INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

**EASTERN EUROPE AND PRODUCT-COUNTRY IMAGES:
A LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS OF THE
COMPETITIVENESS OF
EASTERN EUROPEAN PRODUCTS**

by

Elizabeth Gooding, B.I.B. (Honours)

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Business Administration

School of Business
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
January 15, 2002

Copyright ©
2002, Elizabeth Gooding

**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-72075-6

Canada

The undersigned recommend to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
acceptance of the thesis

**EASTERN EUROPE AND PRODUCT-COUNTRY IMAGES:
A LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS OF THE COMPETITIVENESS OF EASTERN
EUROPEAN PRODUCTS**

submitted by Elizabeth Gooding, B.I.B. (Honours)
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Business Administration

Co-Supervisor

Co-Supervisor

Director, School of Business

School of Business,
Carleton University

January 15, 2002

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this study was to assess Canadian perceptions toward selected Eastern European countries and their products at different points in time. New data was collected in 2000 and was compared to data collected in 1992 and 1995 as part of a longitudinal research program developed by Papadopoulos and Heslop. The results of the longitudinal analysis showed very little change in consumer attitudes toward Eastern Europe between 1992 and 2000. Although consumers admitted to having relatively little knowledge of the countries and products of Eastern Europe, they were found, nevertheless, to have distinct and consistent images of each of the countries studied. Russia was shown to have a clear disadvantage over the other Eastern European countries, while Poland's country and product images revealed the most improvement over time. Another objective of the study was to test a model of country-of-origin effects on buyer behaviour developed by Papadopoulos and Heslop (1997) using structural equation modeling techniques. The results were encouraging. Overall model fit was acceptable and support was found for the majority of the hypothesized structural relationships.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
LIST OF APPENDICES	x
 1.0 Introduction	 1
 2.0 Literature Review	 5
2.1 Product-Country Images	5
2.1.1 Product Country Image as an Information Cue	7
2.2 Stereotyping.....	8
2.2.1 Consumer Ethnocentrism.....	9
2.3 Halo vs. Summary Construct	11
2.4 PCI Research on Developing Nations.....	13
2.5 Longitudinal Studies	15
2.6 National Characteristics of Countries-of-Origin	17
2.6.1 Attitudes Toward Foreign Countries	17
2.6.2 Country vs. Product Evaluations	18
2.7 PCI and Eastern Europe	20
2.7.1 Regional Overview	20
2.7.2 PCI Research on Eastern Europe	26
2.8 Structural Equation Methods	31
 3.0 Research Objectives.....	 36
3.1 Background	36
3.2 Objectives.....	38
3.2.1 Longitudinal Analysis	38
3.2.2 PCI Model.....	40
 4.0 Research Methodology.....	 45
4.1 The Sample	45
4.2 Sample Size	46
4.3 Data Collection	46
4.4 Study Countries	47
4.5 Research Instrument.....	47
4.6 Data Analysis Procedures	48
 5.0 The Pre-Analytic Process	 50
5.1 Data Editing	50
5.2 Data Coding	50
5.3 Tabulation	50

6.0 Findings and Discussion.....	51
6.1 Sample Characteristics	51
6.2 Country and Product Evaluations – 2000	54
6.2.1 Country Image (2000 Results)	54
6.2.1.1 Differences in Eastern European Country Images	56
6.2.2 Product Image (2000 Results)	59
6.2.2.1 Differences in Eastern European Product Images	61
6.3 Longitudinal Analysis	63
6.3.1 Country Image	65
6.3.1.1 1995 vs. 1992	66
6.3.1.2 2000 vs. 1995	68
6.3.1.3 2000 vs. 1992	69
6.3.2 Product Image	74
6.3.2.1 1995 vs. 1992	75
6.3.2.2 2000 vs. 1995	76
6.3.2.3 2000 vs. 1992	77
6.3.3 Product Categories	83
6.3.3.1 1995 vs. 1992	84
6.3.3.2 2000 vs. 1995	85
6.3.3.3 2000 vs. 1992	86
6.3.4 Summary – Longitudinal Analysis	88
6.4 Comparative Rankings	90
6.5 Generalized vs. Product Specific Evaluations	93
6.6 Factor Structure	95
6.6.1 Country Scales (1992)	96
6.6.2 Country Scales (1995)	100
6.6.3 Country Scales (2000)	103
6.6.4 Product Scales (1992)	107
6.6.5 Product Scales (1995)	110
6.6.6 Product Scales (2000)	112
6.6.7 Summary – Factor Structure	115
6.7 PCI Model	117
6.7.1 Initial Tests – 1 st Run	119
6.7.2 Overall Model Fit – 1 st Run vs. 2 nd Run	123
6.7.3 The Structural Model – 2 nd Run	125
6.7.4 Summary	133
6.7.4.1 France	134
6.7.4.2 Russia	136
6.7.4.3 Hungary	138
6.7.4.4 Czech Republic	140
6.7.4.5 Poland	142
6.7.5 Conclusions – PCI Model	144
6.7.6 3 rd Run	146
7.0 Limitations	154
8.0 Conclusions	156

8.1 Longitudinal Analysis	156
8.2 Comparative Rankings	158
8.3 Generalized vs. Product Specific Evaluations	159
8.4 Factor Structure	160
8.5 PCI Model	160
9.0 Research Implications	162
9.1 Implications for Eastern European Firms	162
9.2 Implications for Western Firms.....	164
9.3 Implications for Government	165
9.4 Implications for Future Research	166
References.....	169

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
2.7.1	Annual Percent Changes in Real GDP: Selected Eastern European Countries	24
2.7.2	Exports in Millions of US Dollars, 1992-1997	25
6.1.1	Demographic Characteristics of the Sample	52
6.2.1	Profile of Consumer Views of Selected Countries (2000)	55
6.2.1.2	Doubly Multivariate Analysis of EE Country Differences	58
6.2.2	Profile of Consumer Views of Products Made in Selected Countries (2000)	60
6.2.2.1	Doubly Multivariate Analysis of EE Product Differences	62
6.3.1	Multigroup MANOVA Tests	64
6.3.1.1	Consumers Views of France and Selected Eastern European Countries (1995-1992)	67
6.3.1.2	Consumers Views of France and Selected Eastern European Countries (2000-1995)	69
6.3.1.3	Consumers Views of France and Selected Eastern European Countries (2000-1992)	70
6.3.2.1	Consumer Views of Products Made in France and Selected Eastern European Countries (1995-1992)	76
6.3.2.2	Consumer Views of Products Made in France and Selected Eastern European Countries (2000-1995)	77
6.3.2.3	Consumer Views of Products Made in France and Selected Eastern European Countries (2000-1992)	78
6.3.3.0	Multigroup MANOVA for Product Categories	83
6.3.3.1	Consumer Views of Product Categories Made in France and Selected Eastern European Countries (1995-1992)	84

6.3.3.2	Consumer Views of Product Categories Made in France and Selected Eastern European Countries (2000-1995)	86
6.3.3.3	Consumer Views of Product Categories Made in France and Selected Eastern European Countries (2000-1992)	87
6.4.1	Ordinal Rankings of the Target Countries (1992-2000)	91
6.4.2	Ordinal Rankings of Products Made in the Target Countries (1992-2000)	92
6.5.1	Country Profiles for Specific Products and Global Evaluative Measures	94
6.6.1	Factor Structure (1992): Country Scales	97
6.6.2	Factor Structure (1995): Country Scales	101
6.6.3	Factor Structure (2000): Country Scales	105
6.6.4	Factor Structure (1992): Product Scales	108
6.6.5	Factor Structure (1995): Product Scales	111
6.6.6	Factor Structure (2000): Product Scales	113
6.7.1	R² Values from the Initial Tests	122
6.7.2	Comparison of Fit Indexes	123
6.7.3	Critical Ratios for the Structural Model	126
6.7.4	Incidence of Significant Relationships	133
6.7.5.1	Comparison of Fit Indexes	147

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
2.8.1	LISREL Model of Country-of-Origin Effects	33
2.8.2	Comprehensive Product-Country Image Model	34
3.2.2.1	Modified PCI Model	41
6.3.1.4	Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of France	72
6.3.1.5	Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of Russia	72
6.3.1.6	Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of Hungary	73
6.3.1.7	Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of the Czech Republic	73
6.3.1.8	Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of Poland	74
6.3.2.4	Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of French Products	80
6.3.2.5	Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of Russian Products	80
6.3.2.6	Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of Hungarian Products	81
6.3.2.7	Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of Czech Products	82
6.3.2.8	Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of Polish Products	82
6.7.1	PCI Model	120
6.7.4.1	Revised PCI Model: France	135
6.7.4.2	Revised PCI Model: Russia	137
6.7.4.3	Revised PCI Model: Hungary	139
6.7.4.4	Revised PCI Model: Czech Republic	141
6.7.4.5	Revised PCI Model: Poland	143
6.7.5.1	Summary of PCI Model Results	144
6.7.5.2	Final PCI Model: France	148

6.7.5.3	Final PCI Model: Russia	149
6.7.5.4	Final PCI Model: Hungary	150
6.7.5.5	Final PCI Model: Czech Republic	151
6.7.5.6	Final PCI Model: Poland	152

LIST OF APPENDICES

<u>Appendix</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
A	Consumer Survey	177
B	Doubly Multivariate Analysis of Variance	193
C	Follow-up Tests (Country and Product Scales)	202
D	Follow-up Tests (Product Categories)	224
E	Pearson Correlation Coefficients	228
F	Factor Analysis	231
G	PCI Model (1 st Run)	241
H	PCI Model (2 nd Run)	246
I	PCI Model (3 rd Run)	251

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In recent years there has been a distinct movement away from state-led, import-substitution, economic development strategies that emphasize domestic production and protection from foreign competition. The collapse of the former USSR, and the disintegration of Soviet Communism in Eastern Europe, precipitated an almost universal shift towards policies that support market economy principles and economic freedom. Further evidence of a global trend toward free market economies can be seen in the proliferation of regional trade agreements and in a reduction in trade barriers and restrictions achieved through the WTO.

The move towards export-based developmental strategy implies that companies experience less domestic protection and more opportunities in export markets (Nes and Ghauri, 1998). Since the end of Communism in Eastern Europe, attention has been focused on the need for countries in the region to increase their export levels. Indeed, Eastern Europe's future growth prospects will depend largely on the region's ability to attract foreign direct investment (FDI) and an orientation towards export activities. As Western developed countries account for the majority of robust markets in the world, and about two-thirds of global trade, they are regarded as the primary target for Eastern European goods (Papadopoulos *et al.*, 1997). However, while Eastern European producers and sellers may face fewer tangible barriers to Western markets (such as tariffs and quotas) as a result of a reduction in protectionist measures in these nations, they may

experience intangible barriers in the form of consumer bias (Schooler, 1971; Wang and Lamb, 1983).

In the field of marketing research, the study of consumer attitudes toward various countries and their products is called “Product-Country Images” (PCI). Known also as the “made-in” or “country-of-origin” phenomenon, PCI has attracted the attention of academics and marketers alike (Papadopoulos, 1993). In general, it has been shown that consumers often use stereotyped images of countries and their products to help them form opinions and make choices. The implications of this practice are many and varied, for both strategy and research.

Several studies in the PCI area confirm a negative consumer bias towards products from developing nations (Schooler, 1971; Gaedeke, 1973; Wang and Lamb, 1980, 1983; Heslop, Liefeld, and Wall, 1987; Crawford and Lumpkin, 1993). An unfavourable country image can create significant market barriers for firms from less developed countries (Schooler, Wildt, and Jones, 1987, in Baughn and Yaprak, 1993; Samiee, 1994). It may also pose a dilemma for multinational firms seeking labour cost advantages in developing countries, as management must weigh the benefits in cost savings against a possible erosion in brand-name value. Such a negative bias has been shown to exist towards products from Russia and other former Communist countries (Chasin and Jaffe, 1979; Lumpkin *et al.*, 1992; Darling, 1995; Papadopoulos *et al.*, 1997). Although the region is industrialized and boasts a highly educated, literate workforce, the transformation process from command to market economies has proved difficult, and

Eastern European countries have only recently enjoyed positive growth rates. While politics may, therefore, no longer represent a barrier between East and West, a broadening wealth gap may do so.

Since the political, cultural, social, and economic conditions of nations change over time, Product-Country Images are also likely to change (Samiee, 1994). Consumer perceptions toward countries and their products are not static. The shift in Japan's reputation as a supplier of imitative, low-quality products to a supplier of technologically advanced, high-quality products exemplifies the dynamic nature of country images. Monumental changes have occurred in Eastern Europe over the past ten years as countries in the region have undertaken simultaneous transformations in both the political and economic spheres. The economic and political developments in Eastern Europe, coupled with increased consumer knowledge about and familiarity with the region, may lead to more favourable images of Eastern European countries, and different perceptions of the quality and desirability of their products.

The main purpose of this study was to track changes in consumer perceptions toward both the products and countries of Eastern Europe in three time intervals between 1992 and 2000. New data was collected in autumn 2000 and was compared to previous data collected in 1992 and 1995 as part of an ongoing project on Eastern Europe by Papadopoulos and Heslop. The thesis contributes to the PCI literature by helping to fill a gap that currently exists in longitudinal research examining Western perceptions of Eastern Europe. It also uses structural equation modeling to examine more thoroughly

the relationships between consumers' perceptions of a country, perceptions of the country's products, and purchasing intent.

The thesis is divided into nine chapters. The next chapter includes a literature review of areas in the PCI field that are relevant to the study. The process through which people develop and use stereotypes is discussed, as is the importance of longitudinal analyses. The emergence of Eastern Europe as a competitive player in Western markets is also described. The third chapter outlines the research objectives. The fourth describes the research methodology, including a brief overview of the methods of data analysis. The fifth chapter outlines the pre-analytical process. The sixth presents the study's findings. The seventh chapter provides an overview of the research limitations. The eighth chapter presents the study's conclusions. The final chapter examines the study's implications for business practitioners, government, and researchers.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review is organised into eight sections. The first section provides a definition of the term “Product-Country Images” and clarifies the meaning of the “made-in” images of products. The definition encompasses the use of information cues in product evaluations and quality perceptions. The second section describes the relationship between stereotyping and country-of-origin. The third section looks at the halo and summary constructs hypothesized by Han (1988, 1989). PCI research on developing nations is outlined in section four. The fifth section describes the importance of longitudinal studies in examinations of PCI effects. The sixth section makes a distinction between country image and product image. The seventh section provides an overview of the political and economic transitions in Eastern Europe between 1989 and 2000, and outlines previous PCI research on the region. The final section discusses the use of modeling in Product-Country Image research.

2.1 Product-Country Images

The term “Product-Country Images” (PCI) denotes buyers’ perceptions of the relative qualities of products from different countries (Bilkey and Nes, 1982; Han, 1990). The first academic paper to be published on the subject was written by Robert Schooler (1965), who examined product bias in the Central-American Common Market nations. He found that products identical in every respect except for their country of origin were evaluated differently. Since Schooler’s introductory publication, several hundred studies have been conducted on country image, and two books have been published that review

different PCI issues (Kotler, Haider, and Rein, 1993; Papadopoulos and Heslop, 1993). In general, the research has shown that consumers hold images of different countries and their products that can influence the purchasing decision (Schooler, 1971; Cattin, Jolibert, and Lohnes, 1982; Han, 1989; Samiee, 1994).

An overview of some of the terms frequently used in the PCI literature may be helpful to clarify the meaning of the “made-in” images of products. First, the word “product” can mean goods and services *per se*, but can also denote places, such as cities, states, and nations that seek to market themselves to potential investors and/or tourists (Kotler, Haider, and Rein, 1993). Further, the PCI phenomenon is not limited to “made-in” product labels. Origin cues can be transmitted to consumers in such forms as brand and company names, package design, and promotional messages (Papadopoulos, Heslop and Bennett, 1993). The brand names IBM and Toyota, for example, do not contain country names, but they nevertheless imply American and Japanese origins respectively. The term “made-in” itself can refer to both the country a consumer associates with a certain product or brand as being its country of origin, and/or the country the name of which appears on the “made-in” label (Nebenzahl, Jaffe, and Lampert, 1997). Samiee (1994) argues that most of the PCI literature makes no distinction between country-of-origin and country-of-manufacture. He suggests that it is the resulting influence or bias created from either term that is central to the majority of PCI studies. Finally, to further complicate the issue, products are not strictly made in “countries” (Papadopoulos, 1993). They can be associated with cities, states/provinces, countries, regions, continents, or the

world (in the case of multinational products comprising components from various geographic locations).

This discussion of some of the terms commonly used in the PCI literature helps to highlight the breadth of the country-of-origin phenomenon. Because most products cannot be completely evaluated before a purchase, consumers rely on country-of-origin to create, reinforce, and colour initial perceptions of products (Johansson, 1993).

2.1.1 Product-Country Image as an Information Cue

Bilkey and Nes (1982) suggest that the significance of country-of-origin on the demand for products can be approached as an information-cue question. Products are essentially a collection of intrinsic (e.g. materials, design, workmanship) and extrinsic (e.g. price, brand name, country-of-origin) cues. Consumers are typically faced with a variety of attributes when making purchasing decisions and often, a vast array of product choices. When they do not know much about a product, their evaluation may rely on “surrogate indicators” such as price or warranty (Cattin, Jolibert, and Lohnes, 1982). The image of countries can be regarded as a “surrogate indicator” that consumers may use to evaluate unknown brands or products, especially in the absence of intrinsic cues. The PCI literature argues that all attributes of all products from a given country, along with images of the country itself and its people, form a total image that partially influences the likelihood of purchase (Graby, 1993; Heslop, Liefeld, and Papadopoulos, 1993).

In recent years, several studies have been conducted to ascertain the importance of country-of-origin in multi-cue settings (i.e. country image evaluated in the context of several characteristics, such as price and brand). Seaton and Vogel (1985) investigated consumer evaluations of product quality based on country-of-manufacture, brand name, and price. They found that country of manufacture had the most effect on consumer perceptions of quality. Heslop, Liefeld, and Wall (1987) analyzed consumer attitudes towards three different products using the same product attributes (country-of-origin, brand, and price). They found that in two of the three cases, country-of-origin labeling significantly affected judgments of products' quality. Chao (1989) found strong country-of-origin effects in his multi-cue study of the perception of quality and purchase intent of American consumers toward a group of electronic products from a newly industrialized country. Ahmed, d'Astous, and Zouiten (1993) studied similar issues using automobiles in the province of Quebec. They found that both brand name and country-of-origin were significantly related to the evaluation of a product. These findings suggest that country-of-origin can notably affect consumers' perceptions of the relative qualities of products, even in the presence of multiple intrinsic and extrinsic cues.

