The Thesis committee for Jin-A Choi

Certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:

A Cross-Cultural Examination of Consumer Responses to Celebrity-Endorsed Advertisements

APPROVED BY SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:

Supervisor: _____

Robert Lewis

_____

Lucinda Atkinson

A Cross-Cultural Examination of Consumer Responses to Celebrity-Endorsed Advertisements

by

Jin-A Choi, B.S.Adv.

Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of the University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin
May 2014

I dedicate my thesis to my dad, mom and brother.
Thank You.

Acknowledgement:

I would like to offer my special appreciation to my committee members for their advice and mentorship. I would like to thank Dr. Robert Lewis for guiding me through the thesis process and teaching me a valuable lesson. I would also like to thank Dr. Lucinda Atkinson for her advice and suggestions that helped to shape my thesis.

I would like to give special thanks to my family for their unconditional support and love. I will be forever grateful for all of the sacrifices they have made on my behalf. Even though we are separated by 6,927 miles, your love gives me strength and warmth. Thank you.

Abstract

A Cross-Cultural Examination of Consumer Responses to Celebrity-Endorsed Advertisements

by

Jin-A Choi, M.A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2014

SUPERVISOR: Robert Lewis

Abstract:

Celebrity endorsements are popular advertising methods that are implemented globally. Despite the frequent use of celebrities as product endorsers, few studies, if any, examine the cross-cultural effects of celebrity-endorsed advertisement on consumer response. This study focuses on Korea and the United States as representative of Eastern and Western cultures, respectively, in terms of various cultural values, such as (a) those described by cultural dimensions theory (individualism versus collectivism, uncertainty avoidance), (b) those described by information context theory (communication styles) and (c) those described by moral foundations theory (intuitive domains of social judgment). Findings generally suggest that Koreans respond more favorably, in terms of enjoyment and

purchase intention, to celebrity-endorsed advertisements than Americans. Also, individual-difference measures for the cultural dimensions above yielded patterns consistent with the overall cultural differences. Detailed discussion, including implications and limitations, are provided for both researchers and practitioners.

Keywords: culture, celebrity-endorsed advertising, advertisement appraisal

Table of Contents

Page

List of Tables

Page

List of Figures

Page

Introduction

Although literature has investigated how the frequency of celebrity endorsements in advertisements varies across cultures (Choi, Lee & Kim, 2005), few, if any, studies have hypothesized cultural differences in liking for celebrity-endorsed advertisements, or subsequent purchase intention. This is despite the fact that a number of different observations and theoretical backgrounds contain logic suggesting individuals of Eastern cultures will respond more favorably to celebrity-endorsed advertisements than those of Western cultures.

In the current study, I attempt to fill this gap by quantitatively observing differences in the impact of celebrity-endorsed advertisements between Koreans versus Americans. First, I will discuss the theoretical background of theories that are important to the topic of my study. In order to hypothesize the differences that exist between Korean and American cultures' responses to celebrity-endorsed advertising, I will first discuss cultural dimensions theory (Hofstede, 1984). Then I will delve into the theory behind high context and low context cultures (Hall, 1976). Lastly, I will discuss moral foundations theory (Haidt & Joseph, 2006) in a culturally relevant light. To provide a rationale for my hypotheses and research questions, I will discuss how the theories mentioned above are relevant to cross-cultural examinations of consumer appraisals of celebrity-endorsed advertisements. This rationale will also provide the reason the theories mentioned above are pertinent to my study. Then a detailed method section including information about the participants, procedure, measures and stimuli will be thoroughly discussed. Next, the results section will describe the data, and the discussion section will

reiterate key results and summarize important implications for researchers and practitioners. Finally, the conclusion will outline a complete summary of the study.

Theoretical Background

Cultural dimensions theory. Geert Hofstede's (1984) cultural dimensions framework includes four dimensions that can vary between distinct human groups: *power distance*, *uncertainty avoidance*, *individualism* versus *collectivism*, and *masculinity* versus *femininity*. These dimensions, described in detail below, are culturally variant values that help to distinguish social norms and standards between ingroups.

With regard to power distance, Hofstede's (1984) definition is "the extent to which the members of a society accept that power in institutions and organizations is distributed unequally" and "the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations accept that power is distributed unequally" (Hofstede, 1984b, p. 83; Hofstede & Bond, 1984, p.419). Power distance describes acceptance of human inequality in areas such as prestige, wealth and power, where inequality in power usually consists of a defined hierarchical relationship and level of authority of one individual over the other. To measure this concept, Hofstede (1984) employs the power distance index (PDI), which yields mean scores of countries on their strength in power distances. Cultures that emphasize dominance belong to nations with *collective* cultural values, while cultures that deemphasize dominance belong to nations of *individual* cultural values (Hofstede, 1984a). Individuals in societies with greater power distance will tend to abide by a hierarchical order without challenging authority but those of lower power-distance societies demand power equalization and justification for unequally distributed powers (Hofstede, 1984b).

Research has shown, for example, that Koreans rank higher on PDI than Americans (Hofstede, 1984b). I argue that celebrities should be more favorably appraised by those in societies with relatively greater power-distance levels because celebrity status or power is more accepted in high (vs. low) PDI societies.

With regard to uncertainty avoidance, Hofstede's (1984) definition is the "extent to which people feel threatened by ambiguous situations, and… [their attempts] to avoid these" (Hofstede, & Bond, 1984; p.419). Due to the discomfort of uncertainty, individuals are led to "beliefs promising certainty and to maintaining institutions protecting conformity." (Hofstede, 1984b, p.83) Societies with strong uncertainty avoidance levels keep to tight rules of behavior and rigid norms. Therefore, cultures with high uncertainty avoidance levels reject those who deviate from defined norms and ideas. Individuals from cultures of weak uncertainty avoidance levels have a comparatively relaxed environment with less emphasis on principles and more tolerance towards deviances and aberrations. These reflect the reactions of culturally different nations dealing with conflict and aggression of the unknown future (Hofstede, 1984b). Research has shown that Korean show greater levels of uncertainty avoidance than Americans (Christie, Kwon, Stoeberl & Baumhart, 2003). Therefore, I believe that this theoretical logic reinforces the idea that celebrities will be more persuasive for Koreans than Americans. Celebrities represent high-status individuals, and those will low tolerance for uncertainty may find certainty in the social standards celebrities set by endorsing products.

Individualism versus collectivism is the third cultural dimension. Individualism and collectivism reflect cultural positions on a bipolar continuum. On one end is individualism, which is where individual rights, self-reliance, and interests are valued over those of the state or the social group. On the other end is collectivism, where individuals care for the well being of their ingroup members and show loyalty towards them while distinguishing themselves from outsiders. Cultures with individualistic values tend to have a loosely knit social framework, whereas cultures with collectivistic values tend to have a tightly knit social framework and seek interdependence within their ingroup (Hofstede, 1984b).

Collectivism thus reinforces the desire of individuals to follow group standards, as those standards will be more salient in a tightly knit social group. Celebrities tend to set moral standards and other norms, and Koreans who value ingroup ideas more will rely on and favor celebrity endorsements more than Americans because their collectivistic tendencies make these norms and standards more salient.

With regard to masculinity versus femininity, cultures that hold masculine values emphasize material success, heroism, assertiveness, money and status. In feminine cultures, however, caring for the weak, relationships, modesty, and quality of life are emphasized. Also, individuals in masculine versus feminine cultures have different self-perceptions of sex roles, for example, the various social versus biological roles assigned to each of the sexes (Hofstede & Bond, 1984; Hofstede, 1984b). Cultures that hold masculine values strive for maximum social differentiation of the sexes, and follow the norm of men fulfilling outgoing and assertive roles while women are supposed to fulfill

caring and nurturing roles. These societies are called "performance societies" (p.84) and have clearly defined values for women's place in society. However, feminine societies seek to minimize social differentiation of the sexes and the roles that men and women have to fulfill are not distinctly defined, and women can take assertive roles and men can take nurturing roles if they wish. These societies are called "welfare societies" (p.84) in which members tend to be more caring and nurturing regardless of gender compared to performance societies (Hofstede, 1984b).

