A Cross-National Study on the Perception of Algorithm News in the East and the West

Donghee Shin, College of Communication and Media Sciences, Zayed University, Abu Dhabi, UAE

ABSTRACT

Although algorithms have been widely used to deliver useful services, how users actually experience algorithm-driven news remains unclear. This study examines user attitude and perception of algorithmic journalism and identifies the similarities and differences in experience and satisfaction formation. A comparative study between the United States (U.S.) and South Korea was conducted to examine how the two countries' users experience the quality of algorithm-driven news services and how individuals perceive the topics of fairness, accountability, and transparency. The notable similarities and differences are found by performing a comparison of cognitive processes. The major attitudes toward algorithm news are similar between the two countries, although the weights placed on the qualities differ. South Korean users put more weight on performance qualities, and U.S. users place relatively greater emphasis on procedural features. Different patterns of algorithm news experience imply the contextual nature of algorithm: how users perceive and feel about topics in algorithm news and how they use and engage with algorithm news depend on the context where the experience is taking place. The analysis suggests the importance of user-perceived issues and the contextual nature of such issues.

KEYWORDS

Algorithm Journalism, Automated News, Comparative Study, Cross Algorithm User Experience, Cross-National Analysis

INTRODUCTION

The drastic increase in the use of algorithms has been driven by advances in artificial intelligence techniques (Shin, 2019). Recently, algorithms have been increasingly used in the media, particularly in news services (Fletcher & Nielen, 2019; Diakopoulos & Koliska, 2016). Algorithms are used in the news industry to personalize news offerings to increasingly specific user preferences. Algorithmic journalism (AJ) produces the most relevant news article recommendations to users based on their personal preferences and interests (Zheng, Zhong, & Yang, 2018; Beam & Kosicki, 2014). These services can be useful because information overload is problematic because too much information, especially of little relevance, causes confusion. One of the advantages of AJ is that these services help users sort articles of interest (Thurman & Schifferes, 2012). With advanced and sophisticated algorithms, AJ has become popular and widespread (Jung et al., 2017).

Despite the increasing popularity and adoption, what users of the services enjoy or prefer and how the user experience (UX) is improved by automated processes or algorithmic curation (Beer, 2016; Helberger, Karppinen, & D'Acunto, 2018; Beam & Kosicki, 2014) remain unclear. Algorithmic services have been demonstrated to improve UX and increase revenues of, for example, news services and online providers, but how they improve UX remains an open question. Little knowledge is available

DOI: 10.4018/JGIM.2021030105

This article, published as an Open Access article on February 5th, 2021 in the gold Open Access journal, the Journal of Global Information Management(converted to gold Open Access January 1st, 2021), is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and production in any medium, provided the author of the original work and original publication source are properly credited. about how users experience AJ: how they feel about news selected by algorithms, how they think the algorithm works, and how their perception plays out in the experience (Knijnenburg et al., 2012; Shin & Park, 2019). Based on this revealed gap in the knowledge, this comparative inquiry attempted to find similarities and differences in individuals' AJ consumptions in the U.S. and Korea.

Both countries have been actively developing algorithms and AJ are becoming popular trends in both societies (Shin, 2019). Comparative frames offer a better understanding because an algorithm system is a complex entity and related issues are complicated.

In the comparison of the two countries, we focused on users' cognitive process: how users evaluate the qualities of the AJ news, how users make sense of the new AJ process, and users' level of satisfaction with algorithm news. With user-based AJ in place, following inquires will be useful: how users recognize the function and value of AJ, how users' attitudes/motivations are created, how the perceptual process works, and how people perceive trust in algorithms and interact with AJ. How individual users encounter AJ contents and interact with these systems are legitimate topics and practical concerns when designing AJ and user-centered algorithm systems in lieu of system-oriented methods. To assess this issue, this study attempts to examine a cross-country AJ model incorporating system quality (fairness, accountability, and transparency; FAT) and perceived value (utility, convenience, and accuracy) as antecedent factors of confirmation and satisfaction. With this model in place, this study explores the experience of receiving news through AJ by focusing on the following comparative angles:

RQ: What are the cross-national differences in user attitudes and motivation for adopting AJ content?

- 1. Are there differences between U.S. and South Korean (hereafter, Korean) users regarding their perceptions of FAT in AJ news?
- 2. Do U.S. and Korean users perceive the quality of algorithm news differently?
- 3. How much do the users in the U.S. and Korea trust AJ and how does that level of trust influence the satisfaction of AJ?

With the RQs established, this study presents a conceptual model that addresses user value perception for using algorithmic services. A study showed that perceptions of FAT strongly impact perceived value and satisfaction of algorithmic services (Shin & Park, 2019). Comparative observations in the U.S. and Korea would be useful to examine how value is constructed in both countries and recognize which factors influence user confirmation and satisfaction. The results of this study make two contributions to the literature on automated news and algorithm curations.

First, the AJ user model advances the current user research on news consumption and user literature by recognizing algorithmic heuristics, UX, and their underlying relationship. Because algorithm-based journalism services are rapidly developing, the existing technology acceptance model-based frameworks require updates in line with ever-changing user experiences in algorithmic environments. Although the concepts of FAT have been widely touted when developing algorithm services (Diakopoulos & Koliska, 2016; Klinger & Svensson, *in press*), what they are or how people actually perceive and experience them remain unclear (Zheng, Yang, & Li, 2014). In the AJ context, numerous questions remain inconclusive as to how users perceive the services experienced through algorithms, how algorithms influence user satisfaction and trust, and how users react to their experiences with algorithm-based news. One of the contributions is to highlight the users' cognitive and emotional mechanism, that is, how individuals perceive and process technological features (Kim, Shin, & Park, 2015), how algorithms elicit user motivations (Shin & Biocca, 2018), and how technological cues trigger user experiences (Shin, 2017).

Second, the FAT issues have been thorny subjects in AJ as well as overall algorithm services (Ananny & Crawford, 2018). Algorithmic decision-making has been criticized for its potential to increase discrimination, unfair process, and information asymmetry. Against the concern, however,

research regarding these topics, namely, the user experience of AJ, remains largely unexplored. Users' perceptions about how algorithm works are an essential component of a feedback loop that can cause systems to behave in undesirable or unexpected manner (Rader, 2017). Understanding users' beliefs is a critical procedure towards understanding effects of algorithms and potentially designing AJ that are more user-centered and human-oriented. These topics have rarely been researched from a cross-country context. Because these topics are contextual in nature, cross-country comparative frames would provide notable insights into the understanding of FAT issues in AJ.

The findings of this study guide practitioners in the provision of appropriate interfaces and interaction designs for news algorithms and other algorithm-based technologies. The algorithm user experience is complicatedly related to the users' contextual features. Because the results highlight the emerging issues of FAT in AJ, the findings can provide implications regarding how to elicit user satisfaction with process that are more transparent and fairer. The findings provide useful strategies for global firms to develop user-algorithm frameworks that lead to the successful introduction of international algorithm news services. With globalization, an overall increase in use of AJ has been observed. Understanding how people in different countries use AJ adds a new level to how global news can be organized and produced. The results of this study can be valuable to firms in their attempts to improve algorithm development and to identify the causes influencing cognition and behavior crossnational contexts. The algorithm industry has been attempting to make services more accurate and satisfying (Zheng et al., 2018). Because algorithms represent specific user dimensions, a thorough user analysis based on UX is necessary for effective development and diffusion.

LITERATURE REVIEWS

Algorithms and Algorithmic Journalism

Automated news is possible because of algorithms (Moller et al., 2018). Recommender systems are used by news services to help users access the ever-growing set of services and data available on the internet (Shin, Zhong, & Biocca, 2020). The user chooses news to read or products to purchase, and the system then proposes items that may potentially interest the user based on his/her history. Thus, users are provided recommendations based on products they have already rated or viewed. Recently, recommendation algorithms have been widely used in news recommendations. Nearly all the content people see on online news is chosen not by human editors but by algorithms using massive quantities of data about each user to deliver content that he/she might find relevant or engaging (Beam & Kosicki, 2014). Algorithms determine the news seen on social networks and the search results reviewed on news sites. With the advancement of algorithm technologies, AJ has been widely adopted and is expected to be further diffused in societies. AJ shapes profiles of users' news preferences based on their behavior on the internet. AJ aims to identify news that best fits user preferences (Shin et al., 2020).

Although few would dispute the vast benefits offered by algorithms and AJ, especially in terms of efficiency through improved automation and quality through sophisticated filtering, AJ raises ethical and societal concerns. AJ relies on data and assumptions, and both are subject to biases and unfairness. Some AJ sites are promoting attention-grabbing content ultimately harmful to users, such as sensationalism, propaganda, and the filter bubble (Diakopoulos & Koliska, 2016; Shin & Park, 2019). Once a story is promoted by AJ, a sudden increase is observed in its popularity and viewership. These systems have been demonstrated to have a self-reinforcing nature and are easily vulnerable to manipulation (Möller et al., 2018). These two topics have recently been mentioned in popular press articles, and the problem of manipulation is garnering greater attention among practitioners, industry, and policymakers (Fink, 2018). Additionally, increasing concern over the transparency of algorithm services, which requires firms be transparent and open concerning the strategy, structure, and underlying procedures of algorithms used to search for, process, and provide information, has been observed (Diakopoulos & Koliska, 2016; Kemper & Kolkman, *in-press*). Transparency and

fairness can significantly challenge algorithm-based services by generating a series of undesired and even critical problems in artificial intelligence (AI) systems (Burrell, 2016).

Procedural Quality vs. Performance Quality

In general, there are two distinct types of evaluating qualities: procedural aspects and performance perspectives (Shin & Park, 2019). This frame is nicely applied to AJ because they involve two steps of production: Algorithms involve systematic procedures of input and output.

The output of the AJ algorithm affects the inputs to that same algorithm. There processes are for collecting, processing, and analyzing data. Additionally, there is the outcome and results of certain services based on such process. An evaluation of algorithms should examine procedural aspects (whether accurate and appropriate data are collected legitimately) and performance perspectives (to what extent certain services are accurate, predictable, and individualized contents are provided).

Algorithms are becoming more sophisticated, convenient, and pervasive. With the fast advancement of amazing algorithms, AI has produced enormous opportunities as well as concerns among people, governments, and industry. In general, algorithms provide accuracy, usefulness, and convenience for users (Knijnenburg et al., 2012). AJ users find the services useful and convenient because the automated news services provide predictable and accurate content. These qualities are experienced by users as outcome performance when the services are rendered to users. Although these features of AJ increase the receptivity of media organizations to their audience, whether current deployments of AJ are achieving their objectives remains unclear. Users have little knowledge of which parts of their data are drawn and how such algorithmic filtering/curation occurs; additionally, they have no concrete means to influence these data-driven processes. The procedural aspects of AJ are as follows: whether the data collection process is transparent, whether recommended news articles are fair, and whether services are accountable and responsible. Notably, the impressive progress on the performance quality of algorithms, mounting expectations of fairness, accountability, and transparency is increasing. Improving outcome quality results in two controversial questions: first, how can fair algorithms be realized, and second, how can algorithms that are more accountable and transparent be developed (Diakopoulos, 2016; Rader, 2017)?

In much of the current discussions on AJ, performance quality and procedural quality have been equally highlighted. As algorithms develop and advance, there have been increasing expectations that the journalism industry should be able to prepare for the questions regarding FAT since obscure and discriminatory algorithms may produce unexpected risks, which lend urgency to a debate on how to develop AJ that is transparent, accurate, and accountable (Lee, 2018). In this study, performance quality and procedural quality are addressed regarding their different effects on users' cognitive processes and adoption.

Fairness in AJ contexts refers to that automated decisions should not produce unjust consequences or discriminatory results (Diakopoulos, 2016). A fairness question begins with doubt that algorithms always behave fairly (Beer, 2017). For instance, algorithms can embody gender biases, such as relating the word secretary more closely with the word she than with the word he. The fairness in algorithms stems from accuracy and unbiased processes. Algorithms have raised a concern that they may discriminate against certain groups. Serious concerns have been increased concerning the unfair practices of algorithmic filtering and curating processes.