2.2 Stereotyping

The previous section looked at the use of information cues in product evaluations and quality perceptions. The use of product and country images as "surrogate indicators" of product quality can also be considered stereotyping (Cattin, Jolibert, and Lohnes, 1982). Some theorists argue that the standard processing strategies of the human cognitive system (i.e. categorization, heuristics) can account for stereotyping phenomena

(Bodenhausen and Wyer, 1985). Essentially, stereotypes result from the need for simplicity and understanding in the face of an increasingly complex social environment. Stereotypes develop as people form generalizations abstracted from observations (Papadopoulos, 1993). These observations can be made in a piecemeal fashion (i.e. through direct experiences) or can be in the form of information acquired from the media, family, peers, and educational materials (Stephan and Stephan, 1996). The result is the formation of an image which is evoked in the mind of an individual when exposed to certain stimuli, and which can be used to interpret and classify new information and experiences.

In the study and practice of marketing, images and stereotypes can influence a wide range of strategic decisions, including the direction of promotional efforts, and of international market selection (Papadopoulos, 1993). Furthermore, stereotyped images of countries are commonly accepted as determinants of choice and buying behavior. As a result, many companies employ communication strategies that emphasize an origin connection in order to enhance product appeal. The stereotypical image of France, for example, as a producer of fine fashion may be used as a unique selling proposition by French apparel producers in international markets. People use such stereotypes because they serve as symbols for instant communication (Morello, 1993).

2.2.1 Consumer Ethnocentrism

It has long been recognized that group memberships contribute to our sense of who we are and of our place in the world (Brown, 1988). Indeed, groups can be said to provide

us with a sense of social identity. Most people will belong to a wide variety of groups throughout their lives, and these associations will influence attitudes and behavioral patterns.

A related theme is the importance of social comparison processes. Festinger (1954 in Brown, 1985) proposed that other people serve as vital reference points for the evaluation of our abilities and the validation of our opinions. This theory can be extended to the intergroup level, particularly in relation to the causes of stereotyped national images. The concept of “ethnocentrism” is fundamentally an issue of intergroup dynamics. The underlying principle is that one’s own group, the relevant in-group, is the center of everything, and all other groups, the out-groups, are scaled and rated with reference to it (Sumner, 1906 in Bruning and Hu, 1991).

Shimp and Sharma (1987) use the term “consumer ethnocentrism” to represent “home-country” bias. Ethnocentric consumers are said to view domestic-country products as superior or preferable to those made abroad. The purchase of imported products is seen by these consumers to be wrong because it hurts the domestic economy, causes loss of jobs, and is unpatriotic. Measuring this construct with a 17-item scale (CETSCALE), Shimp and Sharma found general attitudes towards foreign products to be negatively correlated with ethnocentric tendencies. Furthermore, highly ethnocentric consumers were found to be more inclined to accentuate the positive attributes of domestic products while discounting the virtues of foreign items.

Preference for domestic products has been found in several studies (Gaedeke, 1973; Darling and Kraft, 1977; Chasin and Jaffe, 1979; Cattin, Jolibert, and Lohnes, 1982; Wood and Darling, 1992). Nagashima (1970), however, found that Japanese businessmen did not rate domestic products as highly as expected in his comparison of Japanese and U.S. attitudes towards products from selected countries. Only 57% of the Japanese respondents exhibited a preference for domestic goods over foreign products. Similarly, in a large-scale study involving consumers from eight countries, Papadopoulos, Heslop, and Bamossy (1990) found that consumers in Canada, the United States, Great Britain, Greece, and Hungary all provided higher overall ratings for Japanese products than for goods produced in their own country. While the concept of consumer ethnocentrism thus may be useful in determining the effectiveness of “buy-domestic” promotional campaigns, it may not provide a strong basis for market segmentation.

2.3 Halo vs. Summary Construct

Several studies have proposed that the PCI phenomenon may be explained as either a “halo” or a “summary” construct (Han, 1989; Erickson, Johansson, and Chao, 1984; Johansson, Douglas, and Nonaka, 1985; Howard, 1989; Shimp, Samiee, and Madden, 1993). Both hypotheses assume that country image will be specific to product categories, since consumers do not perceive all products from a country as being of equal quality (Gaedeke, 1973; Etzel and Walker, 1974 and Hafhill, 1980 in Han, 1990). The country image for Russian vodka, for example, may be very different from that for Russian automobiles.

Consumers are said to use country image as a halo in product evaluation when they infer the quality of an unknown foreign brand based on their general perceptions of the source country. In this case, the overall country-of-origin image will be based on consumers' beliefs about the country, including such variables as representative products, national characteristics, economic and political background, history, and traditions (Nagashima, 1970). Han (1989) suggests that country image as a halo directly affects consumers' beliefs about product attributes and indirectly affects overall product evaluation through those beliefs. Thus, according to Han, the halo hypothesis suggests the following relationships:

country image → beliefs → brand attitude

In contrast, the summary construct view contends that consumers will use their knowledge about the quality of foreign products from a specific country to construct information about that country and its other products. By generalizing country perceptions to the attributes of foreign products, PCI directly affects consumer attitude toward the brand (Howard, 1989). The summary construct is hypothesized by Han (1989) as:

beliefs → country image → brand attitude

For example, consumers may believe that Japanese products in general are well made because different Japanese product categories (i.e. automobiles, electronics) are well made. As a result, producers from countries with strong reputations in certain product categories may enjoy spillover effects in the form of facilitated entry into international

markets, even for unrelated product classes. Of course, juxtaposed against this positive effect is the possibility that psychological entry barriers may exist for those countries whose images are associated with low-quality products.

Han (1989) tested both constructs on American, Japanese, and Korean brands of automobiles and television sets in a midwestern city in the United States. He found that the summary construct showed “good fit” for American television sets and automobiles, while the halo construct showed good fit for Korean television sets and Korean and American automobiles.

2.4 PCI Research on Developing Nations

In general, consumers view products from less developed countries as being of a lower quality than products from developed countries (Schooler, 1971; Gaedeke, 1973; Wang and Lamb, 1980, 1983; Heslop, Liefeld, and Wall, 1987; Crawford and Lumpkin, 1993). The research suggests that these findings may be attributed to a positive relationship between product evaluations and degree of economic development (Nes and Bilkey, 1993). To some extent, country image can thus be regarded as a function of macro-economic measures, such as GNP per capita and levels of imports and exports. Wang and Lamb (1980, 1983) have also noted a relationship between consumers’ willingness to purchase foreign products and the political environment of the products’ countries-of-origin. Their findings indicate that respondents are more willing to buy products from politically free countries than from ones that award their citizens few civil and political rights.

An unfavourable country image can create significant market barriers for firms from less developed countries (Schooler, Wildt, and Jones, 1987, in Baughn and Yaprak, 1993; Samiee, 1994). As noted earlier, when consumers are unfamiliar with a foreign product, they may use country image to determine product quality. Furthermore, when faced with a large display of product choices, consumers may employ phased strategies in order to reduce the set of alternatives under consideration to a smaller set (Han, 1990). Country image may be used as an important criterion in this situation. When a country image is unfavourable, consumers will eliminate the country's product from the set of alternatives without evaluating it in detail. Producers from developing countries thus face entry barriers in the form of consumer bias that limit their potential success in marketing products internationally.

This negative country-of-origin effect poses a dilemma for multinational firms seeking cost advantages in manufacturing abroad. Management must balance the economic necessity of multinational expansion against a potential loss in brand name value (Johansson and Nebenzahl, 1986). To illustrate, a Volkswagen made in Brazil may not have many overseas markets because consumers perceive it to be inferior to the one made in Germany (Lampert and Jaffe, 1996). Similarly, while a Sony manufactured in Hong Kong is still a Sony, it may have a slightly tarnished image (Tse and Lee, 1989, in Johansson, 1993). In their study of the effects of multinational production on brand value in the automobile industry, Johansson and Nebenzahl (1986) found that consumer perceptions of brand image were significantly altered by shifts in manufacturing location. Respondents indicated that locating production in any of the three low-wage countries

under study (South Korea, Mexico, or the Philippines) detracted considerably from brand appeal. Another study found that substantial price discounts would be necessary for both German and Japanese home electronic products manufactured in South Korea in order to generate significant demand in Israel (Nebenzahl and Jaffe, 1993). Eastern European countries may also experience significant market barriers in the West. An examination of consumer bias towards Eastern European products is examined in detail in Section 2.7.2.

2.5 Longitudinal Studies

A major criticism leveled at cross-cultural studies is that researchers too often collect cross-sectional data, failing to take into consideration the dynamic nature of organizations (Sekaran, 1983). PCI researchers have also voiced this criticism. In their review of the country-of-origin literature, Baughn and Yaprak (1993) suggest that longitudinal research monitoring consumer awareness of country-of-origin for various products will lead to a greater understanding of the processes by which a country's products gain acceptance or meet with resistance over time. Similarly, Shimp, Samiee, and Madden (1993) posit that: "the dynamic nature of the world political economy demands that cross-sectional research studies be replicated so as to compare results in different epochs and to determine the temporal and historical factors that perform moderating roles."

Nagashima (1977) conducted an early longitudinal study examining attitudinal change in Japanese businessmen between 1967 and 1975 towards products made in the USA, Japan, England, Germany, and France. He found that the relative status of American products had declined over the eight-year period while the overall image of Japanese products had

improved significantly. John Darling and his associates have completed a series of studies examining the general attitudes of Finnish consumers towards the products of various countries in five-year intervals between 1975 and 1995 (Darling, 1995). Some findings of interest include a decline in consumer attitudes towards the products from Finland, Sweden, England, and Russia at each data-collecting point from 1975 to 1995, and more positive consumer attitudes with regard to products from the U.S. and Japan between 1975 and 1985. In one of the first longitudinal studies focusing on Eastern Europe, Papadopoulos, *et al.* (1997) measured Australian and Canadian attitudes towards products from various Eastern European countries in three time intervals between 1991 and 1995. While the authors found that the region had some way to go to achieve consumer acceptance in the West, they did notice a marginal improvement in both Canadian and Australian perceptions of Russian and Polish products over the four-year period.

These findings point to the dynamic nature of Product-Country Images. Since political, cultural, social, and economic conditions change over time, the relative influence of country-of-origin is also likely to change (Samiee, 1994).

2.6 National Characteristics of Countries-of-Origin

2.6.1 Attitudes Toward Foreign Countries

A previous section explained how stereotypes are used to process and categorize new information. In modern social psychology, the dominant approach to the study of stereotypes and prejudice, and to intergroup relations, is based on a social cognitive orientation (Locke and Walker, 1999). In this treatment, stereotypes exist cognitively as schemas, in memory, and facilitate cognitive processing by guiding coding, placement, retrieval, and response generation. Locke and Walker (1999) make a distinction between individual and social stereotypes, defining the latter as “widely accepted public expressions of the character of a group and its members”. The images that individuals have of different countries would fall into this category. A fundamental issue then, is how feelings of affinity, or a lack of affinity, for foreign countries develop.

Nincic and Russett (1979) have suggested that perceptions of cultural similarity, and of common economic and security interests, are factors in shaping attitudes toward foreign countries. The researchers argue that individuals strive for congruity between their level of approval for a foreign nation and the extent to which the foreign nation is perceived as similar to their own country. Huston and Levinger (1978) have shown that perceptions of shared personal interests and personal similarity are major determinants of acceptance. This concept can be extended to the country level and can be used to explain why individuals like some countries and not others (Tims and Miller, 1986). Essentially, disliking a foreign nation that is in many ways similar to one’s own, would generally

imply the devaluation of various attributes of one's own nation (Nincic and Russett, 1979).

Tims and Miller (1986) propose that perceived trust is another key determinant of feelings of affinity toward foreign countries. The researchers also suggest that the mass media plays a role in the formation of public opinion about foreign countries by awarding greater and more favourable treatment in entertainment and news media to those countries with which the origin country shares commonalities of the economy, security, and culture.

These findings point to the role of perceived similarity in the formation of positive attitudes toward other countries and support Kelly's (1955; in Jones and Ashmore, 1973) belief that perceptions of people and events are shaped by one's own cognitive structure, as well as the actual characteristics of the people and events. The following section examines country image in the PCI field and describes the construct's importance to understanding how country-of-origin effects operate.

2.6.2 Country vs. Product Evaluations

As demonstrated by the halo and summary hypotheses (Han, 1989), country image and product image can be regarded as two dimensions of the country-of-origin effect. That is, buyers can use country image in product evaluations when they are unable to detect the true quality of an unknown foreign product. Consequently, as buyers become more familiar with a country's products, country image may help to summarize product

attributes for brands originating in that country. The association between the two image constructs, however, may be more complex than either of the relationships described by the halo and summary constructs. Recent studies have recognised the distinction between product image and country image and have sought to understand better how the two constructs relate to each other (Martin and Eroglu, 1993; Li, Fu, and Murray, 1997; Cheung and Denton, 1995; and Heslop and Papadopoulos, 1993).

Wang and Lamb (1983) conducted a study to determine whether American consumers' readiness to accept foreign products was influenced by environmental conditions (i.e. culture, political climate, and/or level of economic development) in the product's country of origin. They found that respondents were most willing to buy products from highly economically developed and politically free countries, with a European or Austral-Asian culture. In a later study, Martin and Eroglu (1993) developed a scale to measure the construct of country image. The 14-item scale measured three dimensions of country image – political, economic, and technological – and was found to exhibit both content and discriminant validity.

In their eight-country PCI study (1990), Papadopoulos, Heslop and Bamossy sought to investigate more thoroughly the links between views of countries and their people and views of products. They suggested that perceptions of the source country include feelings toward the country's people, beliefs about the country's level of industrial development, and a conative dimension relating to the consumer's desired level of interaction with the source country. The study found that consumers perceive good

products to come from well-managed, technologically advanced nations with hard-working people. In other words, people evaluate the quality of foreign brands on the basis of personal feelings and beliefs.

Cheung and Denton (1995) examined attitudes of Hong Kong respondents toward Japan and the United States (as nations), as well as products from both countries. They found that respondents held favourable impressions of both countries, although Japan and the United States were rated differently in two areas: political ideology and interpersonal behaviour. In both instances, the United States was rated more favorably than was Japan. The products of both countries were rated favorably, with Japan faring slightly better in the areas of service and promotion. Finally, Li, Fu, and Murray (1997) conducted a study to assess Chinese consumers' perceptions of various countries and their products. The researchers found that Chinese respondents rated their own country behind both Japan and the USA with regard to levels of economic, political, and technological development. Furthermore, Chinese respondents held favourable perceptions of Japanese and American products, but unfavourable perceptions of Chinese products.

2.7 PCI and Eastern Europe

2.7.1 Regional Overview

In 1989, the Berlin Wall crumbled and communist authority in the USSR began its disintegration. One after another, the former Soviet satellites moved towards free-market democracy (Healey, 1994). Transformation in post-communist Eastern Europe

meant simultaneous transitions in both the economic and political spheres. Political transition (the change of the regime), however, was completed faster than was economic transition. According to Balcerowicz (1995; in Melich, 2000) this asymmetry represented a new sequence of change: mass democracy (or at the very least, some degree of political pluralism) first, and market capitalism later. Before examining Eastern Europe's current growth prospects, a brief review of the region's transition from centrally planned economies towards free market orientation will be discussed.

Prior to 1989, the Soviet Growth Model (SGM) was applied in various forms in all the Eastern European socialist economies (Guriev and Ickes, 2000). The model is a mechanism for extensive growth; growth, that is, through the accumulation of inputs rather than through more efficient use of inputs. According to Guriev and Ickes (2000), the key defect of the SGM was that resources were used beyond the point at which they make positive net contributions to the economy. The results were a decline in worker productivity, less innovation, and ecologic disaster.

Trade in Eastern Europe under the socialist regime was restricted to other (communist) members of the COMECON bloc. Joint-venture opportunities for Western firms were minimal and the repatriation of profits was very difficult. Countertrade was a means to repatriate profits, but most of the products were not of high quality (Korabi and Grieve, 1990). As a result, Eastern Europe's transition from command to market economies that began in 1989 offered enormous opportunities for Western businesses: a large and

relatively untapped market, low-cost sites for offshore investment, access to natural resources, and geographic proximity to Western Europe.

The first ten years of Eastern Europe's transition, however, was a period of sharp economic decline, inflation, high debt, and low productivity. The region's lackluster performance over the past decade can be attributed to several factors. First, while Eastern Europe did boast a highly educated, literate workforce, it lacked trained economists and administrative know-how and skills (United Nations Economic Survey of Europe, 1999). In addition, many countries in the region inherited a legacy of government corruption that touched directly upon other sectors of the economy (Melich, 2000). Executive offices and their attendant resources have, to some extent, continued to be controlled primarily by officials from the old communist *nomenklatura*. Another important factor contributing to Eastern Europe's slow turnaround is that the infrastructure needed to support a free market economy was absent in most of the region's countries. At the institutional level, it was necessary to develop a complex framework of accounting, taxation, legal, social and government infrastructure (Iyer and Masters, 1999). There was also a need to introduce well-developed financial institutions such as insurance companies, banks, and credit and securities markets.

While the first ten years of Eastern Europe's transition were marked by economic and political instability, recent growth forecasts suggest that the region will do far better over the next ten years, with average expansion approaching 4% (Country Monitor, November 1999). The region's economies can now benefit from the lessons of the early transition

years and know better how to achieve sustainable growth. Eastern European governments are under external pressure to maintain macro-stability and carry on with reforms (the result of either the drive towards European Union accession or conditions attached to multilateral loans). The necessary legislative harmonization and policy synchronization with the EU is compelling Eastern European governments to upgrade the policy process and the functioning of the public administration in their respective countries (United Nations Economic Survey of Europe, 1999). EU accession will also continue to stimulate trade and investment with Western Europe.

It is misleading, however, to describe Eastern Europe as a homogenous group of countries. The region comprises 27 countries, including Eastern European countries such as Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic; Baltic States, such as Estonia and Latvia; and Central-Asian countries such as Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic. The Russian Federation spans the Eurasian continent. While this diverse group may share historical-ideological political economies and a common goal of a free market democracy, they are at different levels of economic development and institutional reform. Indeed, intra-regional divergence has characterized the past decade, with Poland's GDP now above its 1989 level by 20%, while Ukraine's is around one-third of that recorded ten years ago (Country Monitor, November 1999). Thus, while some of the region's economies will continue to produce above-average results, others need to bring about further institutional change and must strive to maintain fiscal discipline. It is predicted, for example, that ten years of growth at a rate of 3% per annum would still leave Ukraine's output at only half 1989's level (Country Monitor, January 2000). In addition, ethnic disputes in the

Commonwealth of Independent States and in southeastern Europe have amplified regional disparities in levels of economic and political development (Business Eastern Europe, April 2000). Table 2.7.1 summarizes annual percent changes in real GDP for selected Eastern European countries.

