially in the context of Russia's aggression in Ukraine, its importance is evidenced by the actions of companies withdrawing from the Russian market out of concern for their image, which is due to the broad consumers' reaction and their boycott of those entities and brands that have not decided to take this step (CELI, 2023).

The issue of COO and related concepts is not just a recent development, as even in ancient times it was observed that with reference to silk, for example, China had positive renown as a manufacturer, and especially silk originating from there was desired worldwide (Silk Road, 2023), and a need for assigning products to certain origins in a broad sense was common. Since the 1960s, COO, COI, and COE have been considered among the most important issues in IB, especially in international marketing and branding (Usunier, 2006). Initially, they were understood narrowly as one-dimensional constructs and identified with the “made-in” label and country-of-manufacturing (COM) only (Schooler, Sunoo, 1969; Nagashima, 1970). However, for many years they have been recognized as multi-dimensional constructs including various dimensions, such as country-of-assembly (COA), country-of-parts (COP), country-of-brand-origin (COBO), and country-of-corporate-origin/country-of-corporate-ownership (COCO), with Bilkey and Nes (1982) as one of the pioneers in advocating such a multi-dimensional approach.

This introductory chapter presents an overview of the streams of research on the national origin of companies/products/brands, as well as on the concept of COO and its dimensions, COI, COE, and related terms and concepts, such as “LOO”, the “made-in” label, and GIs. Moreover, various perspectives that can be adopted when considering this occurrence are discussed too.

Referring to the presented overview of the key research streams, terms, and theoretical concepts, this chapter summarizes the key areas of interest of the authors that they discuss in particular chapters, using an interdisciplinary approach, as well as the structure of the monography.

### **Country of Origin – Research Streams, and Related Terms, and Concepts**

The issue of the national origin of enterprises, products, and brands has been one of the key facets in literature on international economics, including international trade, IB, international management (IM), marketing and branding, and international tourism, as well as in publications on the law, including customs law and intellectual property protection (Dobrucali, 2019; Magnusson, Westjohn, 2011; Polański, 2018; Felbermayr, Teti, Yalcinc, 2019).

Research on the national origin of companies/products/brands covers a number of streams, including:

- 1 The origin of goods from a specific country/economic grouping (economic nationality of goods) as a factor determining the measures and instruments of trade policy applied to a given product, especially customs duties and restrictions, and the related rules of origin (ROO), as well as the rules for documenting the origin of goods (e.g., binding origin information) (Cadot, Estavadeoral, Eisenmann, Verdier, 2006; García-Santana, Puccio, Venturini, 2018; Felbermayr *et al.*, 2019);
- 2 The role and importance of the COI as a country-specific advantage (CSA) (Agrawal, Kamakura, 1999; Majid, 2017), considered from the perspective of (1) an outsider (external) (Zeugner-Roth, Bartsch, 2020); and (2) an insider (internal – national stakeholders) (Suter, Munjal, Borini, Floriani, 2021);
- 3 The process and tools of COI creation (Miyamoto, Shimizu, Hayashi, Cheah, 2023; Zeugner-Roth, Zabkar, 2015), as well as COI and COE management at different levels, also through public-private cooperation (Ryan, 2008; Suter, Borini, Coelho, de Oliveira, Machado, 2020);
- 4 LOO (Bartlett, Ghoshal, 2000), i.e., disadvantages that emerge as a consequence of the national origin of a company in host countries that can impact a firm's performance, for example, through organizational imprinting, organizational identity, image, capability development, and resource scarcity (Ramachandran, Pant, 2010), as well as the impact of the country perceptions associated with levels of legitimacy (Bell, Moore, Al-Shammari, 2008), and the influence of COO on the acceptance of foreign subsidiaries in host countries and the ways of overcoming it (Moeller, Harvey, Griffith, Richey, 2013);

- 5 The role of the “national bias” in evaluating companies, products, services, and brands based on their place-of-origin (country, region, city, continent) (Tavolletti, Stephens, Taras, Dong, 2022), and taking into account contexts such as consumer behaviour (Andéhn, Nordin, Nilsson, 2016; Cheah, Zainol, Phaua, 2016), including the COE antecedents and moderators, e.g., consumer materialism or ethnocentrism, socio-demographic profile (Motsi, Park, 2020; Witek-Hajduk, Grudecka, 2021), and industrial marketing and purchase decisions (Wang, Zhou, Mouc, Zhao, 2014; Dobrucalı, 2019), corporate policy and performance (Noorderhaven, Harzing, 2003; Elango, Sethi, 2007), including the COE in MNEs’ global staffing/HRM practices (Pudelko, Harzing, 2007; Lee, Yoshikawa, Harzing, 2022), travel/tourism (Lindblom, Lindblom, Lehtonen, Wechtler, 2018) – whose perspective is linked to the concepts of COO, its dimensions, COI, and COE;
- 6 The usage of indications referring to the place-of-origin, such as indications of origin (indications of source), denominations of origin/appellations of origin, designations of origin, and GIs, as well as economic justification, benefits, and obstacles to their use from the perspective of enterprises, buyers, and the economy at the local, regional, national, and international level (Hajdukiewicz, 2020; Goudis, Skuras, 2021);
- 7 The approaches to incorporating references to the place-of-origin, especially to the COO/its dimensions, in the foreign expansion of companies from both developed and emerging/developing countries (Herstein, Berger, Jaffe, 2014; Witek-Hajduk, Grudecka, 2021);
- 8 The country/region/city/continent-of-origin marketing/branding aimed at communicating the positive COI vs. overcoming a negative origin effect/neutralization of a negative COI (Aichner, 2014; Witek-Hajduk, Grudecka, 2023), and the issue of rebranding in the response, e.g., to the (negative) COE (Guercini, Ranfagni, 2012), as well as semiotic/anthropological aspects of COO marketing/branding communication, especially in the form of advertising, using, for instance, language elements or national colours or symbols to create associations related to the particular COO (Brijs, Bloemer, Kasper, 2011), considering also consumer behaviour with reference to the above (Carnevale, Luna, Lerman, 2017);
- 9 Legal aspects of the use of various indications referring to the place-of-origin, such as the COO (“made-in” label), indications of origin (or source), denominations of origin, designations of origin, appellations of origin, and GIs, as well as other ways of referring to the place-of-origin, especially to the COO (Charlier, Ngo, 2007; Polański, 2018); considering also potential challenges and related pitfalls (Wolffgang, Ovie, 2008; Fabio, 2020);
- 10 Relationships between COO and corporate social responsibility (CSR) and sustainability, with a special focus on comparison of activities undertaken by companies from developed vs. emerging markets (Orudzheva, Gaffney, 2018; Tran, Pappas, 2020), and consumers’ perceptions with reference to the above, including the country’s ecological image (Dekhili *et al.*, 2021).

Thus, research on national origin has been conducted from various perspectives, including the perspective of the institutional environment (Moeller *et al.*, 2013; Polański, 2018; Dobrucali, 2019), as well as the perspective of companies (strategic/management) (Herstein *et al.*, 2014; Witek-Hajduk, Grudecka, 2023), and customers, including the consumer perspective (Tran, Paparoidamis, 2020), and refers to various countries, both developed and emerging/developing ones, and companies/consumers originating from these markets (Chen, Su, 2012; De Nisco, Oduro, 2020).