Masculine values—as they are described here—should reinforce the desire for status by adhering to group standards. Such an example would be celebrity endorsement. That is, individuals in more masculine societies would seek to achieve status through celebrity-endorsed consumption.

Information context theory. Another factor that is important to the current study is information context (Hall, 1976, 2000). Hall stated "all cultures can be situated in relation to one another through the styles in which they communicate." (Würtz, 2005, p.274). He also found that "meaning and context are inextricably bound up with each other" (Hall, 2000, p. 36) which suggests that meaning and context should be considered together in distinguishing cultures. When Hall uses the word "context," he means the situation that surrounds an event, situation or an individual, as well as the background or environment of an event, situation or an individual (Würtz, 2005). Therefore, the degree to which individuals vary in context depends upon their culture.

Depending on the information conveyed, messages vary in their context, either high or low. In a high context message, most of the information is conveyed by relying

on shared knowledge and very little is explicitly communicated (Hall, 1976). Individuals of high context cultures rely on subtle nonverbal cues as well as implicit, shared knowledge to relay information (McLuhan & Powers, 1989). High-context communication involves implied messages through the unspoken, which includes the context of the situation, behavioral cues, and nonverbal cues as integral parts to the communication process (Würtz, 2005). This relies on shared knowledge and experience between members of the ingroup. Also, the relationship between the communicators, the closer they are the more potential to have shared knowledge, as well as the time, physical aspects and situation play a part in high-context messages (Würtz, 2005). Consequently, high context messages are subtle. However, in a low context message, the opposite holds true, and the majority of the information is explicitly communicated (Hall, 1976). Individuals who use language to convey feelings, thoughts and ideas clearly, explicitly, and directly are considered to be from a low-context culture (McLuhan & Powers, 1989). They rely less on members of their ingroup to have shared knowledge and experiences. Low context messages are often precise, open and based on true intentions (Würtz, 2005). Cultures vary in the extent to which they tend to communicate with high or low context.

Some examples of low-context cultures are Scandinavia, Germany and Switzerland because individuals from those nations tend to communicate explicitly through direct statements. Whereas nations such as Japan, China, and South Korea are considered high-context cultures due to their communication via cues such as body language, implicit meanings, and silence (Würtz, 2005). High-context cultures tend to invest more resources in relationships whereas low-context cultures have more short-

lived or loosely bound relationships. Therefore, Western nations are characterized as low-context cultures while Eastern cultures are characterized as high-context cultures. Accordingly, the United States would be considered low context whereas Korea would be considered high context (Cho et al., 1999; Hall, 1976). Choe (2001) exemplifies the difference in directness between Korea and the United States following passage:

> "If a North American supervisor is unsatisfied with a subordinate's sales proposal, the response will probably be explicit and direct: ''I can't accept this proposal as submitted, so come up with some better ideas.'' A Korean supervisor, in the same situation, might say: ''While I have the highest regard for your abilities, I regret to inform you that I am not completely satisfied with this proposal. I must ask that you reflect further and submit additional ideas on how to develop this sales program.'' (p. 5).

Information context holds the idea that since communication styles for dissimilar cultures are different, the same ideas that need much explanation in loosely-knit groups do not need much explanation in tight-knit groups to be understood. This is attributed to the fact that much is already implied through the contextual setting of the culture. A good example of this in advertising is celebrity-endorsed advertisements. Whereas detailed product information is needed for credibility in low-context cultures, a celebrity endorser that already encompasses the ideals of trust reassures quality thus there is less of a need for meticulous facts.

Moral foundations theory. Newer research on culture has integrated understandings from evolutionary psychology, cognitive science, and cultural

anthropology. Moral foundations theory (MFT; Haidt & Joseph, 2006) identifies distinct domains of intuitive ethics that cultures may emphasize differently depending on historical and cultural context. The theory focuses on universal moral domains, defined as distinct pieces of mental circuitry that govern moral judgments, derived from evolution, and can be emphasized or de-emphasized depending on cultural experience and learning. The five intuitive domains of MFT are called *care*, the need to concern or others as well as the negative emotion of distress in harm and suffering of others; *fairness* is about reciprocal altruism; *ingroup* loyalty is the tendency for humans to form teams and tribes and self sacrifice for the group; *authority* relates to the hierarchical order of dominance and submission; and *purity* involves disgust in parasites and contagion as well as sacredness and chastity (Haidt & Joseph, 2006).

Haidt and Graham (2007) labeled the care and fairness domains as *individualizing* domains because they are moral intuitions focused on protecting and caring for individuals as well as respecting individual rights, as in Hofstede's (1984) concept of individualism. The last three domains, ingroup loyalty, authority, and purity are labeled as *binding* domains because they are moral intuitions that connect individuals within groups and work to strengthen group dynamics and institutions. These moral domains tend to be emphasized in more collectivistic cultures (See Haidt & Joseph, 2007 for detailed description of the moral foundations theory).

MFT explains Hofstede's (1984) collectivism and power distance through the use of these universal psychological domains. Moreover, the information-context factors and the cultural dimensions factors described above are thought to emerge from cultural

variation in the emphasis of the psychological domains of MFT (Haidt, 2001). Indeed, research has established that whereas Koreans are higher on all three of the binding domains than U.S. citizens, Koreans are lower on both of the individualizing domains than U.S. citizens (Kim, Kang & Yun, 2012).

Celebrity-Endorsed Advertising and Culture

Concepts from the frameworks above indicate that celebrity-endorsed advertisements may not only be more widespread in Eastern (vs. Western) cultures, as evident in previous research (Choi, Lee & Kim, 2005), but also indicate that celebrity-endorsed advertising might also be more effective in Eastern (vs. Western) cultures. This is because this tactic is more compatible with how collectivistic cultures communicate (Choi, Lee & Kim, 2005), using socially set standards as a basis for judging the moral behavior of ingroup members.

In a collectivistic culture where harmony, belongingness and respect for social hierarchies are main values, celebrities who represent and share their same societal values may be perceived as a credible and influential source (Han & Shavitt, 1994; Hofstede, 1984; Kim, 1996). Also where uncertainty avoidance levels are high, it is common practice to establish what is "in" and what is not (i.e., ingroup-based social standards) through celebrity endorsements and popularized trends.

Its counterpart, individualism, is characterized by low-context communication style thus credibility would not be as easily gained. Celebrities may just be viewed as unique individuals and simply television personalities who are accomplished in their respective field (Choi, Lee & Kim, 2005). Although celebrities may play a similar role, this role of setting social norms and standards should be slightly de-emphasized in Western (vs. Eastern) culture if the rationale above is correct. Moreover, Western (vs. Eastern) cultures are low on uncertainty avoidance, which gives them leeway to explore and find their own interests, rather than psychologically cling to a celebrity-endorsed

trend. The need for more subtle communication in high-context cultures makes celebrities a convenient method for communicating product worthiness to consumers with very little information. A simple endorsement communicates product worthiness, as meaning (such as celebrity credibility) is transferred to the product attributes implicitly in the communication process. Moreover, celebrity-endorsed advertisements are less direct, and don't require the brand to praise itself. Rather, the celebrity is implicitly praising the brand via the endorsement.

Based on the arguments above, I propose the following hypotheses:

H1: Koreans will enjoy celebrity-endorsed advertisements more than Americans

H2: Koreans will have stronger intention to purchase products in celebrity-endorsed advertisements than Americans.

Each of the three theoretical frameworks above references a societal cultural difference; however, the frameworks encompass individual level of analysis as well. Individuals within a culture differ greatly in the degree to which the values above are emphasized. Therefore, these individual differences should moderate appraisals of celebrity-endorsed advertisements and purchase intentions. Based on this argument, I propose the following hypothesis:

H3: Individual differences associated with cultural dimensions theory, information context theory, and moral foundations theory will influence responses to celebrity-endorsed advertisements and purchase intentions.

