

How call center location impacts expectations of service from reputable versus lesser known firms

Anne L. Roggeveen^{a,1}, Neeraj Bharadwaj^{b,*}, Wayne D. Hoyer^{c,2}

^a Babson College, 215 Malloy Hall, Babson Park, MA 02457-0310, United States

^b The University of Chicago, Graduate School of Business, 5807 South Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637, United States

^c McCombs School of Business, The University of Texas at Austin, CBA 7.248, Mailcode: B6700, Austin, TX 78712, United States

Abstract

Businesses are increasingly turning to call service centers located abroad to provide customer support. Although the country-of-origin literature as well as other reports may lead one to believe that consumers will expect offshore call centers to deliver poorer service, call center location is simply one cue which consumers can utilize to form expectations. This research investigates how two factors (location and reputation) impact a consumer's expectations regarding an upcoming service encounter. We employ information integration theory to examine how these two cues are combined. Results from two experiments demonstrate that call center location does not impact pre-encounter expectations if the firm is reputable. If, however, the firm is less known, consumers anticipate being less satisfied if they believe the call center is located in a nation dissimilar to the U.S. (e.g., India or the Philippines) versus in the U.S. or similar to the U.S. (e.g., England). Belief about training provided by the firm is shown to be the key mediator.

© 2007 New York University. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Call centers; Country-of-origin; Offshoring; Reputation; Services; Training

Lured by access to highly skilled personnel, cost savings, and the ability to readily connect with their customers, firms are increasingly turning to call service centers (CSCs) located abroad to provide customer support (Venkatraman 2004). The emerging consensus is that reliance on offshore CSCs is accelerating rapidly. One study, for instance, estimates that over a quarter of a million new call center agent positions will be added in India and the Philippines through 2009, with U.S.-based firms driving the vast majority of the demand (Datamonitor 2005). Although the primary motivation for firms to utilize offshore CSCs is efficiency gains, there remains a pressing need to investigate how CSC location impacts consumer expectations because those expectations can ultimately have important behavioral consequences (Parasuraman et al. 1991). It is therefore necessary to examine the extent to which expectations regarding service quality will be impacted by the offshoring of CSCs.

Prior research (Burgers et al. 2000) and some media reports (Twing 2005) suggest that the geographic location of the call center may influence consumer expectations. The country-of-origin (COO) literature sheds insight into why this might be the case by offering that consumers prefer services from: their own country (Harrison-Walker 1995), more economically developed countries (Wang and Lamb 1983), and countries with closer cultural distance (Shaffer and O'Hara 1995). Thus, one might assume that CSCs should never be offshored—at least not to economically developing countries. However, prior research has shown that COO effects diminish in the presence of additional information. To improve the applicability of COO to services marketing, Javalgi et al. (2001) stress the importance of examining COO in conjunction with other cues. Given that brand reputation may be the most important extrinsic cue that consumers rely on to transfer meaning to unknown offerings when no other information is available (Mazursky and Jacoby 1985), this research examines the joint effect of two cues (CSC location and reputation) on the formation of consumer expectations about the service which will be delivered during an upcoming encounter. More specifically, the central aim of this research is to evaluate if and how firm reputation moderates the impact of CSC loca-

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 773 834 5249.

E-mail addresses: aroggeveen@babson.edu (A.L. Roggeveen), Neeraj.Bharadwaj@chicagogsb.edu (N. Bharadwaj), Wayne.Hoyer@mcombs.utexas.edu (W.D. Hoyer).

¹ Tel.: 1 781 239 4289.

² Tel.: 1 512 471 1128.

tion on a consumer's pre-encounter expectations. Using two experiments, we demonstrate that when firm reputation is lesser known, consumers expect to receive poorer service from CSCs that have been offshored to developing nations; however, if the firm is well-known, CSC location does not matter. The mediating variable is the training which consumers believe each type of firm is likely to provide to their CSC employees.

By integrating the COO and the reputation literatures, this research yields insight into the formation of consumer expectations of service prior to a voice-to-voice encounter having transpired. Managerially, this research posits that migrating a call center abroad may be an acceptable strategy for reputable firms, but unknown firms may want to be more cautious.