Moreover, in research on national origin, different, although related, terms/constructs, and concepts are applied, such as COO and COO dimensions, COI, nation equity, and COE, LOO/liability-of-country-of-origin, CEI, and indications of origin (indications of source) (e.g., “made-in”), denominations of origin/appellations of origin, designations of origin, and GIs.

From the perspective of international trade, the origin of goods from a specific country or economic grouping (economic nationality of goods) is treated as a key factor determining the measures and instruments of commercial policy, especially customs duties and restrictions, applied to a given product. The general rule in foreign trade and international trade policy of countries and groupings is that the origin of goods is not defined as the country from which the goods were shipped. The “national source” (COO) of an imported product is specified based on the ROO covering the laws, regulations, and procedures, as well as the criteria applied. ROO include both the preferential and non-preferential ROO that determine whether goods qualify as originating from certain countries for which special arrangements/agreements apply based on which goods are eligible to be imported with lower duty rates or at zero rate. For instance, according to the regulations in the European Union (EU) (EU, 2013), the general rule is that if a product is wholly obtained in a given country or territory, it is considered to originate from that country or territory, while goods whose production involves more than one country or more than one territory are considered to originate from the country or territory in which the goods underwent the last significant, economically justified processing or treatment, in an enterprise adapted for this purpose, which resulted in the manufacture of a new product or constituted a significant stage of manufacturing.

Since the 1960s, starting with the articles of Dichter (1962), Schooler (1965), and Schooler and Sunoo (1969), the COO concept has been the most widely studied concept in IB literature, especially in IM and consumer behaviour publications (e.g., Peterson, Jolibert, 1995; Aichner, 2014; Andéhn, L'espero Decosta, 2018; Dobrucali, 2019), as well as one of the most often researched phenomena affecting the assessment of products and brands (Kumara, Canhua, 2010). Dichter (1962, p. 162) was one of the first to underline the significant influence of COO on the acceptance of products, and Schooler (1965) was the first to confirm the occurrence of the COE, taking into account the “made-in” label as the only criterion for product evaluation, while Schooler and Sunoo (1969) were the first to research consumer perception of products from the perspective of the “made-in” label.

In early papers, the term “country-of-origin” was understood as one-dimensional, identified with the “made-in” label (Schooler, Sunoo, 1969), and linked

to COM (Nagashima, 1970; Nagashima, 1977). Numerous changes in the global economy in recent decades, including the location of production in overseas markets, the commissioning of the manufacture of products and components/parts to foreign partners, and the development of international trade, as a result of which more than one country is usually involved in the production of many products, make it more and more difficult to identify the COO of a given product definitively (Tjiptono, Tiana, Andrianombonana, 2016).

Therefore, many scholars, including Chao (1993), who was one of the first, criticized the original understanding of COO as only the country in which a product is manufactured (“made in”), suggesting that it should be conceptualized as a multi-dimensional construct, taking into account the various constituent dimensions. Moreover, some researchers, such as Jaffe and Nebenzahl (2006, p. 29), postulate defining COO from the perspective of the origin perceived by consumers as “the country with which the consumer associates certain products/brands as their source, regardless of where the product is actually produced”.

Table 0.1 shows the COO dimensions identified in literature and their definitions, according to the chosen pioneers or their initial followers.

As presented in Table 0.1, the researchers state the COO dimensions, including the following: COM, COP, COCO, country-of-design (COD), COA, country-of-brand (COB), COBO, culture-of-brand (CuOBO), country-of-association (COAS), country-of-service-origin (COSO), COOP, country-of-person (COPS), country-of-technology/innovation-origin (COTO), country-of-technical-culture (COTC), country-of-service-network- location (COSNL), country-of-organizational-culture-origin (COOCO), country-of-brand-launching (COBL).

Among the key dimensions of the COO identified by researchers are those related to the origin of the brand, i.e., COBO, COB, and CuOBO. The COBO construct was postulated first by Thakor and Kohli (1996) and defined as the place, region, and country where the brand, according to customers, comes from, “to which the brand is perceived to belong”. In turn, Lim and O’Cass (2001) focus on the “cultural dimensions” of the brand origin and operationalize this construct using two components: (1) the original culture behind the brand and (2) ethnocentrism. Researchers emphasize that consumers more easily recognize the cultural origin of brands than COO of a product in the traditional sense (Lim O’Cass, 2001).

Moreover, some scholars (e.g., Papadopoulos, Heslop, 1993) criticize the COO construct as too “narrow and misleading” assuming a single place-of-origin of a product, and suggest applying a COI construct, taking into account the multidimensional nature of products and brands and the multiplicity of places involved in manufacturing. Roth and Diamantopoulos (2009) identify the following constructs relating to COI: (1) country image (COI), understood as a set of affective and cognitive associations related to a given country, which influences the general customer’s perception of products from a given country and is shaped based on the perception of production/marketing strengths and weaknesses (Roth, Romeo, 1992); (2) product-country image (PCI), understood as an image attributed to various places (countries/regions) with which customers and suppliers can associate a product (Papadopoulos, Heslop, 1993); (3) country-related product image, interpreted

Table 0.1 COO and its dimensions

<i>COO/COO dimensions</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Sources</i>
<b>Country-of-origin (COO)</b>	The COO of a product	Nagashima (1970)
<b>Country-of-manufacturing (COM)</b>	The country which appears on the “made-in” label is the country where a product is manufactured	Johansson (1989) Ulgado, Lee (1993)
<b>Country-of-parts/key components (COP)</b>	The COO of the key components of the product the COO of some or all parts of the product	Han, Terpstra (1988) Chao (1993); Tse, Lee (1993)
Country-of-corporate-origin/ Country-of-corporate-ownership (COCO)	The country where the headquarters of a company selling the product or brand are located is the home country of the parent company, regardless of the current place of manufacturing of the product	Ozsomer, Cavusgil (1991) Thakor, Lavack (2003)
<b>Country-of-design (COD)</b>	The country where a given part or product is designed	Chao (1993)
<b>Country-of-assembly (COA)</b>	The country where the product is assembled	Chao (1993); Tse, Lee (1993)
<b>Country-of-brand (COB)</b>	The COO of a brand	Ulgado, Lee (1993)
<b>Country-of-brand-origin (COBO)</b>	The country to which the brand is attributed by the target consumers	Takor, Kohli (1996); Iyer, Kalita (1997)
<b>Culture-of-brand (CuOBO)</b>	The culture to which a brand is attributed by the target consumers	Lim, O’Cass (2001)
<b>Country-of-association (COAS)</b>	The country that consumers associate with a given product or brand, regardless of the actual “made-in” location	Nebenzahl, Jaffe (1997)
<b>Country-of-service-origin (COSO)</b>	The country in which the service provider is physically located	Thelen, Honeycutt Jr, Murphy (2010)
<b>Country-of-operation (COOP)</b>	The country in which a company operates	Lee <i>et al.</i> (2017)
<b>Country-of-person (COPS)</b>	The country from which a service provider is from; where they were born or trained	Aruan, Crouch, Quester (2018)
<b>Country-of-technology/innovation-origin (COTO)</b>	The country from which technology or innovations originate from which production processes were transferred	Witek-Hajduk, Grudecka (2019)
<b>Country-of-technical-culture (COTC)</b>	The country from which the technical culture of production originates	Witek-Hajduk, Grudecka (2019)
<b>Country-of-service-network-localization (COSNL)</b>	The country where the repairs are made, including the warranty service, and where the spare parts are available	Witek-Hajduk, Grudecka (2019)