Table 2.7.1 – Annual Percent Changes in Real GDP: Selected
Eastern- European Countries

	Average 1982-91	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Central and Eastern Europe	...	-8.8	-3.8	-2.9	1.7	1.6	2.3	1.8	1.4
Bulgaria	0.3	-7.3	-1.5	1.7	2.2	-10.9	-7.0	3.5	2.5
Croatia	...	...	-8.0	5.9	6.8	6.0	6.5	2.3	-2.0
Czech Republic	...	...	0.6	2.7	6.4	3.8	0.3	-2.3	-0.5
Hungary	-0.4	-3.1	-0.6	2.9	1.5	1.3	4.6	4.9	4.1
Poland	0.2	2.6	3.8	5.2	7.0	6.0	6.8	4.8	4.1
Rumania	-1.0	-8.7	1.5	3.9	7.1	3.9	-6.1	-5.4	-3.9
Ukraine	...	-17.0	-14.2	-22.9	-12.2	-10.0	-3.0	-1.7	-0.4
Russia	...	-19.4	-10.4	-11.6	-4.2	-3.4	0.9	-4.5	3.2

Source: IMF World Economic Outlook, May 2000

Eastern Europe's future growth prospects will depend largely on the region's ability to attract foreign direct investment (FDI). During the transition phase, foreign capital can substitute for domestic savings at a macro-level by generating revenues from privatisation that can be used to finance budget and current account deficits (Gundlach and Nunnenkamp, 1998). At least equally important is FDI's micro-economic function as an instrument to facilitate the transfer of managerial, marketing, and technological

skills. Exposure to new technology and production processes will enable Eastern European firms to develop new and better products that are able to compete in global markets. Other contributions of inward FDI to host countries include the injection of new entrepreneurship, more dynamic competitive practices, more efficient allocation of resources, and assistance in international economic integration (United Nations, World Investment Report, 1999).

Essentially, FDI can be regarded as a way of developing export competitiveness. East-European countries must make every effort to enter export markets because of the potential benefits of doing so. Exports are a means to generate the foreign exchange required to finance the imports of goods and services; to obtain economies of specialisation, scale, and scope in production; and to learn from the experience in export markets (United Nations World Investment Report, 1999). Recognising the importance of an export-led growth strategy, Eastern European countries have made concentrated efforts to increase their export levels. Table 2.7.2 summarizes the export activities of selected Eastern European countries between 1991 and 1997.

Table 2.7.2 – Exports in Millions of US Dollars, 1991-1997

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997
Czech Republic	...	...	14,462	16,203	21,654	21,906	22,792
Poland	14,903	13,324	14,143	17,042	22,895	24,440	25,751
Hungary	10,227	10,680	8,918	10,733	12,540	12,686	19,100
Russia	...	42,039	44,297	67,542	81,096	89,110	87,368

Source: IMF Direction of Trade Statistics Yearbook, 1998

The year 1989 was one of tumultuous social change – a year that marked the greatest outbreak of democracy the world has ever seen (Rutland, 1999). The end of the Cold War not only created fundamental changes in the daily lives of millions of Eastern Europeans; it also brought an end to the old international balance of power, resulting in several outbreaks of armed conflict in Africa and southeastern Europe. The fall of the Berlin Wall marked a new era for Eastern Europe, and the Western media has covered the region's transformation extensively. As a result, consumers are informed about regional developments that have shaped the past decade, including various negative events such as the break-up of the USSR and Czechoslovakia, ethnic disputes in Bosnia, the war in Chechnya, the collapse of the Russian market in the wake of 1998, the Kosovo crisis, and regional economic decline. Present trends appear to favor economic and political stability in Eastern Europe; however, it may take some time for consumer perceptions to change.

2.7.2 PCI Research on Eastern Europe

Few PCI studies had examined Western attitudes toward Eastern Europe prior to 1989. Research that was collected in this field thus provides valuable insight on consumer perceptions toward Eastern Europe during the Cold War, and serves as a reference point for an analysis of changes in consumer attitudes over time toward both the region and its products.

One of the first PCI studies on Eastern Europe was conducted by Chasin and Jaffe (1979), who examined perceptions held by American industrial buyers of products made

in various Eastern European countries. The study found that respondents held unfavourable images of Eastern European products, rating them significantly lower than products from the United States on all attributes. The sample comprised industrial buyers both with and without prior experience in business dealings with the selected countries. As only 30% of the buyers were found to have had previous business dealings with the target countries, the researchers attributed the findings (i.e. unfavourable perceptions of Eastern European products) to a negative halo effect. With little experience with the region's products, respondents necessarily transferred stereotyped images about Communism to descriptions of Eastern European product attributes.

Since the collapse of Communism in Eastern Europe, much attention has been paid to the region's need to increase exports as a means of driving economic growth. The emergence of Eastern Europe as a potential competitor in Western markets has fuelled new interest in consumer attitudes towards the region's products. Several studies have been conducted during the past ten years to assess whether Western consumers are prepared to purchase Eastern European goods – an issue critical to the success of the region's exports (Darling, 1988; Papadopoulos *et al.*, 1997; Darling, 1990; Johansson, Ronkainen, and Czinkota, 1994; Papadopoulos, Heslop, Bennett, 1993; Nes and Ghauri, 1998; Darling, 1995; Szamosi *et al.*, 1995).

Lumpkin *et al.* (1992) measured American consumers' willingness to purchase apparel from Eastern Europe and compared the results to an earlier study conducted in 1982. The researchers sought to examine changes in American consumers' country-of-origin

perceptions before and after the economic and political reforms in Eastern Europe. Data was collected in 1990, during Russian leader Mikhail Gorbachev's *glasnost* and *perestroika* campaigns, but before the disintegration of Soviet Communism. The results indicated that respondents in the second study were more willing to buy apparel from Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and the former USSR; these consumers, however, still demonstrated some reluctance to buy Eastern European goods.

In their analysis of farmers' evaluations of tractors from several countries, Johansson, Ronkainen, and Czinkota (1994) did not find a strongly negative country-of-origin effect for Belarus, a Russian tractor that was introduced in the East-Coast market of the United States in 1987. The researchers investigated the extent to which the risk attitudes, political convictions, and country-of-origin associations of individuals affect buying decisions. Data was collected in April and May of 1990. Although the results indicated a negative product rating for Belarus, the researchers reported that the farmers who were aware of Belarus' country-of-origin tended to rate the Belarus slightly higher than other respondents, suggesting that they rated Russia as a relatively good tractor manufacturer. The findings were attributed to a familiarity effect; that is, the reluctance among farmers to consider unfamiliar brands. Overall, the farmers perceived Belarus as good value for the money, and showed an interest in considering the brand for purchase.

Szamosi *et al.* (1995) examined Australian and Canadian consumer evaluations of the products and countries of Eastern Europe. The study was part of a longitudinal research program developed by Papadopoulos and Heslop to monitor the perceived

competitiveness of Eastern European products in Western markets. This thesis represents the most recent study in the researchers' ongoing project. Szamosi *et al.* collected data in Australia and Canada in 1992. The Eastern European countries under study included Czechoslovakia (the Czech Republic), Hungary, Yugoslavia, Poland, and USSR/Russia, with France used as a Western benchmark. The researchers found that France was rated much higher than the Eastern European countries on both the country and product scales. Despite indicating that they knew more about Russia than any other Eastern European country, respondents in both Australia and Canada rated the country and its products in last position. Australian and Canadian consumers were found to hold similar images of the products from the subject countries. Canadian respondents, however, rated all the countries-of-origin more positively than did Australians, and were significantly more positive toward "Immigration From" and "Alignment" and "Investment" with, Eastern Europe.

Papadopoulos *et al.* (1997) reported on the next study in Papadopoulos and Heslop's longitudinal series on Eastern Europe. The researchers examined the perceptions of Canadian and Australian consumers toward selected Eastern European countries and compared the results to those of previous studies conducted in 1990 and 1992. The researchers found only marginal improvements in Eastern European product images over time, suggesting the region still had some way to go to achieve consumer acceptance in the West. The study also aimed to determine whether category-specific or global evaluations are more appropriate measures of product images. The researchers found that product-specific views were influenced by the respondents' global images of the origin

countries. Australian ratings of the product category “microwave/computer,” for example, improved over the different time intervals for Hungary, Poland, and Russia, in line with the overall images of these three countries over the same period.

As noted, Darling and his associates have tracked Finnish consumers’ attitudes toward the products of selected countries, including Russia, in five time intervals between 1975 and 1995 (Darling, 1995). The results indicate a steady decline in the ratings for products from Russia over the twenty-year period, while perceptions of the products from Germany, Japan, and the United States improved. In addition, Finnish consumers have rated Russian products unfavourably in such areas as workmanship, technological advancement, and quality in all time intervals.

Nebenzahl and Jaffe (1996) examined American perceptions of brand image for products sourced multinationally. The study included two global brands – Sony and General Electric (GE), and five countries – Japan, USA, Russia, Hungary, and Poland. Responding to a six-point semantic differential scale consisting of 13 descriptors, respondents indicated that both Sony and GE products made in Eastern Europe would have a less favourable image than the same products manufactured in Japan or the USA.

Finally, through a comparative study of Dutch, German, and Norwegian attitudes toward industrial suppliers from Estonia and Western Europe, Nes and Ghauri (1998) measured Estonia’s image as an industrial nation. The researchers examined three dimensions of country profile: 1) perceived product quality, 2) company profile (i.e. the “economic,

technical, and personal relationship factors of Estonian industrial suppliers”), and 3) the national business environment (including people, ecology, and country-based perceptions). Data was collected in the Netherlands, Germany, and Norway in the spring and summer of 1994. The results indicated that respondents perceived Estonia’s image as an industrial nation to be lower than the combined image of Germany, Netherlands, and Norway (i.e. the “West”) for all attributes except price level. Factor analysis was performed for all three dimensions. While differences in evaluations between Estonia and the West were found to be very high in factors that included quality or efficiency, differences in evaluations were much smaller for the people factor and somewhat smaller for the relationship factor. The findings suggest that the West demonstrates a negative bias towards Estonian products, but, at the same time, is prepared to accept the country’s people on a level similar to the West.

This overview of some of the PCI studies on Eastern Europe suggests that Western consumers still hold unfavourable images of the region. These perceptions, however, may change as Eastern political ideologies and levels of industrial development become more like those of the West.

2.8 Structural Equation Methods

The process through which consumers employ country-of-origin information to evaluate products is complex and involves the interaction of several variables, some unobserved. Structural equation modeling (SEM) is a statistical technique that was developed to deal with situations of this kind by enabling patterns of relationships among variables to be

articulated and tested through hypothesized structures (models). A structural equation model implies a structure of the covariance matrix of the measures. Once the model's parameters have been estimated, it can be tested statistically in a simultaneous analysis of the entire system of variables to determine the extent to which it is consistent with the data (Byrne, 1994). One of the most important advantages of using SEM techniques is the ability to take measurement error into account (Mackenzie, 2001). Although the first computer program to implement SEM methods (LISREL) was developed more than 20 years ago, SEM has not been widely used in consumer research studies. This thesis, therefore, seeks to contribute to the marketing literature by testing a model developed by Papadopoulos and Heslop (1997) using SEM techniques. The remainder of this section describes both the initial PCI model proposed by the researchers and the modified version that was used in this study.

In 1988, Papadopoulos, Heslop, and Marshall developed a model of country-of-origin effects on buyer behaviour (see Figure 2.8.1). The researchers used the LISREL program to estimate the parameters of the hypothesized model. Their first two hypotheses were that “familiarity with a country’s products”, and favourable “beliefs about the country and its people”, will cause consumers to formulate positive “product quality beliefs” regarding the country’s products. The third and fourth hypotheses were that positive “product quality beliefs” lead consumers to make positive “product evaluations” about a country’s products, and that this leads them to a particular course of buying behavior.

Figure 2.8.1: LISREL Model of Country-of-Origin Effects

As shown in Figure 2.8.1, the constructs were tested using several indicator variables. The model was originally tested on data obtained from consumers in four countries (France, Germany, Great Britain, and Canada), regarding their perceptions of two countries and their products (Japan and the USA). This resulted in eight tests of the overall model and the proposed hypotheses. Although the model was validated in all eight tests (i.e. all structural paths were consistently supported), it showed only moderate overall fit.

Recognizing the value of the Papadopoulos *et al.* (1988) model as a base for further research, the IKON Research Group¹ developed a new PCI model in 1997 using the core components of the first model (PRODUCT BELIEFS, PRODUCT EVALUATION, FAMILIARITY, and WILLINGNESS TO BUY) as a foundation. The updated model included an expanded variable set and new constructs (see Figure 2.8.2).

Figure 2.8.2: Comprehensive Product-Country Image Model

¹ The IKON Research Group is led by Professors Papadopoulos and Heslop at Carleton University and includes research associates from several countries worldwide.

The construct FAMILIARITY, for example, affected only PRODUCT BELIEFS in the Papadopoulos *et al.* (1988) model, whereas the model developed by the IKON Research Group proposed that FAMILIARITY affected all three product constructs (BELIEFS, EVALUATION, and WILLINGNESS TO BUY). In addition, the updated model broke down COUNTRY AND PEOPLE BELIEFS into four separate constructs (COUNTRY DESCRIPTION, PEOPLE DESCRIPTION, COUNTRY COMPETENCE, and PEOPLE COMPETENCE) as these were seen to more fully represent the PCI effect. A RELATIONSHIP construct, representing the desired level of interaction with the target country, was also added. This construct was linked to COUNTRY EVALUATION, PRODUCT EVALUATION, and WILLINGNESS TO BUY.

Dowdles (1997) tested the model, using the Partial Least Squares (PLS) technique, on data obtained from Canadian respondents regarding their views of NAFTA and potential NAFTA countries (Canada, the United States, Mexico, Argentina, and Chile). Overall, the results indicated substantial support for the PCI model – only five observed variables were eliminated due to poor measurement fit and most of the model parameters were found to be significant.

3.0 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

In 1990, Papadopoulos and Heslop conducted a study that was intended to serve as a benchmark for a longitudinal research program. The researchers had two primary objectives: 1) to monitor the perceived competitiveness of Eastern European products in Western markets, and 2) to examine PCI issues in the context of products for which consumers have little or no information. The study was repeated in 1992 and 1995. Data was collected from Canadian samples (amongst others) in all three studies. This thesis sought to contribute to Papadopoulos and Heslop's longitudinal program by collecting new data (2000) that could be compared to that from previous studies.

The 1990 sample, however, was excluded from the longitudinal analysis in this study for two main reasons. First, to avoid the split-sample approach that was employed in the 1990 study, thereby allowing for the use of multivariate forms of data analysis (the split-sample is discussed more thoroughly in the following section). Second, to concentrate on the time intervals in which greater changes had occurred in consumer perceptions toward Eastern European countries and their products (few differences were noted between the 1990 and 1992 studies). The following section provides an overview of the previous research.

3.1 Background

Data for the previous studies was collected under the direction of Papadopoulos and Heslop by Bennett (Canada, 1990), and Papadopoulos and Heslop (Canada, 1992 and

1995). The questionnaires administered in all three studies included sections to measure a) attitudes toward countries, b) attitudes toward products from those countries, c) specific product evaluations, and d) basic demographic information. At the time of the first survey (1990), the USSR had not yet dissolved, and Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia still existed. The Eastern European countries that were chosen as part of the original study comprised the five major economies in the region at the time (Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia, and the USSR). France was included as a Western nation for purposes of comparison.

To avoid administering a lengthy questionnaire comprising six target countries, two parallel versions of the 1990 survey were used, each seeking assessments of five countries (four Eastern European countries and France – the Western benchmark). The USSR and France were included in both versions, with one version of the questionnaire also including Poland and Yugoslavia, and the other version, Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

By the time of the second study (1992), however, the USSR had been dissolved and the situation in Yugoslavia had become increasingly volatile. It was thus decided to replace the USSR with Russia, and to drop Yugoslavia from the study. Since these changes reduced the number of countries evaluated to five, the split-sample approach was no longer required – a single version of the 1992 questionnaire could be used. In 1993, Czechoslovakia split into two separate nations. The only change made to the 1995 survey, consequently, was the substitution of the Czech Republic for Czechoslovakia.

The following product categories were chosen in the 1990 and 1992 studies: *shoes*, *luggage*, *clock radios*, and *microwave ovens*. Consumers were asked to rate these product categories using a 7-point poor vs. good quality scale. The products were selected to represent a range of technological complexity, and were deemed appropriate to the production capabilities of the countries-of-origin. In addition, the products did not appear to be biased in favor of, or against, any one country (e.g. *cosmetics* is generally recognised as a French specialty). For the 1995 survey, however, *microwave ovens* was replaced by *personal computers* (which represent a more technologically demanding product and one that was more consistent with Western technology adoption); *luggage* was replaced by *furniture* (an analysis of early responses indicated that *luggage* may have been perceived as a fashion item, thereby creating a positive bias towards France).

3.2 Objectives

3.2.1 Longitudinal Analysis

Few PCI studies have examined longitudinal changes in Western consumers' perceptions of Eastern European countries and products. One of the main objectives of this research was to track changes in Canadian views toward selected countries from the region at three points in time between 1992 and 2000, and to assess how Canadian images of Eastern European products may have changed during these intervals. The following null hypotheses were proposed:

H₁: Canadian perceptions of various selected Eastern European countries are the same in all time periods studied.

H₂: Canadian perceptions of the products made in various selected Eastern European countries are the same in all time periods studied.

Another objective of this study was to evaluate the relative positions of the Eastern European countries under study and to determine whether any changes in the perceived competitiveness of these countries on the part of Canadian consumers had occurred between 1992 and 2000. According to the Economist Intelligence Unit's business environment rankings model (which uses quantitative data, business surveys, and expert assessment to measure the attractiveness of the business environments in 60 countries), Poland will be the most attractive country in Eastern Europe over the next five years, ahead of both Hungary and the Czech Republic (*Country Monitor*, January 2000). Between 1995 and 1999, Poland was ranked behind Hungary and the Czech Republic. The following null hypothesis was proposed to test for differences in country rankings:

H₃: Canadian consumers' comparative rankings of various selected Eastern European countries and their products are the same in all time periods studied.

A fourth hypothesis was proposed to examine the issue of whether any changes occurred in consumer evaluations of generalized vs. product-specific evaluations. The data collected in 1995 found product-specific and global product images to be congruent, suggesting that a relationship may exist between the two images. The following null hypothesis was proposed:

H₄: Product-specific and general images are not related.

The prior two studies (1992 and 1995) used exploratory factor analysis to determine how and to what extent the scale items were associated, indicating unifying constructs. This thesis also sought to identify any underlying constructs by seeking the minimal number of factors that accounted for covariation among the variables. The results could then be analysed to determine whether the current study showed the same patterns of relationships among responses to the sets of country and product scales as those shown in the past. The following null hypothesis was proposed:

H₅: There will be no differences between the factor structures found in this study and those found in 1992 and 1995.