The transparency in AJ contexts refers to the following: The decisions made by an algorithmic process should be visible, or transparent, to the viewers/users (Ananny & Crawford, 2018). AJ transparency may relate to the data, goals, outcomes, compliance, influence, and/or use of automated news-making systems (Shin & Park, 2019). Due to black-box nature of algorithms, their inner operations are unknown, that is, the information is proprietary and highly complex to not be understood by the general public (Courtois & Timmermans, 2018). Thus, the concepts of explainability and understandability become concerns (Meijer, 20114). When people easily figure out how an AJ works, they are more likely to use the content properly and trust the AJ and the news (Shin & Park, 2019).

Accountability of AJ is about the question, who is accountable when algorithm news get it wrong such as misinformation or fake news? Governments and news companies are deploying AI systems, but the public lacks the tools to hold these systems accountable when they fail. Accountable algorithms have it that the companies using algorithms are accountable for the results or impacts an algorithmic technology has on people and the surroundings (Lee & Boynton, 2017). Journalism industries and AI industries overall should be able to answer questions about FAT because biased and opaque algorithms can become serious risks. The risks lend pressure to a discussion on how to make algorithms fair, accountable, and transparent and, therefore, trustworthy and widely accepted.

User Heuristics of The Expectation Confirmation Process

As algorithm-based news content provides various innovative features, it is critical to recognize what users' expectations are and how they are formed and how users' recognized confirmation affects satisfaction. Expectation confirmation theory (ECT) can be a good frame for this task as the theory posits that both pre-behaviors and post-behaviors influence confirmation, which in turn influence satisfaction and continuance intention (Bhattacherjee, 2001; Shin & Biocca, 2018). Per ECT, higher perceived performance leads to positive confirmation and the level of confirmation then provides the basis for following actions. Users feel satisfied or unsatisfied based on their confirmation levels. While satisfied users form an intention to reuse the product in the future, dissatisfied customers discontinue the subsequent behavior.

ECT is used in this study as a lens to examine the UX of algorithm news content. ECT is right for this analysis since it is structured to describe user behaviors as a function of expectations, performance, and confirmation of beliefs based on cognitive processes. As algorithms and recommendation systems afford users unique experiences, ECT can be extended by incorporating algorithm-specific factors (such as transparency and accuracy) as antecedents of confirmation and trust and utility/convenience as a performance value.

USER MODELING OF AJ

With the aforementioned in mind, we formulate a series of hypotheses and a model. The AJ user model includes cognate constructs that influence satisfaction, which is influenced by performance value. FAT are conceptualized as normative expectations of users and are considered antecedents of confirmation of AJ procedural quality, and the model includes the additional key factor of trust.

Normative Expectations: Transparency, Fairness, and Accountability

FAT are emerging concepts accompanying the increase in the use of automated algorithms (Ananny & Crawford, 2018). These concepts are types of normative expectations, that is, perceptions regarding what algorithms should do in the process of offering algorithm services (Shin & Park, 2019). There are increasing concerns about the use of data, which may be shared illegally or abused. Regarding the algorithms that underpin the journalism environment, users' comfort level with sharing their personal information may heavily depend on why and how their data are being utilized. Automated data decisions may be incorrect, unfair, nontransparent, or unaccountable (Crane, 2016). AJ news entails such FAT issues in greater detail. FAT brings up key considerations in the design and development of AJ (Diakopoulos & Koliska, 2016). AJ is essentially developed to provide precise recommendation systems (Shin & Park, 2019). Whether such recommended results actually reflect individual needs/ preferences, how the processes are performed, and whether the results are reasonably accountable remain open questions (Kitchin, 2017). With a transparent process, users can revise their input in order to improve recommendations. Algorithm users are able to figure out the logic and process of AJ. The providers of AJ are encouraged to ensure that the results are accurate and legitimate to increase user trust. Transparency, fairness, and accountability play significant roles in AJ by improving user trust in algorithms (Diakopoulos & Koliska, 2016). When transparent, fair, and accurate services

are ensured, people are more likely to consider the news to be more credible. Highly transparent AJ can grant users a sense of personalization, and concomitantly, responsible and fair news affords users a sense of trust that fosters a sense of satisfaction and continued use (Shin & Park, 2019). The user awareness and understanding of how and why a particular recommendation is produced was found to be significant. Great visibility and clear transparency regarding relevant feedback increase search performance and satisfaction with the system (Sloan & Warner, 2017). Hence, the following relationships are hypothesized:

- H1: Users' perception of transparency positively affects user confirmation of AJ.
- H2: Users' perception of fairness positively affects user confirmation of AJ.
- H3: Users' perception of accountability positively affects user confirmation of AJ.

Perceived Performance

Ease of use and usefulness have been widely employed as the basis for analyzing user acceptance of technology (Shin, 2017). There has been an intense focus on these perspectives in research of user acceptance and the adoption of recommendation systems (Jung et al., 2017; Knijnenburg et al., 2012; Zheng et al., 2014). In perceived usefulness, this study considers the aspect "capable of being used advantageously" compared with other services. This study attempts to conceptualize usefulness in relation to relative advantage and how consumers perceive AJ as useful and convenient compared with other news services. Convenience has been drawn from perceived ease of use: the degree to which a person believes that using a certain system will be effortless (Shin, 2010). Users may consider AJ acceptance in terms of how useful and convenient they are to use. Related to usefulness and convenience, accuracy is a critical quality determinant in AJ. The accuracy of prediction algorithms has been a key quality criterion for AJ. Perceived accuracy is regarding how well the news recommendations fit an individual's preferences (Knijnenburg et al., 2012). Thus, we propose the following hypotheses:

- H4: Confirmation has a positive effect on the perceived usefulness of AJ.
- H5: Confirmation has a positive effect on the perceived convenience of AJ.
- H6: Confirmation has a positive effect on the perceived accuracy of AJ.

When users confirm usefulness, they tend to be satisfied. In the same manner, when users understand the convenience of AJ, their satisfaction levels increase. These relations have been widely confirmed in various services (Shin & Biocca, 2018 for virtual reality; Shin, 2010, for SNS; Kim et al., 2015, for smartwatch). The most notable example is Zheng et al. (2014), who argue that transparency and accuracy are the determinants of satisfaction.

- H7: Perceived usefulness positively influences satisfaction with AJ.
- H8: Perceived accuracy positively influences satisfaction with AJ.
- H9: Perceived convenience positively influence satisfaction with AJ.

Trust

With the rise of algorithmic news, questions of increasing urgency are how to trust algorithmic systems, how to believe the algorithmic process, and how to trust the results of algorithmic services (Alexander et al., 2018). Particularly notable are concerns about the credibility and trustworthiness of automated news (Montal & Reich, 2017; Wolker & Powell, *in-press*). Trust in algorithmic media is especially relevant and timely when autogenerated propaganda threatens the sustainability of algorithm-enabled news. News through AJ has a low value for users if they do not trust the system.



Figure 1. Algorithm news experience model

Trust can be built by using a recommender system and describing how it generates recommendations and why it recommends an item.

Shin (2011) argued that trust plays a key role in technology adoption, particularly in complicated systems. Numerous studies have consistently shown the key role played by trust in the process of acceptance, continuance intention, and diffusion (Zhang et al., 2014). Whether users' trust certain systems or services obviously affects the users' assessment and such assurance influences the users' willingness to provide more data to the systems and services (Bedi & Vashisth, 2014). In the context of AJ, trust is defined as the reliability to believe in the accuracy of the news articles and using the recommender system's capabilities (Shin & Park, 2019). Thus, trust signifies how reliable and credible the system is. Many trust factors affect the decision to use a technology, but few studies have focused on algorithm services, particularly those used in AJ.

H10: Trust positively influences the satisfaction of AJ.

STUDY DESIGN

The study was based on surveys conducted with samples from the U.S. and Korea. From January to December of 2018, a pool of respondents was collected who had prior experience with AJ or similar algorithm services. Because the survey's main goal was to examine AJ consumption, users who claimed to have not consumed any algorithm-related news were excluded. With the initially collected data, a data reduction was performed in terms of the consistency of the responses, valid responses, and reliability of the answers.

Questionnaire Design

The initial version of the measurments was based on scales developed and validated in previous studies, as indicated: Normative expectations (Shin & Park, 2019; Shin, 2019), perceived performance (Jung et al., 2017; Knijnenburg et al., 2012; Zheng et al., 2014), and trust (based on Bedi & Vashisth, 2014; Shin, 2011). As the scales were developed for use in other contexts, the first stage of the research focused on evaluating their application in different nations. To check this, Korean and American users of algorithm services were interviewed in-depth, in order to capture possible relevant factors, as well as to fit the original indicators to both culture and languages. Four respondents were interviewed in Korea and five in the U.S. Respondents were asked to highlight service attributes related to the

constructs of interest that they considered to be relevant. The interviews lasted on average two hour. The items were then adapted so a higher level of equivalence could be obtained. A marketing professor, a native speaker and proficient in Korean, translated the resulting questionnaire to English. The questionnaire was back translated to Korean by a Korean scholar, proficient in English, to ensure that the translated version had the identical meaning in both languages. Several modifications were necessary to maintain the equivalence in both languages, since certain words and phrases had no exact equivalent in Korean. The instrument was refined with the conduction of pre-tests on different small samples in both countries, totaling 102 participants. The pre-tests were conducted both on the web and in person (three pre-tests for each data collection method), resulting in the elimination of some items and re-wording others, in order to obtain the final form of the questionnaire. The first part of the questionnaire contained questions with transactional variables, intended to identify usage profile, and filter questions to separate the sample with respect to a user's service plan and carrier. The second part presented questions to capture the perception of respondents about the constructs of interest, measured on five-point Likert scales ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree with the neither agree nor disagree as the central point. The third part involved demographic questions.

Sample Selection

Considering the nature of comparative studies, efforts were made to collect equivalent data. A total of 280 questionnaires were acquired in Korea, 260 of which were valid (92.8%). Due to restrictions related to cost and time, convenience sampling was employed. After discarding unreliable responses, 203 valid questionnaires remained. In the U.S., 271 questionnaires were finalized, of which 262 (96.6%) were complete. After discarding questionnaires involving insincere or inconsistent responses, 260 questionnaires were considered for further analysis. Structural equation modeling, independent *t*-tests, and multigroup analysis were used to confirm the proposed model and test the hypotheses.

Procedures For Data Collection

Data collection occurred during the months of February and July 2019, on a temporary website created to host the research instrument. A link to the website was sent via e-mail to undergraduate

	Korea (260)			The U.S. (262)		
A	ge	Number	Α	ge	Number	
Less than 20 years		90	Less than	69		
21-30 years		111	21-30 years	131		
31-40 years	urs 49 31–40 years				30	
Over 40 years		10	Over 40 years	32		
Prior ex	perience	Number	Prior ex	Number		
1–5 months		120	1–5 m	onths	90	
6–12 months		82	6–12 r	nonths	110	
More 1 year		33	More	1 year	20	
More than 2 year		25	More that	an 2 year	32	
Gender	Nur	nber	Gender	Nur	nber	
Female	11	22	Female	32		
Male No response	Iale133Io response5			120 10		

Table 1. Demographics of survey respondents

Table 2. Descriptive statistics

	South Korea	United States
Age (Mean/Standard Deviation)	39.12/14.24	40.11/16.23
Gender (female rate)	52.30	51.11
College educated	42.11	41.34
Algorithm service experience	2.3 years	2.1 years

and graduate student discussion groups in Korea and the U.S. To increase response rate and quality of data, a small gift coupon was provided for selected respondents. Marketing and research firms branched each site handled the data collection. For collecting both samples, ethical clearances were approved by corresponding intuitional review boards.