Method

Participants

Participants (N = 298) were recruited from a large, Southwestern university in the United States for credit in communication courses. Additional Korean participants were recruited from the researcher's social network. American participants (N = 184; M age = 20.46, SD =1.43; $n_{female=}$142) were more heavily recruited through the university while Korean participants (N = 78; M age = 22.18, SD =3.10; $n_{females}$ = 41) were more heavily recruited from the researcher's social network. Note that the Korean sample was slightly older than the U.S. sample. The gender makeup of the Korean versus U.S. sample also diverged. Among the U.S. sample, 23% were male but among the Korean sample, 53% were male. The ethnicities of all of the participants are as follows: 44% individuals of White or European decent (N = 132), 36% Koreans (N = 107), 9% Hispanic or Latino (N = 26), 8% non-Korean Asians (N = 24), 2% African American (N = 26), 1% Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (N = 2), and less than 1% of American Indian or Alaska Natives (N = 1). Participants who completed the survey through the university received course credit in a communications course.

Procedure

The study consisted of an online survey. After viewing a consent page and agreeing to participate, participants responded to several individual-difference measures (see measures section below). After completing these measures, participants were then asked to "name a celebrity that comes to mind." They then rated their liking for their chosen celebrity on a 10-point scale ranging from "not at all" to "a lot." This self-

selection of the celebrity was done for two purposes: (1) to ensure that all participants regardless of country of origin would recognize the celebrity as well as (2) to eliminate confounds associated with using celebrities from a single culture for two different audience cultures. After choosing and rating their celebrity, a fictitious scenario pertaining to a fashion product category endorsed by their specific celebrity was presented, and participants were then prompted to rate their enjoyment of the imagined advertisement as well as their intentions to purchase the product. The same was repeated for food product category using a scenario that was similar in all but the product-related words (see stimulus subheading for these scenarios). Following this, participants viewed a 16-second commercial for the brand *H&M*, endorsed by international celebrity, Beyoncé. In total, nine ANOVAs were run. There were three different dependent variables and three sets of different individual measures for each dependent variable. Demographic questions and course credit information were asked on the final screens.

Measures

All measures listed below can be found in the appendix.

Cultural Dimensions. The five questions that were related to uncertainty avoidance (Yoo, Donthu & Lenartowicz, 2011) were anchored 1: Strongly Disagree to 5: Strongly Agree. A sample item includes "instructions for acceptable behavior are important." The reliability for uncertainty avoidance was α =.84. Also, the set of six questions related to collectivism versus individualism (Yoo, Donthu & Lenartowicz, 2011) was anchored 1: Strongly Disagree to 5: Strongly Agree. A sample item for this dimension includes

"Individuals should sacrifice self-interest for the group."Reliability for collectivism was α =.847.

Moral Foundations Theory. The Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ; Graham, et al., 2008) had 32 questions for all five foundations as was described in the introduction: Care, Fairness, Ingroup, Authority, and Purity. The first half of the scale asks about relevance of various issues to the individual's moral decision making on a 6-point scale 0: Not at all relevant to 5: Extremely relevant. A sample item from the first half includes "Whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group." The next 16 Moral Foundations Questionnaire questions pertain to moral judgments. The questions were asked to be rated on a 6-point scale: 0: Strongly disagree to 5: Strongly agree. A sample item from the later half includes "People should be loyal to their family members, even when they have done something wrong." The reliabilities were as follows: care α =.59, fairness α =.51, ingroup α =.47, authority α =.49, and purity α =.49.

Information Context. For high versus low context (Oddou & Derr, 1999), there were 20 questions about four dimensions: time, relationships, space and communication. For example, an item in the relationships subscale asked, "A commitment I have made to others is more likely to supersede one I've made to myself," which was answered on a 5-point scale 1: Strongly Disagree to 5: Strongly Agree. Reliability for the time dimension was α = .25, relationship α = .21, space α = .05, and communication α = .56.

Dependent Variables (Imaginary Scenarios). Participants were asked five questions on how much they would like the advertisement and their purchase intention on a 5-point scale ranging from 1: Strongly Disagree to 5: Strongly Agree. The 3-item

enjoyment scale by Oliver and Bartsch (2010) was adapted to contain four items. Questions included "I would like this commercial," (measuring enjoyment) and a fifth question "I would be inclined to purchase the product" (measuring purchase intention). The same procedure was repeated for a fashion product, food product, and the ecological stimulus described below.

Stimuli

Fashion: Imagined Scenario. Participants read one scenario regarding fashion product and another scenario with food products featuring their chosen celebrity. For the fashion product scenario, the survey read:

> "Please consider the following scenario: As you are watching television, the celebrity you chose above appears endorsing a fashion product (such as cosmetics, clothes, or perfume). As best you can, please respond to the following items about the scenario you just read."

Food: Imagined Scenario. Similarly, participants read a second imagined scenario again, but this time with a food product category. They were asked to imagine a celebrity of their choice in the scenario again. This time, the survey read:

> "Please consider the following scenario: As you are watching television, the celebrity you chose above appears endorsing a food product (such as a restaurant, coffee, or brand of ice cream). As best you can, please respond to the following items about the scenario you just read."

Ecological Stimulus. Following the imagined scenarios, participants were shown an actual 16-second video commercial. This advertisement for *H&M* depicted Beyoncé

Knowles endorsing their low-price bikini. This stimulus was chosen to provide an ecologically valid test for our rationale. In the video, the famous celebrity is shown posing by palm trees and dancing around on a sandy beach to one of her songs in a black *H&M* bikini. The logo for the *H&M* brand is shown as well as the price.

Results

Prior to testing the hypothesis, liking for the chosen celebrities was compared between the U.S. and Korean samples. Contrary to what one might expect based on the logic above, Americans tended to rate their chosen celebrities higher on liking than Koreans, t (257) = 3.01, p = .003, Cohen's d =0.50. Liking for chosen celebrities for Americans was (M = 8.25; SD = 2.15) and liking for their chosen celebrities for Koreans was (M = 7.37; SD =1.20). Although it is tempting to suggest that this reflects something about celebrity liking and its variance between cultures, it may have been the case that the U.S. sample showed a more extreme response style (cf. Chun, Campbell, & Yoo, 1974), thus lowering the mean rating for the Korean sample (vs. U.S. sample). Regardless, interpretation of further results should take this difference into account. (See Table 7 for descriptive statistics on these and other measures).

To test H1, I initially examined the imagined advertisements with participants' self-chosen celebrities. Liking for the various advertisements was entered as the dependent variable in a general linear model, with culture (Korean vs. American) and gender as a between-subjects factors as well as age and celebrity-liking as covariates. Variables such as gender and age were confounded with culture so they were entered into the model for control purposes. For the fashion advertisement featuring the participant's chosen celebrity, two factors yielded significance. Not surprisingly, celebrity liking strongly predicted liking for the imagined fashion advertisement, F (1, 252) = 121.71, p < .01. A near-significant main effect was observed for culture, F (1, 252) = 3.49, p = .06. Means (see Table 7) indicate slightly higher ratings for the Korean (vs. U.S.) sample.

Most interesting was a significant interaction between gender and culture, F (1, 252) = 8.60, $p < .01$. (See Table 1 for ANOVA statistics for Fashion Ad Liking.) The weighted means plot indicated that whereas American and Korean females reported similar levels of liking for fashion ad, Korean males reported liking the fashion ad more than American males.

The same analysis was conducted for the food ad. Only two factors yielded significance. Again not surprisingly, liking for the celebrity was a strong and significant predictor of liking for the imagined food advertisement, F (1, 252) = 38.11, $p < .01$. More importantly, culture also predicted food ad liking, F (1, 252) = 7.13, $p < .01$. When this analysis is considered alongside the weighted means, it indicates that when controlling for celebrity liking, Koreans liked the celebrity-endorsed food ad more than the U.S. sample. (See Table 2 for ANOVA statistics for Food Ad Liking).