3.2.2 PCI Model

The second main objective of this research involved the validation of a PCI model for Canadian consumers regarding various Eastern European countries. The model was developed by the IKON Research Group (1997 – see Section 2.7.2) to test Canadian perceptions of various NAFTA and potential NAFTA countries. Dowdles (1997) performed the NAFTA tests and did find substantial support for both the measurement model and the structural model, although some of the structural paths showed only moderate results. For this study, the structural paths were not revised. The NAFTA study, however, used a slightly different research instrument than the one used for this thesis, thus some modifications were made in terms of the variable set employed (the measurement model). Figure 3.2.2.1 shows the revised PCI model.

The variables “Democratic” and “Western Culture,” for example, were added to the model in the COUNTRY DESCRIPTION construct as they were seen to represent important attitudinal ratings given Eastern Europe’s transition from centrally planned economies towards free market orientation. Two other descriptive variables (“Ideal” and “Safe”) were also added to this construct. Although the variables “Know Country”, and “Expensive” had been found to be problematic in the NAFTA study when tested for overall fit within the COUNTRY DESCRIPTION and PRODUCT BELIEFS constructs, respectively (Dowdles, 1997), they were left in the model to determine whether a better fit could be obtained using the current Eastern European data.

Figure 3.2.2.1: Modified PCI Model

The only structural path added to the revised PCI model was that between COUNTRY EVALUATION and PRODUCT BELIEFS. As mentioned earlier, consumers may use country image as a halo in product evaluation when they infer the quality of an unknown foreign brand based on their general perceptions of the source country. One of the implications of the halo hypothesis is that consumers may rate specific attributes of a country's products in accordance with their overall country image (Han, 1990). Since Canadians are generally unfamiliar with Eastern European products, they may base their product beliefs on evaluative country ratings.

The four constructs of the model that relate to a country and its people are COUNTRY COMPETENCE, PEOPLE COMPETENCE, COUNTRY DESCRIPTION, and PEOPLE DESCRIPTION. The COUNTRY COMPETENCE construct was associated with beliefs about how "Economically Rich" and "Industrialized" the country is, while the PEOPLE COMPETENCE construct was believed to be reflected by such items as "Hardworking," "Active," and "Educated." Seven variables were associated with the COUNTRY DESCRIPTION construct: "Political Stability," "People Have Many Rights," "Democratic," "Western Culture," "Ideal," "Safe," and "Know About the Country." Two variables were associated with the PEOPLE DESCRIPTION construct: "Trustworthy" and "Individualistic." The COUNTRY and PEOPLE DESCRIPTION constructs – together with the two competence constructs – are hypothesized to lead to an overall evaluation of the country. This COUNTRY EVALUATION component was represented by the variables "Aligned with Canada," "Peaceful," and "I Like the Country."

The **RELATIONSHIP** construct is linked to **COUNTRY EVALUATION**. It describes consumers' desired level of interaction with a country and its people, and was represented by three variables – “Immigration,” “Ties,” and “Investment.” The **PRODUCT BELIEFS** construct is another cognitive component – it describes perceptions toward a country's product attributes. Product beliefs relate to views about a country's ability to produce a certain quality of goods. It is linked to the **PRODUCT EVALUATION** construct, which reflects consumers' overall satisfaction with products from the target country.

The **FAMILIARITY** construct represents consumers' level of experience with a country's products. Three measured scales were believed to be reflective of this construct (“Recognizable Brands”, “Easy to Find”, and “Know About”). **FAMILIARITY** is directly linked to all three product constructs: **PRODUCT BELIEFS**, **PRODUCT EVALUATION**, and **WILLINGNESS TO BUY**. The latter has only one measurement scale associated with it – “Willing to Buy.”

The model was tested using the 2000 data on Canadian perceptions toward the five target countries (France, Russia, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland). Based on the structural model paths, the following hypotheses were proposed:

- H₆: Canadian consumers' beliefs about a country's descriptive characteristics are positively related to their evaluation of that country.
- H₇: Canadian consumers' beliefs about a country's people are positively related to their evaluation of that country.

- H₈: Canadian consumers' beliefs about the abilities of a country's people are positively related to their evaluation of that country.**
- H₉: Canadian consumers' beliefs about the abilities of a country's people are positively related to their beliefs about its products.**
- H₁₀: Canadian consumers' beliefs about a country's competence are positively related to their beliefs about its products.**
- H₁₁: Canadian consumers' beliefs about a country's competence are positively related to their evaluation of that country.**
- H₁₂: Canadian consumers' evaluation of a country is positively related to their evaluation of products from that country.**
- H₁₃: Canadian consumers' evaluation of a country is positively related to their desired level of interaction with that country.**
- H₁₄: Canadian consumers' evaluation of a country is positively related to their beliefs about that country's product attributes.**
- H₁₅: Canadian consumers' beliefs about the products from a country are positively related to their evaluation of products from that country.**
- H₁₆: Canadian consumers' desired level of interaction with a country is positively related to their evaluation of products from that country.**
- H₁₇: Canadian consumers' desired level of interaction with a country is positively related to their willingness to buy products from that country.**
- H₁₈: Canadian consumers' familiarity with a country's products is positively related to their beliefs about products from that country.**
- H₁₉: Canadian consumers' familiarity with a country's products is positively related to their evaluation of products from that country.**
- H₂₀: Canadian consumers' familiarity with a country's products is positively related to their willingness to buy products from that country.**
- H₂₁: Canadian consumers' evaluation of a country's products is positively related to their willingness to buy products from that country.**

4.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Data measuring Canadian attitudes towards Eastern European countries and products was collected between October 28 and December 11, 2000. The research was completed using a self-administered questionnaire, distributed by the drop-off/pick-up technique to adult consumers in a sample of households in the Ottawa-Hull region. The survey mainly comprised two separate scales of 7-point bi-polar adjective items aimed at determining respondents' views toward selected countries and their products. The research design was *ex post facto*, facilitating comparison to data collected in 1992 and 1995.

4.1 The Sample

The population comprised individuals living in households in Ottawa. The sample was selected using a multi-stage, systematic, random sampling procedure based on area maps and the 1996 census tracts (Statistics Canada, 1996). From the 20 census tracts randomly selected by the researcher, 20 intersections (i.e. starting points) were randomly chosen. The fieldworkers proceeded from the prescribed starting point following a prearranged walk pattern (e.g. if a member of the household agreed to complete a questionnaire, the fieldworker was instructed to skip at least three households before approaching another). Apartment buildings were not approached as they are inaccessible to nonresidents. The sample element was adult consumers above the age of 18, selected to ensure balance in gender and age groupings.

4.2 Sample Size

In line with the previous studies, a sample size of approximately 300 respondents was determined *a priori*. According to Stevens (1996), power (the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis when it is false) is heavily dependent on both sample size and the number of dependent variables (i.e. as the number of dependent variables increases, the power of the multivariate tests generally declines). A large sample thus helps to reduce the possibility of poor power (or equivalently, a type II error).

In total, fieldworkers approached 571 households in which potential respondents were at home. Of the 571 households, 418 agreed to participate. Of the 418 participants, 329 questionnaires were later picked up and 27 questionnaires were received in the mail. This represents an overall response rate of 62% before data editing. A maximum of 20 questionnaires was collected in each census tract.

4.3 Data Collection

The drop-off/pick up technique was used to distribute the questionnaires. This method has been shown to yield high response rates and to have the added benefit of quick data collection. Beside the researcher, six other individuals assisted in the data collection. The fieldworkers approached households using a prearranged walking procedure (Section 4.1). If someone responded, the interviewer described the nature of the study, and attempted to obtain the cooperation of the potential respondent in completing the survey. When an individual agreed to participate, the interviewer returned to the household later

that same day to collect the completed questionnaire. Stamped envelopes were provided to respondents who were unable to complete the survey during the allocated time.

4.4 Study Countries

In line with the previous studies, the Eastern European countries included in the survey were the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Russia. France was used as a Western nation for purposes of comparison.

4.5 Research Instrument

All four Eastern European studies used a questionnaire developed by Papadopoulos and Heslop, with minor adjustments made by the researchers reflecting changes in Eastern Europe's political and economic environment (see Appendix A). To evaluate attitudes towards the various countries-of-origin and their people, 20 bipolar adjective scales were used (e.g. "aggressive" vs. "peaceful").

To evaluate products from each country, respondents were presented with another set of 20 bipolar adjective scales (e.g. "expensive" vs. "inexpensive"). The first 16 items measured global product evaluations and have been shown to provide a complete profile of key product attributes. The remaining four items were aimed at obtaining product-specific evaluations through a "poor vs. good quality" rating for each of four product categories (shoes, clock radios, computers, and furniture).

Another section of the questionnaire asked respondents to give a “poor vs. good quality” rating for exports from seven other Eastern European countries (Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, Ukraine, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Croatia). This section was intended to provide general product ratings for several other Eastern European countries without making the survey unnecessarily cumbersome to complete. Respondents were also asked to provide basic demographic information and to identify the various information sources from which they learned about the countries in the questionnaire.

4.6 Data Analysis Procedures

The previous studies utilized univariate statistics for their longitudinal analyses. This was necessary to accommodate the 1990 survey, which had a smaller sample resulting from the split-half sampling technique. A series of ANOVA and *t*-tests were used to determine whether Canadian images of the Eastern European countries and their products had changed over the different time periods under study.

The current study’s longitudinal analysis, however, used multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to assess attitudinal changes in country and product ratings. Stevens (1996) suggests that multiple criterion measures obtain a more complete and detailed description of the phenomenon under investigation. The author outlines several reasons for preferring MANOVA over separate univariate analyses: a) it takes into account important information (i.e. the intercorrelations among the variables), b) it keeps the overall α level under control, and c) it has greater sensitivity for detecting differences in certain situations. Rao’s F approximation of Wilk’s lambda was used as the test statistic.

For the PCI model, AMOS (Arbuckle, 1999), Version 4.0, was used. Overall model fit (i.e. the differences between the variance/covariance matrix predicted by the model and the sample variance/covariance matrix from the observed data) was assessed using four different fit indexes: Steiger's root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), the incremental fit index (IFI), and James, Mulaik, and Brett's parsimonious fit index (PNFI). Although a chi-square statistic was reported for each model test, it was not used to judge model fit because it is sensitive to sample size. Significance of the structural paths was determined by examining their critical ratios, which are comparable to *t* statistics.

Principal components analysis (PCA) was used to determine whether the current study showed the same factor structure as those observed in previous studies. PCA is appropriate for determining how many dimensions (underlying constructs) account for most of the variance on a scale. It is unlikely that the 20 country scale items and the 16 product scale items measure that large a number of constructs.

Finally, to test for a relationship between general and product specific perceptions, Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated. Descriptive statistics, or more specifically, mean scores, were also examined for purposes of comparison.

5.0 THE PRE-ANALYTICAL PROCESS

5.1 Data Editing

Once the data was collected, the 356 retrieved questionnaires were checked for completeness. Of these, 60 were incomplete (i.e. respondents failed to fill out one page or more of the survey), and were thus eliminated from the study. In total then, the final number of usable questionnaires was 296. This represents a response rate of 51.8% after data editing.

5.2 Data Coding

All of the completed questionnaires were translated into numerical codes and entered into a database on the SPSSX statistical program. The researcher then visually rechecked the coded data for out-of-range entries against the original questionnaires to detect possible entry errors.

5.3 Tabulation

Tabulation was used to create categories for analysing the sample's demographic characteristics. The results will be discussed in the following section.

6.0 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

6.1 Sample Characteristics

Table 6.1.0 describes the sample's demographic characteristics. As noted in the table, the percentage of male respondents was 54.2 and that of female respondents, 45.3. The median age of the respondents was between 40-44 years, approximately 50% of those surveyed were university graduates, and the median household income was between \$75,000 and \$99,999.

The population statistics of Ottawa-Hull – based on the 1996 census – are also shown in Table 6.1.1. Comparison of the census population with the sample population reveals several differences. Male respondents, for example, were slightly over-represented (and equivalently – female respondents were slightly under-represented). The respondents were also above average on both education and income levels. The discrepancy in education levels between the sample population and the census population, however, may be partly attributable to the sample element used in this study (adult consumers above the age of 18). The census population comprised individuals of all ages and thus included children and young adults at early stages of their scholastic careers.

Differences in income and education levels between the sample population and the census population of Ottawa-Hull may have been caused by several factors. The over-representation of respondents with higher income levels, for example, may be attributable to the sampling technique employed.

Table 6.1.1 – Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Variable		Sample	Population*
Sex:	Male	54.2%	48.8%
	Female	45.3%	51.2%
Age:	Less than 20	3.7%	–
	20-24 years	7.1%	9.4%+
	25-29 years	5.4%	10.5%
	30-34 years	10.2%	9.4%
	35-39 years	10.8%	12.8%
	40-44 years	13.6%	11.6%
	45-49 years	16.9%	10.5%
	50-54 years	13.6%	7.8%
	55-59 years	8.1%	5.8%
	60-64 years	3.7%	4.9%
	65 or more	6.8%	13.9%
	Median age:	40-44	
Educational Level:	Grade school	0.7%	8.1%
	Some high school	3.7%	17.4%
	High school graduate	8.5%	14.3%
	Some college	6.8%	6.5%
	College graduate	11.5%	16.5%
	Some university	11.5%	11.8%
	University graduate	52.5%	22.7%
	Other	4.7%	N/A
Household Income:	Under \$24,999	5.0%	Under \$10,000 6.6%
	\$25,000-\$44,999	9.6%	\$10,000-\$19,999 12.0%
	\$45,000-\$64,999	19.5%	\$20,000-\$29,999 10.5%
	\$65,000-\$74,999	11.0%	\$30,000-\$39,999 11.0%
	\$75,000-\$99,999	22.7%	\$40,000-\$49,000 10.8%
			\$50,000-\$59,999 10.1%
			\$60,000-\$69,999 8.8%
			\$70,000-\$79,999 7.4%
			\$80,000-\$89,999 5.9%
			\$90,000-\$99,999 4.3%
	Over \$100,000	32.3%	12.4%
	Median Income	\$75,000-\$99,999	

*Source: Statistics Canada (1999), *Profile of Census Tracts*. Ottawa: Industry Canada 1996 Census of Canada.

+Note: The population percentages have been adjusted and exclude individuals less than 20 years in order to reflect a sample population over 18 years.

Only single-family dwellings were approached to complete questionnaires, which means that families living in apartment buildings were excluded from the study. Since owning a house is generally more costly than renting an apartment, homeowners tend to have higher incomes than apartment dwellers. The higher income levels of homeowners may be credited to a correspondingly high level of schooling. In general, individuals with higher levels of education tend to also have higher income levels. In addition, 34.9% of the sample comprised individuals between the ages of 33-49. This particular age group may be earning peak salaries.

The sample's above average education level may also be credited to a greater propensity on the part of more educated individuals to value academic research, and thus to participate in consumer studies. Individuals with higher education levels may also be more willing to voice and share their opinions.

While the sample may not be fully representative of the entire population of Ottawa-Hull in terms of education level and income distribution, it is, nevertheless, useful for the purposes of this study. A sample that includes a considerable number of opinion leaders (typically educated individuals with high levels of income) can be advantageous because it assesses the views of those consumers who are expected to have a considerable influence on the attitudes and behavioural orientations of the population at large. These consumers may also have had greater exposure to foreign countries and markets, and are likely to be familiar with foreign products.

6.2 Country and Product Evaluations – 2000

Prior to reviewing the results of the longitudinal analysis, the findings from the most recent survey (2000) will be discussed. Sections 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 provide a summary of the mean ratings for the target countries on both the nation and product scales. The results from a series of within-subject comparisons are also discussed. These tests were performed to determine whether there were any differences in the views held by Canadians toward the selected Eastern European countries and their products.

6.2.1 Country Image (2000 Results)

Table 6.2.1 presents the mean ratings for the target countries on the country scales. Canadians rated France the highest overall, and on 19 of the 20 individual bipolar adjective scale items. On almost every scale item, France's mean score was at least one point higher than those of the Eastern European countries. France's average score (5.32) reflects this difference (the Eastern European countries received average scores ranging from 3.60 to 4.45). The only item for which France did not score the highest was "Hardworking People" (France received a lower mean score than Poland, the Czech Republic, and Russia on that item).

As discussed in the literature review, perceptions of cultural similarity and of common economic and security interests are factors in shaping attitudes toward foreign countries (Nincic and Russett, 1979). Given that Canadians view France as similar to their own culture (France's mean score on the items "Western culture" and "Aligned with Canada"

were much higher than the scores received by the four Eastern European countries on those items) it is not surprising, perhaps, that France received very high scores on such variables as “Industrialized,” “Educated People,” “Rich” and “Democratic.”

Table 6.2.1 – Profile of Consumer Views of Selected Countries (2000)

Variable	France	Russia	Hungary	Czech Republic	Poland
Industrialized	6.18 +	4.38 -	4.45	4.92	4.89
Educated	6.20 +	4.60 -	4.84	5.03	4.91
Western culture	5.13 +	2.99 -	3.61	3.84	3.90
Know a lot about	4.50 +	3.21	2.46 -	2.93	3.07
Stable	5.83 +	2.39 -	4.25	4.13	4.46
Rich	5.66 +	2.52 -	3.47	3.62	3.57
Democratic	5.39 +	3.02 -	3.96	4.04	4.27
An ideal country	4.98 +	2.33 -	3.64	3.75	3.83
Safe	5.45 +	2.59 -	4.14	3.98	4.31
Active	5.33 +	4.17 -	4.36	4.72	4.56
Welcome immigration from	5.39 +	4.58 -	4.94	5.01	5.10
Many rights	5.74 +	2.73 -	3.85	3.85	4.10
I like	5.73 +	4.40 -	4.81	4.84	5.06
Peaceful	4.98 +	3.36 -	4.62	4.32	4.70
Aligned with Canada	4.90 +	3.20 -	3.90	4.05	4.22
Should have closer ties with	5.13 +	4.72 -	4.89	4.86	5.02
Trustworthy	5.32 +	4.22 -	4.80	4.85	5.03
Hardworking	4.82	4.85	4.77 -	5.00	5.07 +
Individualistic	4.77 +	3.43 -	3.95	4.02	4.08
Favor investment in	4.96 +	4.33 -	4.70	4.80	4.94
Average Score	5.32	3.60	4.22	4.33	4.45

Notes

- Scores range from 1 (low) to 7 (high)
- The highest scores for each item are indicated by a plus sign (+)
- The lowest scores for each item are indicated by a minus sign (-)

The lowest ratings by respondents were given to Russia. The country had the lowest average score, and received the lowest ratings on 18 of the 20 items. In particular, Russia was rated poorly on items dealing with standard of living (“Stable,” “Rich,” “Ideal Country,” “People Have Many Rights”). It is also interesting to note that respondents

indicated knowing more about Russia than the other Eastern European countries, and yet rated Hungary, the Czech Republic and Poland much higher on such items as “Democratic”, “Peaceful”, and “Stable.” Russia’s historical image during the Cold War was that of an aggressor. Indeed, President Ronald Reagan once referred to the nation as an “evil empire.” Such stereotypes, combined with the negative media attention that Russia has received in recent years because of such events as the war in Chechnya, and the economic collapse of 1998, may have shaped unfavourable consumer perceptions toward the country. Although respondents may know less about the other three Eastern European countries, the absence of negative imagery may in fact create a more favourable country image, or at the very least, one of neutrality.