Data Measurements

All of the measures in this study were based on measures validated in the literature and considered reliable. The measured items were tested with Cronbach's alpha, which the score varied between 0.68 and 0.90, suggesting acceptable internal consistency and, thus, acceptable reliability (Table 1). The convergent validity for the proposed constructs is suitable, as evidenced by the average variance extracted (AVE). Discriminant validity is tested by comparing the square of the correlation between two constructs and the average variance extracted (AVE) of each construct. Discriminant validity can be satisfied if its independent variance is higher than shared value with other constructs (Fornell & Laker, 1981). Since all square roots of the AVEs are higher compared to all inter-construct correlations, thus discriminant validity is confirmed (Hair et al., 2010). The descriptive statistics for each of the measurement items are detailed in Table 2. This finding indicated overall positive responses to the constructs measured in this study. The standard deviations for all variables were desirable, indicating that the item scores were around the average scores.

		South Kor	rea	United Sta	tes
	Factor	Cronbach's alpha	AVE	Cronbach's alpha	AVE
	Transparency	0.717	0.671	0.783	0.665
Procedural	Fairness	0.788	0.626	0.783	0.558
	Accountability	0.795	0.7613	0.859	0.823
	Usefulness	0.758	0.7170	0.775	0.577
Performance	Accuracy	0.866	0.8380	0.757	0.632
	Convenience	0.851	0.8106	0.776	0.746
	Trust	0.888	0.8520	0.880	0.665
Attitude	Confirmation	0.908	0.8636	0.908	0.867
	Satisfaction	0.889	0.8196	0.889	0.812

Table 3. Reliability and validity

Table 4. Factor loadings (Rotated Component Matrix: Korea: the U.S.)

	Component											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7					
Transparency	0.722:0.781 0.711:0.729 0.701:0.724											
Fairness		0.791:0.849 0.722:0.811 0.721:0.801										
Accountability			0.743:0.769 0.711:0.766 0.699:0.719									
Usefulness				0.720:0.782 0.699:0.711 0.622:0.694								
Accuracy					0.788:0.853 0.699:0.783 0.648:0.784	3						
Convenience				0.726: 0.800 0.700:0.789 0.699:0.722								
Trust			0.783:0.800 0.727:0.743 0.688:0.722									
Confirmation						0.772:0.888 0.711:0.873 0.698:0.706						
Satisfaction							0.687:0.656 0.672:0.623 0.644:0.611					

*Extraction method: Principal Component Analysis; Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

CORRELATION

Measurement Equivalence

Multiple-group equivalence test was used to analyze the cross-national invariance and the hypotheses concerning the differences in attitudes between the U.S. and Korea. First, multiple single group models with the same item-factor structure were tested to see if the same model form held across groups. The second stage is to compare the unconstrained model with a constrained one, in which equality constraints were imposed across the two samples (Jensen & Wagner, 2019). The factor structure was similar across nations, if the fit of the unconstrained model did not differ significantly from the fit of the constrained one. The results indicate similarity in the fit of the unconstrained and constrained models, implying invariant factor structures across the two countries.

Common Method Bias

Since our data were collected from a single source, common method bias test should be examined to see if the majority of the variance could be accounted for by one general factor. We used Harman's one-factor test (Podsakoff et al., 2012), the most commonly used technique for addressing common method variance to rule out the influence of common method bias. We compared the one-factor

Figure 2. Correlation matrix of the Korean sample

		144	1282	100	1.21	(0)	101	147	192	PAT	1961	942	193	401		ACT	121	12	10.1		10	10.1	Are .	840	440	9.24	f133	1.11
1,000	Permit Considers		450"	416	361	828	628	113	115	101	345	211	375	416	425	393	915	411	474	7.86	109	126	465"	493	861	406	211	347
	The Cristed		.88	8.00	.300	000	.015	0.11	.103	.0.04	300	585	.965	205	101	2.00	200	416	000		345	234	.000		.000	.800	.201	308
		248	210	298	283	298	248	298	288	291	268	248	259	200	288	298	250	148	299	248	258	291	1910	288	. 299	296	288	298
1012	Passacé Donnéatou	485		447	20	245	165	101	105	.191	0.1	136		294	298	.812	305	310	425	378	. 811	407	394		416	10	244	347
	Big (Disale)	- 004		896		666	384	104		884	304	609		- 204	369		860	110	000	4000	845	- 494	100		.869	100		
-		241	- 28	244	200	280	201	200	242	288	200	292	258	200	268	248	260	198	203	748	282	- 28	288	288	288	298	783	- 288
244	Parameter Consumption	198				800		0.01	245	-375	.215	-219	-317	3.96	-212	.872	- 147	.276		4.85	847	441		875	4.74		180	- 200
	TR. CITATOR	2071		dead		100	100	2017	100	100	100	100		200	100	100		100	2007		-	144		144		100	242	
1000	Participation of the local division of the l	344	- 25	-			100	100	- 27	114	1417	110	114	248	100	100	417	100	Sec."	10	les"	100	and a	100	427	441		-
	The Literate in	104		100		400		101	248	12.00	1074	124	376	- 100		826	000	110	909	316	845	214	142		.049	100		-
		794	248	298	245	290	248	298	248	288	249	248	245	348	248	288	346	348	283	288	248	248	248	298	288	288	268	248
602	Prover Constance	.526	240	410	816		\$17"	det	313	394	.218	643	240	311	812	479	475	047	141	296	810	541	193"	114	547	426	247	310
	PA Drale #	-004	.812	896	305		.0081	188	.868	838	300	.136	203	300	388	316	500	816	000	100	.862	.036	300	898	1000	300	.908	008
	NI	298	268	248	280	240	268	261	268	240	268	280	263	288	268	248	265	248	269	248	248	218	200	240	269	268	289	298
003	Pagines Constation	429	.118"	.997	305	826	1	0.0	284	.295	239"	. 118	.03	29"	414	367	- 266	.417	.40	2.96	501	204	.494"	417"	482	ALC	- 244"	396
	19 CON-8	0.00	908	396	905	198		179	148	124	3820	578		-208	150	074	160	111	909	- 608	111	- 791			3872	100		178
-	No.	298		200	200	200		288	240	- 28	3	280	288	200	200	248	200	240	280		280		200	- 200		- 200	288	
1000	The October		144	412					100	443	100	- 11	1000		144	110	474	100	1714	170	144	471	100	200				10.00
	in several	264	245	268	200	280	268	248	240	248	269	280	264	284	242	248	268	- 188	265	200	262	201	268	248	265	248	202	288
11/2	Province Coordinate	379	.105	345	.811	310*	.264	340"	1	210	316	256	.Hf*	304	308	244	307"	405	.303	215	Mr	305	314	415	-301	315	.146	211
	The Chatest	0.00	212	120	300	.010	1022			222	902	179	827	018	342	0.00	000	820	3903	000	363	075	200	826	3872	101	217	100
	N.	284	288	286	282	180	289	200	248	388	380	280	288	288	288	246	260	246	280	286	295	282	269	286	- 289	286	283	288
141	Passars Considers	111	101	341	305	104	.248	116	299			647	116	147	218	314	107	116	435	101	307	101	386	314	10	141	817	142
	He Oneire	- 694	803	201	.000	000	313	813	100		Det	647	.829	. 047	.101	838	501	410	000	800	818	101	800	8.04	000	100	218	1622
	M	- 24	248	281	20	240	211	290	248	248	200	288	201	200	240	248	366	248	282	248	268	244	262	288	269	260	201	258
- 100	Population Constraints	M	313	114	291	299	212	286	316	. 427	4.	.198	434	405	316	291	297	314	30	378	354	325	363	300	104	29	228	
	TH DAMES			200	1011					547	-	100		- 204			100	100	200			- 10		-0-		- 100	303	
-	Factor Constant	- 10	- 27	214	112	200	114	100	- 100	141	2		225	- 27	100	144	-2-	110	- 10	215	100	214	2	110	149	146	710	
	Int Cash-R			414	014	126		100		447	1000		383	000	142	882	807	110	102.5	1014	415	100	100	428	11.0	818	343	
	in .	218	349	286	262	290	268	248	248	242	268	288	268	200	268	288	268	246	249	248	249	244	200	288	288	298	269	
90	Pagence Consistent	576	.268	39"	104	246	115	304	20*	126	434	215		395	20	245	365"	246**	10	387	285	3254	216	100	311	339	228	.218
	The Editoria	0.96	300	896	370	000	381	0.0	.968	629	.000	608		. 016	105	246	2005	.826	.969	000	910	896	915	416	.005	100	345	008
		298	268	294	258	240	211	290	268	288	292	288	201	298	288	- 215	268.7	210	299	298	268	28	289	298	282	298	283	298
.455	Painter Denstation	416	286	111	- 341	. 316	218	249	434	187			311	+	917	475	425	.875		499	:424	451	425	311	495	407	-341	- 290
	Tig Orate e	296	44.0	291	365	100	365	0.00	105	822	3630		361		161	818	160	100	383	808	860	101		416	(855	100	368	
1000	Terrore	244	- 28	241	260		- 268	200	268	288	200	280	263	208	218	381	- 20	246	249	248	268	208	200	246	200	200	201	- 200
~	Passer Languages	825	250	392	301	852	828	100	300	359	325	381	201	101			419	210	479	542	311	101	878	-	405	101	178	30
	and streams				. 100	144		740		144		146	144	140	140			194	1000		144	144			. 164	195	140	144
802	Pearson Constitutes	201	and a	377	385	426	365	000	244	364	207	100	243	275	112		821	114	104	10	411	410	416	107	825	-	311	377
	the Constant	100	10.0	884	808					1234	4874	482	202				10.0	4.00	2003	404		416	46.6	824	1828	418		-
	-	216	210	290	268	299	244	298	288	244	248	299	288	288	248	244	208	294	299	248	248	298	298	298	- 219	266	248	294
82	Fagners Considers	515	318	385"	813	475	505	.001	328	325	.247	142	361	428	418	823		798	325	016	160	111	982	741"	416	516	365	414
	Ris Change	006	340	396	300	000	.808	-874	.100	.076	300	497	.963	000	.900	0.06		618	999	100	3815	496	360	898	000	101	.912	0.00
	10	204	200	261	210	248	248	248	268	288	200	210	299	298	248	288	205	246	290	240	289	28	289	210	- 20	200	210	248
10	Pagest Consider	A91.	115	314.		MC	ART.	004	425	HC	315"	214	341	415	415	214	796		.185	198	.185	891	799	880"	AS1	MC	nr.	492
	INE CHANNE	1008	10.0		902	666		301		100	300	696		- 008	111	- 10	309		000		915	- 18	100		.000	108		
-	Taxante Company		- 10	100			-22		- 27	416			100	- 27	415	- 101	100	141		-2-	100	100	100			100	110	-27
12	the Charlest		800	894		100		via	140	100	100	494	305	104	244	-	000	414		- 2004	100	-	160	454	.000	100	30.0	- 100
		248	248	248	260	240	248	240	248	248	260	245	-262	268	248	248	240	210	282	248	268	248	240	245	242	201	261	242
81	Pagencia Constitutor	316"	111"	436	527*	.100	128"	011	215	345	219	211	301	.405	142"	407	111	(H [*]	.101		101	710"	1995		/91	001	115	
	the chaines	-291		330	1411	000		1.93	312	111	.000	894	363	006	111	215	300	416	000		810	898	002	818	909	101	.968	.000
	W	216	248	298			288	298	218	. 292	200	280	- 243	201	288	218	298		282	288	240	291	210	248		268	288	298
42	Paarlos Constators	326	\$12	.847	504	526	781	(278	385	.783	374	248	28.9	426	815	435	345	286	367	801		18	794"	673	215	625	. 418	316
	fig 27480-10	.894	363	816	- 305	101	- 313	212		334	308	488	303	-388	165		818	110	205	686		- 204	362	316	010	108	315	
-	Resident Residents	200	200	100	- 200	200	- 20	299	- 20	100	- 20		203	200	255	298	200	- 200	200	26	200	- 14	100	100	- 20	200	200	- 20
100	Prover Landaue						144	041		457		479					-						- 14					
	No. of Concession, No.	185	20	288	385	285	388	200	211	288	200	286	263	258	168	288	200	194	280	288	265	248	188	246	200	198	202	
461	Pages Company	314	394	487	541	812	818	2864	384	284	175	.728	.194	#12	478	415	865	105	961	899	794	825		587"	850	882	#75	882
	the Classe	100		216	301	100	.008	314	102	438	1010	618	100.0	- 210	.000	104	1010	616	000	448	859				.000	100	343	208
	-	268	248	298	216	2#8	289	281	248	292	268	240	269	298	268	298	268	296	289	248	269	288	268	288	20	268	263	246
(40)	Parents Constants	#K]"	387	471	.327	116	417		425	314	301	145	311	38	241			10	. 566	485	873"	245	187	÷	814	-01	314	.525
	the Challent	010	100	1010	.000	000		. 977	.111	998	300	828	.803	201	110		200	110	000	800	315	128	300		80	100	365	- 308
		298	20	291	280	240	289	298	248	264	200	298	293	268	211	294	262	245	289	246	289	284	260	288	289	280	288	298
100	Provide Constants	-		424	827	245	882	0.00	200	378	308	145	311	-	836	328	128	101	991	100	145	215	80.0	814		196	875	411
	ing Crasse			100	- 100	100	144	-	142	144		100			100	144	200	100	000		100	- 100	140	100	100	100	100	
	Farmer Linespier	416	236	216	445	100	112	-010	315	345	210	146	216	41	415	411	-	116	105	644	424	-	101	100	100		115	- 115
	the Cristed	-		100		105		407	14P	100	100	879	100		102	100	100		202	100	101		100		1002		542	100
		294	288	298	280	246	203	200	280	292	260	246	297	249	268	288	290	290	285	288	282	298	248	286	289	288	289	298
910	Premis Considers	211	344	190	285	282	246	-434	145	877	228	276	228		276	.50**	.365	416	421	495	474	347	875	.294	875	415"	. 8	614
	No. Literatures	-0.90		207	305	.000		241	347		300	696	1010		.000	838	.000	111	000		.010	000	868	.000	.000	856		108
		294	348	396	268	240	299	290	248	244	248	- 286	298	200	248	244	218	296	249	288	288	298	292	286	268	288	288	291
9.12	Patrace Scientifics	HT	347	281	A06	.148	389	-143	216	140'	.234	179	215	316	345	MC	404	442	475	543	.816	672	M2"	103	116	040	101	. t
	Dis Orable	016		090	303	000		433	310	811	900	894		016	348	100	000	500	000	606	315	0.01	368		.000	806	975	-
-	The second second second	288	258		258	240	. 211	298	20	784	258	- 296	791	288	248	248	786	258	249	288	588	298	39	286	251	296	293	- 24