Background

The country-of-origin effect refers to the extent to which the place of production influences product/service evaluations. For CSCs, the location of the employee providing the assistance is the country-of-origin, and this variable is posited to affect consumer appraisals. In general, research on COO effects shows that favorable country perceptions lead to favorable product/service evaluations (e.g., Peterson and Jolibert 1995; Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran 2000). COO serves as a halo—allowing consumers to make inferences about expected product/service quality based on general perceptions held about that country before the product or service is experienced (Han 1989).

However, inferences about product/service quality based on COO may only occur when the consumer does not recognize the brand name of a service. Ofir and Lehmann (1986) report that when specific brands were not well-known, the country's product-category image dominated. In surveying 296 U.S. skiers about European ski resorts, they found that despite low familiarity with the resorts, respondents viewed Swiss resorts to be better than French resorts. Similarly, Huber and McGann (1982) found that when consumers are unable to detect true quality, they are likely to turn to the country's product-category image to infer the quality of unknown products. Previous COO research therefore suggests that when a firm with an unknown reputation offshores the CSC to a developing nation, consumers are likely to possess lower service expectations. However, how consumers are likely to evaluate an offshore CSC from a reputable firm is not fully understood. The key question is whether they will also have lower expectations.

The joint impact of location and reputation

Javalgi et al. (2001) found that COO effects diminish in the presence of additional information. Reputation is one such cue. A firm's reputation, as conveyed by its brand name, is a commonly used extrinsic cue to infer quality perceptions

(Richardson et al. 1994).³ Thus, the question arises as to how these two cues – location of the CSC and reputation – jointly impact consumer evaluations. To answer this question, we turn to information integration theory.

Information integration theory suggests that when multiple cues exist, a consumer's judgment will be based on the summed contribution of each cue where the contribution is equal to the weight applied to that information times the value of the information (Anderson 1971). This is similar to other expectancy-value models (e.g., Fishbein and Ajzen 1975). The weight is the relevance or importance of that information for that individual (Beckwith and Lehmann 1975). If both cues are deemed equally relevant, they will both be assigned equal weight. If one cue is deemed more relevant, that cue is applied a greater weight in the judgment formation and the second cue less weight. The value of the information is what the person perceives the information to mean—for example, the consumer's belief about the service they will receive from a CSC based on that information.

In terms of the weights assigned to the reputation and location cues, we can propose two competing hypotheses. One stream of research suggests that consumers prefer to know brand name more than any other cue when evaluating quality (Mazursky and Jacoby 1985). One may, therefore, expect that reputation will be weighted more heavily than location. In contrast, another research stream reports that COO can have a greater effect on consumer evaluations of product quality than brand name (Tse and Gorn 1992). Thus, one may expect that location will be weighted more heavily than reputation. We test these competing explanations in Experiment 2.

In addition to understanding the weights which consumers apply to each cue, we also need to know how the value of each cue is evaluated. We naturally expect that firms with a good reputation will be valued more highly than firms with unknown reputations. A good reputation is based on a firm's past actions, and is commonly used to make inferences about a firm's future actions (Shimp and Bearden 1982). Beyond this however, a strong reputation has the power to create "goodwill"—or a sense of leniency towards the firm (Campbell 1999) and create inferences of high service quality (Grewal et al. 1998). In essence, a firm's positive past actions are likely to have a halo effect which serves to buffer against information, such as an offshored CSC location, which could be interpreted negatively (Beckwith and Lehmann 1975). In other words, due to the company's good reputation, consumers will be more likely to assume that the firm will ensure quality service regardless of CSC location. We, therefore, expect perceptions of offshored CSCs will be less negative if the CSC is from a reputable firm than if the CSC belongs to a lesser known one.

³ As firm name and brand name are often the same (i.e., Campbell's, CVS, etc.), we view the two interchangeably as referring to firm reputation.

In sum, when consumers form expectations about the service that is to be received during an upcoming service encounter, we predict that consumer expectations will be a weighted average of how they perceive the company reputation and the geographic location of the CSC. We hypothesize that this will result in consumers forming expectations such that:

H1a. *When the consumer purchases a product from a firm with a lesser known reputation, there will be a greater difference in service expectations when the CSC is inferred to be located in a country which is perceived as dissimilar (vs. similar) to the U.S.*

H1b. *When the consumer purchases a product from a firm with a good reputation, this difference in service expectations as a result of the CSC location is expected to be reduced.*

Two experiments are conducted to test this location by reputation interaction hypothesis. Experiment 1 tests it in the context of a reputable firm versus a firm with a less known reputation that has a CSC located in one of four nations—U.S., England, India, or the Philippines.⁴ Experiment 2 then provides evidence of the underlying process.