Finally, for my ecological analysis, these same ANOVAs were conducted with an *H&M* advertisement featuring Beyoncé (with liking for Beyoncé as a covariate). Liking for the celebrity Beyoncé, F (1, 253) = 184.77, $p < .01$, was a significant factor. Not surprisingly, means plots indicated that women liked the celebrity-endorsed bikini ad more than men. More importantly, culture was also significant, F (1, 253) = 6.74, $p = .01$. Weighted means showed that Koreans liked the Beyoncé ad more than Americans when controlling for extraneous and confounding factors such as age and gender. (See Table 3 for ANOVA statistics for Beyoncé Ad Liking). Across all three analyses, culture was a significant (or nearly significant) predictor of advertising enjoyment. When controlling for other factors (celebrity liking, gender, and age), Koreans liked the real and imagined

celebrity-endorsed advertisements more than Americans. Thus, I interpret these results as generally supportive of H1.

For H2, I conducted identical analyses (with the same independent factors) except with purchase intention as the dependent variable. Results were similar as above. For the imagined fashion advertisement featuring the participant's chosen celebrity, a significant relationship was observed for culture, F (1, 252) = 29.32, p < .01. (See Table 4 for ANOVA statistics for Fashion Purchase Intention).

Also, for the imagined food advertisement, featuring the participant's chosen celebrity yielded a significant main effect for culture, F (1, 252) = 5.62, p = .02. (See Table 5 for ANOVA statistics for Food Purchase Intention.)

Finally, my ecological analysis, an *H&M* advertisement featuring Beyoncé, yielded two significant factors. A significant effect for culture was observed, F (1, 252) = 15.53, p < .01. This means that culture is a significant predictor of purchase intention, with Koreans showing stronger purchase intentions than Americans when controlling for celebrity liking, gender, and age. Also, gender yielded a significant effect, F (1, 252) =18.77, p<.01. (See Table 6 for ANOVA statistics for Beyoncé Ad Purchase Intention). Thus, I interpret these results as generally supportive of H2.

Individual Differences

Furthermore, liking for the various advertisements was entered as the dependent variable in a general linear model, with culture (Korean vs. American) and gender as a between-subjects factors as well as cultural values (uncertainty avoidance and

collectivism), progressivism and information context as covariates. Each set of covariates were run separately.

For the fashion advertisement with cultural-dimensions covariates, two factors yielded significance. Unsurprisingly, liking for the celebrity was a strong and significant positive predictor of liking for fashion advertisements. Both uncertainty avoidance, F (1, 249) =8.41, p<.01, and collectivism, F (1, 249) = 4.01, p=.05, were also strong and significant positive predictors for liking of the imagined fashion ad. (See Table 8 for ANOVA statistics for Fashion Ad Liking Covariate for Cultural Dimensions).

For the imagined fashion advertisement with progressivism as a covariate, one factor yielded significance. The progressivism factor yielded a significance, F (1, 251) = 11.22, p<.01. There was a negative relationship between liking for the fashion advertisement and progressivism. (See Table 9 for ANOVA statistics for Fashion Ad Liking Covariate for Progressivism).

Furthermore, the fashion advertisement with information context as covariates, a significant effect was observed for the Relationship Dimension of the high versus low context F (1, 247) = 4.68, p<.03. The high-context cultures liked the fashion advertisement more than low-context cultures. (See Table 10 for ANOVA statistics for Fashion Ad Liking Covariate for Information Context).

Next, a similar process was repeated for imagined food advertisements and the covariates. Liking for the celebrity was a strong and significant predictor of liking for the imagined food advertisements.

The imagined food advertisement with cultural values covariates yielded a result where culture was a strongly significant positive predictor for liking for food advertisement F (1, 249) = 34.73, p<.01. (See Table 11 for ANOVA statistics for Food Ad Liking Covariate for Cultural Values).

Next for the progressivism covariate, culture was a significant predictor for liking for food advertisement F (1, 251) = 3.80, p =.05 as well as progressivism which was nearly significant at F (1, 251) = 3.65, p =.06. The relationship was such that the more progressive an individual, the less the individual liked food advertisements; and the less progressive an individual, the more the individual like food advertisements. (See Table 12 for ANOVA statistics for Food Ad Liking Covariate for Progressivism).

For information context, (ie. relationship dimension, space dimension, and communication dimension) culture was again, a strong positive significant predictor for liking for food advertisement F (1, 247) = 5.51, p<.05. (See Table 13 for ANOVA statistics for Food Ad Liking Covariate for Information Context).

Finally, the processes above were replicated again for Beyoncé advertisements and covariates. Liking for Beyoncé was a strong positive and significant predictor of liking for the Beyoncé ads. For the cultural values covariate and Beyoncé ad liking, a significant effect was observed for culture, F (11, 250) = 5.99, p<.05. (See Table 14 for ANOVA statistics for Beyoncé Ad Liking Covariate for Cultural Values).

For Progressivism, two significant effects were observed: culture, F (1, 252) = 5.60, p<.05 and gender, F (1, 252) = 10.81, p<.01. Also, a nearly significant effect was observed for progressivism, F (1, 252) = 2.54, p=.11. Again, there was a negative

relationship between progressivism and liking for the Beyoncé advertisement. (See Table 15 for ANOVA statistics for Beyoncé Ad Liking Covariate for Progressivism).

Finally culture, F (1, 248) = 5.08, p<.05 and information context's "communication" dimension, F (1, 248) = 5.01, p<.03, were strong significant predictors for information context. Information context's "space" dimension yielded a nearly significant effect, F (1, 248) = 3.22, p=.07. Both culture and high and low context yielded significance.

Discussion

In this study, celebrity endorsement effects were examined cross-culturally. Two dissimilar cultures representing Eastern culture and Western cultures were chosen, Korea and America respectively.

Three hypotheses were posed at the beginning of the cross-cultural examination of consumers' response to celebrity-endorsed advertisements. The first, H1, predicted that Koreans would enjoy celebrity-endorsed advertisements more than Americans. The second, H2, predicted that Koreans would have stronger purchase intentions for products that appear in celebrity-endorsed advertisements than Americans. Finally, H3 predicted that individual differences associated with cultural dimensions theory, information context theory, and moral foundations theory would influence responses to celebrity-endorsed advertisements and purchase intentions.

These hypotheses were made based on my anecdotal observations of the two cultures and curiosity about the existing differences that exist between advertisements on Korean media and those on American media in regard to the frequency with which celebrities appear in advertisements. Although technological advancements, globalization and acculturation of the 21st century would make it seem that consumers' responses to advertisements would be globally unified and similar, cultural boundaries still segment one society from another. It was anticipated that celebrity-endorsed advertisements would be especially influenced by a society's cultural values because celebrities are often symbolic of and embody the ideals of their own culture. Celebrities are individuals of elevated status, which gives them credibility, authority, and power to influence.

Consequently, cultural values seem to influence the manner in which consumers evaluate celebrity-endorsed advertisements.

I found that Koreans generally responded more favorably to celebrity-endorsed advertisements than their American counterparts when controlling for confounding variables of gender and age. More specifically, Koreans enjoyed celebrity-endorsed advertisements more and had stronger purchase intentions for products in celebrity-endorsed advertisements than did Americans. The patterns observed in the data seemed attributable to the cultural differences described by theories mentioned in the rationale. Culturally, Koreans are known to be collectivistic, high uncertainty avoidance, high-context, and possess characteristically high levels of loyalty, respect for authority and emphasis of moral purity. However, Americans are known to be individualistic, low uncertainty avoidance, low-context, and defined more by the care and fairness moral domains.