Canadians gave high ratings to all five countries on the items “Welcome Immigration From” and “Should Have Closer Ties With” (> 4.5). This may reflect Canada’s cultural diversity, and a willingness on the part of Canadians to respond favourably to foreigners.

6.2.1.1 Differences in Eastern European Country Images

Doubly multivariate within-subject comparisons were performed to test for differences in Canadian perceptions of the Eastern European countries. Rao’s F approximation of Wilk’s lambda was used as the test statistic. The country profiles were considered significantly different if $p < .05$. The result of this test indicated that respondents did rate the countries of Eastern Europe differently ($p < .05$, exact $F = 15.881$).

Following the significant overall result, pairwise doubly multivariate tests were performed to determine which country pairings differed. As the study included four Eastern European countries, six pairwise profile comparisons were possible. To keep overall alpha for the pairwise tests under control, the level of significance was set at $.05/6 = .008$.

The results of the pairwise tests revealed that all six comparisons were significantly different at $p < .008$ (Russia/Hungary, Russia/Czech Republic, Russia/Poland, Hungary/Czech Republic, Hungary/Poland, Czech Republic/Poland). To examine the country profile comparisons more thoroughly, differences at the variable level were assessed. To control for Type I error, each variable was tested at $\alpha = .01$. This ensured that overall alpha was less than or equal to .20. The results of these tests are presented in Table 6.2.1.2 (see Appendix B for a detailed summary of all tests).

Table 6.2.1.2 – Doubly Multivariate Analysis of EE Country Differences**Significant Differences for Country Items (Max = 20)**

Country Pairing		R/H	R/C	R/P	H/C	H/P	P/C
	p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Exact F	34.791	23.249	40.084	5.399	5.379	3.948
Variable	p-value	p-value	p-value	p-value	p-value	p-value	p-value
Industrialized	.645	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.619
Educated	.007	.000	.000	.000	.010	.333	.060
Western culture	.000	.000	.000	.000	.014	.000	.303
Know a lot about	.000	.001	.052	.000	.000	.000	.068
Stable	.000	.000	.000	.196	.021	.002	
Rich	.000	.000	.000	.051	.142	.574	
Democratic	.000	.000	.000	.483	.001	.011	
An ideal country	.000	.000	.000	.152	.010	.204	
Safe	.000	.000	.000	.042	.042	.000	
Active	.020	.000	.000	.000	.012	.028	
Welcome immigration	.000	.000	.000	.287	.009	.190	
Many rights	.000	.000	.000	.967	.003	.002	
I like	.000	.000	.000	.625	.000	.000	
Peaceful	.000	.000	.000	.001	.282	.000	
Aligned with Canada	.000	.000	.000	.028	.000	.028	
Closer ties with	.049	.116	.001	.642	.051	.019	
Trustworthy	.000	.000	.000	.446	.001	.003	
Hardworking	.399	.043	.037	.002	.002	.518	
Individualistic	.000	.000	.000	.444	.108	.466	
Favor investment in	.000	.000	.000	.136	.000	.042	
Total # of Significant Differences	16	18	18	5	11	6	

Legend

R = Russia, H = Hungary, C = Czech Republic, P = Poland

A first general observation from Table 6.2.1.2 is the number of significant differences between Russia and the three other Eastern European countries (most at $\alpha = .001$). Russia received significantly lower ratings than Hungary (16 items), the Czech Republic (18 items), and Poland (18 items). The country was rated significantly lower than all of the Eastern European countries on 15 items: “Educated,” “Western Culture,” “Stable,”

“Rich,” “Democratic,” “Ideal,” “Safe,” “Welcome Immigration From,” “People Have Many Rights,” “I Like,” “Peaceful,” “Align,” “Trustworthy,” “Individualistic,” and “Favor Investment In.” These results demonstrate that Russia has a significantly less favourable country image than the other Eastern European countries.

Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic were rated more similarly by respondents. In general, Poland received higher ratings than the Czech Republic (six items) and Hungary (11 items). Hungary and the Czech Republic registered six significant differences. Of these differences, the Czech Republic was rated higher on five items (“industrialized”, “educated,” “know a lot about”, “active”, and “hardworking”). Hungary received a higher rating than the Czech Republic on the item “peaceful.”

6.2.2 Product Image (2000 Results)

Table 6.2.2 presents the mean ratings for the product scales. Canadian perceptions of products made in the target countries are congruent with their attitudes toward the countries themselves, as discussed in the previous section. France, for example, had the highest average score, and on all individual bi-polar adjective items. Russia received the lowest rating on every item except “Know A Lot About” – respondents stated that they were least familiar with products made in the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland. In addition, the distance between the means for France and the Eastern European countries on the product scale was similar to that shown on the country scale (the average score for French products was 5.01 vs. 3.30 to 3.90 for Eastern European products).

Table 6.2.2 – Profile of Consumer Views of Products Made in Selected Countries (2000)

Variable	France	Russia	Hungary	Czech Republic	Poland
Attractive	5.82 +	3.26 -	4.18	4.34	4.11
Good value	4.51 +	3.89 -	4.33	4.24	4.32
Willing to buy	5.18 +	3.61 -	4.33	4.39	4.31
Innovative	5.21 +	3.32 -	3.84	4.00	3.81
Good quality	5.32 +	3.39 -	4.22	4.15	4.11
Recognizable brands	5.16 +	2.89 -	2.90	3.12	3.01
Expensive	5.57 +	3.45 -	3.74	3.85	3.74
Know a lot about	3.80 +	2.42	2.27	2.26 -	2.37
Reliable	5.11 +	3.27 -	4.05	4.18	4.10
Proud to own	4.89 +	3.40 -	3.96	4.11	4.01
Technically advanced	5.38 +	3.45 -	3.77	3.91	3.80
Good after sales service	4.16 +	3.33 -	3.71	3.77	3.70
Easy to find	4.28 +	2.81 -	3.13	3.24	3.27
Good workmanship	5.35 +	3.50 -	4.19	4.35	4.21
Satisfied with	5.10 +	3.54 -	4.07	4.23	4.12
Good overall	5.34 +	3.27 -	4.04	4.25	4.10
Average Score	5.01	3.30	3.80	3.90	3.82

Notes

- Scores range from 1 (low) to 7 (high)
- The highest scores for each item are indicated by a plus sign (+)
- The lowest scores for each item are indicated by a minus sign (-)

All four Eastern European countries scored consistently low on items related to market presence (“Recognizable brands,” “Know A Lot About,” “Easy to Find”). Despite having indicated that they were more familiar with Russian products than with those from the other Eastern European countries, respondents rated Russian goods much lower than those produced in Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland on such items as “Innovative,” “Good Quality,” “Reliable,” and “Good Workmanship.” Common product references for Russia may have included the Lada automobile, vodka, and caviar. With the exception of the Lada automobile, these references are quite favourable. Furthermore, Russia is known to have a very sophisticated space program. Yet despite

these positive examples of Russian innovation and quality, respondents rated Russian products lowest overall. Respondents may, therefore, have transferred unfavourable images about Russia (both historical and current) to descriptions of its product attributes.

6.2.2.1 Differences in Eastern European Product Ratings

Doubly multivariate within-subject comparisons were also performed to test for differences in Canadian perceptions of the products made in various Eastern European countries. The within-subjects techniques used to test for differences in product ratings are the same as those outlined in the analysis of country profile differences (Section 6.2.1.1).

The overall doubly multivariate analysis of variance was significant at $p < .05$ (exact $F = 5.249$). Respondents did, therefore, rate the products from Eastern Europe differently. The doubly multivariate pairwise comparisons revealed three significant results: Russia/Hungary, Russia/Czech Republic, and Russia/Poland. The Hungary/Czech Republic ($p = .010$), Hungary/Poland ($p = .451$), and Poland/Czech Republic ($p = .069$) pairwise comparisons were not found to differ significantly.

Differences at the variable level were assessed for the three significant pairwise profiles – again, an alpha level of .01 was used for each test. The findings are presented in Table 6.2.2.1 (see Appendix B for complete test results).

Table 6.2.2.1 – Doubly Multivariate Analysis of EE Product Differences**Significant Differences for Product Items (Max = 16)**

Country Pairing		R/H	R/C	R/P	H/C	H/P	P/C
	p-value	.000	.000	.000	.010	.451	.069
	Exact F	10.391	13.728	10.697	2.064	1.006	1.598
Variable	p-value	p-value	p-value	p-value	p-value	p-value	p-value
Attractive	.000	.000	.000	.009	.519	.006	
Good value for money	.000	.000	.000	.289	.552	.429	
Willing to buy	.000	.000	.000	.577	.665	.275	
Innovative	.000	.000	.000	.087	.721	.011	
Good quality	.000	.000	.000	.541	.043	.347	
Recognizable brands	.969	.027	.115	.009	.226	.184	
Expensive	.000	.000	.000	.042	.957	.061	
Know a lot about	.009	.072	.572	.592	.063	.091	
Reliable	.000	.000	.000	.028	.488	.077	
Proud to own	.000	.000	.000	.028	.694	.156	
Technically advanced	.000	.000	.000	.037	.884	.089	
Good after sales service	.000	.000	.000	.341	1.000	.432	
Products easy to find	.000	.000	.000	.101	.119	.856	
Good workmanship	.000	.000	.000	.043	.957	.014	
Satisfied with	.000	.000	.000	.004	.424	.030	
Good overall products	.000	.000	.000	.001	.492	.031	
Total # of Significant Differences		15	14	14	4	0	1

Legend

R = Russia, H = Hungary, C = Czech Republic, P = Poland

Study results indicate that respondents rated products made in Russia differently than those made in the other three Eastern European countries. Indeed, the product profiles are similar to the country profiles in that Russian products had a significantly less favorable image than did products made in Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland. Russia received the lowest rating on almost all of the significant items. The only variables for which the country did not receive the lowest ratings were “Recognizable Brands” and “Know A Lot About.” Respondents did not, therefore, rate the products

from Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland more favourably than those from Russia because of a higher level of familiarity. Rather, respondents seem to have transferred a negative country image for Russia onto the country's product attributes.

6.3 Longitudinal Analysis

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) tests were conducted to address the null hypotheses of no differences between Canadian perceptions of Eastern European countries and their products between 1992, 1995 and 2000 (null hypotheses one and two). The MANOVA tests examining differences in national image had 20 dependent measures for each subject in each group, while those examining changes in product image had 16 dependent measures for each subject in each group. All items in both the country and product scales were included in the analysis to uncover all pertinent information behind the data.

The MANOVA tests were conducted using Rao's F approximation of Wilk's lambda as the test statistic. The decision rule was to reject the null hypotheses if the F statistic was significant at $p < .05$. Table 6.3.1 presents the results of the overall MANOVA tests. As shown in the table, all tests revealed significant overall differences on both the country and product scales for the four Eastern European countries. France had a significant overall result on the country scales, although the overall MANOVA test performed on Canadian perceptions of French products revealed no significant differences across the three time periods under study.

Table 6.3.1 – Multigroup MANOVA Tests

Country Image	Value	Exact <i>F</i>	Hyp. df	Error df	Sig.
France	.902	2.077	40.000	1562.000	.000
Russia	.838	3.648	40.000	1580.000	.000
Hungary	.892	2.293	40.000	1564.000	.000
Czech Republic	.867	2.960	40.000	1596.000	.000
Poland	.852	3.360	40.000	1608.000	.000

Product Image	Value	Exact <i>F</i>	Hyp. df	Error df	Sig.
France	.949	1.316	32.000	1604.000	.112
Russia	.927	1.920	32.000	1590.000	.002
Hungary	.941	1.522	32.000	1580.000	.031
Czech Republic	.830	4.792	32.000	1574.000	.000
Poland	.914	2.286	32.000	1600.000	.000

Follow-up pairwise *t*-tests (Hotelling's T^2 's) were then performed to determine which pairs of groups (survey comparisons) differed significantly on the set of variables (i.e. over which time periods had Canadian perceptions of Eastern European countries and products changed?). Following Stevens (1996), the overall α level for the pairwise multivariate tests was set at $\alpha = .15$ in order to maintain reasonable power. For three groups (1992, 1995, 2000), therefore, each T^2 test was conducted at the $.15/3 = .05$ level of significance (Bonferroni multiple comparison level). The results indicated that respondents rated the four Eastern European countries differently across all three time periods under study and rated France differently in two time periods (1995-2000 and 1992-2000). On the product scales, differences were noted for three of the four Eastern European countries between 1992 and 1995 (Russia, the Czech Republic, and Poland), while all four Eastern European countries registered significant pairwise results for the

period 1992-2000. The only pairwise *t*-test found to be significant for product evaluations between 1995 and 2000 was Poland's (see Appendix C for pairwise results).

All significant pairwise multivariate results were then followed by univariate *t*-tests, each at the .05 level, to determine which of the individual variables were contributing to the significant pairwise differences (i.e. which scale items were significantly different in each survey comparison – see Appendix C for complete findings). The results of these tests are described more thoroughly in the following sections.

6.3.1 Country Image

The first research objective was to determine whether any changes had occurred in Canadian perceptions of the selected Eastern European countries. The following hypothesis was developed and tested using the procedures mentioned in the previous section:

H_1 : Canadian perceptions of various selected Eastern European countries
are the same in all time periods studied.

Tables 6.3.1.1 to 6.3.1.3 show the results of the follow-up *t*-tests for each period under study (the tables also include the *F* and α values for the pairwise tests). As shown in the tables, changes have occurred in Canadian attitudes toward the target countries between 1992 and 2000. Null hypothesis one was therefore rejected. The following sections describe the nature of these changes.

6.3.1.1 1995 vs. 1992

Table 6.3.1.1 presents the results of the univariate tests for the period 1992 to 1995. As indicated in the table, no significant changes occurred in Canadian perceptions of France and Hungary over this time period. Consumer attitudes toward Russia, the Czech Republic, and Poland, however, declined between 1992 and 1995.

Russia had the most number of significant differences between the respondent groups. Of the nine variables contributing to the overall pairwise significance, only one item (“Industrialized”) demonstrated an increase in mean score. Russia’s image, therefore, between 1992 and 1995 became less favorable. Given the country’s poor economic performance in the years following the end of Soviet Communism, and its unstable political environment, it is not surprising that the mean scores for such variables as “Ideal Country,” “Safe,” “Like,” and “Peaceful” decreased significantly.

Hungary’s image remained fairly constant between 1992 and 1995. Univariate tests revealed that only three variables were contributing to the pairwise difference (“Welcome Immigration From,” “Should Have Closer Ties With,” and “Would Welcome Further Investment In”). These items were rated slightly lower by respondents in the later period, suggesting that Canadians were less enthusiastic about affiliating themselves more closely with Hungary in 1995 than they had been in 1992. Indeed, out of a total of 14 items found to be significant for the Czech Republic and Poland, only two demonstrated a positive change (“Stable” and “Rich” for Poland). Overall then, Canadians rated the countries of Eastern Europe less favourably in 1995 than they had in 1992.

**Table 6.3.1.1 – Consumer Views of France and Selected
Eastern European Countries (1995-1992)**

Variables	France			Russia			Hungary			Czech Republic			Poland		
	'95	'92	p	'95	'92	p	'95	'92	p	'95	'92	p	'95	'92	p
Indust.	5.97	5.99	n/s	4.24	3.92	.027	4.26	4.03	n/s	4.61	4.60	n/s	4.68	4.55	n/s
Educ.	5.93	5.98	n/s	4.17	4.34	n/s	4.44	4.37	n/s	4.71	4.81	n/s	4.54	4.49	n/s
West.	4.96	5.30	n/s	2.83	2.79	n/s	3.38	3.60	n/s	3.46	3.76	.031	3.54	3.88	.016
Know	4.10	4.41	n/s	3.11	3.36	n/s	2.23	2.40	n/s	2.79	2.81	n/s	2.97	3.18	n/s
Stable	5.39	5.52	n/s	2.32	2.13	n/s	3.84	3.75	n/s	3.64	3.86	n/s	3.91	3.58	.004
Rich	5.16	5.33	n/s	2.38	2.32	n/s	3.20	3.01	n/s	3.27	3.25	n/s	3.21	2.85	.000
Democ.	5.34	5.36	n/s	2.85	2.99	n/s	3.76	3.75	n/s	3.68	3.76	n/s	3.94	4.02	n/s
Ideal	4.75	4.78	n/s	2.17	2.39	.039	3.35	3.19	n/s	3.34	3.39	n/s	3.50	3.30	n/s
Safe	5.17	5.20	n/s	2.76	3.35	.000	3.98	3.95	n/s	3.76	4.16	.001	4.14	4.20	n/s
Active	5.06	5.11	n/s	3.99	3.89	n/s	4.15	4.33	n/s	4.59	4.48	n/s	4.41	4.59	n/s
Immig.	4.89	5.19	n/s	4.29	4.93	.000	4.49	5.00	.000	4.80	5.17	n/s	4.76	5.10	.012
Rights	5.48	5.45	n/s	2.54	2.75	n/s	3.71	3.55	n/s	3.65	3.57	n/s	3.66	3.51	n/s
Like	5.41	5.57	n/s	4.28	4.76	.000	4.64	4.82	n/s	4.60	5.13	.000	4.75	5.07	.002
Peaceful	4.71	4.79	n/s	3.10	3.59	.000	4.40	4.48	n/s	4.02	4.55	.000	4.50	4.56	n/s
Align	4.82	4.98	n/s	3.20	3.40	n/s	3.58	3.52	n/s	3.62	3.78	n/s	3.88	3.81	n/s
Ties	4.92	5.20	n/s	4.63	5.14	.000	4.62	5.12	.000	4.58	5.16	.000	4.74	5.11	.002
Trust	5.03	5.27	n/s	4.18	4.67	.000	4.71	4.89	n/s	4.61	5.02	.000	4.92	5.07	n/s
Hardwork	4.67	4.66	n/s	4.98	4.74	n/s	4.77	4.82	n/s	4.74	4.88	n/s	4.89	4.85	n/s
Individ.	4.73	4.95	n/s	3.32	3.17	n/s	3.94	3.78	n/s	3.92	3.84	n/s	3.88	3.68	n/s
Invest	4.46	4.99	n/s	4.32	5.00	.000	4.45	4.83	.003	4.50	4.95	.001	4.65	5.03	.004
Avg. Score	5.05	5.20		3.48	3.68		4.00	4.06		4.04	4.25		4.17	4.22	
# Of Sig. Differences	0			9			3			7			7		
Rank	1	1		5	5		4	4		3	2		2	3	
F	1.264			3.744			2.353			3.284			2.516		
α	.195			.000			.001			.000			.000		

During the early years of Eastern Europe's transition economists and business practitioners were fairly optimistic about the region's growth prospects. By 1995, however, the economic and political environments of most Eastern European countries were still fairly unstable, and it became clear that the region's transformation would take much longer than originally predicted. The less favourable rating of Eastern Europe by

respondents in 1995 may, therefore, be a reflection of the region's lackluster performance during the first five years of transition.