Experiment 1

Method

Subjects and design

Participants were 229 MBA students in the U.S. This study involved a 2×4 between-subjects design in which CSC location (U.S., England, Philippines, India) and company reputation (Strong: Dell; Lesser known: ZTGroup) were manipulated.⁵

Procedure

Similar to earlier services retailing research (Menon and Kahn 2002), we used a scenario-based experimental approach which permitted the tighter control of the independent variable. Such an approach alleviated difficulties associated with the observation or enactment of services in the field, such as ethical considerations, and managerial undesirability of intentionally imposing controlled service encounters on customers. Furthermore, scenarios reduced biases resulting from

memory lapses, rationalization tendencies, and consistency factors.

The subjects read a brief scenario that described them buying a new laptop with a post-sales support contract from either a reputable or lesser known company. It also identified the CSC location (U.S., England, India, or the Philippines). Participants then rated their satisfaction expectations using a 4-item scale, in which their responses could range from '1' (strongly disagree) to '9' (strongly agree), that was adapted from *Gotlieb et al. (1994)*. The measures were: "I anticipate that I will be satisfied with the customer service I receive from this computer company," "I anticipate that I will be happy about my decision to purchase from this company," "I did the right thing by purchasing my laptop from this company," and "Overall, I anticipate that I will be satisfied with this company." The scale was found to be highly reliable ($\alpha = .92$). Lastly, manipulation checks were included in which the participants were asked to recall the company name, CSC location, and rate firm reputation (i.e., the firm has a good reputation, 1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly disagree).

Results

Manipulation checks

The manipulations worked as intended. First, 98 percent of participants accurately recalled the firm. Furthermore, they viewed Dell as more reputable than ZTGroup ($M_{\text{Dell}} = 5.9$, $M_{\text{ZTGroup}} = 3.1$, $F(1, 216) = 230.15$, $p < .001$). No other effects were significant. Additionally, 97 percent believed the CSC was located in the country given in the scenario.

Satisfaction expectation

As hypothesized, there was a location by reputation interaction ($F(3, 216) = 2.36$, $p < .05$, one-tailed) such that when the product was purchased from a reputable company, customers had similar satisfaction expectations regardless of the CSC location ($M_{\text{U.S.}} = 5.9$, $M_{\text{England}} = 6.5$, $M_{\text{Philippines}} = 6.2$, $M_{\text{India}} = 5.9$, p 's $> .15$). When the product was purchased from a lesser known firm, buyers expected to be more satisfied if the CSC was located in the U.S. (6.5) than if it was located in India (5.4; $F(1, 216) = 9.03$, $p < .01$) or the Philippines (5.5; $F(1, 216) = 8.33$, $p < .01$). When the CSC was located in England, there was no significant difference in anticipated satisfaction between the U.S. (6.5) and England (6.2, $p > .4$).

Discussion

These results provide support for the hypothesized interaction between reputation and location. When a firm is reputable, CSC location does not impact anticipated satisfaction. When the firm is lesser known, CSC location impacts satisfaction such that when the CSC is located in a developing country which has a less similar culture (Philippines or India), participants anticipate being less satisfied than when

⁴ Because many business processes, including call centers, are offshored to India and the Philippines (Venkatraman 2004; Datamonitor 2005), we compare expectations from CSCs located in those countries to the U.S. To ensure that any differences between the U.S. and the dissimilar nation are not based on the simple fact that they are an outside nation (i.e., out-group), we also included England.

⁵ An additional factor, external information provided (advantages, disadvantages), was also manipulated. Since no interactive effects were found for this variable, it will not be discussed.

the CSC is in a developed country where the culture was more similar to the U.S. (England).

Although this study demonstrates that the impact of location on expected satisfaction varies as a function of firm reputation, it has several limitations. First, it does not provide evidence for the underlying information integration process. Second, the manipulation of location is extremely strong (i.e., country named explicitly). In “real world” situations, consumers often do not know the actual name of the country; they can only infer this from the accent of the speaker. In the second experiment, we provide process evidence and enhance the scenario realism by describing an employee’s accent and allowing participants to infer location.