Implications

For American practitioners the implications are relevant. First, compared to Korean media, the American media has fewer celebrity-endorsed advertisements. However, results showed that Americans (albeit mostly undergraduate college students) reacted very favorably to celebrity-endorsed advertisements as well. Korean practitioners are already immersed in and invested a lot to signing celebrities with their brand, and as the study suggests, Korean consumers respond favorably and even develop purchase intention for celebrity-endorsed brands and products. Therefore, it would be helpful for American practitioners to understand and realize the effects of celebrity-endorsed

advertisements so that it may be better weighed as a strategic alternative. That is, American practitioners should think of how audience identification with celebrities and whether it's consistent with their overall branding strategies.

For researchers, the study extended previous research by showing that cultural differences may manifest in response to celebrity-endorsed advertisements. Previous research (Choi, Lee & Kim, 2005) examined how the frequency of celebrity endorsements varies according culture. Choi et al. found that the execution and implementation styles of celebrity endorsements reflected the respective dominant cultural values of its country. That is, celebrity-endorsed advertising is more frequent in Eastern cultures than Western cultures.

My study examined the cross-cultural effect of celebrity-endorsed advertisements which may serve as an extension of Choi, Lee & Kim's (2005) study. Specifically, whereas Choi et al. examined content, I examined audience response. When interpreted in light of the results from Choi et al., the current study suggests that producers of advertising content may be aware (perhaps implicitly so) of the values of their respective audiences.

Future research may seek to look for effects of celebrity-endorsed advertising. Perhaps frequent exposure to celebrity-endorsed advertising might reinforce the cultural norms that were predictive of responses in the current study. This is speculative, but worth addressing empirically. Also, a cross-cultural study of celebrity endorsements for social marketing could be explored. If celebrities were influential enough to influence consumers' purchase intention, are they influential to a degree as to bring about social

change through roles such as advocacies for childhood obesity prevention programs, spokespersons for green initiatives, and becoming the face of anti-smoking campaigns?

Several questions might provide interesting answers: 1) Does endorsing a social marketing campaign reinforce the celebrities' credibility and liking? 2) Could this reinforcing of liking then carry over to effectiveness of subsequent campaigns?

Limitations

Although the findings of this study provide insight for the cross-cultural responses of consumers to celebrity-endorsed advertisements, several limitations must be noted.

First, the primary lesson from the current study in terms of limitations is the difficulty of removing confounding factors in cultural research. It may have been the case that my research design was unable to properly test the question of whether celebrity-endorsed advertisements were more effective for Korean versus American audiences. First, in an ecologically designed study, as represented by my choice to have Beyoncé appear as one of my stimulus materials, recognition and liking for the celebrity must be controlled. Culture is thus confounded with liking and recognition of the celebrity, and although I attempted to control celebrity liking, this was not achieved because liking was different between the two cultures even when participants were allowed to choose any celebrity they wished. Moreover, although Beyoncé was recognized and liked by both the Korean and American audiences, the U.S. sample tended to recognize and like Beyoncé even more. This example illustrates the difficulty in finding a neutral celebrity (i.e., one who is equally recognized and liked across cultures) for ecological research.

My attempt to overcome this limitation is represented in my choice to let participants choose their own celebrity in the imagined advertisement scenarios. Again, however, results show that this design actually did not remove all confounds with culture. Even when allowed to choose a celebrity that comes to mind, there were cultural differences in the degree to which their chosen celebrity was liked. Again, this example illustrates the difficulty of my design to test the question of whether celebrity-endorsed advertisements are more effective for Koreans versus Americans.

In order to conduct ecological research, future studies taking this route should likely pre-test international superstars who may have a better chance of being equally liked and recognized across cultures. Researchers could first investigate celebrity liking and recognition on a number of different celebrities within and across the two cultures on different dimensions of liking and evaluation. Researchers could then find celebrities that might be comparable in terms of not just liking and recognition, but other factors that are relevant to social judgments of consumers. Studies may be able to test a large number of celebrities rather than focusing in on just one, as in the current study. Researchers may then remove (or at least measure) confounds by using the imagined-advertisement method I employed in the current study. This way, more generalizability might be added to the logic described in the current paper.

A second limitation regards the sample of Koreans in the study. First, their gender and age were confounded with culture. Additionally, the particular Koreans recruited for the study may not reflect traditional Korean culture as much as if the study had taken a truly random sample of the South Korean population. I recruited participants from Korea

by using my social network of friends and acquaintances. Therefore, participants included students who were born in Korea but are currently in other countries studying abroad. The Korean international students may be influenced by the culture of the place they reside in as well. However, regardless of where the participants reside, I believe that the culture of international students versus second or third generation immigrant participants are vastly different. If my Korean sample consisted of the latter group, then there may be a problem with unpredictably fluctuating views, however, since my sample consisted of the first group, it is safer to say that the answers they gave were reflective of more traditional Korean culture. Also, the American sample included American-born Koreans who consider themselves to be ethnically Korean. When asked to choose a celebrity from their home country, they chose a Korean celebrity versus an American celebrity. Both populations consisted largely of university students, and were thus comparable in that regard.

A third limitation regards the quasi-experimental nature of the study. The current study never observed the "effect" of celebrity-endorsed advertising because the presence/absence of celebrity endorsement was not manipulated. Future studies may overcome this by giving participants two imagined advertisements (or randomly assigning them to conditions), one with a celebrity endorser and one without a celebrity endorser. Since the current study did not manipulate this variable, it is impossible to determine whether Koreans are simply responding more favorably to advertising in general or whether it indeed was attributable to the presence of a celebrity in the advertisement. Because of advertising's norm-setting function, one might imagine that

Eastern cultures would be more receptive to advertising (regardless of whether a celebrity is involved) than Western cultures. Future studies manipulating the presence of celebrities in ads would be able to tease apart these relationships to see if culture moderated consumer responses.

Conclusion

This study aimed to examine the cross-cultural responses of consumers to celebrity-endorsed advertisements. Currently, many studies about celebrity endorsements exist; however, there are only a few studies that examine cultural differences in consumer response to celebrity-endorsed advertising. Integrating cultural theories with the study of celebrity-endorsed advertising was also insightful. These culture-based theories were essential in forming the understanding necessary to conduct my study.

As representative of Eastern and Western cultures, two similar yet different countries, Korea and America, were chosen for closer examination. The effects observed were largely supportive of all three hypotheses posed at the beginning of the study, which reinforces the logic regarding celebrity-endorsed advertising and its variation between the two cultures. For Koreans, enjoyment of celebrity-endorsed advertisements as well as purchase intention of products in celebrity-endorsed advertisements, regardless of product category, tended to be higher than for Americans. Also, the individual differences showed expected results as well. Although a few of the results were non-significant, they all fell in expected directions. The less individualistic a participant was, the more favorably the individual responded to celebrity-endorsed advertisements.

There were many confounding variables associated with culture that were difficult to work with, such as age, gender, celebrity liking, and the fact that the study did not include a "no celebrity" control group. However, despite these strong limitations, the study show results that are consistent with the idea that Koreans respond more favorably to celebrity-endorsed advertisements than Americans, and that cultural values play a role.

Even though there were limitations in the study that were detected in hindsight, the study yielded insight that was both theoretical and practical.