6.3.1.2 2000 vs. 1995

The results for the 1995-2000 comparison are shown in Table 6.3.1.2. One notable observation from the table is the striking similarity in the direction of change across all countries. All variables contributing to the overall multivariate pairwise significance were rated higher by respondents in the 2000 sample than they were by those in the 1995 sample. This suggests that Canadian perceptions of Eastern European countries have improved over the past five years.

Russia registered the smallest number of significant differences. Only the variables "Educated People," "Welcome Immigration From," and "Peaceful" were found to be significant at the .05 level. The univariate tests, however, indicated that a large number of variables were contributing to the pairwise significance for France (14), Hungary (10), the Czech Republic (14), and Poland (12). Canadians rated all four countries significantly higher on the items "Educated People," "Stable," "Rich," and "Ideal Country". It is also worth noting that while Canadian images of all target countries changed between 1995 and 2000, France was the only country about which respondents indicated knowing significantly more over the five-year period.

**Table 6.3.1.2 – Consumer Views of France and Selected
Eastern European Countries (2000-1995)**

Variables	France			Russia			Hungary			Czech Republic			Poland		
	'00	'95	p	'00	'95	p	'00	'95	p	'00	'95	p	'00	'95	p
Indust.	6.18	5.97	.016	4.38	4.24	n/s	4.45	4.26	n/s	4.92	4.61	.013	4.89	4.68	n/s
Educ.	6.20	5.93	.000	4.60	4.17	.000	4.84	4.44	.000	5.03	4.71	.003	4.91	4.54	.001
West.	5.13	4.96	n/s	2.99	2.83	n/s	3.61	3.38	n/s	3.84	3.46	.005	3.90	3.54	.006
Know	4.50	4.10	.002	3.21	3.11	n/s	2.46	2.23	n/s	2.93	2.79	n/s	3.07	2.97	n/s
Stable	5.83	5.39	.000	2.39	2.32	n/s	4.25	3.84	.000	4.13	3.64	.000	4.46	3.91	.000
Rich	5.66	5.16	.000	2.52	2.38	n/s	3.47	3.20	.006	3.62	3.27	.001	3.57	3.21	.000
Democ.	5.39	5.34	n/s	3.02	2.85	n/s	3.96	3.76	n/s	4.04	3.68	.003	4.27	3.94	.003
Ideal	4.98	4.75	.028	2.33	2.17	n/s	3.64	3.35	.005	3.75	3.34	.000	3.83	3.50	.001
Safe	5.45	5.17	.004	2.59	2.76	n/s	4.14	3.98	n/s	3.98	3.76	n/s	4.31	4.14	n/s
Active	5.33	5.06	.016	4.17	3.99	n/s	4.36	4.15	.034	4.72	4.59	n/s	4.56	4.41	n/s
Immig.	5.39	4.89	.000	4.58	4.29	.031	4.94	4.49	.001	5.01	4.80	n/s	5.10	4.76	.005
Rights	5.74	5.48	.032	2.73	2.54	n/s	3.85	3.71	n/s	3.85	3.65	n/s	4.10	3.66	.000
Like	5.73	5.41	.006	4.40	4.28	n/s	4.81	4.64	n/s	4.84	4.60	.023	5.06	4.75	.001
Peaceful	4.98	4.71	.033	3.36	3.10	.012	4.62	4.40	.029	4.32	4.02	.008	4.70	4.50	n/s
Align	4.90	4.82	n/s	3.20	3.20	n/s	3.90	3.58	.001	4.05	3.62	.000	4.22	3.88	.001
Ties	5.13	4.92	n/s	4.72	4.63	n/s	4.89	4.62	.011	4.86	4.58	.015	5.02	4.74	.011
Trust	5.32	5.03	.011	4.22	4.18	n/s	4.80	4.71	n/s	4.85	4.61	.013	5.03	4.92	n/s
Hardwork	4.82	4.67	n/s	4.85	4.98	n/s	4.77	4.77	n/s	5.00	4.74	.021	5.07	4.89	n/s
Individ.	4.77	4.73	n/s	3.43	3.32	n/s	3.95	3.94	n/s	4.02	3.92	n/s	4.08	3.88	n/s
Invest	4.96	4.46	.000	4.33	4.32	n/s	4.70	4.45	.036	4.80	4.50	.020	4.94	4.65	.015
Avg. Score	5.32	5.05		3.60	3.48		4.22	4.00		4.33	4.04		4.45	4.17	
# Of Sig. Differences	14			3			10			14			12		
Rank	1	1		5	5		4	4		3	3		2	2	
F	2.905			2.075			1.742			2.062			2.382		
α	.000			.004			.023			.004			.001		

6.3.1.3 2000 vs. 1992

The results for the 1992-2000 comparison are shown in Table 6.3.1.3. Overall, the average rating for every country – with the exception of Russia – improved between 1992 and 2000. The univariate tests indicated that six variables were contributing to the overall pairwise significance for France. All of these differences demonstrated an

increase in mean score. Similarly, Poland – for which the univariate tests indicated nine variables contributing to the overall difference – enjoyed positive increases in mean scores on all significant items.

Table 6.3.1.3 – Consumer Views of France and Selected Eastern European Countries (2000-1992)

Variables	France			Russia			Hungary			Czech Republic			Poland		
	'00	'92	p	'00	'92	p	'00	'92	p	'00	'92	p	'00	'92	p
Indust.	6.18	5.99	.031	4.38	3.92	.001	4.45	4.03	.001	4.92	4.60	.013	4.89	4.55	.006
Educ.	6.20	5.98	.007	4.60	4.34	.031	4.84	4.37	.000	5.03	4.81	n/s	4.91	4.49	.000
West.	5.13	5.30	n/s	2.99	2.79	n/s	3.61	3.60	n/s	3.84	3.76	n/s	3.90	3.88	n/s
Know	4.50	4.41	n/s	3.21	3.36	n/s	2.46	2.40	n/s	2.93	2.81	n/s	3.07	3.18	n/s
Stable	5.83	5.52	.002	2.39	2.13	.012	4.25	3.75	.000	4.13	3.86	.047	4.46	3.58	.000
Rich	5.66	5.33	.000	2.52	2.32	.044	3.47	3.01	.000	3.62	3.25	.001	3.57	2.85	.000
Democ.	5.39	5.36	n/s	3.02	2.99	n/s	3.96	3.75	n/s	4.04	3.76	.024	4.27	4.02	.032
Ideal	4.98	4.78	n/s	2.33	2.39	n/s	3.64	3.19	.000	3.75	3.39	.001	3.83	3.30	.000
Safe	5.45	5.20	.010	2.59	3.35	.000	4.14	3.95	n/s	3.98	4.16	n/s	4.31	4.20	n/s
Active	5.33	5.11	n/s	4.17	3.89	.037	4.36	4.33	n/s	4.72	4.48	.022	4.56	4.59	n/s
Immig.	5.39	5.19	n/s	4.58	4.93	.014	4.94	5.00	n/s	5.01	5.17	n/s	5.10	5.10	n/s
Rights	5.74	5.45	.021	2.73	2.75	n/s	3.85	3.55	.006	3.85	3.57	.019	4.10	3.51	.000
Like	5.73	5.57	n/s	4.40	4.76	.002	4.81	4.82	n/s	4.84	5.13	.005	5.06	5.07	n/s
Peaceful	4.98	4.79	n/s	3.36	3.59	.041	4.62	4.48	n/s	4.32	4.55	n/s	4.70	4.56	n/s
Align	4.90	4.98	n/s	3.20	3.40	n/s	3.90	3.52	.001	4.05	3.78	.015	4.22	3.81	.000
Ties	5.13	5.20	n/s	4.72	5.14	.002	4.89	5.12	.050	4.86	5.16	.012	5.02	5.11	n/s
Trust	5.32	5.27	n/s	4.22	4.67	.000	4.80	4.89	n/s	4.85	5.02	.090	5.03	5.07	n/s
Hardwork	4.82	4.66	n/s	4.85	4.74	n/s	4.77	4.82	n/s	5.00	4.88	n/s	5.07	4.85	n/s
Individ.	4.77	4.95	n/s	3.43	3.17	.043	3.95	3.78	n/s	4.02	3.84	n/s	4.08	3.68	.000
Invest	4.96	4.99	n/s	4.33	5.00	.000	4.70	4.83	n/s	4.80	4.95	n/s	4.94	5.03	n/s
Avg. Score	5.32	5.20		3.60	3.68		4.22	4.06		4.33	4.25		4.45	4.22	
# Of Sig. Differences	6			13			8			11			9		
Rank	1	1		5	5		4	4		3	2		2	3	
F	2.008			5.443			2.871			3.672			5.472		
α	.006			.000			.000			.000			.000		

Hungary had a number of significant differences between respondent groups, of which only one was rated less favourably in 2000 than it had been in 1992 (“Ties”). The Czech

Republic had similar results, with only 3 out of 11 significant differences indicating a decrease in mean score (“Like,” “Ties,” and “Trustworthy”).

Russia, on the other hand, was the only country whose image became less favourable between 1992 and 2000. Although the country did receive higher mean scores on such items as “Industrialized,” “Educated People,” “Stable,” and “Rich,” its ratings on seven items were significantly lower in 2000 than they were in 1992. As mentioned earlier, Russia has received a great deal of negative media attention in recent years. Highly publicized events such as the War in Chechnya – and, most recently, the tragic death of 118 sailors on board the stricken nuclear submarine Kursk – may be shaping negative consumers perceptions about the country.

Figures 6.3.1.4 to 6.3.1.8 provide graphical representations of consumer perceptions toward the five target countries in 1992, 1995, and 2000 for the 20 country scale items. The graphs show that France consistently received the highest ratings by consumers. All of the Eastern European countries received relatively low scores on the variables “Know About,” “Rich,” “Many Rights,” “Aligned With Canada,” and “Individualistic.” Russia also received low ratings on these variables, as well as on the items “Stable,” “Ideal,” and “Peaceful,” indicating that Russia is perceived differently than the other Eastern European countries. As mentioned previously, Russia’s image deteriorated between 1992 and 2000, which may be a reflection of the economic and social difficulties the country experienced during this time period.

Figure 6.3.1.4 – Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of France

Figure 6.3.1.5 – Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of Russia

Figure 6.3.1.6 – Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of Hungary

Figure 6.3.1.7 – Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of the Czech Republic

Figure 6.3.1.8 – Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of Poland

6.3.2 Product Image

The second main research objective was to determine whether any changes had occurred in Canadian perceptions of the products made in selected Eastern European countries.

The following null hypothesis was proposed:

H₂: Canadian perceptions of the products made in various selected Eastern-European countries are the same in all time periods studied.

As shown in Tables 6.3.2.1 to 6.3.2.3 changes have occurred in Canadian perceptions of Eastern European products during all three time periods. Null hypothesis two was

therefore rejected. The following sections provide a more extensive review of these changes.

6.3.2.1 1995 vs. 1992

Table 6.3.2.1 presents the results of the 1992-1995 comparison. The most striking observation from the table is the paucity of significant results. The lack of significance in these scales can also be observed when comparing the average scores for each country between the two time periods. Very little change occurred between 1992 and 1995 in the average product rankings of the five countries.

The univariate results indicated that there were no significant differences between Canadian perceptions of products made in both France and Hungary between 1992 and 1995. Russia had two significant differences between respondent groups (“Attractive” and “Innovative”), the Czech Republic had one significant result (“Expensive”), and Poland had three (“Attractive,” “Willing to Buy,” and “Innovative”). Of the six items contributing to the overall pairwise significance, all had higher mean scores in 1995 than in 1992. Overall, very little change occurred in Canadian views toward Eastern European products during this time period, although the differences that did take place were positive.

Table 6.3.2.1 – Consumer Views of Products Made in France and Selected Eastern European Countries (1995-1992)

Variables	France			Russia			Hungary			Czech Republic			Poland		
	'95	'92	p	'95	'92	p	'95	'92	p	'95	'92	p	'95	'92	p
Attractive	5.59	5.76	n/s	3.04	2.80	.041	3.98	4.06	n/s	4.03	4.05	n/s	3.83	3.57	.016
Good value	4.40	4.52	n/s	3.64	3.43	n/s	4.18	4.14	n/s	4.10	4.11	n/s	4.07	4.02	n/s
Buy	4.92	5.16	n/s	3.35	3.31	n/s	4.12	4.30	n/s	4.18	4.37	n/s	4.21	3.83	.004
Innovative	5.07	5.10	n/s	3.16	2.90	.031	3.72	3.79	n/s	3.86	3.68	n/s	3.69	3.39	.004
Quality	5.15	5.19	n/s	3.27	3.09	n/s	4.05	4.00	n/s	4.05	4.14	n/s	3.89	3.85	n/s
Rec. brands	4.81	4.86	n/s	2.74	2.58	n/s	2.98	2.86	n/s	3.10	3.00	n/s	3.06	2.83	n/s
Expensive	5.59	5.46	n/s	3.68	3.46	n/s	3.82	3.76	n/s	3.85	2.90	.000	3.68	3.69	n/s
Know	3.58	3.58	n/s	2.55	2.51	n/s	2.31	2.33	n/s	2.59	2.56	n/s	2.55	2.47	n/s
Reliable	4.98	4.90	n/s	3.26	3.22	n/s	4.18	3.92	n/s	4.00	4.05	n/s	3.89	3.90	n/s
Proud own	4.62	4.69	n/s	3.22	3.35	n/s	3.84	3.94	n/s	3.94	4.05	n/s	3.81	3.81	n/s
Tec. advan	5.08	5.05	n/s	3.38	3.48	n/s	3.53	3.52	n/s	3.77	3.70	n/s	3.44	3.46	n/s
Service	3.98	4.12	n/s	3.19	3.11	n/s	3.60	3.63	n/s	3.68	3.56	n/s	3.65	3.50	n/s
Easy to find	3.99	4.20	n/s	2.75	2.54	n/s	3.00	2.87	n/s	3.24	3.07	n/s	3.11	3.00	n/s
Workman.	5.11	5.03	n/s	3.43	3.30	n/s	4.08	3.92	n/s	4.16	4.19	n/s	4.03	3.90	n/s
Satisfied	4.93	4.99	n/s	3.41	3.43	n/s	3.94	3.99	n/s	4.09	4.17	n/s	3.93	3.93	n/s
Overall	5.18	5.25	n/s	3.14	3.08	n/s	3.97	3.89	n/s	4.06	4.11	n/s	3.94	3.80	n/s
Avg. Score	4.81	4.87		3.20	3.10		3.70	3.68		3.79	3.73		3.67	3.56	
# Of Sig. Differences	0			2			0			1			3		
Rank	1	1		5	5		3	3		2	2		4	4	
F	1.251			1.707			1.362			6.094			2.064		
α	.223			.040			.153			.000			.008		

6.3.2.2 2000 vs. 1995

The results of the 1995-2000 comparison are provided in Table 6.3.2.2 – the only country to have registered any significant change was Poland. The tests indicated that respondents rated Polish products more favorably in 2000 than they did in 1995. Eight variables contributed to the country's significant pairwise result ("Attractive," "Good Value," "Quality," "Reliable," "Proud to Own," "Technically Advanced," "Easy to Find," and "Satisfied With"). All of these differences demonstrated an increase in mean

score. Canadian respondents, therefore, appear to hold Polish products in higher esteem than they did five years ago.

Table 6.3.2.2 – Consumer Views of Products Made in France and Selected Eastern European Countries (2000-1995)

Variables	France			Russia			Hungary			Czech Republic			Poland		
	'00	'95	p	'00	'95	p	'00	'95	p	'00	'95	p	'00	'95	p
Attractive	5.82	5.59	n/s	3.26	3.04	n/s	4.18	3.98	n/s	4.34	4.03	n/s	4.11	3.83	.012
Good value	4.51	4.40	n/s	3.89	3.64	n/s	4.33	4.18	n/s	4.24	4.10	n/s	4.32	4.07	.012
Buy	5.18	4.92	n/s	3.61	3.35	n/s	4.33	4.12	n/s	4.39	4.18	n/s	4.31	4.21	n/s
Innovative	5.21	5.07	n/s	3.32	3.16	n/s	3.84	3.72	n/s	4.00	3.86	n/s	3.81	3.69	n/s
Quality	5.32	5.15	n/s	3.39	3.27	n/s	4.22	4.05	n/s	4.15	4.05	n/s	4.11	3.89	.022
Rec. brands	5.16	4.81	n/s	2.89	2.74	n/s	2.90	2.98	n/s	3.12	3.10	n/s	3.01	3.06	n/s
Expensive	5.57	5.59	n/s	3.45	3.68	n/s	3.74	3.82	n/s	3.85	3.85	n/s	3.74	3.68	n/s
Know	3.80	3.58	n/s	2.42	2.55	n/s	2.27	2.31	n/s	2.26	2.59	n/s	2.37	2.55	n/s
Reliable	5.11	4.98	n/s	3.27	3.26	n/s	4.05	4.18	n/s	4.18	4.00	n/s	4.10	3.89	.018
Proud own	4.89	4.62	n/s	3.40	3.22	n/s	3.96	3.84	n/s	4.11	3.94	n/s	4.01	3.81	.045
Tec. advan	5.38	5.08	n/s	3.45	3.38	n/s	3.77	3.53	n/s	3.91	3.77	n/s	3.80	3.44	.000
Service	4.16	3.98	n/s	3.33	3.19	n/s	3.71	3.60	n/s	3.77	3.68	n/s	3.70	3.65	n/s
Easy to find	4.28	3.99	n/s	2.81	2.75	n/s	3.13	3.00	n/s	3.24	3.24	n/s	3.27	3.11	.049
Workman.	5.35	5.11	n/s	3.50	3.43	n/s	4.19	4.08	n/s	4.35	4.16	n/s	4.21	4.03	n/s
Satisfied	5.10	4.93	n/s	3.54	3.41	n/s	4.07	3.94	n/s	4.23	4.09	n/s	4.12	3.93	.024
Overall	5.34	5.18	n/s	3.27	3.14	n/s	4.04	3.97	n/s	4.25	4.06	n/s	4.10	3.94	n/s
Avg. Score	5.01	4.81		3.30	3.20		3.80	3.70		3.90	3.79		3.82	3.67	
# Of Sig. Differences	0			0			0			0			8		
Rank	1	1		5	5		4	3		2	2		3	4	
F	1.327			1.224			1.364			1.615			2.006		
α	.174			.242			.153			.059			.011		

6.3.2.3 2000 vs. 1992

The results for the period 1992-2000 are shown in Table 6.3.2.3. As indicated in the table, the average product ratings for each study country improved between 1992 and 2000. No significant differences were found in Canadian perceptions of French products

during this time period, however, indicating a consistent image for French products across all three respondent groups.