Experiment 2

The most frequently cited difficulties with overseas CSCs arise from accent, communication and language problems, cultural differences, and inferior service due to lack of experience, expertise and technical knowledge (Mahapatra 2006). However, all of these issues can be offset with training. We hypothesize that consumers may infer that reputable firms will ensure quality service by investing in training its offshored employees, hiring only motivated and qualified employees, and compensating them well. Research has shown that reputable firms are in fact, more likely to invest in enhancing their employees’ skill sets so as to protect and enhance the firm’s stature in the eyes of the public (Valle et al. 2000).

To have a clearer understanding if consumers made inferences about any of these factors as a function of the company’s reputation and CSC location, we ran a pretest using 60 executive MBA participants. We manipulated perceived CSC location and reputation of the company resulting in a 2×2 between-subject design. We measured beliefs about training as well as beliefs about the employee’s ability, competence, desire to solve the problem, and compensation. The only variable which was impacted by both firm reputation and location was training. Thus, we included questions about training in Experiment 2 to determine if belief about training mediates the relationship between reputation, location and expected problem resolution.

Also, we modified the key dependent variable from satisfaction expectation to anticipated problem resolution. It is intuitive that customers placing a call to a CSC are seeking resolution to a given problem, and whether it is reconciled satisfactorily should be the most important criterion shaping their appraisal (Maxham and Netemeyer 2002). Additionally, this anticipated problem resolution is likely to dictate how much time and energy the customer will invest with the customer service agent, a fact which will impact the ultimate outcome of the exchange. Consistent with Study 1, we hypothesize the same reputation by location interaction.

Method

A 2×2 between-subjects design manipulating the accent of the CSC employee (similar to someone you once met from the Philippines vs. Tennessee) and firm reputation (i.e., good vs. unknown) was investigated using 60 students in the United States. The subjects read a brief scenario that described a person getting ready to purchase a new laptop computer and speaking with a number of friends about the brand. In one condition, the friends are all familiar with the company and the company has a good reputation. In the other condition, the friends are not familiar with the company and the company’s reputation is unknown. The scenario goes on to describe that the user purchased the computer and after using it several times the screen became dim. Upon calling the 1–800 number for customer support, an agent picks up the phone. The agent has an accent similar to someone the caller once met from the Philippines (Tennessee) and used words and phrases similar to that person. Finally, participants were told that after 15 min on the phone with the customer service agent, the problem was still not resolved.

Participants then asked two questions about training: (1) “I believe this customer service agent is well trained” and (2) “I believe that this computer company has trained its customer service agents well.” Both were on based on Likert-scales ranging from ‘1’ (strongly disagree) to ‘9’ (strongly agree), and two questions about problem resolution: (1) “this customer service agent will be able to solve the problem with my computer screen” ‘1’ (strongly disagree) to ‘9’—(strongly agree), and (2) “do you think that the problem will be resolved before you decide to hang up” using a scale from ‘1’ (definitely will not be resolved) to ‘9’ (definitely will be resolved). Measures related to the importance of a factor and perceptions based on that factor were also collected. The importance of the factor was captured by assigning points to reputation, country, or other (which they were asked to specify) to indicate how important each of those factors was in determining the likelihood that a problem would be resolved. Perceptions were assessed by asking “how would you rate the level of service you would expect to receive based on the reputation of the computer company (the geographic location of the call center representative).” Finally, participants completed a closed-ended manipulation check in which they identified the reputation of the firm as unknown or good, and an open-ended manipulation check which they commented on where they believed the call center was located.

Results

Manipulation checks

The manipulations worked as intended as 89 percent of participants correctly identified the firm’s reputation as either unknown or good, and 93 percent inferred that the CSC was located in the country consistent with the accent manipulation

Resolution expectation

Because the two items measuring resolution expectation were correlated ($r = .74$, $p < .001$), these items were combined. An ANOVA on this measure revealed a significant interaction between location and reputation ($F(1, 56) = 5.77$, $p < .05$). Consistent with our hypothesis, the interaction revealed that when the firm had a good reputation, CSC location did not impact belief about the likelihood of problem resolution ($M_{U.S.} = 4.2$, $M_{overseas} = 4.7$, $F < 1$). When firm reputation was unknown, participants believed the problem was more likely to be resolved if the CSC was located in the U.S. versus overseas ($M_{U.S.} = 4.6$, $M_{overseas} = 3.2$; $F(1, 56) = 7.56$, $p < .01$).