(Continued)

Table 0.1 (Continued)

<i>COO/COO dimensions</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Sources</i>
<b>Country-of-organizational-culture-origin (COOCO)</b>	The country from which the organizational culture of a given company originates	Witek-Hajduk, Grudecka (2019)
<b>Country-of-brand-launching (COBL)</b>	The country perceived as the first one in which the brand was sold	Witek-Hajduk, Grudecka (2019)
<b>Country-of-processing (COPR)</b>	The country where raw materials are processed	Aizaki, Sato (2020)
<b>Country-of-growing (COG)</b>	For food products – the country where raw materials grow	Aizaki, Sato (2020)

*Source:* Own elaboration.

as customers' opinions on the perceived quality of goods and services manufactured in different countries (Nes, Bilkey, 1993). To measure COI, researchers apply scales including various dimensions of COI (Martin, Eroglu, 1993), such as: (1) political dimension, including: democratic vs. dictatorial system, capitalist vs. communist system, civilian vs. military, pro-western vs. pro-communist, and free market vs. centrally planned system; (2) economic dimension: standard of living, stability of the economic environment, quality of products, existence of a welfare system, and level of labour costs; (3) technological dimension: industrialization, level of technological research, level of literacy, and mass production compared to hand-made products. Askegaard and Ger (1998) develop the construct of PCI in the direction of the contextualized approach, i.e., the contextualized product-place image (CPPI). They consider the variety of connotations and stereotypes that should be considered when formulating images associated with particular products and places, taking into account the cultural context. They assume that all of this should be perceived from the perspective of the relationship between the imagery of the local market and, e.g., consumption patterns. This means that the impact of images of products and places-of-origin is context-specific and is determined by factors such as customers' motivations, their symbolic values, etc.

An important concept related to COO is also the COE, whose precursors were Nebenzahl and Jaffe (1997). COE is identified with the impact of the image of a given country or region on the perception and assessment by buyers of products or brands originating from it (Andéhn, L'esperoir Decosta; 2018; De Nisco, Oduro, 2021). This may translate into the purchasing behaviour of buyers. The occurrence of COE is strongly related to overt, declared, or implicit attitudes towards a given country and its inhabitants because stereotypes about a given country affect its image, which translates into the perception of brands and products from that country (Verlegh, Steenkamp, 1999) and attitudes towards firms, products, or brands originating in that country (Andéhn *et al.*, 2016).

The concepts of COO/COE are also related to the concept of LOO/liability of country-of-origin (LOR), which refers to disadvantages faced by companies in the

host foreign countries due to their national origins (Ramachandran, Pant, 2010), as COO can become for a company either a source of advantages or liabilities (Moeller *et al.*, 2013).

In turn, Maheswaran and Chen (2006) introduce the concept of nation equity, incorporating COE and integrating different facets of country perceptions by consumers. The concept of nation equity is that each country, similar to brands, has equity, and this follows not only from the COE created based, for instance, on a country's performance components (resulting predominantly in its reputation based on its products' quality, i.e., product-related COE) but also from consumers' incidental emotions and appraisals associated with these emotions with reference to a given country. Such incidental emotions within a more general mood can impact, for example, the influence of message persuasion or consumers' evaluations of products originating from a given country (Maheswaran, Chen, 2006; Chen, Maheswaran, Wei, Saxeba, 2015).

Moreover, a number of terms referring to the product origin associated with a specific geographical area are also related to the issue of national origin, such as indications of origin/indications of source, denominations of origin/appellations of origin, designations of origin, and GIs (Charlier, Ngo, 2007; Moschini, Menapace, Pick, 2008). According to Hajdukiewicz (2020), indications of origin refer to the country or place in a given country as the place of the geographical origin of a product and not necessarily the origin of a company that manufactures the product (e.g., labels such as "made in", but also terms such as Brazilian coffee, Indian tea, Swiss cheese, etc.). These indications constitute the broadest and most general category of indications of the geographical origin of goods from a particular country or region, but they are not GIs.

In turn, according to the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights of the World Trade Organization (TRIPS, 1994), GIs are defined as "indications which identify a good as originating in the territory of a Member (*of the World Trade Organization*) or a region or locality in that territory, where a given quality, reputation, or other characteristic of the good is essentially attributable to its geographical origin". This document also defines general standards for the protection of GIs for all types of products, including agri-food products. Products with a protected geographical indication (PGI) are produced, processed, or prepared in the geographical area from which they take their name and have a particular quality, reputation, or other feature attributable to the geographical origin concerned.

In turn, denomination of origin (also known as appellation of origin) is a sub-type of GI. According to the Lisbon Agreement for the Protection of Appellations of Origin and their International Registration of 1958 (Lisbon Agreement, 1958), as amended, appellation of origin is "the geographical denomination of a country, region, or locality, which serves to designate a product originating therein, the quality or characteristics of which are due exclusively or essentially to the geographical environment, including natural and human factors" (e.g., Prosciutto di Parma – a name of ham produced in the province of Parma, the Emilia-Romagna region in Italy and using exclusively pigs from that area, wherein each step of production is monitored and controlled by the Istituto Parma Qualità, which qualifies the ham as

Parma ham) (PdO, 1992). Products bearing an appellation of origin label owe their quality and characteristics to the environment of the geographical area, including its natural and human factors, such as climate, soil, topography, local know-how, traditional production methods, etc. Both appellations of origin and GIs require a qualitative link between the product they identify and its place-of-origin and inform customers about a product's geographical origin and a product's quality/characteristics related to this place-of-origin.

Thus, there are two types of GIs: (1) a simple one, which conveys only simple, qualitatively neutral information about the origin of goods from a specific geographical area and does not refer to the reputation of goods or their specific quality characteristics related to the geographical origin (e.g., Brazilian coffee, Indian tea); and (2) a qualified GI, for which there must be a genuine link between the geographical origin of the goods and their reputation, quality, or other characteristics (e.g., Prosciutto di Parma, Gruyère, Roquefort). In addition, GIs are divided into: (1) direct indications, which include geographical names, e.g., names of towns, regions, countries, etc., which directly state the place-of-origin of the goods (e.g., German sausages from the state of Thuringia – Thüringer Rostbratwurst, Polish buns, originating from the area of Lublin, made of yeast dough with onion – Cebularz lubelski, French wines from northern France – Champagne or British whisky, i.e. Scotch whisky); and (2) indirect indications, which do not directly state a specific geographical origin, but contain elements enabling specific goods to be associated with a specific geographical place (e.g., Greek cheese made of a particular combination of milk types – Feta, Polish croissants made of half puff pastry with white poppy inside, prepared in Poznań to celebrate Saint Martin's Day – Rogal świętomarciński).

A protected designation of origin (PDO) is a type of GI in the EU and the United Kingdom aimed at preserving the designations of origin of food-related products and to designate products that have been produced, processed, and developed in a specific geographical area, using the recognized know-how of local producers and ingredients from a given region, from which they take their name. In turn, traditional specialties guaranteed (TSG) are products manufactured from traditional raw materials or which feature a traditional composition or method of production/processing, with a specific characteristic which differentiates them from other agri-food products in the same category (Hajdukiewicz, 2020).