Table 6.3.2.3 – Consumer Views of Products Made in France and Selected Eastern European Countries (2000-1992)

Variables	France			Russia			Hungary			Czech Republic			Poland		
	'00	'92	p	'00	'92	p	'00	'92	p	'00	'92	p	'00	'92	p
Attractive	5.82	5.76	n/s	3.26	2.80	.000	4.18	4.06	n/s	4.34	4.05	.010	4.11	3.57	.000
Good value	4.51	4.52	n/s	3.89	3.43	.001	4.33	4.14	n/s	4.24	4.11	n/s	4.32	4.02	.005
Buy	5.18	5.16	n/s	3.61	3.31	.034	4.33	4.30	n/s	4.39	4.37	n/s	4.31	3.83	.000
Innovative	5.21	5.10	n/s	3.32	2.90	.000	3.84	3.79	n/s	4.00	3.68	.002	3.81	3.39	.000
Quality	5.32	5.19	n/s	3.39	3.09	.012	4.22	4.00	.017	4.15	4.14	n/s	4.11	3.85	.010
Rec. brands	5.16	4.86	n/s	2.89	2.58	.018	2.90	2.86	n/s	3.12	3.00	n/s	3.01	2.83	n/s
Expensive	5.57	5.46	n/s	3.45	3.46	n/s	3.74	3.76	n/s	3.85	2.90	.000	3.74	3.69	n/s
Know	3.80	3.58	n/s	2.42	2.51	n/s	2.27	2.33	n/s	2.26	2.56	.001	2.37	2.47	n/s
Reliable	5.11	4.90	n/s	3.27	3.22	n/s	4.05	3.92	n/s	4.18	4.05	n/s	4.10	3.90	.041
Proud own	4.89	4.69	n/s	3.40	3.35	n/s	3.96	3.94	n/s	4.11	4.05	n/s	4.01	3.81	n/s
Tec. advan	5.38	5.05	n/s	3.45	3.48	n/s	3.77	3.52	.016	3.91	3.70	n/s	3.80	3.46	.001
Service	4.16	4.12	n/s	3.33	3.11	n/s	3.71	3.63	n/s	3.77	3.56	.024	3.70	3.50	.041
Easy to find	4.28	4.20	n/s	2.81	2.54	.018	3.13	2.87	.027	3.24	3.07	n/s	3.27	3.00	.017
Workman.	5.35	5.03	n/s	3.50	3.30	n/s	4.19	3.92	.004	4.35	4.19	n/s	4.21	3.90	.001
Satisfied	5.10	4.99	n/s	3.54	3.43	n/s	4.07	3.99	n/s	4.23	4.17	n/s	4.12	3.93	.038
Overall	5.34	5.25	n/s	3.27	3.08	n/s	4.04	3.89	n/s	4.25	4.11	n/s	4.10	3.80	.002
Avg. Score	5.01	4.87		3.30	3.10		3.80	3.68		3.90	3.73		3.82	3.56	
# Of Sig. Differences	0			7			4			5			12		
Rank	1	1		5	5		4	3		2	2		3	4	
F	1.370			2.943			1.866			7.366			2.833		
α	.149			.000			.020			.000			.000		

Poland had the highest number of significant differences between 1992 and 2000. All of the 12 variables contributing to the overall multivariate pairwise significance for Poland had higher mean scores in 2000 than in 1992. The changes in Canadian perceptions toward products from Poland have thus been positive, suggesting that consumer images

of Polish products have improved significantly between 1992 and 2000. Of the significant differences observed for the other three Eastern European countries, only one indicated a decrease in mean score (“Know About” on the Czech Republic product scale). In general then, respondents rated products from Eastern Europe more positively in 2000 than they did in 1992.

The variable “Know About” was only significant for the Czech Republic (where, in fact, there was a decrease in mean score). Canadians, therefore, report that they do not know more about the products of Eastern Europe than they did in 1992, and yet rated them more favourably. One possible explanation for this may be that Canadians have transferred more favourable attitudes toward Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic to their beliefs about Eastern European products. As mentioned earlier, Russia was the only country whose image became less favourable between 1992 and 2000. More positive beliefs about the three other Eastern European countries and their people, therefore, may have affected Canadian perceptions toward products from the region.

Figures 6.3.2.4 to 6.3.2.8 provide graphical representations of consumer perceptions toward the five target countries in 1992, 1995, and 2000 for the product scales. All five countries received low scores on the variables “Know About” and “Products Are Easy to Find.” The Eastern European countries were also rated poorly on the item “Recognizable Brands,” which has been found to group with the variables “Know About” and “Products Are Easy to Find” in factor analyses (Papadopoulos, Heslop, Bamossy, 1994; Papadopoulos, Heslop, and Szamosi, 1997).

Figure 6.3.2.4 – Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of French Products

Figure 6.3.2.5 – Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of Russian Products

Figure 6.3.2.6 – Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of Hungarian Products

Figure 6.3.2.7 – Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of Czech Products

Figure 6.3.2.8 – Canadian Consumers' Perceptions of Polish Products

The Czech Republic was the only country to have registered a large discrepancy in scale rating. The variable in question, "Expensive," jumped from a mean score of 2.90 in 1992 to 3.85 in 1995 (the variable also received a mean score of 3.85 in 2000), indicating an important change in perception about Czech products between 1992 and 1995. Since consumers may use price as a surrogate indicator for quality (Cattin, Jolibert, and Lohnes, 1982), items that are perceived as being expensive are generally regarded more favorably by consumers than less expensive items. A final observation regarding the product graphs is the more consistent results obtained by Russia (mean scores on the product scales ranged from 2.54 to 3.89 vs. 2.13 to 4.98 for the country scales).

6.3.3 Product Categories

As mentioned in section 3.1, a portion of the questionnaire asked respondents to rate four specific products from the target countries on a poor vs. good quality scale (Shoes, Radio, Microwave/Computer, and Luggage/Furniture). In general, each country's product category rating is similar to its ratings on the country and product scales. France was rated the highest on all four product categories, while Russia was rated the lowest. In addition, French products were given an average score approximately one scale point higher than the Eastern European countries (e.g. French products received an average score of 4.76 in 2000 vs. 3.29 to 3.93 for products made in Eastern Europe).

MANOVA tests were conducted to assess whether any changes had occurred in consumer views toward the four product categories between 1992, 1995, and 2000. The methodology employed in this section is the same as that described in section 6.3. Overall MANOVA tests were conducted at the .05 level of significance (Rao's F approximation of Wilk's lambda was used as the test statistic). Table 6.3.3.0 presents the results of these tests.

Table 6.3.3.0 – Multigroup MANOVA for Product Categories

Country Image	Value	Exact F	Hyp. Df	Error df	Sig.
France	.673	45.174	8.000	1650.000	.000
Russia	.950	5.314	8.000	1642.000	.000
Hungary	.885	13.000	8.000	1644.000	.000
Czech Republic	.893	12.004	8.000	1648.000	.000
Poland	.901	11.044	8.000	1652.000	.000

Follow-up pairwise *t*-tests were then conducted, the results of which indicated that respondents rated the product categories differently for France, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland between 1992 and 1995, Russia, Hungary, and Poland between 1995 and 2000, and all five target countries between 1992 and 2000. Univariate *t*-tests were performed as a follow-up to the significant pairwise results (see Appendix D for both pairwise and univariate results).

6.3.3.1 1995 vs. 1992

The results for the 1992-1995 comparison are shown in Table 6.3.3.1. Overall, 11 significant changes occurred in Canadian perceptions of the quality of specific products made in France and three of the Eastern European countries (Hungary, Czech Republic, and Poland) during this time period.

Table 6.3.3.1 – Consumer Views of Product Categories Made in France and Selected Eastern European Countries (1995-1992)

Variables	France			Russia			Hungary			Czech Republic			Poland		
	'95	'92	p	'95	'92	p	'95	'92	p	'95	'92	p	'95	'92	p
Shoes	5.17	4.19	.000	3.07	2.94	n/s	3.80	3.39	.000	3.94	3.49	.000	3.75	3.34	.000
Radio	4.23	5.26	.000	3.09	3.02	n/s	3.52	3.76	.018	3.70	3.91	n/s	3.53	3.62	n/s
Micro/Com	4.07	4.28	.037	2.95	2.98	n/s	3.18	3.48	.002	3.32	3.57	.017	3.19	3.46	.011
Lugg/Furn	4.93	5.14	n/s	3.38	3.12	n/s	3.87	3.75	n/s	3.95	3.84	n/s	3.84	3.61	.032
Avg. Score	4.60	4.72		3.12	3.02		3.59	3.59		3.73	3.70		3.58	3.51	
# Of Sig. Differences	3			0			3			2			3		
Rank	1	1		5	5		3	3		2	2		4	4	
F	75.821			1.945			15.581			15.384			13.858		
α	.000			.101			.000			.000			.000		

All of the positive changes were made in the “Shoes” and “Luggage/Furniture” product categories, while less favorable ratings were given in 1995 in the more technically demanding “Radio” and “Microwave/Computers” categories. This may be a reflection of Eastern Europe’s economic performance during the first five years of transition. In 1995, there was a general feeling of disappointment toward Eastern Europe’s transformation from centrally planned economies to free market. The region’s transition was proving to be more difficult than many had originally anticipated. Respondents may, therefore, have had less confidence in Eastern Europe’s ability to produce technically sophisticated products.

6.3.3.2 2000 vs. 1995

Table 6.3.3.2 provides the results of the 1995-2000 product category comparison. As shown in the table, all products that registered a significant change were rated higher by respondents in the 2000 sample than they were by those in the 1995 sample. Overall, therefore, Canadian views about the target countries’ ability to manufacture certain types of products improved during this time period. Russia had two significant products (“Shoes” and “Luggage/Furniture”), Poland registered three significant results (“Shoes,” “Radio,” and “Luggage/Furniture”), while all four products were found to be significant for Hungary.

With the exception of Hungary, no noticeable improvements were observed in consumer perceptions toward the target countries’ capability of manufacturing the most technically demanding product category “Microwave/Computers.” Indeed, all five countries

received their lowest scores on this variable. The somewhat poor results for “Microwave/Computers” may be a result of the United States’ domination of the personal computer market – because consumers do not know of any computers made in France or Eastern Europe, they may assume that the countries are either incapable of manufacturing the product, or that any computers that are made in those countries are of poor quality (and thus not exported to North American markets).

Table 6.3.3.2 – Consumer Views of Product Categories Made in France and Selected Eastern European Countries (2000-1995)

Variables	France			Russia			Hungary			Czech Republic			Poland		
	'00	'95	p	'00	'95	p	'00	'95	p	'00	'95	p	'00	'95	p
Shoes	5.38	5.17	n/s	3.28	3.07	.042	4.09	3.80	.003	4.18	3.94	n/s	4.00	3.75	.015
Radio	4.40	4.23	n/s	3.24	3.09	n/s	3.84	3.52	.000	3.88	3.70	n/s	3.79	3.53	.004
Micro/Com	4.16	4.07	n/s	2.94	2.95	n/s	3.38	3.18	.037	3.46	3.32	n/s	3.37	3.19	n/s
Lugg/Furn	5.10	4.93	n/s	3.70	3.38	.004	4.23	3.87	.000	4.19	3.95	n/s	4.13	3.84	.003
Avg. Score	4.76	4.60		3.29	3.12		3.89	3.59		3.93	3.73		3.82	3.58	
# Of Sig. Differences	0			2			4			0			3		
Rank	1	1		5	5		3	3		2	2		4	4	
F	1.457			4.001			4.267			1.880			2.371		
α	.213			.003			.002			.112			.051		

6.3.3.3 2000 vs. 1992

Table 6.3.3.3 presents the results for the period 1992-2000. Overall, 10 of 11 significant results represented a positive change (France registered a decrease in mean score for the “Radio” category). Respondents therefore rated the target countries’ ability to produce certain product categories more favorably in 2000 than they did in 1992.

**Table 6.3.3.3 – Consumer Views of Product Categories Made in France and
Selected Eastern European Countries (2000-1992)**

Variables	France			Russia			Hungary			Czech Republic			Poland		
	'00	'92	p	'00	'92	p	'00	'92	p	'00	'92	p	'00	'92	p
Shoes	5.38	4.19	.000	3.28	2.94	.002	4.09	3.39	.000	4.18	3.49	.000	4.00	3.34	.000
Radio	4.40	5.26	.000	3.24	3.02	.045	3.84	3.76	n/s	3.88	3.91	n/s	3.79	3.62	n/s
Micro/Com	4.16	4.28	n/s	2.94	2.98	n/s	3.38	3.48	n/s	3.46	3.57	n/s	3.37	3.46	n/s
Lugg/Furn	5.10	5.14	n/s	3.70	3.12	.000	4.23	3.75	.000	4.19	3.84	.001	4.13	3.61	.000
Avg. Score	4.76	4.72		3.29	3.01		3.89	3.56		3.93	3.70		3.82	3.51	
# Of Sig. Differences	2			3			2			2			2		
Rank	1	1		5	5		3	3		2	2		4	4	
F	77.495			10.408			20.885			20.738			18.454		
α	.000			.000			.000			.000			.000		

Once again, most of the categories found to be significant at the .05 level represented products that are not technically sophisticated (“Shoes” and “Luggage/furniture”). No significant differences were observed in the “Microwave/Computers” product category. As was the case with the other comparisons, France received an average product category rating about one scale point higher than those received by the Eastern-European countries. As Eastern Europe producers increase their export levels in the West and begin to build strong brand names, however, their perceived manufacturing capabilities should improve.

Based on each country’s average product category score, French products were perceived as being best in quality, Russian product least desirable, and those made in the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland between the two extremes, and in that order. These

results were consistent across all three time periods. Given Poland's improved ratings on both the country and product scales between 1992 and 2000, it is somewhat surprising that it should receive the second lowest average score on the product category measures. One possible explanation for this discrepancy is that respondents may have used reference products when assessing the product category measures. If they had more reference products for Hungary and the Czech Republic than they did for Poland (e.g. it is well-known that the Bata shoe company has manufacturing facilities in the Czech Republic), the latter may have received lower scores.

6.3.4 Summary – Longitudinal Analysis

In general, Canadian perceptions toward France and the Central Eastern European countries improved between 1992 and 2000, while attitudes toward Russia became less favourable. During the period 1992-1995, the images of France and Hungary remained constant, while those of Russia, the Czech Republic, and Poland declined slightly. France, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland received higher scores in 2000 than they had in 1995 and 1992, however, resulting in an overall improvement in country image between 1992 and 2000. Russia's image, however, was consistently unfavourable in all three time periods, which may be a reflection of the country's poor economic performance since the fall of Communism.

Canadian perceptions of products from the target countries remained fairly constant between 1992 and 2000. While very little change was observed in the average product ratings of the five countries between 1992 and 1995, the changes that did occur were

positive. During the period 1995-2000, the only country to have registered any significant change was Poland, whose product image improved. Russia consistently received the lowest scores on the product scales in all three time periods.

An important observation from the longitudinal analyses was the positive changes in consumer attitudes toward Poland. In 1992, for example, respondents rated the Czech Republic higher than both Hungary and Poland on 12 of the 20 country scales. In 2000, however, Poland was awarded more favorable scores than Hungary and the Czech Republic on 16 of the 20 country scales, including “Ideal Country,” “Aligned with Canada,” and “Favor Investment In.” These results suggest that Canadian consumers may now view Poland as one of Eastern Europe’s strongest economies.

The differences between the mean scores for France and the Eastern European countries (on both the product and country scales) were similar for all three samples. France and French goods were given average scores higher than Eastern Europe and Eastern European goods by approximately one scale point in all three time periods under study. This would indicate that respondents consistently rated France (a Western nation) differently than they did the Eastern European countries. This may be attributed to both a lack of familiarity on the part of Canadian consumers toward Eastern Europe and on the persisting negative stereotypes associated with Communism.

Although respondents stated that the Eastern European country they knew most about was Russia, they evaluated the country and its products least favorably overall. This

supports previous research showing a negative bias towards products from less developed countries (Schooler, 1971; Gaedeke, 1973; Wang and Lamb, 1980, 1983; Heslop, Liefeld, and Wall, 1987; Crawford and Lumpkin, 1993). Russia's transition from command to market economy has been marked by economic and political instability. Indeed, the country now lags behind other Eastern European nations in both economic development and institutional reform. Russia's slow turnaround appears to have negatively influenced Canadian perceptions toward the country.

Finally, although all five target countries registered improvements in product category ratings between 1992 and 2000, all were given consistently low scores on the "Microwave/Computer" category. This suggests that consumers view the ability of the target countries to produce "good quality" products that are technically sophisticated as lower than their ability to make products such as shoes and furniture.

6.4 Comparative Rankings

Another objective of this study was to evaluate the relative positions of the Eastern European countries and to determine whether any changes in the perceived competitiveness of these countries on the part of Canadian consumers had occurred between 1992 and 2000. The following null hypothesis was proposed:

H₃: Canadian consumers' comparative rankings of various selected Eastern European countries are the same in all time periods studied.

The overall average response ratings for both the product and country scales are provided in Tables 6.4.1 and 6.4.2. The relative ordinal rankings for the selected countries and their products for each of the years are noted in parentheses.

Table 6.4.1 – Ordinal Rankings of the Target Countries (1992-2000)

Country	1992	1995	2000
France	5.20(1)	5.05(1)	5.32(1)
Russia	3.68(5)	3.48(5)	3.60(5)
Hungary	4.06(4)	4.00(4)	4.22(4)
Czech Republic	4.25(2)	4.04(3)	4.33(3)
Poland	4.22(3)	4.17(2)	4.45(2)

As shown in Table 6.4.1, France received the highest overall rating on the country scales for each time period, and Russia was consistently rated the lowest. Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary were rated between these two extremes, in that order, in 1995 and 2000 (the Czech Republic received the second highest ranking in 1992). Canadian consumers appear to perceive Poland, therefore, as the emerging leader Eastern Europe.