Mediation analysis

The procedure outlined by Baron and Kenny (1986) was used to test whether belief in the training of employees mediates the effect of the independent variables (reputation and location) on belief that the problem will be resolved. A regression analysis was conducted with the resolution expectation as the dependent variable. Reputation, location, and an interaction term were independent variables. All betas reported are standardized. The reputation main effect was significant ($\beta = .466$, $t(56) = 2.68$, $p = .01$), suggesting that participants had higher expectations that the problem would be resolved when the company had a good reputation. There was also a main effect for location ($\beta = .449$, $t(56) = 2.75$, $p < .01$), suggesting that participants had higher expectations that the problem would be resolved when the accent of the CSC employee sounded like someone from the U.S. The predicted interaction effect between reputation and location was significant ($\beta = -.491$, $t(56) = -2.40$, $p < .05$).

The mediator, training, was then regressed on reputation, location and the interaction. As there was a high correlation between the two questions designed to capture beliefs about training of employees ($r = .95$), these measures were combined. Both main effects and the interaction were significant (reputation: $\beta = .573$, $t(56) = 3.36$, $p = .001$; location: $\beta = .414$, $t(56) = 2.58$, $p = .01$, interaction: $\beta = -.549$, $t(56) = -2.73$, $p < .01$). Finally, resolution expectation was regressed on the independent variables and training. The previously significant main effects and interaction between location and reputation on resolution became insignificant (reputation: $p > .8$, location: $p > .2$, interaction: $p > .6$), whereas the effect of training was significant ($\beta = .76$, $t(55) = 8.3$, $p < .001$), indicating that training mediates the effect of reputation and location. This result reinforces the notion that it is belief in the level of training that a company provides to employees which mediates the effect of reputation and location on the resolution expectation belief.

Importance and perceptions

A mixed factorial design revealed that participants gave more points to reputation (61) than location (27; $F(1, 45) = 30.52$, $p < .001$) indicating that reputation was considered more important than the assumed country in which the

CSC representative is located in determining the likelihood that a problem would be resolved. No other effects were significant indicating that the weight given to reputation and location did not vary as a function of the condition.

Finally, perception measures were analyzed using ANOVAs on each of the measures. One question asked “how would you rate the level of service you would expect to receive based on the reputation of the computer company.” As expected, this question revealed a main effect of reputation such that perceptions were better for companies with good (6.3) versus unknown reputations (4.6; $F(1, 53) = 13.64$, $p < .001$). There was no impact of the location. For the second question which asked “how would you rate the level of service you would expect to receive based on the geographic location of the call center representative,” there was a reputation by location interaction ($F(1, 53) = 4.2$, $p < .05$). When the company had a good reputation, there was no difference in perceptions regarding the expected service based on the location of the CSC regardless of whether the CSC was believed to be located in the U.S. (6.0) or overseas (6.1; $F < 1$, $p = .9$). However, when the company had an unknown reputation, participants expected better service when the CSC was located in the U.S. (5.4) than overseas (3.8; $F(1, 53) = 9.13$, $p < .01$). These two perception questions reveal that perceptions based on reputation are affected only by the reputation manipulation. However, perceptions based on location are affected both by the location and the reputation manipulations.

Information integration

To determine if participants are in fact integrating information as proposed by information integration theory, we created a variable which used the percentage of points they assigned to how important they viewed the reputation and location factors to be in determining the likelihood that the problem would be resolved and multiplied those percentages by the rating they gave to the perception questions. We then compared that calculated variable to their resolution expectation using a paired-sample *t*-test. Results reveal that, as expected, participants resolution expectation was no different than the calculated variable ($M_{\text{Resolution expectation}} = 4.23$, $M_{\text{calculated expectation}} = 4.47$, $t(47) = -.93$, $p > .35$).