Constation is spectrum at the 0.21 level (2-table)
 Constation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-table)

Harman's confirmatory factor analysis solution to a five-factor solution. The results showed that the first factor accounted for only 22.38% of the variance, less than 50%, and this finding could be accepted. Also, common method variance was tested by using the marker technique (Podsakoff et al., 2012). The results indicated the inclusion of the common method variance in 5-factor model did not improve the overall model fit of 4-factor model significantly. It was found that the single-factor solution did not fit the data well, *Chi-Square* (147)=3,651, p < .01; comparative fit index = .41; Tucker–Lewis index = .31; root-mean-square error of approximation= .19, and was indeed significantly worse, *Chi-Square* (10)=3,118.24, p < .01, than the five-factor solution. Thus, it was determined that the common method bias was not a problem in this study.

Volume 29 • Issue 2 • Bi-Monthly 2021

Figure 3. Correlation matrix of the U.S. sample

Image Control Image Control Image Control Image Control <t< th=""><th>Considers the E Considers ford Considers ford Constation ford Constation ford Constation ford Constation ford Constation</th><th>2 ¹⁶.2 2 ¹⁶.2 2,2 -</th><th>12 10 10 1 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1</th><th>416" 555 271 447" 201 202 4</th><th>303⁴⁴ 303 233⁴⁴ 393 233⁴⁴</th><th>525⁴ 000 270 245⁴ 000 280</th><th>426[°] 303 201 005[°] 309</th><th>643 879 798 739 739 739</th><th>315⁴ 011 200 110 110</th><th>308" 000 299 184"</th><th>344⁴⁴ .803 .201 .171⁴⁴</th><th>298¹⁰ 298 238¹⁰</th><th>379" 300 200 200</th><th>416" 100 295 294"</th><th>425° 383 269 299°</th><th>31 58 28</th><th>543^{°°} 300 240 308^{°°}</th><th>49" 311 311</th><th>424" 300 200 425"</th><th>18[°] 18 18</th><th>529" 303 292 411"</th><th>13⁴ 28 28</th><th>543⁴⁴ 383 384⁴</th><th>452" 1011 2011 341"</th><th>441° 000 210 419°</th><th>408⁴⁴ 000 290 239⁴⁴</th><th>318[°] 343 348[°]</th><th>347" 305 396</th></t<>	Considers the E Considers ford Considers ford Constation ford Constation ford Constation ford Constation ford Constation	2 ¹⁶ .2 2 ¹⁶ .2 2,2 -	12 10 10 1 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	416" 555 271 447" 201 202 4	303 ⁴⁴ 303 233 ⁴⁴ 393 233 ⁴⁴	525 ⁴ 000 270 245 ⁴ 000 280	426 [°] 303 201 005 [°] 309	643 879 798 739 739 739	315 ⁴ 011 200 110 110	308" 000 299 184"	344 ⁴⁴ .803 .201 .171 ⁴⁴	298 ¹⁰ 298 238 ¹⁰	379" 300 200 200	416" 100 295 294"	425° 383 269 299°	31 58 28	543 ^{°°} 300 240 308 ^{°°}	49" 311 311	424" 300 200 425"	18 [°] 18 18	529" 303 292 411"	13 ⁴ 28 28	543 ⁴⁴ 383 384 ⁴	452" 1011 2011 341"	441° 000 210 419°	408 ⁴⁴ 000 290 239 ⁴⁴	318 [°] 343 348 [°]	347" 305 396
Result Result 00 Second Seco	de E Disertation de g Disertation de g Constation de g Constation de g Constation	2 ¹ 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 2	8 2 ° 8 2 8 1	an a	300 200 201 ²⁴ 300 203	000 200 244 ⁴ 000 200	303 210 005 ⁴ 309	875 298 737 534	010 250 602 ⁴	000 298 101 ¹⁰	383 281 175 ⁴	805 299 239 ⁷⁷	100 200 204	848 795 284	.000 209 299	200	388 268 365	310 291 251	300 300 401	400 200 309	202 202 411 ¹⁰	211 211	383 285 384	200 200 347	200 200 419	200 240 236	943 247 344 [°]	305 395
II Parase Lore S Parase Lore S S S	Linesianus Ing Consident Sed Linesianus Ing Constation Ing Linesianus	2 ² ,2 2 ² ,2 2 ³ ,2	1 1 N 1 1	201 447 2010 10 10	200 201 ⁴ 200 200	288 245 ⁴⁴ 000 280	218 105 ⁴ 109	298 737 534	200	298 181 ⁴	283 175 ⁴	248 228 ⁷⁷	218	295 294	201	28	212	200	218 425 ^{°°}	315	282	211	200	201	210	200	262	298
IDE Productions in products in product	Constant Ing Const	2 2,7 2 2,7 2 2 2 3	1 8 4 R 1	447" 200 200	231 999 243	245° 000 200	105	131	102	161	175	226	24	284	259	100	.305	333	405	3.9	411	- 10	394	347	419	226	244	247
Home of the second se	Constation And Constation And Constation And Constation Constation	2 N'S 2 N'S 2	20 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	298 298 4	999 263	280	1010	5.04	04.0																			
B Control Participation Participation Partipation	Constant In S Constant Constant Constant Constant Constant Constant	N.N. N.N. N.	200 44*** 300	200	268	280						1998	009	895	.009	444		- 1994	10.6	. 414	993	- 199	968		010	010	000	104
 March Low Sectors Sectors	Constation and Constation ded Constation ded Constation ter S	896" 354 369" 369"	.441"				248	288	269	290	268	288	262	288	293	288	268	. 248	200	248	249	288	249	746	289	282	243	268
Regime Regime 8 8 9 7 9 <td< td=""><td>ned Constance ded Constance ded Constance ted</td><td>314 214 319¹⁶ 319</td><td>300</td><td></td><td>.318</td><td>400</td><td>347</td><td>628</td><td>345</td><td>2/1</td><td>265</td><td>211</td><td>287</td><td>396</td><td>341.</td><td>322</td><td>365</td><td>374</td><td>366</td><td>-400</td><td>841</td><td>.847</td><td>#17</td><td>.872</td><td>434</td><td>316</td><td>190</td><td>261</td></td<>	ned Constance ded Constance ded Constance ted	314 214 319 ¹⁶ 319	300		.318	400	347	628	345	2/1	265	211	287	396	341.	322	365	374	366	-400	841	.847	#17	.872	434	316	190	261
International system Part State Part State Part State	Constance de S Constance de B Constance de D	200 349 ¹⁶ 090			303	000	308	877	100	000	308	014	000	814	003	300	382	.216	ME	836	089	- 000	365	824	000	888	.042	100
Image Control Marce Control Marce Control Marce Control <t< td=""><td>Constance Constance Mail Constance Constance Constance</td><td>30</td><td></td><td>201</td><td>289</td><td>260</td><td>218</td><td>291</td><td>211</td><td>240</td><td></td><td>202</td><td>240</td><td>241</td><td>28</td><td>200</td><td>268</td><td></td><td>260</td><td>285</td><td>201</td><td>- 201</td><td>310</td><td>28</td><td>242</td><td>240</td><td>243</td><td>291</td></t<>	Constance Constance Mail Constance Constance Constance	30		201	289	260	218	291	211	240		202	240	241	28	200	268		260	285	201	- 201	310	28	242	240	243	291
Bit Classifier 8 2 8 2 9 2 9 2 10 2 10 2 10 2 10 2 10 2 11 2 12 2 13 2 14 2 15 2 16 2 17 2 18 2 19 2 10 2 10 2 10 2 11 2 12 2 13 2 14 2 15 2 16 2 17 2 18 2 19 2 10 2 11 2 12 2 13 2 14 </td <td>des Constation de 2 Constation De 2 Constation</td> <td></td> <td>110</td> <td>314</td> <td>. 4.</td> <td></td> <td>101</td> <td>-982</td> <td>312</td> <td>314</td> <td>215</td> <td>. 115</td> <td>194</td> <td>,741</td> <td>.995</td> <td>74</td> <td>492</td> <td>.854</td> <td>901</td> <td>327</td> <td>304</td> <td>828</td> <td>.142</td> <td>Thi.</td> <td>A27:-</td> <td>443</td> <td>287</td> <td>404</td>	des Constation de 2 Constation De 2 Constation		110	314	. 4.		101	-982	312	314	215	. 115	194	,741	.995	74	492	.854	901	327	304	828	.142	Thi.	A27:-	443	287	404
Image: constraint of the second sec	Constitution (constitution (constitution) (constitution)	1000		100	-	000		804	000			014	100	111			210	391	200	- 11-	009		301	128	000			
Image: second	Constance Constance	- 2	-5								-3-		-3-	- 2-	- 52	- 2-	- 2-		- 2-					-3-	- 5-	100	100	- 22
No No 2 Second Gam 3 Second Gam 4 Second Gam 5 Second Gam 6 Second Gam 8 Second Gam 8 Second Gam 8 Second Gam 9 Second Gam <	Constitutes (n=0	101	100		100		107	100	200			100			44.2	100	815		100	100	200		111	114			191	
000 Ferrers Care 101 Ferrers Care 102 Parales Care 103 Parales Care 104 Parales Care 105 Parales Care 104 Parales Care 105 Parales Care 106 Parales Care 107 Parales Care 108 Parales Care 109 Parales Care 101 Parales Care 102 Parales Care 103 Parales Care 104 Parales Care 105 Parales Care 106 Parales Care 107 Parales Care 108 Parales Care 109 Parales Care 101 Parales Care 102 Parales Care 103 Parales Care 104 Parales Care 105 Parales Care 106 Parales Care 107 Parales Care 108 Parales Care	Constatute In-D	144		100		240	200	144	- 200	144		100		144		100		141		144	242	244	244	- 00-		100	242	
Register Register 16 Register Register 17 Register Register 18 Register Register 18 Register Register 18 Register Register 18 Register Register 19 Register Register 10 Register Register 10 Register Register 11 Register Register 12 Register Register 13 Register Register 14 Register Register 15 Register Register 16 Register Register 17 Register Register 18 Register Register 19 Register Register 10 Register Register 11 Register Register 12 Register Register 13 Register	Longene	10	100	810	100	810		111	26	100	115	110	100	110	-06	100	100	10	445	110	841	-	-	100	40	100	140	100
n n 10 Autora Lines Signal S	Lonwaren	294	20.0	100	9474	0.00		111	1000		100		1000				241		1410			-			.000	120		204
Inference Inference	Longian	288	288	286	285	200	.268	285	295	286		248	388	298	288	240	288	298	368	288	263	288	285	248	260	288	283	259
Application Construction 1/2 Second loss application Second loss application		111	107	828	-912	100	218		340	116	311	171	107	.788	100	040	313	.054	174	243	876	Dat.	- 361	1.00	8772	- 612	-114	-142
I Second Se	le g.	678	.104	477	.418	145	.775		.001	0.0	.008	1014	008	110	327	208	.918	303	214	433	222	477	324	837	542	897	885	/822
Inc. Security of the s		298	285	298	243	248	268	290	288	268	268	248	268	282	288	280	248	248	298	246	265	288	280	248	240	288	265	298
Big Calebit N Calebit N 101 Reset Care Normality Sector Care Normality 101 Sector Care Normality N 101 Reset Care Normality N 101 Reset Care Normality N 102 Reset Care Normality N 101 Reset Care Normality N 102 Reset Care Normality N 103 Reset Care No Car	Consideration		.110	345"	307	310"	204	346		200	216	208	317	454	201	344	108	.429	300	311	367	245	304	A21 ¹⁰	305	310	.146	291
N Non- transmission 30 Second Secon	in the second second	1796	212	876	303	939	308	221		199	811	0.08	3570	898	3812	200	952	370	380	524	3453	306	261	279	.000	171	.817	876