### **Country-of-Origin – The Theoretical Frameworks**

The COO, COI, and COE, as well as the related concepts, have been researched in reference to various theoretical frameworks, such as means-end theory, signaling theory, information processing theory, information integration theory, the brand-origin-recognition-accuracy (BORA) concept, country halo effect, summary construct effect, product attribute effect, default heuristic effect, schema congruity theory, institutional and legitimacy theory, and semiotic theory.

A means-end theory is applied in the research on COE (Reynolds, 2001; Adina, Gabriela, Roxana-Denisa, 2015; Olson, Xiao, Guo, D'Ambra, 2017). According to this theory, consumers evaluate products/brands by linking their attributes to the

perceived consequences in a hierarchical way, and a hierarchical consumers' decision-making model consists of three interconnected levels (Olson, Reynolds, 2001; Dibley, Baker, 2001): (1) a product's/brand's attributes (features and properties); (2) consequences of use (effects of a product's/brand's use); and (3) personal values. Thus, COE is shaped based on the following mechanisms: (a) cognitive – COO is a cue referring to the experience of a given country in the production of specific product categories, which affects perceptions of functional attributes; (b) affective – the COO's symbolic/emotional values may have led to affinity or animosity towards products/brands; and (c) normative (social/personal) variables that affect the overall perceptions of products/brands originating from a given country and consumers' willingness to buy them (Adina *et al.*, 2015; Xiao *et al.*, 2017; Motsi, Park, 2020). Han (2020) states also that consumers may formulate new knowledge by applying inferential thinking instead of referring to their actual experiences, and some associations may be automatically and unintentionally activated. Rashid (2017) suggests that depending on the product parameters considered by consumers together with the COO cues, a product's evaluation follows either cognitive, affective, or normative processing. He explains that even an affective reaction may occur without any cognition, and a consumer's judgement made on this basis may be more confident. This is because these mechanisms are partially independent and impact each other, and consumer decisions also depend on what type of information is accessible when making evaluations.

A signalling theory is applied to describe behaviour when two parties (organizations or individuals) have access to different information. This concept is based on the prerequisite that an individual is rational and risk-averse, and thus both the sender (e.g., the company) and the receiver (e.g., the customer) of signals have an interest in reducing information asymmetry. Therefore, the COO cue applied by a firm (e.g., “made-in” label, a foreign-brand-name, GI) may be treated as a signal aimed at reducing customer uncertainty about the quality of a product, while the customer, as the receiver of this signal, makes the cognitive effort to interpret it to limit risk (Kirmani, Rao, 2000; Erdem, Swait, Valenzuela, 2006). Thus, according to the signalling theory, a company may reduce the noise caused by the negative COI and increase the effectiveness of its marketing/branding by using various signals in the form of the COO cues associated with a country enjoying a positive image (Magnusson, Haas, Zhao, 2008).

An information processing theory explains how information is encoded into memory and is based on the idea that individuals do not merely respond to stimuli from the environment but rather process the received information, i.e., they perceive, analyze, use, and remember, and do not “just respond” to the signal (Bloemer, Brijs, Kasper, 2009; Siahtiri, Lee, 2019; Motsi, Park, 2020; Oh, Lee, Lee, 2021). Thus, according to this theory, information referring to COO (e.g., a “made-in” label, a foreign-brand-name, GI) serves as an extrinsic cue in consumers' information processing (Han, 2016).

Somehow similar to the above is the information integration theory proposed by Anderson (1971), assuming that customers integrate information from various sources to formulate attitudes and make an overall judgement. First, they evaluate

them, then integrate them, e.g., with their subjective values, and finally – respond to them, i.e., act. Moreover, they assign weights and values to each piece of information. This approach is also adopted as a theoretical framework for various studies on COO (Lang, Crown, 1993; Chu, Chang, Chen, Wang, 2010).

The BORA concept (Samiee, Shimp, Sharma, 2005) refers to the knowledge that potential consumers store in their minds and can use when assessing and making decisions about brands and products and serves to explain the influence of brand names, especially foreign branding, on consumer behaviour. Samiee, Shimp and Sharma (2005) define BORA as the consumer's ability to correctly identify the COO. In contrast to many authors assuming that consumers are aware of the origin of brands, which affects their assessment of product quality, attitudes towards a brand, and purchase intentions, the authors listed above assume that consumers have little knowledge about the COO and that consumers' ability to recognize the COO is based mainly on associating the brand name with a language suggesting its origin. Thus, according to the BORA concept, by choosing a specific brand name or logo (characteristic colours, symbols), a company can suggest a specific COO to consumers, although, according to Usunier (2011), linguistic suggestions related to the choice of a brand name can lead to both correct and incorrect categorization of brands by consumers due to their national origin, which is influenced, among other things, by the brand dominance, name of a company, and its products, as well as specific features of a given language.

The influence of the COO on consumer behaviour is reflected in the form of a country's halo effect, a summary construct effect, a product-attribute effect, and a default heuristic effect (Han, 2020). The country's "halo effect", first described and named by Johansson, Douglas and Nonaka (1985), refers to consumers who are not familiar with products/brands originating from a given country. Therefore, the image of this country acts as a "halo", directly affecting their attitudes towards the product/brand and, eventually, indirectly influencing the overall evaluation of products or brands from that country that the consumer comes across in the future (Bloemer *et al.*, 2009). Zbib, Ghaddar, Samarji and Wahbi (2021) note that consumers have access to various types of information, so the decisions they reach may depend on mental shortcuts resulting in perceptual distortions such as stereotypes and the halo effect.

In turn, the summary construct effect occurs when consumers are already familiar with products/brands originating from a specific country and they draw conclusions regarding COO based on their knowledge of all products originating from that country. Thus, a consumer's knowledge of or perception (sum of previous impressions) of products/brands originating from a specific country indirectly influences attitudes towards other products/brands from that country and simplifies the evaluation of these products (Johansson, Douglas, Nonanka, 1985; Han, 1989; Hong, Wyer, 1989; Ahmed, Johnson, Yang, Fatt, Teng, Boon, 2004). It is also a shortcut to making a purchase decision (Johansson, 1989). Thus, the summary construct, which allows consumers to directly evaluate a given product without verifying additional information, can positively enhance the overall COI (Park, Park, Dubinsky, 2011).

In turn, according to the product-attribute effect first described by Hong and Wyer (1989) and confirmed also by the results of the research conducted, e.g., by Li and Wyer (1994) and Hadjimarcou and Hu (1999), the COO of a product/brand arouses a consumer's interest in its quality and thus contributes to the inclusion of additional attributes in the decision-making process.

The default heuristic effect is considered a middle-ground approach between the halo effect and the summary effect, as it combines elements of both the halo and summary construct effects (Bloemer *et al.*, 2009). According to this concept, information about a product's/brand's COO is processed during decision-making together with additional information about a given product/brand, and this results in an interactive and interconnected effect on the product evaluation by the consumer. Thus, various COO cues mutually effect their interpretation (Manrai, Manrai, Lascu, Ryans Jr., 1998).