General discussion

The results from the two studies demonstrate that COO for the CSC location is more likely to affect consumer expectations of the post-sales service they are likely to receive only if the company is lesser known (vs. a firm that has a favorable reputation). More specifically, if a consumer infers that the CSC of a lesser-known company is located overseas in a nation which is economically and culturally distinct from the U.S., s/he will possess lower expectations regarding the service s/he is likely to receive in relation to if the CSC is inferred to be located in the U.S. For firms with good reputations, CSC location does not seem to impact expectations. Experiment

2 demonstrates that resolution expectations are based on the weighted summed contribution of the reputation and location cues where the weight is the importance of the information times the perception of that information. Additionally, our results support that reputation is a more important cue than location for CSC, thereby supporting Mazursky and Jacoby's (1985) contention that brand name is more important than any other cue when evaluating quality. This contradicts Tse and Gorn's (1992) findings that COO has a greater effect on product quality than brand name.⁶

In terms of the inferred COO of the CSC representative, how consumers interpret that cue is not solely based upon CSC location. Instead consumers interpret that cue as a function of the reputation of the firm. Consumers believe that reputable companies will provide equivalent service regardless of CSC location. However, companies with lesser known reputations are expected to provide worse service if the CSC is located overseas than in the U.S. Belief about the level of training the company provides to its representatives is shown to mediate the result.

Theoretical implications

The country-of-origin literature offers that “the conditions under which, and the process by which, country-of-origin information influences [consumer] evaluations are not clearly understood” (Maheswaran 1994, p. 354). Additionally, prior research has noted that the consequences of firm reputation within the specific context of voice-to-voice encounters are not fully understood (de Ruyter and Wetzel 2000). We therefore evaluate the joint effects of COO and reputation on expectations of service from a CSC encounter, thereby integrating the two literature streams to better understand the nuances of the impact of call center location on expectations of service from reputable versus lesser know firms.

This research also provides insight into initial expectations. This is important in light of the contentions that “the nature of customer service expectations and how they are formed has remained ambiguous” (Parasuraman et al. 1991, p. 39) and that there is a need for “insight into customer expectations with regard to voice-to-voice service behavior” (Burgers et al. 2000 p. 156). While the service quality literature does provide invaluable insight into the nature of expectations within the context of a relational exchange (e.g., Boulding et al. 1993), it is relatively silent regarding pre-transaction expectations. Our research offers insight into this understudied facet of consumer appraisals. Lastly, we find that training is an important mediating variable. This offers evidence for the notion that reputable firms are perceived to offer better on-the-job training to their employees.

Managerial implications

Prior research suggests that customers are more likely to switch their business to another firm due to problems with a company's pre- and/or post-sales assistance than problems with the ‘product’ itself (Shapiro et al. 1992) indicating the importance of understanding how service can impact the firm-customer relationship. Our results offer insights to manufacturers and retailers engaged in direct business models in which they manage the firm-customer interface themselves, and to those firms looking to migrate sales to their websites and rely upon call centers to provide order fulfillment and customer support. Our results are encouraging for well-known firms indicating that customers are likely to expect good service from these firms regardless of whether the CSC is offshored.

In contrast, our results indicate that if lesser known firms offshore, consumers are likely to expect poorer service. If these firms invest heavily in training their agents they may be able to overcome some of these negative expectations. Given the limited set of cues that can shape perceptions in voice-to-voice interactions, frontline service provider aptitude (Reinartz and Chugh 2002) and listening skills (de Ruyter and Wetzel 2000), both of which can be improved through training, take on increased importance. One caveat to note, however, is that we examined a post-sales CSC interaction of a technical nature where training may be more important than more basic call center interactions (e.g., billing inquiry). Future research should explore other types of CSC interactions. A second limitation to note is that we used a paper-based scenario. Future research should enhance the external validity either by working with an actual CSC or mimicking a call center encounter through a role playing exercise (e.g., Folkes and Matta 2006). It would also be interesting to determine if consumers infer the COO of the CSC based on the wording used to respond to consumer inquiries (e.g., Hsieh et al. 2005) in web-based service encounters, and how that impacts perceptions.

Future research should also explore the impact of an off-shore CSC agent from a lesser known firm successfully resolving a consumer's issue. In such a situation, the firm may benefit because it runs counter to the consumer's expectation (Matta and Folkes 2005). This disconfirmation can impact satisfaction (Cronin et al. 2000; Phillips and Baumgartner 2002). Additionally, it would be interesting to understand not only how expectations evolve over time (Boulding et al. 1993; Dabholkar et al. 2000), but also how expectations may be updated differently based on varying levels of problem resolution (i.e., service failure, moderate success, complete success) (Maxham and Netemeyer 2002).