Appendix

Table 1

ANOVA for Fashion Ad Liking

Source	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	*h*
Age	1	0.05	0.08	.78	.00
Celeb Liking	1	81.75	121.71 ***	.00	.31
Culture	1	2.34	3.489 *	.06	.01
Gender	1	0.45	0.67	.42	.00
Culture*Gender	1	5.78	8.604 ***	.00	.02
Error	252	0.67			
Total	258				

Note. a. R Squared = .354 (Adjusted R Squared = .341). *$p < .10$, **$p < .05$, ***$p < .001$

Table 2

ANOVA for Food Ad Liking

Source	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	*h*
Age	1	1.91	0.71	.40	.00
Celeb Liking	1	103.40	38.11 ***	.00	.13
Culture	1	19.33	7.13 **	.01	.02
Gender	1	0.00	0.00	.99	.00
Culture*Gender	1	5.64	2.08	.15	.01
Error	252	2.71			
Total	258				

Note. a. R Squared = .148 (Adjusted R Squared = .131). *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table 3

ANOVA for Beyoncé Ad Liking

Source	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	*h*
Age	1	0.06	0.08	.78	.00
Celeb Liking	1	127.82	184.77 ***	.00	.39
Culture	1	4.66	6.74 **	.01	.01
Gender	1	5.12	7.39 **	.01	.02
Culture*Gender	1	0.10	0.15	.70	.00
Error	253	0.69			
Total	259				

Note. a. R Squared = .465 (Adjusted R Squared = .455). *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table 4

ANOVA for Fashion Purchase Intention

Source	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	*h*
Age	1	1.93	1.95	.16	.01
Celeb Liking	1	58.35	58.82***	.00	.18
Culture	1	29.09	29.33 ***	.00	.09
Gender	1	0.02	0.02	.89	.00
Culture*Gender	1	7.46	7.52 **	.01	.02
Error	252	0.99			
Total	258				

Note. a. R Squared = .249 (Adjusted R Squared = .234). *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table 5

ANOVA for Food Purchase Intention

Source	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	*h*
Age	1	6.02	1.55	.21	.01
Celeb Liking	1	132.56	34.16***	.00	.12
Culture	1	21.79	5.62 *	.02	.02
Gender	1	8.17	2.11	.15	.01
Culture*Gender	1	8.70	2.24	.14	.01
Error	252	3.88			
Total	258				

Note. a. R Squared = .140 (Adjusted R Squared = .122). *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table 6

ANOVA for Beyoncé Ad Purchase Intention

Source	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	*h*
Age	1	0.07	0.05	.82	.00
Celeb Liking	1	73.91	55.96 ***	.00	.16
Culture	1	20.51	15.53 ***	.00	.04
Gender	1	24.25	18.37 ***	.00	.05
Culture*Gender	1	3.22	2.44	.12	.01
Error	252	1.32			
Total	258				

Note. a. R Squared = .283 (Adjusted R Squared = .269). *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table 7

Means for Covariates

		Group Statistics			
		n	Mean	Std. Deviation	95% CI
Self Promotion	*America*	184	3.32	0.88	[3.31, 3.33]
	Korea	78	3.34	0.90	[3.31, 3.36]
Ingratiation	*America*	184	3.21	0.62	[3.21, 3.22]
	Korea	78	3.24	0.83	[3.22, 3.26]
Exemplification	*America*	184	3.07	0.62	[3.06, 3.07]
	Korea	78	3.14	0.75	[3.12, 3.16]
Intimidation	*America*	184	1.83	0.89	[1.82, 1.84]
	Korea	77	2.87	1.12	[2.84, 2.90]
Supplication	*America*	184	1.71	0.91	[1.70, 1.72]
	Korea	77	2.66	1.07	[2.63, 2.69]
Uncertainty Avoidance	*America*	184	4.07	0.64	[4.06, 4.07]
	Korea	78	4.13	0.63	[4.11, 4.14]
Collectivism	*America*	184	3.54	0.66	[3.54, 3.55]
	Korea	78	3.41	0.75	[3.39, 3.43]
Care	*America*	184	4.34	0.68	[4.33, 4.35]
	Korea	78	4.08	0.76	[4.06, 4.95]
Fairness	*America*	184	4.30	0.67	[4.29, 4.21]
	Korea	78	4.09	0.64	[4.07, 4.10]
Ingroup	*America*	184	3.87	0.68	[3.87, 3.88]
	Korea	78	3.91	0.76	[3.89, 3.92]
Authority	*America*	184	3.87	0.75	[3.86, 3.88]
	Korea	78	3.91	0.72	[3.89, 3.93]
Purity	*America*	184	3.68	0.82	[3.67, 3.68]
	Korea	78	3.77	0.76	[3.75, 3.78]
Time Dimension	*America*	184	3.56	0.54	[3.56, 3.57]
	Korea	78	3.51	0.45	[3.50, 3.52]
Relationship Dimension	*America*	184	3.46	0.46	[3.45, 3.46]
	Korea	78	3.54	0.53	[3.52, 3.55]
Space Dimension	*America*	184	3.36	0.44	[3.36, 3.37]
	Korea	78	3.18	0.64	[3.16, 3.20]
Comm Dimension	*America*	184	3.47	0.57	[3.47, 3.48]
	Korea	78	3.21	0.73	[3.19, 3.23]

Note. CI = Confidence Interval

Table 8

ANOVA for Fashion Ad Liking Covariate for Cultural Values

Source	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	*h*
Culture	1	1.08	1.68	.20	.00
Gender	1	0.27	0.43	.52	.00
Celeb Liking	1	72.61	112.80 ***	.00	.28
Age	1	0.09	0.13	.72	.00
Uncertainty Avoidance	1	5.41	8.41 ***	.00	.02
Collectivism	1	2.58	4.01 **	.05	.01
Gender*Uncertainty Avoidance	1	0.09	0.14	.71	.00
Gender*Collectivism	1	2.22	3.46 *	.06	.01
Error	249	0.64			
Total	258				

Note. a. R Squared = .388 (Adjusted R Squared = .368). *$p < .10$, **$p < .05$, ***$p < .001$

Table 9

ANOVA for Fashion Ad Liking Covariate for Progressivism

Source	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	*h*
Culture	1	0.20	0.31	.58	.00
Gender	1	0.16	0.24	.63	.00
Celeb Liking	1	86.18	129.22 ***	.00	.33
Age	1	0.09	0.13	.72	.00
Progressivism	1	7.48	11.22 ***	.00	.03
Gender * Progressivism	1	1.96	2.94	.09	.01
Error	251	0.67			
Total	258				

Note. a. R Squared = .361 (Adjusted R Squared = .345). *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table 10

ANOVA for Fashion Ad Liking Covariate for High vs. Low Context

Source	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	*h*
Culture	1	1.33	1.99	.16	.01
Gender	1	1.95	2.93	.09	.01
Celeb Liking	1	69.59	104.43 ***	.00	.27
Age	1	0.01	0.02	.90	.00
HLC Relationship Dimension	1	3.12	4.68 *	.03	.01
HLC Space Dimension	1	1.61	2.42	.12	.01
HLC Communication Dimension	1	0.69	1.04	.31	.00
Gender * HLC Relationship Dimension	1	4.84	7.26 **	.01	.02
Gender * HLC Space Dimension	1	1.14	1.71	.19	.00
Gender * HLC Communication Dimension	1	0.09	0.13	.72	.00
Error	247	0.67			
Total	258				

Note. a. R Squared = .371 (Adjusted R Squared = .346). *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table 11

ANOVA for Food Ad Liking Covariate for Cultural Values

Source	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	*h*
Culture	1	15.06	5.50 *	.02	.02
Gender	1	0.02	0.01	.93	.00
Celeb Liking	1	95.18	34.73 ***	.00	.12
Age	1	1.90	0.69	.41	.00
Uncertainty Avoidance	1	5.69	2.08	.15	.01
Collectivism	1	0.05	0.02	.89	.00
Gender*Uncertainty Avoidance	1	0.39	0.14	.71	.00
Gender*Collectivism	1	0.49	0.18	.67	.00
Error	249	2.74			
Total	258				

Note. a. R Squared = .150 (Adjusted R Squared = .122). *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table 12

ANOVA for Food Ad Liking Covariate for Progressivism

Source	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	*h*
Culture	1	10.28	3.80 *	.05	.01
Gender	1	0.01	0.00	.95	.00
Celeb Liking	1	108.67	40.15 ***	.00	.14
Age	1	1.73	0.64	.43	.00
Progressivism	1	9.89	3.65 *	.06	.01
Gender * Progressivism	1	1.66	0.61	.43	.00
Error	251	2.71			
Total	258				