A schema congruity theory is applied in research on a country's information influence on the evaluation of products and brands (Allman, Fenik, Hewett, Morgan, 2016; Cheah *et al.*, 2016). According to this concept, congruity is a state between at least two objects that have equally valenced evaluations, and thus – within such a schema, it is easy for a consumer to process information as it does not require huge cognitive effort. Such a situation occurs if, for instance, the images (positive) of the COBO and COM correspond to each other (Carvalho, Samu, Sivaramakrishnan, 2011). Otherwise, if incongruity emerges, consumers seek to resolve this, for example, by changing the existing schema and mental assumptions, etc. If this is not possible or too demanding, it leads to negative evaluations, e.g., of a brand originating from a particular country with a positive image being manufactured in a poorly perceived one, as consumers cannot understand why a “strong brand” is manufactured in a “weak country”. With reference to the above, the COO is a form of stereotype that simplifies information processing, contributes to reducing consumer risk aversion, and thus supports the purchase decision (Carvalho *et al.*, 2011; Cheah *et al.*, 2016).

An institutional theory and legitimacy theory perspective are also applied in studies on COO (Wang *et al.*, 2014; Lin, Huang, Lin, Chuang, 2019). According to institutional theory, institutional norms, governmental policies, and resources applied in order to secure them play an important role, such as in the shaping of norms and bounds in a society and business ethics (Einwiller, Ruppel, Schnauber, 2016). Thus, consumers' perception of a given country's legal institutions (those formal and informal ones) and activities undertaken by them affect both the COE (Einwiller *et al.*, 2015) and COI (Lin *et al.*, 2019), resulting further, for instance, in preferences towards companies, products, or brands originating from particular countries. In turn, the key assumption of the legitimacy theory is that a company acts in a desired and proper manner to meet social norms, values, and beliefs and thus accounts for stakeholders' interests as well (Schiopoiu Burlea, Popa, 2013). Therefore, COI results from consumers' recognition and judgement of, e.g., a product's legitimacy, considering the country it originates from (Wang *et al.*, 2014).

Researchers (e.g., Askegaard, Ger, 1998) also refer to stereotypes and semiotic theory, drawing on the earlier insights of Papadopoulos and Heslop (1993) on the

impact of stereotypes on product and country perception by consumers. With reference to stereotyping, the theory identifies them as shortcuts simplifying interactions with a complex environment because there are pre-existing mental representations, which are not free, however, from cognitive memory biases. In turn, semiotic theory explains how meanings are created, communicated, and transferred into one's behaviour, also with reference to PCIs (Askegaard, Ger, 1998). Therefore, it is useful to understand how these stereotypes are created (Brijs *et al.*, 2011). As Lotz and Hu (2001) note, sourcing also from the social stereotype theory, negative COO beliefs (stereotypes) can be minimalized or eliminated by exposing consumers to disconfirming product information, as they have the potential to change beliefs.

### **The Aim and Structure of this Monograph**

This monograph aims at pointing out various aspects of COO/its dimensions, and COE that remain significant challenges for both consumers and companies and brands, not only from emerging and developing countries but also from developed ones.

This monograph presents COO and its dimensions as complex phenomena and challenges in IB, with an interdisciplinary nature influencing both companies' strategies and consumer behaviour (COE). Its purpose is to collect significant contributions to both the theory and practice of IB, marketing, and branding in terms of COO/its dimensions and COE, taking an interdisciplinary approach (including economic, marketing, legal, and semiotic/anthropological aspects) from both the strategic (management) and consumer perspectives. This monograph is intended to contribute to the ongoing discussion on the role of the COO/its dimensions in contemporary and increasingly globalized and complex IB. The novelty lies also in considering the perspectives of consumers and firms from both emerging/developing countries and developed ones.

This monograph consists of three parts and 12 chapters, including the introductory chapter, which presents an overview of the COO concept and theoretical approaches, as well as key research streams related to the issue of COO.

The first part of this monograph is devoted to COO in IB from a strategic perspective. It starts with a discussion on the key challenges related to COO with reference to IB, taking the strategic perspective of companies from both emerging/developing markets and developed countries. Next, the issue of managing COE through public-private cooperation is discussed, followed by the approaches to the COO issues from the relatively novel perspective of corporate responsibility and sustainability, and then—rebranding and COE, discussing predominantly the issue of rebranding in response to the challenges related to COE. Finally, the issue of semiotic persuasion, and more specifically, the communication of COO in advertising, is addressed in the first part.

The second part of this monograph considers the economic and legal perspectives of COO in IB. Firstly, the unique form of intellectual property, i.e., GIs, used not only to identify geographical origin but also, e.g., specific quality, is discussed, followed by a discussion on COO determination, one of the basic issues influencing the number of customs duties, including the issue of loopholes in customs regulations and related legal pitfalls. Next, normative imperfections putting the EU at a

disadvantage relative to its trading partners such as the United States are addressed, while also making reference to the Versace Law and Haute Couture.

The focus of the third part of this monograph is COE in IB from a consumer perspective. It starts with the impact of COO, its dimensions, and related concepts on consumer behaviour, considering those from emerging/developing markets and developed countries. Then, the impact of COO on Generation X, Y, and Z's perceptions of luxury goods and their purchase intentions is addressed, followed by the impact of the COO and region-of-origin on consumers' evaluation and valuation of food products, considering the moderating role of consumer ethnocentrism.

Thus, a distinguishing feature of this monograph is a multifaceted approach to COO/its dimensions and COE, including both consumer and strategic perspectives, as well as developed countries and emerging/developing markets. The strategies in response to these phenomena, including the ways of COO communication/neutralization, as well as some economic (GIs' benefits for exporters) and legal issues (pitfalls of COO determination, normative imperfections, Versace Law, and Haute Couture), and semiotic/anthropological aspects of COO communication in advertising, are analyzed. COE management through public-private cooperation, the context of corporate responsibility/sustainability, and links between rebranding and COE are also discussed. The impact of COO on consumer behaviour, including the evaluation and pricing of luxury goods and food products, and the role of consumer ethnocentrism, is also discussed.

This monograph takes a novel, interdisciplinary approach to the field, covering various aspects of COO, its implications for IB, further theoretical developments with regard to COO, and empirical evidence delivered by scholars representing different fields of science. This monograph is addressed predominantly to the academic community, i.e., academics, scholars, and upper-level students already dealing with, and those who are just becoming interested in, the discussed issues.

## References

- Adina, C., Gabriela, C., Roxana-Denisa, S. (2015). Country-of-origin effects on perceived brand positioning, *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 23, pp. 422–427.
- Agrawal, J., Kamakura, W.A. (1999). Country of origin: a competitive advantage?, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 16, pp. 255–267.
- Ahmed, Z.U., Johnson, J.P., Yang, X., Fatt, C.K., Teng, H.S., Boon, L.C. (2004). Does country of origin matter for low-involvement products?, *International Marketing Review*, 21, pp. 102–120.
- Aichner, T. (2014). Country-of-origin marketing: a list of typical strategies with examples, *Journal of Brand Management*, 21(1), pp. 81–93.
- Aizaki, H., Sato, K. (2020). Consumer preferences for three dimensions of country of origin of a processed food product, *British Food Journal*, 122(11), pp. 3361–3382.
- Allman, H.F., Fenik, A.P., Hewett, K., Morgan, F.N. (2016). Brand image evaluations: the interactive roles of country of manufacture, brand concept, and vertical line extension type, *Journal of International Marketing*, 24(2), pp. 40–61.