Image Status Read Status 30 Read Status 31 Reade Status 32 Reade Status 33 Reade Status 34 Reade Status 35 Reade Status 36 Reade Status 37 Reade Status 38 Reade Status 39 Reade Status 30 Reade Status 31 Reade Status 32 Reade Status 33 Reade Status 34 Reade Status 35 Reade Status 36 Reade Status 37 Reade Status 38 Reade Status 39 Reade Status 30 Reade Status 31 Reade Status 32 Reade Status 33 Reade Status 34 Reade Status 35 Reade Status 36 Reade Status 36 Reade Status 36		288	385	246	289	299	291	288	280	288	.288	290	209	248	389	280	248	296	290	346	282	298	288	248	380	280	283	299
Hold Control N No Section No	Constance	311	781	317	305	394	200	196	294		AD.	647	110	187	394	344	125	10	425	343	20	100	264	114	176	347		143
N N Resci Central Section 2014 N N Resci Central Section 2014 N Resci Central Section 2014 <t< td=""><td>ive.</td><td>.01</td><td>807</td><td>898</td><td>903</td><td>000</td><td>.163</td><td>813</td><td>810</td><td></td><td>347</td><td>447</td><td>124</td><td>882</td><td>.912</td><td>000</td><td>383</td><td>838</td><td>508</td><td>100</td><td>186.9</td><td>100</td><td>260</td><td>0.94</td><td>000</td><td>110</td><td>25.8</td><td>822</td></t<>	ive.	.01	807	898	903	000	.163	813	810		347	447	124	882	.912	000	383	838	508	100	186.9	100	260	0.94	000	110	25.8	822
Percent parts No. No. No.		294	209	298	263	260	218	240	268	260	268	248	268	214	211	240	268	241	260	746	268		288	244	260	288	263	260
Route No Second S	Construction of the local division of the lo	316	.171	218	203	299	253	298	385	8.27	×.	200	834	425	119	205	267	375	303	.306	304	3.3	383	.100	328	219	128	224
9 Joseph Construction 10 Joseph Construction 11 Joseph Construction 12 Joseph Construction 13 Joseph Construction 14 Joseph Construction 15 Joseph Construction 16 Joseph Construction 17 Joseph Construction 18 Joseph Construction 19 Joseph Construction 10 Joseph Construction 11 Joseph Construction 12 Joseph Construction 13 Joseph Construction 14 Joseph Construction 15 Joseph Construction 16 Joseph Construction 17 Joseph Construction	-		- 22	100	305	000				041	-		100	111		100	345			100	100		202	100	100			
Image: second	Company of California (California (Califor	100	12		110	- 21		100	- 27	241			- 62 -	100	- 27	100	100	110		140	- 14	216		- 10	100	144		
Allower of the second sec	1111001110		1000			1.16			-	447			1410	100	-	697	847		601			-	86.0		24.6	214		1014
92 Asayo Line log Line 2 92 Say Check 2 9 Say Check 2 10 Say Check 2 11 Say Check 2 12 Parano Check 2 13 Say Check 2 14 Parano Check 2 15 Parano Check 2 16 No 17 Parano Check 2 18 Parano Check 2 19 Parano Check 2 10 No 11 Parano Check 2 12 Parano Check 2 13 Parano Check 2			248	216	269	296	208	248	.269	298	248	240	.268	- 246	268	246	268	284	268	288	289	294	289	248	280	210	349	264
Bit Classed N Provide Classes Not State Clas	Constant	316*	216	.10	- 114	245	188	310	317	1.16	424	215	1	288	.281	210	341	317	445	341		10	200	310	364	239	228	218
N N Non-1 Parallo Chene Ing Crawes Ing	ind.	378	805	899	839	000	301	.0.01	100	678	361	898		898	303	848	310	395	202	816	362	-006	801	118	.000	876	303	006
 Republic for the second second		- 294	218	240	258	200	218	288	268	286	282	288	269	210	289	299	288	291	259	246	289	298	269	298	280	389	263	298
B) Classe B) Cla	Dimension	414		196	345		218"	248	416		405	200	316		467*	329	428	:411		100	424	411	A12	386	400	407	.81	286
N N Segara Care Segara Care Segara Care N Segara Care N Feasys Care N Segara Care Segara Care Segara Care Segara Care Segara Care N Segara Care Segara Care Segara Car	1-E.	.239	808	898	818	008	365	.000	1011	487	.963	0.00	160		.008	100	308	938	.000	626	2009	318	355		000	496	.003	-206
 NC2 Please Lows Big Colong N N Source Core N Source Core Source Core N Source Core Source Core Source		288	- 20	200	243	288	20	241	- 268	200	268	200	268	244	268	248	298		298	246	289	288	249	248	280	246	201	264
B Comes N: N: N: Solars N: Parencient Parenciente Parenciente Parencient Parenc	Constants.	825	250	352	- 1961	852	414	104	345	258	219	-201	201	786		505	111	314	419	.042		41	478	382	105	108	- 274	20
NCI Parame Correl NU R () Galling NU Parame Correl NU Parame Correl NU NU SU Parame Correl NU NU SU Parame Correl NU		0.05	300	206		000	300	101		000	200	000	000	896	-	000	305	399	100	100	000	000	200		2000	620	200	-006
Rg (Colleg) G) Fegeta Cole Rg (Clend) Rg (Clend) Rg (Clend) G Cl. Power Cole Rg (Clend) Rg (Clend) Rg (Clend) Rg (Clend) Rg Rg (Clend) Rg Rg Rg Rg Rg Rg Rg Rg Rg Rg	Constatute	100	-27			100			246	141		100		476	- 100		- 22.0	414		100	415	444	416	444	100	-	-	111
17 Freeze Cone By Dumit, By Dum			-	444	101		400	100	1000		881		48.0		1418				10.0				844		-			
E1 Person Cont Big (Dumit) Big Dumit Cont Payson Cont Distance Cont Dist		241	20	210	288	248	218	248	248	298	268	214	248	216	249	248	248	- 244	248	244	299	- 246	249	248	240	240	249	206
Ing Drawel, No. 1990 (Drawel, No. 1990) (Drawel, Crawel, Crawel, No. 1990) (Drawel, Crawel, Cra	Curvement		319	392	#12 ^m	879	100	873	325	325	241"	102	367	425	419	812		145	125°	616	245	496	182	541"	6.25	10F	.917	40.5
N L1 President No. Colored N L3 President N D1 President N R1 President N R2 President R2 Presi	0.0	0.04	300	896	. 999	000	300	976	000	010	307	002	2000	816	.009	000		000	200	806	003	-008	364	014	000	000	009	000
 Protect Core In C		248		366	263	289	315	210	290	288	218	248	210	218	298.0	240	248	200	269	246	289	201	249	216	210	248	288	291
No. District U 1.1 Frances Correl No. District No. Di	Condition	897	300	315	501	247	417	204	407	396	315	291	345	471	.413	216	.796		.185	196	725	480	215	/82	Her."	214	875	492
Constant Constan	he .	1.04	100	486	348	000	101	393	160	000	368	908	000	100		898	318		346	474	2019		909 -	110	000	028	80	- 100
 Press Control N West Control N Press Control N District Control N Press Control N Press Control N Press Control N Press Control 		298	- 28	144	-31-		211	244	-3-	100		200	298	- 215	- 28	200	248	294	248	198	288	- 28	211	- 274	- 200		243	205
10 Denies 10 Parenie Cores 10 Parenie Cores 1	Constant of the local division of the local	474	801	378	10.7		848	274		8.85		248			474		797	197		100		-	- 10.1	200	101	360	8.71	1.1
Prominic Lorent No Disabert W Prominic Lorent N Prominic Lorent N Prominic Lorent N		164	- 10	147	342	760	242	244	140	142	242	742	262	788	100	240	141	244	740	248	242	200	760	144	260	140	143	262
Na Diales N R1 Faster Cont Na Diales R2 Faster Cont R3 Faster Cont	Comment	110	10	400	411	100	126		10	30	215	213	365	105	147	417	116	400	126		Nex"	414	100	445	100	111	415	563
N N Parates Control No. Charles No. Charle	dardi.		100	100	387.0	0.06	101	1.35	1000	498	868	0004	1000	8.84	3618				100.0		1000	100			000	100	100	
NI Pases Core No. Chaine NI NI NI NI NI NI NI NI NI NI NI NI NI		216	210	296	298		248	291	269	290	248	248	288	218	208	288	248	298	208	298	289	288	260	298	210	248	258	298
No Craites In 83 Propert Lana Ins Contact	(undated)	5.78	611	841."	208	3.78	385	878	367"	299	384	286	283	424	.351	838°	785	599	787	805"		118	.724	872	715	1.3	418	234
No Permit Lang	14.5	316	368	876	903	000	305	323	.800	438	363	-208	360	414	:010	416	.868	394	800	616		.000	361	416	363	418	.888	.058
83 Pepese Lang		298	26	210	248	200	215	286	268	2960	218	- 268	268	210	288	200	298	288	268	248	265	201	288	24	260	248	243	256
The Children of	Comment	124,	407	.241	315	241"	266	(4)	365	367	319	-294	323	.401	479	491	606	495	.801	494	106		828	.793	315	er.	447*	872
the second	De di	- 216		896	301	000	368	472	905	000	359	. 696	369	878	301	245		399	000	896	887		200	114	500	198	100	005
and Research	-	100	200	191	100	200	100	275	100	2	788	100	200	200	100	200	100	100	200	100	200	200	245	100	- 22	441	410	295
and Pressedues		111			141	012	-			100				. 412	415		100	100				0.0		101		-	411	1002
Taxante.	T	144	744	140	141	748		144		744	144	144		1 244	144	140	148	- 144	100	144	200	-	745	144	200	140	143	144
ATT Passace (Constants	415	387	87	MI	216	10	106	115	315	313	141	30	316	381	41	547"	332		111	673	280	ALC: N	1	116	13	34	526
the Original	in d	- 214		111	301	000	101	414		000		101	200	100		500	111	111	200		1912	100	105		800	128	913	.004
- 10		294	285	196	292	289	288	291	289	280	2958	298	700	296	293	290	298	295	298	796	299	298	266	294	299	280	289	210
AND PRANCEDUNE	Dominant	441	41.0	A26	\$27"	548"	#82	4.51	385	576	216"	148	38.9	A16"	436	529	825	451	821	.196	15.9"	275	878	814		100	975"	118
by Otatell	the di-			486	102	000	.965	242	805	489	100	016	268	8.88	.909		304	10.00		416	343	000	362	.018		0.00	013	404
		288	288	298	269	240	201	288	268	298	241	248	298	248	268	288	288	201	248	240	269	241	288	248	260	240	269	258
721 Pagmon Loose		414	.118	39	M3	101	402	-813	310	342	21.8	148	294	ARC	407	495	308	294	505	181	625	407	982	826	.798	E	.815	445
To Disket	Constantion .	494	.000	896	909	005	342	#85	3400	016	313	219	100	895	945	199	313	394	140		988	- 896	38.0	316	305		311	898
an pilling	Constantion Re-E	294	200	296	288	280	268	240	- 20	260	782	200	20	248	200	200	282	288	200	200	289	200	280	288		200	200	255
The Date of the	Constant-s In-E	28	200	190	191	282	200	- 2.54	144	811	100		100		-	-		410	421	490		417	815	100	815			100
11.9010.9	Constants No.2			197	197	2000	242	240	247	244	248	240	100	718	200	284	265	244	204	199	242	100	242	244	200	200	242	244
9.0 Paraleting	Constation Neg Constitution Neg	195	100							1.00																		
The Chaine	Constitutes Constitutes Geneticites Geneticites	2N 31	347	287	411	344	325	-162	210	145	214	116	216	216	340	217	404	410	475	243	224	472	MJ	128	115	846	. 116	
	Constation Geneticities Constation Constation	20 34"	341" 341"	287	A13 ²⁴ 393	3496	325	-143	200	143'	214	116"	215°	214" 118	.145 [°] 389	217 ²⁴ 000	494 ^{**}	442 ⁴⁴ 331	472 ^{**} 260	143 [°] .898	134 ²⁰ 980	472 ⁴⁷ .	MJ ^a	/CH ^{**}	816 [°]	845 ^{**}	.846"	