In sum, it has become readily accepted that call centers are an important source of competitive (dis)advantage. Off-shore CSCs will continue to become increasingly important in the management of customer relationships, especially as more firms pursue direct business models and more retailers evolve away from relying solely on brick-and-mortar inter-

⁶ However, an important difference to note is that our study focuses on expectations of a follow-up service and not on the inherent quality of the core product.

faces to satisfy customer requirements. While most research on call centers has been carried out in operations management and has focused primarily on efficiency gains and call allocation decisions (see Gans et al. 2003 for a review), our effort is an attempt to examine the joint effects of call center location and firm reputation on consumer expectations. We are hopeful that additional research in marketing will build upon this effort to more deeply understand the behavioral and financial consequences of offshoring call centers.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank S. Tamer Cavusgil for his feedback on an earlier version of this document, participants at the 2005 AMA Summer Educators' Conference Special Session entitled "Outsourcing and Offshoring of CRM Activities" for their insightful commentary, and the editors, guest editor, and three anonymous reviewers for their guidance and suggestions. The support offered by the W. F. Glavin Center for Global Management at Babson College is also gratefully acknowledged. Professor William Bearden served as a guest editor for this paper.

References

- Anderson, Norman H. (1971). "Integration Theory and Attitude Change," *Psychological Review*, 78 (3) 171–206.
- Baron, Reuben M. and David A. Kenny (1986). "The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51 (6) 1173–1182.
- Beckwith, Neil E. and Donald R. Lehmann (1975). "The Importance of Halo Effects in Multi-Attribute Models," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 12 (August) 265–275.
- Boulding, William, Ajay Kalra, Richard Staelin and Valarie A. Zeithaml (1993). "A Dynamic Process Model of Service Quality: From Expectations to Behavioral Intentions," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30 (February) 7–27.
- Burgers, Arjan, Ko de Ruyter, Cherie Keen and Sandra Streukens (2000). "Customer Expectation Dimensions of Voice-to-Voice Service Encounters: A Scale-Development Study," *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 11 (2) 142–161.
- Campbell, Margaret C. (1999). "Perceptions of Price Unfairness: Antecedents and Consequences," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36 (May) 187–199.
- Cronin, J. Joseph, Michael K. Brady, G. Tomas and M. Hult (2000). "Assessing the Effects of Quality, Value, and Customer Satisfaction on Consumer Behavioral Intentions in Service Environments," *Journal of Retailing*, 76 (2) 193–218.
- Dabholkar, Pratibha A., C. David Shepherd and Dayle I. Thorpe (2000). "A Comprehensive Framework for Service Quality: An Investigation of Critical Conceptual and Measurement Issues through a Longitudinal Study," *Journal of Retailing*, 76 (2) 139–173.
- Datamonitor (February 25, 2005). "The Future of Contact Center Outsourcing in India and the Philippines."
- de Ruyter, Ko and Martin G.M. Wetzels (2000). "The Impact of Perceived Listening Behavior in Voice-to-Voice Service Encounters," *Journal of Service Research*, 2 (February) 276–284.
- Fishbein, M. and I. Ajzen (1975). *Attributes, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Folkes, Valerie S. and Shashi Matta (2006). "Perceptions of Atypical Employees: How Different People Differentiate the Organization," *Working Paper*. University of Southern California.
- Gans, Noah, Ger Koole and Avishai Mandelbaum (2003). "Telephone Call Centers: Tutorial, Review, and Research Prospects," *Manufacturing and Service Operations Management*, 5 (2) 79–141.
- Gotlieb, Jerry B., Dhruv Grewal and Stephen W. Brown (1994). "Consumer Satisfaction and Perceived Quality: Complementary or Divergent Constructs?," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79 875–885.
- Grewal, Dhruv, R. Krishnan, Julie Baker and Norm Borin (1998). "The Effect of Store Name, Brand Name and Price Discounts on Consumers' Evaluations and Purchase Intentions," *Journal of Retailing*, 74 (Fall) 331–353.
- Gurhan-Canli, Zeynep and Duirairaj Maheswaran (2000). "Cultural Variations in Country of Origin Effects," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 37 (August) 309–317.
- Han, C.Min (1989). "Country Image: Halo or Summary Construct?," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 26 (May) 222–229.
- Harrison-Walker, L.J. (1995). "The Relative Effects of National Stereotype and Advertising Information on the Selection of a Service Provider," *Journal of Service Marketing*, 9 (1) 47–59.
- Hsieh, Yi-Ching, Hung-Chang Chiu and Mei-Yi Chiang (2005). "Maintaining a Committed Online Customer: A Study Across Search-Experience-Credence Products," *Journal of Retailing*, 81 (1) 75–82.
- Huber, Joel and John McGann (1982). "The Impact of Inferential Beliefs on Product Evaluations," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19 (August) 324–333.
- Javalgi, Rajshekhkar G., Bob Cutler and William A. Winans (2001). "At Your Service! Does Country of Origin Research Apply to Services?," *The Journal of Services Marketing*, 15 (6–7) 565–582.
- Mahapatra, Rajesh. (2006). "IBM Develops Programs for Call Centers," Associated Press. http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20061107/ap_on_hi_te/outsourcing_accents (accessed November 7).
- Maheswaran, Durairaj (1994). "Country of Origin as a Stereotype: Effects of Consumer Expertise and Attribute Strength on Product Evaluations," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21 (September) 354–365.
- Matta, Shashi and Valerie Folkes (2005). "Inferences about the Brand from Counterstereotypical Service Providers," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32 (September) 196–206.
- Maxham, James G. III and Richard G. Netemeyer (2002). "Modeling Consumer Perceptions of Complaint Handling Over Time: The Effects of Perceived Justice on Satisfaction and Intent," *Journal of Retailing*, 78 239–252.
- Mazursky, D. and J. Jacoby (1985). "Forming Impressions of Merchandise and Service Quality," in *Perceived Quality*, J. Jacoby and J. Olson eds. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books., 13–54.
- Menon, Satya and Barbara Kahn (2002). "Cross-category Effects of Induced Arousal and Pleasure on the Internet Shopping Experience," *Journal of Retailing*, 78 (1) 31–40.
- Ofir, Chezy and Donald R. Lehmann (1986). "Measuring Images of Foreign Products," *Columbia Journal of World Business*, 105–108. Summer
- Parasuraman, A., Leonard L. Berry and Valarie A. Zeithaml (1991). "Understanding Customer Expectations of Service," *Sloan Management Review*, 39–48. Spring.
- Peterson, Robert A. and Alain J.P. Jolibert (1995). "A Meta-Analysis of Country-of-Origin Effects," *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26 (4) 883–900.
- Phillips, Diane M. and Hans Baumgartner (2002). "The Role of Consumption Emotions in the Satisfaction Response," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 12 (3) 243–252.
- Reinartz, Werner and Pankaj Chugh (2002). "Learning from Experience: Making CRM a Success at Last," *Call Center Management*, 4 (3) 207–219.