- Andéhn, M., L'espoir Decosta, J.-N.P. (2018). Re-imagining the country-of-origin effect: a promulgation approach, *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 27(7), pp. 884–896.
- Andéhn, M., Nordin, F., Nilsson, M.E. (2016). Facets of country image and brand equity: revisiting the role of product categories in country-of-origin effect research, *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 15(3), pp. 225–238.
- Anderson, N.H. (1971). Integration theory and attitude change, *Psychological Review*, 78(3), pp. 171–206.
- Aruan, D.T.H., Crouch, R., Quester, P. (2018). Relative importance of service delivery, country of person and country of brand in hybrid service evaluation: a conjoint analysis approach, *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 27(7), pp. 819–831.
- Askegaard, S., Ger, G. (1998). Product-country images: towards a contextualized approach, *European Advances in Consumer Research*, 3, pp. 50–58.
- Bartlett, C.A., Ghoshal, S. (2000). Going global: Lessons from late movers, *Harvard Business Review*, 78(2), pp. 132–142.
- Bell, G., Moore, C., Al-Shammari, H.A. (2008). Country of origin and foreign IPO legitimacy: understanding the role of geographic scope and insider ownership, *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 32(1), pp. 185–202.
- Bilkey, W.J., Nes, E. (1982). Country-of-origin effects on product evaluations, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 13, pp. 89–100.
- Bloemer, J., Brijs, K., Kasper, H. (2009). The CoO-ELM model. A theoretical framework for the cognitive processes underlying country of origin-effects, *European Journal of Marketing*, 43(1/2), pp. 62–89.
- Brijs, K., Bloemer, J., Kasper, H. (2011). Country-image discourse model: unraveling meaning, structure, and function of country images, *Journal of Business Research*, 64(12), pp. 1259–1269.
- BritishMuseum(2023). *Fortis*, <https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/term/BIOG58344>. (Access: 15.02.2023).
- Cadot, O., Estavadeoral, A., Eisenmann, A.S., Verdier, T. (eds.) (2006). *The Origin of Goods: Rules of Origin in Regional Trade Agreements*, Centre for Economic Policy Research, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carnevale, M., Luna, D., Lerman, D. (2017). Brand linguistics: a theory-driven framework for the study of language in branding, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 34(2), pp. 572–591.
- Carvalho, S.W., Samu, S., Sivaramakrishnan, S. (2011). The effect of country-related brand associations and product attributes on attitude toward unfamiliar foreign brands: a schema congruity perspective, *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 23(2), pp. 135–150.
- CELI (2023). *Over 1,000 Companies Have Curtailed Operations in Russia – But Some Remain*, <https://som.yale.edu/story/2022/over-1000-companies-have-curtailed-operations-russia-some-remain> (Access: 17.02.2023).
- Chao, P. (1993). Partitioning country of origin effects: consumer evaluations of hybrid product, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 24(2), pp. 291–306.
- Chao, P. (1993). Partitioning country of origin effects: consumer evaluations of hybrid product, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 24(2), pp. 291–306.
- Charlier, C., Ngo, M-A. (2007). An analysis of the European Communities: protection of trademarks and geographical indications for agricultural products and foodstuffs dispute, *The Journal of World Intellectual Property*, 10(3/4), pp. 171–186.
- Cheah, I., Zainol, Z., Phaua, I. (2016). Conceptualizing country-of-ingredient authenticity of luxury brands, *Journal of Business Research*, 69, pp. 5819–5826.

- Chen, C.Y., Maheswaran, D., Wei, J., Saxene P. (2015). Culture, emotions, and nation equity. In: S. Ng, A.Y. Lee (Eds.), *Handbook of Culture and Consumer Behavior*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 183–205.
- Chen, Y.M., Su, Y.F. (2012). Do country-of-manufacture and country-of-design matter to industrial brand equity?, *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 27(1), pp. 57–68.
- Chu, P.-Y., Chang, C.-C., Chen, C.-Y., Wang, T.-Y. (2010). Countering negative country-of-origin effects: the role of evaluation mode, *European Journal of Marketing*, 44(7/8), pp. 1055–1076.
- De Nisco, A., Oduro, S. (2021). Partitioned country-of-origin effect on consumer behavior: a meta-analysis, *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 34(5), pp. 1–23.
- Dekhili, S., Crouch, R., El Moussawel, O. (2021). The relevance of geographic origin in sustainability challenge: the facets of country ecological image, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 38(6), pp. 664–678.
- Dibley, A., Baker, S. (2001). Uncovering the links between brand choice and personal values among young British and Spanish girls, *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 1(2), pp. 77–93.
- Dichter, E. (1962). The world customer, *Harvard Business Review*, 40(4), p. 113.
- Dobrucali, B. (2019). Country-of-origin effects on industrial purchase decision making: a systematic review of research, *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 34(2), pp. 401–411.
- Einwiller, S., Rupper, C., Schnauber, A. (2016). Harmonization and differences in CSR reporting of US and German companies. Analyzing the role of global reporting standards and country-of-origin, *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 21(2), pp. 230–245.
- Elango, B., Sethi, S.P. (2007). An exploration of the relationship between country of origin (COE) and the internationalization-performance paradigm, *Management International Review*, 47, pp. 369–392.
- Erdem, T., Swait, J., Valenzuela, A. (2006). Brands as signals: a cross-country validation study, *Journal of Marketing*, 70, pp. 34–49.
- EU (2013). *Regulation (EU) No 952/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 October 2013 laying down the Union Customs Code (recast)*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A32013R0952> (Access: 13.02.2013).
- Felbermayr, G., Teti, F., Yalcinc, E. (2019). Rules of origin and the profitability of trade deflection, *Journal of International Economics*, 121, p. 103248.
- García-Santana, P., Puccio, L., Venturini, R. (2018). From final goods to inputs: the protectionist effect of rules of origin, *American Economic Review*, 108(8), pp. 2335–2365.
- Goudis, A., Skuras, D. (2021). Consumers' awareness of the EU's protected designations of origin logo, *British Food Journal*, 123(13), pp. 1–18.
- Guercini, S., Ranfagni, S. (2013). Integrating country-of-origin image and brand image in corporate rebranding: the case of China, *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 31(5), pp. 508–521.
- Hadjimarcou, J., Hu, M. Y. (1999). Global product stereotypes and heuristic processing: the impact of ambient task complexity, *Psychology and Marketing*, 16(7), pp. 583–612.
- Hajdukiewicz, A. (2020). European union agri-food quality schemes for the protection and promotion of geographical indications and traditional specialities: an economic perspective, *Folia Horticulturae*, 26(1), pp. 3–17.
- Han, C.M. (2020). Assessing the predictive validity of perceived globalness and country of origin of foreign brands in quality judgments among consumers in emerging markets, *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 19(5), pp. 463–480.
- Han, C.M. (2016). Global identity strategy and its efficacy for Asian brands: is Toyota global or Japanese to consumers?, *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing*, 25(5), pp. 862–877.