RESULTS

Model Fit

The use of SEM commonly involves using several indices to measure model fit. A variety of fit indices is used for the validation of model fit, including X^2 . Because X^2 (df) is sensitive to sample size, the fit indices such as normed fit index (NFI), Root mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA), and comparative fit index (CFI) more correctly reflect model fit (Hair et al., 2010). Results were acquired for the Incremental fit index (IFI) = 0.84; 0.83, the root mean-square residual (RMSR) = 0.05/0.04, the NFI = 0.78/0.77, and the CFI = 0.82/0.84. Hoelter's values showed acceptable results because both cases were within the suggested criteria (75 \leq value < 200). Although NFI and CFI were lower than recommended value, other fit indices showed the satisfactory criteria. Considering together, these figures show evidence of reasonably good fit. Internal consistencies for the three scales were also strong, that is, supported by a coefficient alpha of 0.93. The model fit is therefore

considered acceptable, and ten structural relations were analyzed with the model. The fit indices showed satisfactory fit of the fit.

Nationality-Related Differences

The independent *t*-test was conducted to verify possible statistical differences of measures between the two country samples. Summated scales were used to examine any differences between the two countries regarding the variables included in the model. Summated scales were computed by averaging the responses to individual items belonging to each of the constructs. Standard deviations and averages are presented along with corresponding t-tests for differences in Table 5. The independent t test showed higher levels of performance qualities among Korean users, and the U.S. users were more concerned with procedural features. The U.S. users were more concerned with FAT compared with Korean users. Korean users are significantly more concerned with accuracy, usefulness, and convenience than the U.S. users. Regarding trust, the Korean users were significantly more trusting than the U.S. users (M_{US} =4.08, M_{Korea} =3.76, *t* = 0.00). Satisfaction was lower in the U.S. sample than in the Korean one (M_{US} =4.03, M_{Korea} = 4.443, *t* = 0.00). The U.S. shows a higher level of confirmation than Korea (M_{US} =4.24, M_{Korea} = 4.03, *t* = 0.00). Overall, the table reveals that the items significantly different from one another. The items are not distinct in every case, but clear and significant differences in the factors across countries are observed.

Multigroup Analysis: Testing for Multigroup Invariance

Multigroup analysis conducted in AMOS software evaluated the structural paths from the model across the two groups by employing the method of Jensen and Wagner (2019). Table 4 illustrates the results of the multigroup analysis. Because standardized coefficients are sample specific and incomparable across samples, unstandardized coefficients were utilized to compare the results because they retain their scale effect. The two models indicated good fit with the data, and distinct patterns were observed that supported the hypotheses.

Notably, the two hypotheses that correspond to the procedural and performance metrics, respectively, were rejected in each case. The results indicated notable differences in path formation and item composition, providing insights on dissimilar value structures (Table 6). In the U.S. case, the paths from convenience and accuracy to satisfaction are rejected, and in the Korean case, the paths from transparency and fairness to confirmation are rejected. Additionally, the paths from transparency, accountability, and fairness to confirmation were significant with high coefficient values in the U.S. case (0.463; 0.478; 0.459), whereas the counterpart values were either low or rejected. In general, procedural qualities were important antecedents to confirmation for the U.S. users (CR 4.168; 5.330; 3.389), whereas performance qualities were more important determinants to satisfaction to the Korean users (CR: 9.767; 5.078; 3.120). The results of squared multiple correlations also supported the idea of different value structures in the two samples. The R² of confirmation in the U.S. was 0.73, and the counterpart value was 0.45. Additionally, the R² of accuracy and satisfaction of Korea was noticeably higher than that of the U.S..

Figure 4 shows the validated model with the unstandardized coefficients and their significance for both samples. Korean unstandardized coefficients are shown first, and the U.S. coefficients shown in bold.

DISCUSSION

This study attempted to cross analyze the AJ experience model to identify possible cross-national value differences in the algorithm news consumption. Because users' cultures and media ecology differ, the cross comparison revealed similarities and differences in users' AJ experiences in the two countries, leading to an inference about the contextual nature of algorithm news. In the comparison

Journal of Global Information Management

Volume 29 • Issue 2 • Bi-Monthly 2021

Table 5. T-test for national differences

	South Korea		The	U.S.	t-test value (Sig.)	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation		
Usefulness1	4.07	1.068	2.50	1.134		
Usefulness2	3.76	1.127	3.65	1.248	7.072 (0.000)**	
Usefulness3	3.85	1.202	3.85	1.202		
Conveneince1	4.48	1.269	3.09	1.257		
Conveneince2	4.33	1.174	4.10	1.394	6.783	
Conveneince3	4.65	1.254	4.23	1.662		
Fairness1	3.59	1.407	4.35	1.092		
Fairness2	3.70	1.384	4.25	1.249	-5788 (0.000) **	
Fairness3	3.96	1.218	4.03	1.133		
Trans1	4.09	1.276	4.24	1.115		
Trans2	3.96	1.439	4.20	1.301	-1.801	
Trans3	3.74	1.221	3.81	1.140	(0.012)	
Acount1	4.12	1.426	4.33	1.211		
Acount2	4.38	1.391	4.47	1.284	-1.086	
Acount3	4.06	1.019	4.06	1.019		
Confirm1	4.05	1.158	4.35	1.158		
Confirm2	4.04	1.093	4.24	1.093	1.587	
Confirm3	4.02	1.080	4.12	1.080		
Satis1	4.38	1.138	4.32	1.135		
Satis2	4.55	1.202	4.51	1.200	0.801	
Satis3	4.40	1.310	4.40	1.310		
Acurracy1	4.78	1.289	2.68	1.241		
Acurracy2	4.38	1.378	3.59	1.600	11.18	
Acurracy3	4.18	1.296	3.67	1.591		
Trust1	Trust1 3.99		4.46	1.333		
Trust2	4.11 1.490		3.37	1.269	3.219	
Trust3	4.14	1.533	3.37	1.439		

*p<0.05; **p<0.01

of the two countries, we focused on users' cognitive process: how users evaluate the qualities of AJ news, how users make sense of the AJ news-making process, and users' level of satisfaction with the suggested news. The model implies that interacting with algorithms involves a number of cognitive processes. To understand user attitudes and behaviors of AJ, research must consider system quality, user heuristics, and performance value. Developing effective user-centered algorithm services requires understanding users' cognitive processes and reflecting them in design work.

The findings imply that people's perceptions of algorithmic processes are contextual. This implication is consonant with Shin and Park's argument (2019) that similar algorithms can be viewed differently depending on the circumstances or the contexts in which the algorithms are developed,

Hypothesis		South Ko	rea		1	United St	ates	
	Unstandardized coefficient	SE	CR	Support	Unstandardized coefficient	SE	CR	Support
H1 (TR-C)	0.066	0.123	0.539	No	0.463**	0.112	4.168	Yes
H2 (AC-C)	0.709**	0.134	5.284	Yes	0.478**	0.090	5.330	Yes
H3 (FA-C)	0.416	0.208	1.997	No	0.459**	0.136	3.389	Yes
H4 (C-U.S.)	0.695**	0.066	10.615	Yes	0.434**	0.073	5.848	Yes
H5 (C-AR)	0.871**	0.074	10.828	Yes	0.584**	0.077	7.604	Yes
H6 (C-CO)	0.807**	0.074	10.868	Yes	0.651**	0.096	6.789	Yes
H7 (U.SS)	0.151*	0.048	3.120	Yes	1.420**	0.284	5.007	Yes
H8 (AR-S)	0.607**	0.062	9.767	Yes	0.157	0.096	1.623	No
H9 (CO-S)	0.221**	0.044	5.078	Yes	0.058	0.044	1.329	No
H10 (TU-S)	0.186**	0.033	5.713	Yes	0.256**	0.037	6.947	Yes

Table 6. Summary of hypothesis testing

* *p*<.05; ** *p*<.001

Table 7. Squared multiple correlation comparison

	South Korea	United States
Confirmation	0.547	0.742
Convenience	0.532	0.268
Accuracy	0.705	0.484
Usefulness	0.498	0.775
Satisfaction	0.856	0.639

Note: The result of multicollinearity test shows no signs of a multicollinearity problem.