Note. a. R Squared = .153 (Adjusted R Squared = .133). *$p < .10$, **$p < .05$, ***$p < .001$

Table 13

ANOVA for Food Ad Liking Covariate for Information Context

Source	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	*h*
Culture	1	15.34	5.51 *	.02	.02
Gender	1	0.00	0.00	.99	.00
Celeb Liking	1	94.26	33.86 ***	.00	.12
Age	1	2.17	0.78	.38	.00
HLC Relationship Dimension	1	0.03	0.01	.91	.00
HLC Space Dimension	1	0.11	0.04	.85	.00
HLC Communication Dimension	1	0.57	0.21	.65	.00
Gender * HLC Relationship Dimension	1	0.53	0.19	.66	.00
Gender * HLC Space Dimension	1	0.40	0.14	.71	.00
Gender * HLC Communication Dimension	1	0.05	0.02	.89	.00
Error	247	2.78			
Total	258				

*Note. a. R Squared = .143 (Adjusted R Squared = .108). *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001*

Table 14

ANOVA for Beyoncé Ad Liking Covariate for Cultural Values

Source	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	*h*
Culture	1	4.12	5.99 ***	0.02	0.01
Gender	1	0.23	0.33	0.57	0.00
Beyoncé Liking	1	120.85	175.7 ***	0.00	0.37
Age	1	0.04	0.06	0.80	0.00
UncertaintyAvoidance	1	1.17	1.70	0.19	0.00
Collectivism	1	0.00	0.00	0.96	0.00
Gender*Uncertainty Avoidance	1	0.40	0.58	0.45	0.00
Gender*Collectivism	1	0.17	0.25	0.62	0.00
Error	250	0.69			
Total	259				

Note. a. R Squared = .475 (Adjusted R Squared = .458). *$p < .10$, **$p < .05$, ***$p < .001$

Table 15

ANOVA for Beyoncé Ad Liking Covariate for Progressivism

Source	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	*h*
Culture	1	3.78	5.60 ***	0.02	0.01
Gender	1	7.30	10.81 ***	0.00	0.02
Beyoncé Liking	1	130.98	193.99 ***	0.00	0.40
Age	1	0.04	0.06	0.82	0.00
Progressivism	1	1.72	2.54	0.11	0.01
Gender * Progressivism	1	1.39	2.06	0.15	0.00
Error	252	0.68			
Total	259				

*Note. a. R Squared = .480 (Adjusted R Squared = .468). *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$*

Table 16

ANOVA for Beyoncé Ad Liking Covariate for Information Context

Source	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	*h*
Culture	1	3.47	5.08 ***	0.03	0.01
Gender	1	0.86	1.26	0.26	0.00
Beyoncé Liking	1	117.71	171.98 ***	0.00	0.36
Age	1	0.10	0.15	0.70	0.00
HLC Relationship Dimension	1	0.22	0.32	0.57	0.00
HLC Space Dimension	1	2.20	3.22	0.07	0.01
HLC Communication Dimension	1	3.43	5.01 *	0.03	0.01
Gender * HLC RelationshipDimension	1	0.77	1.12	0.29	0.00
Gender * HLC Space Dimension	1	1.23	1.80	0.18	0.00
Gender * HLC Communication Dimension	1	1.90	2.78	0.10	0.01
Error	248	0.68			
Total	259				

Note. a. R Squared = .482 (Adjusted R Squared = .461). *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table 17

Means for America

		Group Statistics			
		n	Mean	Std. Deviation	95% CI
Fashion Ad Like	*Male*	42	3.60	1.15	[3.55, 3.65]
	Female	142	4.12	0.96	[4.11, 4.13]
Food Ad Like	*Male*	42	4.52	1.90	[4.43, 4.61]
	Female	142	4.98	1.67	[4.96, 5.00]
Beyoncé Like	*Male*	42	3.07	1.26	[3.01, 3.13]
	Female	142	3.85	1.02	[3.84, 3.86]
Beyoncé Scale	*Male*	41	7.12	2.19	[7.02, 7.22]
	Female	142	8.27	1.96	[8.24, 8.30]
Fashion Purchase Intent	*Male*	42	2.50	0.97	[2.45, 2.55]
	Female	142	2.99	1.15	[2.97, 3.01]
Food Purchase Intent	*Male*	42	4.02	2.30	[3.91, 4.13]
	Female	142	4.15	2.10	[4.12, 4.18]
Beyoncé Purchase Intent *Male*		42	1.88	1.06	[1.83, 1.93]
	Female	141	3.17	1.29	[3.15, 3.19]

Note. a. America=1, Korea=2, other=3 (country of origin) = 1.00

Table 18

Means for Korea

Group Statistics					
		n	Mean	Std. Deviation	95% CI
Fashion Ad Like	*Male*	41	3.98	1.01	[3.91, 4.03]
	Female	37	3.76	0.90	[3.71, 3.81]
Food Ad Like	*Male*	41	5.37	1.79	[5.28, 5.46]
	Female	37	4.92	1.89	[4.82, 5.02]
Beyoncé Like	*Male*	41	3.22	1.22	[3.16. 3.28]
	Female	37	3.65	1.01	[3.60, 3.70]
Beyoncé Scale	*Male*	41	6.41	2.65	[6.28, 6.54]
	Female	36	6.83	2.34	[6.70. 6.96]
Fashion Purchase Intent	*Male*	41	3.41	1.10	[3.36, 3.46]
	Female	37	3.14	1.21	[3.08, 3.20]
Food Purchase Intent	*Male*	41	4.66	2.15	[4.56, 4.76]
	Female	37	3.97	1.88	[3.87, 4.07]
Beyoncé Purchase Intent *Male*		41	2.68	1.42	[2.61, 2.75]
	Female	37	3.27	1.19	[3.21, 3.33]

Note. a. America=1, Korea=2, other=3 (country of origin) =1.00

Table 19

Means for Dependent Variable

Group Statistics					
		n	Mean	Std. Deviation	95% CI
Fashion Ad Liking	*America*	184	4.00	1.03	[3.99, 4.01]
	Korea	78	3.87	0.96	[3.85, 3.89]
Fashion Ad Purchase Intention	*America*	184	2.88	1.13	[2.87, 2.89]
	Korea	78	3.28	1.15	[3.25, 3.31]
Food Ad Liking	*America*	184	4.88	1.73	[4.86, 4,90]
	Korea	78	5.15	1.84	[5.10, 5.20]
Food Ad Purchase Intention	*America*	184	4.12	2.14	[4.10, 4.14]
	Korea	78	4.33	2.04	[4.28, 4.28]
Beyoncé Ad Liking	*America*	184	3.67	1.12	[3.66, 3.68]
	Korea	78	3.42	1.13	[3.39, 3.45]
Beyoncé Ad Purchase Intention	*America*	183	2.87	1.35	[2.86, 2.88]
	Korea	78	2.96	1.34	[2.93, 2.99]

Note. CI = Confidence Interval

Figure 1. Cultural Dimension Scale: Uncertainty Avoidance

The questions below were rated between 1: Strongly Disagree to 5: Strongly Agree.

1. It is important to have instructions spelled out in detail so that I always know what I'm expected to do.
2. It is important to closely follow instructions and procedures.
3. Rules and regulations are important because they inform me of what is expected of me.
4. Standardized work procedures are helpful.
5. Instructions for operations are important.

Figure 2. Cultural Dimension Scale: Collectivism versus Individualism

The questions below were rated between 1: Strongly Disagree to 5: Strongly Agree.

1. Individuals should sacrifice self-interest for the group.
2. Individuals should stick with the group even through difficulties.
3. Group welfare is more important than individual rewards.
4. Group success is more important than individual success.
5. Individuals should only pursue their goals after considering the welfare of the group.
6. Group loyalty should be encouraged even if individual goals suffer.