- Han, C.M. (1989). Country image: Halo or summary construct?, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 26(2), pp. 222–229.
- Han, C., Terpstra, V. (1988). Country-of-origin effects for uni-national and bi-national products, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 19, pp. 235–255.
- Herstein, R., Berger, R., Jaffe, E.D. (2014). How companies from developing and emerging countries can leverage their brand equity in terms of place branding, *Competitiveness Review*, 24(4), pp. 293–305.
- Hong, S.T., Wyer Jr., R.S. (1989). Effects of country-of-origin and product-attribute information on product evaluation: an information processing perspective, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16(2), pp. 175–187.
- Iyer, G.R., Kalita, J.K. (1997). The impact of country-of-origin and country-of-manufacture cues on consumer perceptions of quality and value, *Journal of Global Marketing*, 11(1), pp. 7–28.
- Jaffe, E.D., Nebenzahl, I.D. (2006). *National Image and Competitive Advantage: The Theory and Practice of Place Branding*, 2nd ed., Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Johansson, J.K. (1989). Determinants and effects of the use of “made in” labels, *International Marketing Review*, 6(1), pp. 47–58.
- Johansson, J.K., Douglas, S.P., Nonaka, I. (1985). Assessing the impact of country of origin on product evaluations: a new methodological perspective, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 22(4), pp. 388–396.
- Kirmani, A., Rao, A.R. (2000). No pain, no gain: a critical review of the literature in signaling unobservable product quality, *Journal of Marketing*, 64, pp. 66–79.
- Kumara, P.A.P.S., Canhua, K. (2010). Perceptions of country of origin: an approach to identifying expectations of foreign products, *Journal of Brand Management*, 17(5), pp. 343–353.
- Lang, J.Q., Crown, M.E. (1993). Country-of-origin effect in apparel choices: a conjoint analysis, *Journal of Consumer Studies and Home Economics*, 17(1), pp. 87–98.
- Lee, H., Chae, M.-S., Lew, Y.K. (2020). The application of categorization and stereotype content theories to country of origin image: vietnamese perception towards Korean wave brands, *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 26(3), pp. 336–361.
- Lee, S., Oh, H., Hsu, C.H.C. (2017). Country-of-operation and brand images: evidence from the Chinese hotel industry, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29&70, pp. 1814–1833.
- Lee, H.-J., Yoshikawa, K., Harzing, A-W. (2022). Cultures and institutions: dispositional and contextual explanations for country-of-origin effects in MNC ‘ethnocentric’ staffing practices, *Organization Studies*, 43(4), pp. 497–519.
- Li, Z.G., Murray, L.W., Scott, D. (2000). Global sourcing, multiple country-of-origin facets, and consumer reactions, *Journal of Business Research*, 47(2), pp. 121–133.
- Li, W.K., Wyer, R.S. (1994). The role of country of origin in product evaluations: informational and standard-of-comparison effects, *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 3(2), pp. 187–212.
- Lim, K., O’Cass, A. (2001). Consumer brand classifications: an assessment of culture of origin vs. COO, *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 10(2), pp. 120–136.
- Lin, C.-P., Huang, C.-J., Lin, H.-M., Chuang, C.-M. (2019). The origin of the country-of-origin image: the role of law, *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 29(5), pp. 617–636.
- Lindblom, A., Lindblom, T., Lehtonen, M.J., Wechtler, H. (2018). A study on country images, destination beliefs, and travel intentions: a structural equation model approach, *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 20(5), pp. 1–10.

- Lisbon Agreement (1958). *Lisbon Agreement for the Protection of Appellations of Origin and Their International Registration of 31 October 1958, as Revised at Stockholm on 14 July 1967*, [https://treaties.un.org/Pages/showDetails.aspx?objid=080000028010ec75&clang=\\_en](https://treaties.un.org/Pages/showDetails.aspx?objid=080000028010ec75&clang=_en) (Access: 15.02.2013).
- Lotz, S.L., Hu, M.Y. (2001). Diluting negative country of origin stereotypes: a social stereotype approach, *Journal of Marketing Management*, 17(1–2), pp. 105–120.
- Magnusson, P., Haas, S.M., Zhao, H. (2008). A branding strategy for emerging market firms entering developed markets, *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 20(3–4), pp. 95–107.
- Magnusson, P., Westjohn, S.A. (2011). *Is There a country-of-Origin Theory?*, Handbook of Research in International Marketing, Second Edition Edited by Subhash C. Jain and David A. Griffith, pp. 292–315.
- Majid, K.A. (2017). Drawing negative inferences from a positive country-of-origin image” consumers’ use of COI and price levels to assess counterfeit drugs, *International Marketing Review*, 34(2), pp. 293–310.
- Maheswaran, D., Chen, C.Y. (2006). Nation equity: incidental emotions in country-of-origin effects, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33, pp. 370–376.
- Manrai, L.A., Manrai, A.K., Lascu, D.N., Ryans Jr., J.K. (1998). How green-claim strength and country disposition effect product evaluation and company image, *Psychology and Marketing*, 14(5), pp. 511–537.
- Martin, I.M., Eroglu, S. (1993). Measuring a multi-dimensional construct: country image, *Journal of Business Research*, 28, pp. 191–210.
- Miyamoto, J., Shimizu, A., Hayashi, J., Cheah, I. (2023). Revisiting “Cool Japan” in country-of-origin research: a commentary and future research directions, *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, Ahead-of-print.
- Moeller, M., Harvey, M., Griffith, D., Richey, G. (2013). The impact of country-of-origin on the acceptance of foreign subsidiaries in host countries: an examination of the ‘liability-of-foreignness’, *International Business Review*, 22, pp. 89–99.
- Moschini, G.C., Menapace, L., Pick, D. (2008). Geographical indications and the competitive provision of quality in agricultural markets, *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 90(3), pp. 794–812.
- Motsi, T., Park, J.E. (2020). National stereotypes as antecedents of country-of-origin image: the role of stereotype content model, *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 32(2), pp. 115–127.
- Nagashima, A. (1970). A comparison of Japanese and U.S. attitudes toward foreign products, *Journal of Marketing*, 34(1), pp. 68–74.
- Nagashima, A. (1977). A comparative “made in” product image survey among Japanese businessman, *Journal of Marketing*, 41(3), pp. 95–100.
- Nebenzahl, I.D., Jaffe, E.D. (1997). Measuring the joint effects of brand and country image in consumer evaluation of global products, *Journal of Marketing Practice: Applied Marketing Science*, 3(3), pp. 190–207.
- Nes, E., Bilkey, W.J. (1993). A multi-cue test of country-of-origin theory. In: N. Papadopoulos, L.A. Heslop, (Eds.) *Product-country images*, New York: International Business Press, pp. 179–196.
- Noorderhaven, N.G., Harzing, A.W. (2003). The “Country-of-origin Effect” in multinational corporations: sources, mechanisms and moderating conditions. In: N.G. Noorderhaven, (Ed.), *Management and International Review, Journal of International Business*, 2. Wiesbaden: Gabler Verlag, pp. 47–66.