Figure 4. Compared unstandardized coefficients (*p < .05; **p < .01)



Volume 29 • Issue 2 • Bi-Monthly 2021

Table 8. Summative findings

RQ	Findings
What are the cross-national differences in user attitudes and motivation for adopting AJ content?	The results report national differences of users' perceptions of and attitudes toward AJ in the two countries. There are differences in cross-national behaviors in terms of procedural and performance quality of AJ. There are also differences in cross-national estimates of trust and satisfaction, which could be due to differences in the study sample, study design and cultural differences in the use and service types of AJ.
RQ1: Are there differences between U.S. and South Korean users regarding their perceptions of FAT in AJ news?	The notable similarities and differences are found by performing a comparison of cognitive processes. The major attitudes toward algorithm news are similar between the two countries, although the weights placed on the qualities differ. South Korean users put more weight on performance qualities, and U.S. users place relatively greater emphasis on procedural features. Different patterns of algorithm news experience imply the contextual nature of algorithm: How users perceive and feel about topics in algorithm news and how they use and engage with algorithm news depend on the context where the experience is taking place.
RQ2: Do U.S. and Korean users perceive the quality of algorithm news differently?	By proposing procedural qualities (i.e., transparency, fairness and accountability) influence confirmation that in turn affects performance qualities (i.e. usefulness, convenience and accuracy), the model reveals the mediating role of confirmation in the relationship between procedural qualities and performance qualities. A strong mediating role of confirmation between the procedural qualities–procedural qualities implies the importance of measuring confirmation separately from algorithm service qualities when modelling the effects of quality on outcome constructs. This relationship also suggests that confirmation is critically important for examining trust and satisfaction.
RQ3: How much do the users in the U.S. and Korea trust AJ and how does that level of trust influence the satisfaction of AJ?	The Korean users were significantly more trusting than the U.S. users. Satisfaction was lower in the U.S. sample than in the Korean one. The U.S. users navigate to algorithmic news on social media with generalized skepticism because most people in the U.S. have low trust in how algorithm news is selected and tend to be skeptical of how algorithms select news.
Common conclusions	 -AJ should establish user trust and credibility through clear FTA. AJ must transcend perfunctory transparency or mechanical accuracy and fulfill actual user needs and perspectives. -Understanding user affordance facilitates the development of a user-centered interface for AJ

adopted, and used. Users' perceptual system quality plays a critical role in the consumption of news content and the adoption of the system overall (Zheng et al., 2018). The algorithmic heuristic occurs when users' subjective perceptions about procedural qualities act as a mental shortcut of usability, satisfaction, and trust. Users' perceptual cognizance of AJ quality and trust are key heuristics in determining the effects of objective systems on the three aspects of UX: system characteristics, contextual factors, and perceived value. The results also show that users find the capability to actively shape or control news recommendation mechanisms as a useful and necessary feature. We infer that users actively engage and contribute to news recommendations and algorithms respond to the users' desires. AJ recommends the content users want to see; thus, the content is based on the users' cognitively reconstructed reality.

Procedural Quality Versus Performance Quality

It is shown that users in both samples who perceive AJ services as high quality and useful generally have positive confirmation, resulting in high satisfaction. Users who perceive AJ as transparent are more likely to show a positive attitude and favor the procedural aspects of algorithms. Users who have positive conformation of AJ are more likely to trust, which then lead to satisfaction of AJ services.

The findings show that procedural qualities and performance qualities are valid differentiators of AJ use and satisfaction in the two countries. The AJ users in the two countries, however, differ in how they felt, perceived, and preferred to interact with AJ in terms of the procedure–performance framework. From the findings, we infer that the value structure differs in the two countries regarding process versus performance. User motivations in different contexts are a critical explanatory variable when identifying cross-national AJ experience patterns. Results of difference tests indicate that each component of procedural qualities and performance qualities differs, implying that the needs and values of algorithm users between the two countries may differ. The findings indicate that Korean AJ users are more affected by qualities regarding performance of AJ services such as accuracy, usefulness, and convenience than by procedural qualities, whereas users in the U.S. reveal opposite preferences. Notably, the differences in patterns are also linked to perceived quality. Users who perceive outcome values of AJ also think accuracy and convenience key factors that influence their satisfaction. Users who perceive procedural values also consider transparency and fairness quality to be key factors that influence their confirmation.

The R-squared measures in the model support the arguments. Performance qualities such as usefulness, accuracy, and convenience explain 74% of the variance in satisfaction with AJ for Korean users, and 65% for U.S. users. Procedural qualities explain 73% of the variance in confirmation for U.S. users, and 54% for Korean users. Korean users are more likely to be gratified with utility of AJ than U.S. users, whereas U.S. users are more likely to be confirmed through procedural quality than their Korean counterparts. Other underlying factors might explain confirmation for Korean users, and there might be other variables accounting for satisfaction for the U.S. users. Maybe the U.S. users expect more than performance in terms of algorithm satisfaction, whereas Korean users expect more than FAT in terms of confirming the procedural qualities. Although high R-squared values are not necessarily good, we infer that perceived procedural and performance qualities are perhaps meticulously interdependent factors that co-influence AJ users across countries, as proposed by Shin and Park (2019).

These differences are largely due to the different public attitudes toward computer algorithms. A survey demonstrated that the U.S. public-by and large-is skeptical about the capacity of algorithms (Pew Research Center Survey, 2018). More than half of the U.S. population feels that automated programs will inevitably reveal some level of human prejudice. The public is concerned that algorithms might infringe privacy, fail to reflect the details of complicated situations, or simply put the people they are evaluating in an biased situation. People's perceptions of algorithmic decision-making can be contextual. People in the U.S. might be more skeptical about the algorithmic features when used in the AJ context than Koreans. This finding is partially consistent with Zheng et al.'s finding (2019) that U.S. users prefer human-reporter-written news to algorithm-generated news, whereas Chinese users show the opposite preference. Similarly, Flether and Nielsen (2019) found the U.S. users navigate to algorithmic news on social media with generalized skepticism because most people in the U.S. have low trust in how algorithm news is selected and tend to be skeptical of how algorithms select news. Although we cannot assert that Korean users have more faith in how algorithms select news, perhaps Korean users do not understand exactly (or less care about) how the news they receive is curated/ filtered by what algorithms; thus, they uncritically receive news including the concerns regarding FAT. Although the U.S. users may not understand the specific algorithm process either, there are widespread concerns about FAT and skepticism of algorithmic selection; thus, individuals in the U.S. tend to critically review the issues, including FAT (Pew Research Center, 2018). Korean users feel more comfortable with algorithms, assume procedural aspects are legitimate, and tend to trust algorithms more than U.S. users (H10; beta: 0.186 vs 0.256; CR 5.713 vs. 6.947). Korean users may consider the AJ more trustworthy and reliable than U.S. users. They probably are more concerned with the results/performance of the recommended news by AJ regarding whether they are predictable and accurate and how convenient and useful rather than how and why their data are being used and when.

The findings show that similar algorithms can be viewed differently depending on the circumstances or the contexts in which they are accepted. These inferences from the findings are conceptually related to findings in the literature. For instance, studies by Shin and Choo (2012) and Jensen and Wagner (2019) have demonstrated that user experiences of media/technologies are largely reliant on national characteristics. This study attempted to examine why users from the U.S. and Korea experience AJ differently. Possible explanations for the difference include that algorithm technologies are more widely used and available in Korea than in the U.S., and the advanced technological infrastructure in Korea has spurred rapid adoption and satisfaction with the algorithm medium (Shin, 2019). A general social norm is that algorithm technologies are bounded with legal provisions and regulatory limitations (data policy and privacy regulation) in the U.S. that are relatively narrow in scope, and that algorithm service offerings are limited compared with those in Korea, where rates of algorithm adoption and diffusion are fairly high in the world. Hence, it is clear that the substantial differences between the algorithmic environments of the two countries would influence user attitudes toward, and motivation for using, algorithm services. There may be differences in the social and cultural milieu that guide the diverse motivations for utilizing algorithm services. This cultural dimension was not considered in this study, but further research may explore this area.

Our results show that the relation between procedural and performance qualities is more intricate when such a distinction is applied to cross-national contexts. Users in the two countries who believed algorithm services as high quality and usable generally had positive confirmation, which rendered high satisfaction. Those who perceived algorithms as procedural were more likely to show a positive attitude and like the transparent processes of algorithms. The findings also reveal that users in both countries differ in how they think about and prefer to interact with algorithms in terms of process and performance dimensions. Based on the findings, we infer the value structure of the two countries differs in terms of process versus performance. User motivations in different contexts are a critical explanatory power when considering cross-national algorithm adoption patterns. Results of difference tests imply that the needs and values of algorithm users between the two countries may also differ. The findings also reveal that Korean users are more affected by accuracy qualities of AJ than by transparency utility compared with users in the U.S., who had the opposite views.

Implications

The primary contribution of this study is the application of expectation–confirmation–satisfaction frame from information system in the algorithm news domain.

Theoretical Implications

The quality of user experience is complicatedly related to the users' contextual individualities and this is true regarding AJ. However, not many attempts have made to investigate cultural or national characteristics closely related to user experience. The key goal of this study was to reveal potential national differences related to the user experience of algorithms and to measure them cross-nationally with AJ.

This study makes three contributions to the ongoing body of literature. First, a main contribution of this research is the cross-country framework we propose to understand why people perceive certain features used in algorithms as good or invalid. Our framework identifies six properties of features, for instance, fairness, transparency, and accountability as latent considerations that confirm people's heuristic judgment, and usefulness, accuracy, and convenience as antecedents of satisfaction. Our findings have heuristic implications. At a high-level, we show that people's attitudes toward algorithms are contextual and call for further research on the relation of contextuality and culture/ individual features.

Second, this study explored the nature of qualities in algorithms by clarifying procedural and performance qualities in AJ cross-nationally. The theoretical contribution of this study is the examination and proof of the mediating role of confirmation between procedural and performance qualities in the satisfaction-trust process. The mediating effects of confirmation on performance qualities imply that people use procedural features as judgmental cues assessing performance values (Shin & Park, 2019). User's perceived procedural qualities serve as judgmental rules of thumb for values, satisfaction and trust. Much of the user interactions, limitations, and affordances in algorithms are dependent upon user heuristics. Users rely on heuristics to make assessments of quality efficiently, quickly, and repeatedly, with limited information about material features (Shin, 2019). AJ is no exception to this tendency. Due to the complexity of algorithm systems, users rely on heuristics to navigate the algorithm services to assess qualities in making decisions about AJ. People use their own heuristics when forming judgements and making decisions about AJ. Ordinary users are not familiar with the details of algorithm operation and structure. When they are making decisions about AJ, they are often content to trust a plausible judgement that comes to mind, like a vague perception of transparency, fairness, and accountability.

Third, the results showed that algorithm use and interactions were positively related to perceived values, which were significantly associated with the users' notions of transparency and accuracy and with future intention. The findings of this study implied the connections between a dynamic experience, algorithm services, and users' interactions with the automated environment. The implied links constitute a theoretical advancement of user heuristic research. In the expectation–confirmation theory literature, perceived values have been considered to influence expectations, which then leads to confirmation. The heuristic model in this study shows how such values are formed and how they together influence confirmation in the context of algorithms. The model shows how perceived values are related to confirmation, which then influences usability and satisfaction. User attitudes are formed through underlying perceptions including transparency, accuracy, and perceived value. Assessing these perceptions improves predictions of AJ content adoption and the diffusion of algorithm services. By identifying antecedents of perceived value and by clarifying cognitive processes, this result provides modest but meaningful theoretical progress regarding expectation–confirmation theory.

Practical Implications

The pragmatic implications of algorithms and AJ can be the potential for evaluating framework for user experience and design guidelines for new algorithm services. For the developers of AJ or other similar algorithmic services, the implications of this study can help advance the systems' performance and UX toward their products. From a comparative perspective, the findings also highlight the importance of considering national culture when examining users' expectations and confirmation of algorithm services.

The results of this study give two key implications to AJ practitioners. First, the most apparent differences between users in Korea and the U.S. are in value structure and procedure versus performance. Although both values are needed to understand the role of algorithms in peoples' daily lives, process and outcome influence the use and consumption of AJ differently between the two countries. The findings indiciate the importance of procedural value in algorithms, which represents user-centered algorithms, and this point should be carefully considered by the algorithm industry, especially in the Korean society, where FAT concerns have been troubling recently. Globally, algorithm users expect legitimacy of algorithms in addition to usability and convenience. In addition to the pragmatic aspect of usability that serves users' functional needs, procedural values comprise the designs and dimensions that focus on satisfying users' rights to know about the internals of algorithms.

Second, U.S. and Korean users have dissimilar value structures that influence expectations, confirmations, and satisfaction. The findings imply that the industry should examine the specific algorithm services desired by target countries or at least by a regional culture. To improve the levels of AJ user satisfaction in different countries, localized strategies should consider the cultural features unique to each country. The contrasting patterns of the two countries imply that the AJ users have diverse experiences with and expectations of algorithm services. Algorithm industry may focus on following specific questions.

RQ1. How to provide Korean users with assurable procedural features? RQ2. How to provide a quality of performance highly usable and convenient for U.S. users?

The different formations further suggest algorithm firms should adopt localization strategies to optimally serve local audiences. The findings of the study provide hints on how to enhance fairness, accountability, and transparency in AJ and how to increase trust and thereby improve satisfaction overall.