- Richardson, Paul S., Alan S. Dick and Arun K. Jain (1994). "Extrinsic and Intrinsic Cue Effects on Perceptions of Store Brand Quality," *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (October) 28–30.
- Shaffer, Teri Root and Bradley S. O'Hara (1995). "The Effects of Country-of-Origin on Trust and Ethical Perceptions of Legal Services," *Service Industries Journal*, 15 (2) 162–185.
- Shapiro, Benson P., V. Kasturi Rangan and John J. Sviokla (1992). "Staple Yourself to an Order," *Harvard Business Review*, July–August 113–121.
- Shimp, Terrence A. and William O. Bearden (1982). "Warranty and Other Extrinsic Cue Effects on Consumers' Risk Perceptions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9 (June) 38–46.
- Tse, David K. and Gerald J. Gorn (1992). "An Experiment on the Salience of Country-of-Origin in the Era of Global Brands," *International Journal of Marketing*, 1 (1) 57–76.
- Twing, Dan (2005). "Could Frustrated Consumers Reverse the Off-shore Call Center Trend?" on <http://www.networkworld.com>, accessed 10/19/05.
- Valle, Ramon, Fernando Martin, Pedro Romero and Shimon Dolan (2000). "Business Strategy, Work Processes, and Human Resource Training: Are They Congruent?," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21 283–297.
- Venkatraman, N. Venkat (2004). "Offshoring Without Guilt," *Sloan Management Review*, 14–16. Spring
- Wang, Chih-Kang and Charles W. Lamb (1983). "The Impact of Selected Environmental Forces Upon Consumers' Willingness to Buy Foreign Products," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 11 (2) 71–84.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.