- Oh, H., Lee, M., Lee, S.A. (2021). Global or local brand? Hotel selection in global travel context, *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 30(1), pp. 104–117.
- Olson, J.C., Reynolds, T., Thomas, J. (2001). The means-end approach to understanding consumer decision making. In: T. Reynolds and J. Olson (Eds.), *Understanding Consumers Decision Making: The Means-End Approach to Marketing and Advertising Strategy*, New York: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, pp. 3–24.
- Orudzheva, L., Gaffney, N. (2018). Country-of-origin and CSR initiatives: a social dominance perspective, *Social Responsibility Journal*, 14(3), pp. 501–515.
- Ozsomer, A., Cavusgil, T. (1991). Country-of-origin effects on product evaluations: a sequel to Bilkey and Nes review. In: M.C. Gilly (Ed.), Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association, 2, pp. 269–277.
- Papadopoulos, N., Heslop, L. (1993). *Product and Country Images: Research and Strategy*, New York: The Haworth Press.
- Park, J.Y., Park, K., Dubinsky, A.J. (2011). Impact of retailer image on private label attitude: halo effect and summary construct, *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 63(3), pp. 173–183.
- PdO (1992). *Prosciutto di Parma (Parma Ham). Protected Designation of Origin*, <https://www.politico.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/parma.pdf> (Access: 14.02.2023).
- Peterson, R.A., Jolibert, A.J.P. (1995). A meta-analysis of country-of-origin effects, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26(4), pp. 883–900.
- Polański, P.P. (2018). Revisiting country of origin principle: challenges related to regulating e-commerce in the European Union, *Computer Law and Security Review*, 34, pp. 562–581.
- Pudelko, M., Harzing, A-W. (2007). Country-of-origin, localization, or dominance effect? An empirical investigation of HRM practices in foreign subsidiaries, *Human Resource Management*, 46, pp. 535–559.
- Ramachandran, J., Pant, A. (2010). The Liabilities of origin: an emerging perspective on the costs of doing business abroad, *Advances in International Management*, 23, pp. 231–265.
- Rashid, M. S. (2017). Weakening the effect of unfavorable country of origin: a process- and parameter-associated theoretical framework, *Journal of Global Marketing*, 30(2), pp. 87–98.
- Roth, M.S., Romeo, J.B. (1992). Matching product category and country image perceptions: a framework for managing country-of-origin effects, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23(3), pp. 447–497.
- Roth, K.P., Diamantopoulos, A. (2009). Advancing the country image construct, *Journal of Business Research*, 62(7), pp. 726–740.
- Ryan, J. (2008). The Finnish country-of-origin effect: the quest to create a distinctive identity in a crowded and competitive international marketplace, *Journal of Brand Management*, 16, pp. 13–20.
- Samiee, S., Shimp, T.A., Sharma, S. (2005). Brand origin recognition accuracy: its antecedents and consumers' cognitive limitations, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(4), pp. 379–397.
- Schiopoiu Burlea, A., Popa, I. (2013). Legitimacy theory. In: S.O. Idowu, N. Capaldi, L. Zu, A.D. Gupta (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Corporate Social Responsibility*, Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 1579–1584.
- Schooler, R.D. (1965). Product bias in the Central American common market, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 2(4), pp. 394–397.
- Schooler, R.D., Sunoo, D.H. (1969). Consumer perceptions of international products, *Social Science Quarterly*, 49(March), pp. 886–890.

- Siahtiri, V., Lee, W.J. (2019). How materialists choose prominent brands in emerging markets?, *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 46(4), pp. 133–138.
- Silk Road (2023). *Silk history*. Abundance of raw materials like pure cotton, <http://www.silk-road.com/artl/silkhistory.shtml> (Access: 15.02.2023).
- Suter, M.B., Borini, F.M., Coelho, D.B de Oliveira, M.M. Jr., Machado, M.C.C. (2020). Leveraging the country-of-origin image by managing it at different levels, *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 16(3), pp. 224–237.
- Suter, M.B., Munjal, S., Borini, F.M., Floriani, D. (2021). Conceptualizing country-of-origin image as a country-specific advantage: an insider perspective, *Journal of Business Research*, 134, pp. 415–427.
- Tavoletti, E., Stephens, R.D., Taras, V., Dong, L. (2022). Nationality biases in peer evaluations: the country-of-origin effect in global virtual teams, *International Business Review*, 31(2), p. 101969.
- Thakor, M.V., Kohli, C.S. (1996). Brand origin: conceptualization and review, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 13(3), pp. 27–42.
- Thakor, M.V., Lavack, A.M. (2003). Effect of perceived brand origin association on consumer perceptions of quality, *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 12(6), pp. 394–407.
- Thelen, S.T., Honeycutt Jr, E.D., Murphy, T.P. (2010). Services offshoring. Does perceived service quality affect country-of-service origin preference?, *Managing Service Quality*, 20(3), pp. 196–212.
- Tjiptono, F., Tiana, H., Andrianombonana, R. (2016). Examining brand origin recognition accuracy in Indonesia, *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 28(5), pp. 878–897.
- Tran, T.T.H., Pappasidou, N.G. (2020). Eco-innovations in global markets: the effect of ecological (in) congruence on consumers' adoption intentions, *Journal of International Marketing*, 28(3), 64–83.
- Tse, D.K., Lee, W.N. (1993). Removing negative country images: effects of decomposition, branding, and product experience, *Journal of International Marketing*, 1(4), pp. 25–48.
- TRIPS (1994). *Standards Concerning the Availability, Scope and Use of Intellectual Property Rights*, [https://www.wto.org/english/docs\\_e/legal\\_e/27-trips\\_04b\\_e.htm](https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/27-trips_04b_e.htm) (Access: 14.02.2013).
- Ulgado, F., Lee, M. (1993). Consumer evaluations of bi-national products in the global market, *Journal of International Marketing*, 1(3), 3, pp. 5–22.
- Usunier, J.C. (2011). The shift from manufacturing to brand origin: suggestions for improving COO relevance, *International Marketing Review*, 28(5), pp. 486–496.
- Usunier, J.C. (2006). Relevance in business research: the case of country-of-origin research in marketing, *European Management Review*, 3(1), pp. 60–73.
- Verlegh, P., Steenkamp, J.B. (1999). A review and meta-analysis of country-of-origin research, *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 20(5), pp. 521–546.
- Wang, T., Zhou, L., Muc, Y., Zhao, J. (2014). Study of country-of-origin image from legitimacy theory perspective: evidence from the USA and India, *Industrial Marketing Management*, 43, pp. 769–776.
- Witek-Hajduk, M.K., Grudecka, A. (2023). Ways to neutralize the country-of-origin effect in the emerging market firms international branding, *International Journal of Management and Economics*, 59(1), pp. 1–11.

- Witek-Hajduk, M.K., Grudecka, A. (2021). Brand types applied by emerging markets' firms: country of brand origin and brand use motives, *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 9(1), pp. 155–168.
- Witek-Hajduk, M.K., Grudecka, A. (2019). Country of origin from a management perspective of emerging market companies, *International Journal of Management and Economics*, 55(3), pp. 212–229.
- Wolffgang, H.M., Ovie, T. (2008). Emerging issues in European customs law, *World Customs Journal*, 2(1), pp. 3–16.
- Xiao, I., Guo, Z., D'Ambra, J. (2017). Analyzing consumer goal structure in online group buying: a meansend chain approach, *Information and Management*, 54(8), pp. 1097–1119.
- Zbib, I., Ghaddar, R., Samarji, A., Wahbi, M. (2021). Examining country of origin effect among Lebanese consumers: a study in the cosmetics industry, *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 33(2), pp. 194–208.
- Zeugner-Roth, K.P., Bartsch, F. (2020). COO in print advertising: developed versus developing market comparisons. *Journal of Business Research*, 120, pp. 364–378.
- Zeugner-Roth, K.P., Zabkar, V. (2015). Bridging the gap between country and destination image: assessing common facets and their predictive validity, *Journal of Business Research*, 68(9), pp. 1844–1853.