CONCLUSION

This study reports a comparative study that examines users' perceptions of and attitudes toward AJ in the U.S. and South Korea. A cross-national analysis of AJ was conducted to investigate drivers affecting perceived qualities and satisfaction in the two countries. By proposing procedural qualities (i.e., transparency, fairness and accountability) influence confirmation that in turn affects performance qualities (i.e. usefulness, convenience and accuracy), the model reveals the mediating role of confirmation in the relationship between procedural qualities and performance qualities. A strong mediating role of confirmation between the procedural–performance qualities implies that it is important to measure confirmation separately from algorithm service qualities when modelling the effects of quality on outcome constructs. This relationship also suggests that confirmation is critically important for examining trust and satisfaction.

The results of the study suggest that while users' general attitudes toward algorithm news are similar, the weights placed on the qualities of algorithm news differ between these two countries. The Korean users put greater emphasis on the performance qualities of algorithm news, and the U.S. users place more weight on the procedural features of algorithm news. Different patterns of algorithm news acceptance imply contextual nature of algorithm: How users perceive and feel about issues in algorithm news and how they use and engage with algorithm news depend on context where the experience is taking place. This result suggests the importance of user perceived issues as well as the contextual nature of such issues. The results of this study offer a conceptual model that addresses user value perception for using algorithmic news. While the findings of this study confirm the previous research that perceptions of FAT strongly impact perceived value and satisfaction of algorithmic services (Shin & Park, 2019), the results of this study make contributions to the literature on automated news and algorithm curations. Comparative observations in the findings are useful to juxtapose how value is constructed in the countries and recognize which factors influence user confirmation and satisfaction.

LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

Whereas the findings of this study are useful, the findings must be interpreted with discretion for the following grounds. First and foremost, this study conducted a cross-national comparison but excluded cultural factors. The focus of a cross-national approach in this study is basically from the intention to evade cultural factors in drawing the argument. This study excludes such cultural factors parsimonious reasons to focus on FAT issues, which are difficult to connect with cultural dimensions. This exclusion is a limitation because we do not provide a clear explanation for the national differences we observe. This topic can be a research area for further research and opens heuristic questions concerning how the perception of FAT in different contexts shapes use and provisions of FAT. Clearly, additional studies that systematically link FAT and media use and compare findings and explanatory factors across countries with different levels of algorithm media use are necessary.

Second, the data in this study have limitations. The samples were collected with self-selected convenient samplings; thus, the generalizability of the findings may be limited. Additionally, the self-reported nature of the survey may inherently be limited in conceptualizing FAT, which is highly

abstract. The concerns regarding the sample and the generalizability may be inherent problems in general social scientific studies. Nonetheless, the samples could have been collected in a broader context. Additionally, this study did not include the various effects of demographic traits. Users' personality may greatly influence the consumption and adoption of AJ. Trust in algorithms may depend on a user's dispositional trust. Further research could conduct investigations while considering these excluded factors, and a time-series analysis can be accompanied with a large sample.

Third, the findings exhibit limited or partial pictures of UX with AJ. Because algorithms and AJ are still early stages of development, this study is limited in its application to other countries in that its results cannot be fully generalized to the broader population of algorithm users. We did not confirm whether AJ represents a type of recommendation system. Moreover, the concepts of FAT should be further and more clearly defined and measurably operationalized. This study attempted to address such concepts and incorporated them into the user model as antecedent factors of satisfaction and trust. Such issues are presently popular, but the factors have not been validated, and this study approached them on an exploratory basis. Although such concepts should be incorporated into algorithm design, how to accomplish this task remains uncertain. Additionally, such factors have been defined as legal concepts, and further research can define them further and develop them in reference to UX.

Altogether, the limitations imply the need for a more meticulous approach and theoretical refinement, specifically regarding how to best capture the interaction between users and algorithms, how to define the roles of trust in the course of interactions, and how to infuse social topics into the design and development of algorithms. From a long-term perspective, further research should examine a wider range of user experiences, including how users' traits influence the perceived accuracy and transparency of recommendations. Indeed, there is a growing need to create a new field around algorithm services, which examines the interplay of social and algorithms.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This project has been funded by the Research Office of Zayed University, Research Incentive Fund (R20082/2020). This project has been also supported by the Center for Educational Innovation of ZU, Teaching Innovation Research Fund (TIRF-S19-01: B19053).

REFERENCES

Ananny, M., & Crawford, K. (2018). Seeing without knowing. *New Media & Society*, 20(3), 973–989. doi:10.1177/1461444816676645

Beam, M. A., & Kosicki, G. M. (2014). Personalized news portals. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 91(1), 59–77. doi:10.1177/1077699013514411

Bedi, P., & Vashisth, P. (2014). Empowering recommender systems using trust and argumentation. *Information Sciences*, 279, 569–586. doi:10.1016/j.ins.2014.04.012

Cramer, H., Evers, V., Ramlal, S., van Someren, M., Rutledge, L., Stash, N., Aroyo, L., & Wielinga, J. (2008). The effects of transparency on trust in and acceptance of a content-based art recommender. *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction*, *18*(5), 455–496. doi:10.1007/s11257-008-9051-3

Diakopoulos, N., & Koliska, M. (2016). Algorithmic transparency in the news media. *Digital Journalism*, 5(7), 809–828. doi:10.1080/21670811.2016.1208053

Fletcher, R., & Nielen, R. (2019). Generalized skepticism: How people navigate news on social media. *Information Communication and Society*, 22(12), 1751–1769. Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/1369 118X.2018.1450887

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *JMR, Journal of Marketing Research*, 48(1), 39–50. doi:10.1177/002224378101800104

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). Multivariate data analysis (7th ed.). Prentice Hall.

Helberger, N., Karppinen, K., & D'Acunto, L. (2018). Exposure diversity as a design principle for recommender systems. *Information Communication and Society*, *21*(2), 191–207. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2016.1271900

Jensen, J. M., & Wagner, C. (2018). A cross-national comparison of Millennial consumers' initial trust towards an e-travel website. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, *36*(3), 318–333. doi:10.1108/MIP-12-2017-0327

Jung, J., Song, H., Kim, Y., & Oh, S. (2017). Intrusion of software robots into journalism. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 71, 291–298. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2017.02.022 PMID:32288175

Kemper, J., & Kolkman, D. (in press). Transparent to whom? *Information Communication and Society*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2018.1477967

Kim, K., Shin, D., & Park, E. (2015). Can coolness predict technology adoption? *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, *18*(9), 528–533. doi:10.1089/cyber.2014.0675 PMID:26348813

Kitchin, R. (2017). Thinking critically about and researching algorithms. *Information Communication and Society*, 20(1), 14–29. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2016.1154087

Klinger, U., & Svensson, J. (in press). The end of media logics? *New Media & Society*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/1461444818779750

Knijnenburg, B., Willemsen, M., Gantner, Z., Soncu, H., & Newell, C. (2012). Explaining the user experience of recommender systems. *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction*, 22(4-5), 441–504. doi:10.1007/s11257-011-9118-4

Moller, J., Trilling, D., Helberger, N., & van Es, B. (2018). Do not blame it on the algorithm. *Information Communication and Society*, *21*(7), 959–977. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2018.1444076

Pew Research Center. (2018). Public attitudes toward computer algorithms. https://www.pewresearch.org/staff/ aaron-smith

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63(1), 539–569. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452 PMID:21838546

Rader, E. (2017). Examining user surprise as a symptom of algorithmic filtering. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 98, 72–88. doi:10.1016/j.ijhcs.2016.10.005

Shin, D. (2010). The effects of trust, security and privacy in social networking. *Interacting with Computers*, 22(5), 428–438. doi:10.1016/j.intcom.2010.05.001

Shin, D. (2017). Conceptualizing and measuring quality of experience of the Internet of things. *Information & Management*, 54(8), 998–1011. doi:10.1016/j.im.2017.02.006

Shin, D. (2019). Toward fair, accountable, and transparent algorithms. *Javnost: The Public*, 26(3), 1–17. doi:1 0.1080/13183222.2019.1589249

Shin, D., & Biocca, F. (2018). Exploring immersive experience in journalism what makes people empathize with and embody immersive journalism? *New Media & Society*, 20(8), 2800–2823. doi:10.1177/1461444817733133

Shin, D., & Choo, H. (2012). Exploring cross-cultural value structure with smartphone. *Journal of Global Information Management*, 20(2), 67–93. doi:10.4018/jgim.2012040104

Shin, D., & Park, Y. (2019). Role of fairness, accountability, and transparency in algorithmic affordance. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 98, 277–284. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2019.04.019

Shin, D. (2021). The effects of explainability and causability on perception, trust, and acceptance. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, *146*, 102551. doi:10.1016/j.ijhcs.2020.102551

Thurman, N., & Schifferes, S. (2012). The future of personalization at news websites. *Journalism Studies*, *13*(5-6), 775–790. doi:10.1080/1461670X.2012.664341

Zheng, L., Yang, F., & Li, T. (2014). Modeling and broadening temporal user interest in personalized news recommendation. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 47(7), 3168–3177. doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2013.11.020

Zheng, Y., Zhong, B., & Yang, F. (2018). When algorithms meet journalism. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 86, 266–275. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2018.04.046

APPENDIX

Table 9. Survey measurement items

	Perceived Performance (Outcome)	Source
Usefulness	 AJ news is useful. AJ news is practical. AJ news is functional and beneficial. 	Shin, 2017; Shin, 2016; Shin, 2010; Shin & Park, 2019
Convenience	 AJ news is convenient. AJ news is easy to use. AJ news is accessible. 	
Accuracy	The recommended news is accurate. AJ content is fair. The AJ process is interpretable and explainable.	
	Normative value (Procedural Quality)	Source
Transparency	 The algorithm processes are transparent. AJ processes are consistent. Overall, AJ follows a legitimate process. 	Initial notions were derived from Diakopoulos & Koliska,
Accountability	 The system needs a person in charge accountable for its adverse individual or societal effects in a timely fashion (Responsibility) Algorithms should be designed to enable third parties to examine and review the behavior of an algorithm (Auditability) I have the ability to change algorithm system and configuration regarding privacy and results (Controllability) 	2016; Shin, 2021. Shin & Park, 2019
Fairness	 The system has no favoritism and does not discriminate against people (Non-discrimination) The source of data throughout an algorithm and its data sources should be identified, logged, and benchmarked (Accuracy) The system follows due process of impartiality with no prejudice (Due process). 	
	Cognitive processing	Source
Trust	 I trust the news recommended by AJ. Recommended news from AJ is trustworthy. AJ results are reliable. 	Hoff & Bashir, 2015; McBride, Rogers, & Fisk, 2011; Shin, 2010; Zhang et al., 2014
Confirmation	 AJ meets my needs overall. AJ fits my expectation and needs. AJ news proves my prior thinking and trust. 	Kim et al., 2013; Shin, 2010
Satisfaction	 Largely, I am fairly pleased with algorithm services. Overall, the algorithm services fulfill my initial expectation. Generally, I am satisfied with the contents of algorithm services. 	Shin, 2010; Lee et al., 2015

Journal of Global Information Management

Volume 29 • Issue 2 • Bi-Monthly 2021

Dr. Shin has been a Professor at the College of Communication and Media Sciences at Zayed University, Abu Dhabi since 2019. Over the last 19 years, he taught at various universities in the US and Korea, including Penn State University and SKK University. Prior to Zayed University, he was a Professor at Sungkyunkwan University, Seoul, Korea. He also was founding Chair of the Department of Interaction Science, an interdisciplinary research initiative sponsored by the Ministry of Education and Samsung Foundation. As a Head and Director of Interaction Science Research Center, he also served as a Principal Investigator of BK21 Plus, a national research project hosted by the Ministry of Education in Korea. Don received his bachelor's degree from Sungkyunkwan University (1997), his master's degree from Southern Illinois University (1998), and his another master degree and PhD degrees from Syracuse University (2004).