Figure 3. Moral Foundations Theory Scale: Relevance

The questions below were rated between 0: not at all relevant to 5: extremely relevant.

1. Whether or not someone suffered emotionally
2. Whether or not some people were treated differently than others
3. Whether or not someone's action showed love for his or her country
4. Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for authority
5. Whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency
6. Whether or not someone was good at math
7. Whether or not someone cared for someone weak or vulnerable
8. Whether or not someone acted unfairly
9. Whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group
10. Whether or not someone conformed to the traditions of society

11. Whether or not someone did something disgusting
12. Whether or not someone was cruel
13. Whether or not someone was denied his or her rights
14. Whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty
15. Whether or not an action caused chaos or disorder
16. Whether or not someone acted in a way that God would approve of

Figure 4. Moral Foundations Theory Scale: Judgment

The questions below were rated between *0: Strongly Disagree to 5: Strongly Agree.*

1. Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue.
2. When the government makes laws, the number one principle should be ensuring that everyone is treated fairly.
3. I am proud of my country's history.
4. Respect for authority is something all children need to learn.
5. People should not do things that are disgusting, even if no one is harmed.
6. It is better to do good than to do bad.
7. One of the worst things a person could do is hurt a defenseless animal.
8. Justice is the most important requirement for a society.
9. People should be loyal to their family members, even when they have done something wrong.
10. Men and women each have different roles to play in society.
11. I would call some acts wrong on the grounds that they are unnatural.

12. It can never be right to kill a human being.
13. I think it's morally wrong that rich children inherit a lot of money while poor children inherit nothing.
14. It is more important to be a team player than to express oneself.
15. If I were a soldier and disagreed with my commanding officer's orders, I would obey anyway because that is my duty.
16. Chastity is an important and valuable virtue.

Figure 5. Information Context Scale

The questions below were rated between 1= Strongly Disagree to 5: Strongly Agree.

1. I typically find myself much more preoccupied with making short-term plans (i.e., what I'm going to do this weekend) than long-term ones (i.e., what I'm planning on doing or being in several years).
2. In my spare time, I am more likely to be found doing something by myself than with others.
3. I probably feel more comfortable having a clearly defined place that is mine where I can control whom I interact with.
4. When someone is correcting me, I would rather the person just tell me what he or she doesn't like and not make "suggestions."
5. My natural work style is to finish one thing before moving on to the next.
6. A commitment I have made to others is more likely to supersede one I've made to myself.

7. I feel comfortable talking about subjects like my future, my family, and so on, with most people, even if I have only know them a short while.
8. I prefer having things completely spelled out from the beginning than to start operating without an overview of the situation.
9. I dislike it when things don't go according to plans.
10. I have several really close friends who are friends for life rather than a lot of friends who come and go in my life.
11. Beyond knowing my first name, I consider my age, my family status, my profession (or my parent's profession) as private matters reserved for only a few close friends.
12. I would feel more uncomfortable having a contract that doesn't list every detail pertaining to the agreement than to have some "gray" areas which would require negotiating later on.
13. Changing plans—even at the last minute—is no problem for me.
14. A fair amount of my spare time is spent phoning or writing friends I don't see often.
15. Having a hedge or wall around my house would seem too confining to me.
16. It is usually better to call "a spade a spade" (be direct) than to hide a situation's "true colors" (be indirect).
17. It bothers me when I am later to appointments.
18. If I had some significant problems I needed help solving, I have any number of friends I could easily turn to for help.

19. Those I term my “best friends” know just about everything about me and I would never have a problem telling them things that are very personal.
20. If my boss or teacher were wrong, I would be more likely to tell her or him than to simply suggest there might be another answer.

Figure 6. Beyoncé H&M Video Ad

References

Biswas, A., Olsen, J. E., & Carlet, V. (1992). A comparison of print advertisements from the United States and France. *Journal of Advertising*, *21*(4), 73-81.

Cho, B., Kwon, U., Gentry, J.W., Jun, S., & Kropp F. (1999). "Cultural Values Reflected in Theme and Execution: A Comparative Study of U.S. and Korean Television *Commercials," Journal of Advertising*, *28*(4), 59-73.

Choe, Y. (2001). *Intercultural conflict patterns and intercultural training implications for Koreans.* Paper presented at the 16th Biennal World Communication Association Conference, Cantabria, Spain.

Choi, S. M., Lee, W. N., & Kim, H. J. (2005). Lessons from the rich and famous: A cross-cultural comparison of celebrity endorsement in advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, *34*(2), 85-98.

Christie, P. M. J., Kwon, I. W. G., Stoeberl, P. A., & Baumhart, R. (2003). A cross-cultural comparison of ethical attitudes of business managers: India Korea and the United States. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *46*(3), 263-287.

Chun, K. T., Campbell, J. B., & Yoo, J. H. (1974). Extreme Response Style in Cross-Cultural Research A Reminder. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*,*5*(4), 465-480.

Cutler, B. D., & Javalgi, R. G. (1992). A cross-cultural analysis of the visual components of print advertising: The United States and the European Community. *Journal of Advertising Research*.

Frank, T. (1998). The conquest of cool: Business culture, counterculture, and the rise of hip consumerism. *University of Chicago Press*.

Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2008). The Moral Foundations Questionnaire (full version).

Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101, 366-385.

Haidt, J., & Graham, J. (2007). When morality opposes justice: Conservatives have moral intuitions that liberals may not recognize. *Social Justice Research*, 20, 98-116.

Haidt, J., & Joseph, C. (2006). The moral mind: How five sets of innate intuitions guide the development of many culture-specific virtues, and perhaps even modules. *The innate mind*, *3*, 367-391.

Hall, E. T. (1976). Beyond Culture. *New York: Anchor Books*, 222, 13.

Hall, E. T., & Hall, M. R. (2001). Key concepts: Underlying structures of culture. *International HRM: Managing diversity in the workplace*, 24-40.

Hall, E. T. (2000). Context and meaning. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.). I*ntercultural Communication*: A reader, 9th ed. (pp. 34–43). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Kant, R. (2013, September 9). H&M Summer Collection 2013 TV Commercial Featuring Beyoncé [Video file]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ds1jgwekaP8

Han, S. P., & Shavitt, S. (1994). Persuasion and culture: Advertising appeals in individualistic and collectivistic societies. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *30*(4), 326-350.

Hofstede, G. (1984a). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Vol. 5). Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1984b). Cultural dimensions in management and planning. *Asia Pacific journal of management*, *1*(2), 81-99.

Hofstede, G. & Bond, M. H. (1984). Hofstede's Culture Dimensions An Independent Validation Using Rokeach's Value Survey. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, *15*(4), 417-433.

Kim, K. R., Kang, J. S., & Yun, S. (2012). Moral intuitions and political operation: similarities and differences between Korea and the United States 1, 2. *Psychological reports*, *111*(1), 173-185.

McLuhan, M., & Powers, B. R. (1989). *The Global Village. Transformations in World Life and Media in the 21st Century*. Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford.

Miracle, G. E., Chang, K. Y., & Taylor, C. R. (1992). Culture and advertising executions: a comparison of selected characteristics of Korean and US television commercials. *International Marketing Review*, *9*(4).

Oddou, G., & Derr, C.B. (1999). Managing Internationally: A Personal Journey. Forth Worth: The Dryden Press. Part II, 7-10.

Oliver, M. B., & Bartsch, A. (2010). Appreciation as audience response: Exploring entertainment gratifications beyond hedonism. *Human Communication Research*, 36, 53-81.

Würtz, E. (2005). Intercultural Communication on Web sites: A Cross-Cultural Analysis of Web sites from High-Context Cultures and Low-Context Cultures. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, *11*(1), 274-299.

Yoo, B., Donthu, N., & Lenartowicz, T. (2011). Measuring Hofstede's five dimensions of cultural values at the individual level: Development and validation of CVSCALE. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, *23*(3-4), 193-210.