The ordinal rankings for the selected Eastern European countries are consistent with the Economist Intelligence Unit's business environment rankings model, which rated Poland the most attractive country in Eastern Europe (*Country Monitor*, January 2000). As mentioned earlier, foreign direct investment (FDI) has been, and continues to be, an important component of the strategies of many Eastern European governments to privatise their productive resources and create market economies (Jermakowicz and

Bellas, 1997). The decisive prerequisite for attracting FDI, however, is that host countries offer stable political circumstances and liberal economic structures (Wieners, 1996). Poland, with its sound macro-economic policies and commitment to democracy, is the current leader in attracting FDI inflows (United Nations, 1999).

**Table 6.4.2 – Ordinal Rankings of Products Made in
the Target Countries (1992-2000)**

Country	1992	1995	2000
France	4.87(1)	4.81(1)	5.01(1)
Russia	3.10(5)	3.20(5)	3.30(5)
Hungary	3.68(3)	3.70(3)	3.80(4)
Czech Republic	3.73(2)	3.79(2)	3.90(2)
Poland	3.56(4)	3.67(4)	3.82(3)

Table 6.4.2 presents the overall average response ratings for the product scales. French products were evaluated as “best” overall by all samples, and Russian products were consistently rated the lowest. In 1992 and 1995, Canadian consumers rated products from the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland between these extremes, and in that order. Only one change occurred in the 2000 study (Polish products were ranked higher than they had been in the previous studies). Similarly to its overall country image then, consumer views regarding Poland’s ability to make products became stronger between 1992 and 2000.

Based on these findings, the null hypothesis of no differences in Canadian consumers’ comparative rankings of Eastern European countries during the various time periods

under study was not rejected. Respondents in all three samples rated both the countries and products of Eastern Europe in a consistent manner, adding external validity to the study.

6.5 Generalized vs. Product-Specific Evaluations

Pearson correlation coefficients were used to test the hypothesis that respondents rate both specific products and general product images using the same criteria:

H_4 : Product-specific and general images are not related.

The product-specific images (Shoes, Furniture, Radio, Computer) were compared to three relevant measures from the global evaluation scale: a) the “Quality” item, which is consistent with the phrasing used in the product-specific evaluations; b) the “Good/Poor Overall” item – a broad evaluative measure; and c) the average score of all 16 product scale items. The data is presented in Table 6.5.1. In all cases, the statistic was positive and significant at the .01 level (see Appendix E). Given these results, it was concluded that a relationship may exist between product-specific and global product images – null hypothesis three was therefore rejected.

As demonstrated in the table, the means for the product-specific columns, for all countries, follow an almost identical pattern as those for the global evaluations. That is to say, product-specific images increase (or decrease) in line with global product images. The image of French products, for example, declined between 1992 and 1995, and then

became more favorable between 1995 and 2000. These changes were reflected in both the product-specific and global measures. The decline in ratings for French goods in 1995 was attributed to concerns over French government actions regarding both nuclear testing and the country's occasional support of the sovereignty movement in Quebec (Papadopoulos, Heslop, and Szamosi, 1997). National image, therefore, was found to influence respondent views toward specific products.

Table 6.5.1 – Country Profiles for Specific Products and Global Evaluative Measures

Country	Year	Shoes	Lugg/ Furn.	Radio	Micro/ Comp.	"Quality"	"Overall"	16-Item Summ.
France	1992	5.26	5.14	4.28	4.19	5.19	5.25	4.87
	1995	5.17	4.93	4.23	4.07	5.15	5.18	4.80
	2000	5.38	5.10	4.40	4.16	5.32	5.34	5.01
Russia	1992	3.02	3.12	2.98	2.94	3.09	3.08	3.10
	1995	3.07	3.38	3.09	2.95	3.27	3.14	3.19
	2000	3.28	3.70	3.24	2.94	3.39	3.27	3.30
Hungary	1992	3.76	3.75	3.48	3.39	4.00	3.89	3.68
	1995	3.80	3.87	3.52	3.18	4.05	3.97	3.67
	2000	4.09	4.23	3.84	3.38	4.22	4.04	3.80
Czech Republic	1992	3.91	3.84	3.57	3.49	4.14	4.11	3.73
	1995	3.94	3.95	3.70	3.32	4.05	4.06	3.78
	2000	4.18	4.19	3.88	3.46	4.15	4.25	3.90
Poland	1992	3.62	3.61	3.46	3.34	3.85	3.80	3.56
	1995	3.75	3.84	3.53	3.19	3.89	3.94	3.66
	2000	4.00	4.13	3.79	3.37	4.11	4.10	3.82

Observations from Table 6.5.1 concerning Eastern European products support this finding. Respondent ratings of specific products from Eastern Europe are consistent with the country and product evaluations discussed in previous sections. Russian goods, for example, were perceived less favourably than those produced in Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland by respondents in all three samples (Russia received a mean score

of 3.27 for the “Good Overall” scale, while Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland received much higher ratings – 4.04, 4.25, and 4.10, respectively). Respondents also rated specific products from Russia less favourably than those made in the other three Eastern European countries.

Another observation is that respondents were able to discriminate between product categories in each time period under study. While France, for example, did receive much higher product-specific ratings than the Eastern European countries across all three samples, respondents gave the country lower ratings for the items “Radio” and “Microwave/Computer” than they did for “Shoes” and “Luggage/Furniture.” The same observation can be made for the Eastern European countries. Respondents appear to be saying, therefore, that the ability of the target countries to make “good quality” products that are technologically demanding is lower than their ability to make shoes and furniture.

6.6 Factor Structure

Principal components analysis (VARIMAX rotation) was used to test the hypothesis that the factor structure observed in the 2000 sample resembled those from the 1995 and 1992 samples:

H₅: There will be no differences in the factor structure found in this study and those found in 1992 and 1995.

Principal components analysis is an exploratory form of variable reduction that groups a large number of variables into a small group of underlying constructs. The constructs are

unobserved hypothetical variables that underlie and explain the observed correlations (Loehlin, 1998). Kaiser's rule of using only those components with eigenvalues greater than one was used to determine how many factors to retain. Variables with loadings of .50 or higher were considered significant, although those with loadings between .40 and .49 were also retained if they were found to contribute to an identifiable construct.

Tables 6.6.1 to 6.6.6 show the country and product constructs for the five target countries, along with the variables with factor loadings greater than .50 (see Appendix F for complete results). Despite some variations, the tables indicate a fairly consistent pattern of factor groupings across the three time periods under study.

6.6.1 Country Scales (1992)

Four constructs emerged from the 1992 data. The total amount of variance explained by the factors ranged from 55.9 percent (Russia) to 63.0 percent (France). The results are presented in Table 6.6.1. The first construct represented respondents' feelings of affinity toward, and desired relationship with, the target countries. It was named "Affect" and contained seven variables – "Immigration," "Like," "Peaceful," "Ties," "Trustworthy," "Investment," and "Safe." In all five analyses, these variables were found to load exclusively on this one construct. For Russia, Hungary, and Poland six or seven of the "Affect" items were contained in a single factor, whereas for France and the Czech Republic, the variables were distributed between two factors.

Table 6.6.1 – Factor Structure (1992): Country Scales

Construct Variable	France 1992					Russia 1992					Hungary 1992					Czech R. 1992					Poland 1992					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	I	II	III	IV	V	I	II	III	IV	V	I	II	III	IV	V	I	II	III	IV	V
Immigration																										
Like	.81						.69					.82					.84					.77				
Ties	.63						.68					.57					.51					.79				
Investment	.79						.68					.81					.69					.83				
Trustworthy	.76						.77					.68					.79					.65				
Peaceful	.61						.74					.79					.64					.82				
Safe							.48					.58					.74					.74				
Rich												.54					.52					.64				
Stable												.61					.77					.81				
Ideal												.62					.75					.76				
Many Rights												.44					.66					.61				
Industrialized												.47					.43					.53				
Educated												.53					.65					.61				
Western												.82					.69					.83				
Know About												.76					.48					.71				
Active												.55					.44									
Democratic												.52					.53									
Align												.80					.49									
Hardworking												.69					.61									
Individualistic												.68					.72									
Cumulative % of Variance	63.035						55.889					59.446					61.388					57.819				

The second construct to emerge from the 1992 sample was related to consumer beliefs about the target countries' level of industrial development. It comprised six variables – “Rich,” “Stable,” “Ideal,” “Many Rights,” “Industrialized,” and “Educated.” This construct was named “Development.” Unlike the first construct, which was fairly consistent across all five target countries, some discrepancies were found in the second construct. For Russia, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland five or six of the “Development” variables loaded together in one or two factors, indicating that consumers rated the Eastern European countries' in a consistent manner on these items. Two additional variables (“Safe” and “Western”), however, were found to load in the “Development” factor for the Czech Republic. In addition, France's second factor did not include the items “Ideal” and “Many Rights.” This is an indication that consumers perceive France differently than they do the Eastern European nations. Canadians may have simply assumed, for example, that France, as a Western nation, is an ideal country that awards its citizens many rights. This assumption could not be made for the Eastern European countries, however, because their degree of industrial development is lower and thus their progress in terms of civil liberties, possibly less advanced.

The third construct comprised three variables – “Western,” “Know About,” and “Democratic.” It was named “Politics.” Although a consistent pattern of factor loadings was identified for this construct, individual results for the target countries differed somewhat. France's “Politics” construct, for example, comprised all three variables, whereas the Eastern European countries had only two variables loading together on this construct. In addition, the variables included in the third construct for the Eastern

European countries were not the same in each country (i.e. “Western” and “Know About” loaded together for Hungary and Poland, while “Western” and “Democratic” loaded together for Russia, and “Know About” and “Democratic” for the Czech Republic). For Hungary, the variables “Ideal” and “Many Rights” also loaded on the “Politics” construct. This indicates that Hungary’s “Politics” construct may include a social welfare component that is not present in any other country. Finally, even though the variable “Active” is included in the third factor grouping in Table 6.6.1, it did not load consistently on any one construct.

The fourth construct identified from the 1992 data was related to descriptive characteristics of the target countries’ populations. It was named “People” and contained the variables “Aligned with Canada,” “Hardworking,” and “Individualistic.” These variables appeared in combinations of two or three for all of the countries except Russia. This suggests that Canadian consumers in 1992 may have been unsure as to how to rate Russian people. The variable “Individualistic,” for example, did not load on any factor for Russia, and the variable “Hardworking” was found to load with “Know About” and “Peaceful.” The collapse of the former USSR changed people’s perceptions about the country and highlighted the economic and social deficiencies of a communist state. Canadians may have been confused as to how a people that had the capability to engage in a sophisticated arms race and develop a space program, could have such a low quality of life.

1992 Country Constructs

“Affect”:	Immigration, Like, Ties, Investment, Trustworthy, Peaceful, Safe
“Development”:	Rich, Stable, Ideal, Rights, Industrialized, Educated
“Politics”:	Western, Know, Democratic
“People”:	Hardworking, individualistic

6.6.2 Country Scales (1995)

Four constructs were identified from the 1995 data (the results are shown in Table 6.6.2). The total amount of variance explained by the factors ranged from 57.5 percent (Hungary) to 62.6 percent (Czech Republic). Similarly to the 1992 sample, the first construct to emerge was related to consumers’ feelings of affinity toward, and desired relationship with, the target countries. It was also named “Affect” and comprised six variables – “Immigration,” “Like,” “Ties,” “Investment,” “Trustworthy,” and “Peaceful.” These six variables loaded together on the first factor in all five countries. For the Eastern European countries, no other scale item loaded on this factor. Contrary to the 1992 sample, the variable “safe” did not load on the “Affect” construct in 1995. This may indicate a change in perceptions on the part of Canadians in terms of their desired relationships with the target countries. In 1992, the memory of the Cold War between Russia and the United States may have made the perceived safety of the countries an important component of consumers’ willingness to interact with them. By 1995, however, trade and tourism had grown considerably in Eastern Europe and the issue of safety may no longer have been a concern.

Table 6.6.2 – Factor Structure (1995): Country Scales

Construct Variable	France 1995					Russia 1995						Hungary 1995					Czech R. 1995					Poland 1995				
	I	II	III	IV	V	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	I	II	III	IV	V	I	II	III	IV	V	I	II	III	IV	V
Immigration	.64					.75						.76					.80					.83				
Like	.77					.76						.71					.74					.72				
Ties	.80					.78						.81					.83					.84				
Investment	.75					.81						.75					.84					.82				
Trustworthy	.78					.76						.74					.74					.64				
Peaceful	.57					.51						.49					.50					.48				
Stable	.53					.70						.66					.71					.59				
Many Rights						.54						.49					.67					.66				
Rich												.59					.75					.60				
Ideal												.58					.55					.48				
Democratic												.51					.45					.69				
Safe												.64					.41					.54				
Align												.57					.76					.77				
Industrialized												.84					.76					.73				
Educated												.81					.76					.77				
Western												.73					.53					.77				
Know About												.56					.71					.72				
Active												.51					.48					.77				
Hardworking												.57					.50					.67				
Individualistic												.70					.76					.75				
Cumulative % of Variance	58.501					59.624						57.468					62.627					58.029				

The second construct identified from the 1995 data was also comparable to that from the 2000 study – it had some identification with beliefs about each country's level of industrial development. This construct was named "Development" and comprised nine variables ("Stable," "Many Rights," "Rich," "Ideal," "Democratic," "Safe," "Align," "Industrialized," and "Educated"). For France, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland these items were distributed between two factors, whereas for Russia, they loaded together in four factors. Unlike the "Development" construct identified in the 1992 sample, the second construct from the 1995 data included three extra variables – "Democratic," "Safe," and "Align," which appear to be related to a country's level of social development or quality of life. As mentioned earlier, the variable "Safe" may have changed factor groupings between 1992 and 1995 (from "Affect" to "Development") because safety in Eastern Europe may have become less of a concern to Canadians and thus not a necessary component of their desired level of interaction with countries from the region. The variables "Democratic" and "Aligned" may have been included in the "Development" factor in 1995 because Canadian consumers were better informed about Eastern Europe at that time than they were in 1992. The transformation in Eastern Europe was somewhat disappointing in that it took longer than predicted. The poor performance of the Eastern European countries between 1992 and 1995, therefore, may have suggested to Canadians that countries that are democratic and aligned with Canada are more industrialized than those that are not.

The third construct to emerge from the 1995 sample comprised two variables – "Western" and "Know About." These two variables loaded together in every country

except the Czech Republic. The construct was named “Disparity” because it seemed to reflect a contrast between consumer knowledge about the target countries and the countries’ orientation. The “Disparity” construct contained two of the three variables that loaded together on the “Politics” construct from the 1992 data (the latter also included the variable “Democratic”). Similarly to the 1992 sample, the variable “Active” was found to be somewhat problematic – it did not load consistently on any one factor.

The fourth construct comprised the variables “Hardworking” and Individualistic.” These variables loaded together in all five target countries. As with the fourth construct identified in the 1992 sample, this construct was named “People” as it seemed to reflect descriptive characteristics of the target countries’ people. In two instances (Hungary and Poland) the variable “Active,” which is another people attribute, also loaded on the fourth construct.

1995 Country Constructs

Affect:	Immigration, Like, Ties, Investment, Trustworthy, Peaceful
Development:	Stable, Rights, Rich, Ideal, Democratic, Safe, Align, Industrialized, Educated
Disparity:	Western, Know
People:	Hardworking, Individualistic

6.6.3 Country Scales (2000)

Four constructs emerged from the 2000 data. The total amount of variance explained by the factors ranged from 55.9 percent (Russia) to 63.0 percent (France). The results are

presented in Table 6.6.3. As with the 1992 and 1995 samples, the first construct in the 1992 sample represented respondents' feelings of affect and desired level of interaction with the target countries. It was named "Affect" and comprised six variables – "Immigration," "Like," "Ties," "Investment," "Trustworthy," and "Peaceful."

The second construct was also comparable to that from the previous two samples. It reflected consumer beliefs about the countries' degree of industrial and social development and thus was similarly named "Development." This construct comprised nine variables – "Industrialized," "Educated," "Rich," "Stable," "Many Rights," "Democratic," "Ideal," "Safe," "Western," and "Know About." The last two variables were not included in this construct in 1992 and 1995. For Hungary and Poland, eight of the nine "Development" variables loaded together, while all nine variables loaded together for the Czech Republic. This suggests that consumers evaluated the three Central Eastern European countries in a similar manner. The results for the "Development" construct, however, were somewhat different for France and Russia. Instead of the variables loading together in one factor (as they did for the three other countries), the nine "Development" items were distributed among three different factors. For France and Russia, therefore, the "Development" factor actually comprised three different variable groupings. This result may be a reflection of consumers' level of familiarity with France and Russia. Respondents in the 2000 sample admitted to knowing more about the two countries than they did about Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland, and were thus possibly better able to distinguish between the various descriptive country characteristics when evaluating them.

The third construct to emerge from the 2000 data comprised the variables “Active,” “Hardworking,” and “Align.” As these variables were primarily related to characteristics of the countries’ people, the construct was named “People.” Unlike the “People” constructs from the previous two samples, however, this construct did not include the variable “Individualistic.” Indeed, “Individualistic” was shown to load by itself in all five countries, and was thus identified as a fourth construct. For the four Eastern European countries, the variables “Active” and “Hardworking” consistently loaded together on the third construct. The “People” construct for the Czech Republic and Poland also included the variables “Industrialized” and “Educated”, suggesting that for these two countries, the third construct may represent a larger construct that encompasses evaluative measures regarding the capabilities of the countries’ people. France’s third construct comprised only the variables “Hardworking” and “Align.” “Active” may have been excluded from France’s “People” construct because consumers evaluated the variable differently for that country than they did for the Eastern European nations. As a G7 country, and member of NATO, the European Union, and other organisations, France may be considered a visibly active country. The Eastern European countries, on the other hand, have traditionally been less active in the world community. Consumers, therefore, may have evaluated France as a country on the variable “Active” but evaluated the populations of the four Eastern European countries instead on the same variable.

2000 Country Constructs

Affect:	Immigration, Like, Ties, Investment, Trustworthy, Peaceful
Development:	Industrialized, educated, Rich, Stable, Many Rights, Democratic, Ideal, Safe, Western, Know About
People:	Active, Hardworking, Align
Individualistic:	Individualistic

6.6.4 Product Scales (1992)

Three constructs were identified from the 1992 sample (the results are shown in Table 6.6.4). The total amount of variance explained by the factors ranged from 53.4 percent (Hungary) to 62.5 percent (Russia). The first construct identified from the 1992 sample represented product attributes and was named “Product Description.” It comprised 12 items – “Attractive,” “Innovative,” “Technically Advanced,” “Workmanship,” “Reliable,” “Satisfaction,” “Overall,” “Good Quality,” “Proud to Own,” “Good Value,” “Buy,” and “Service”. The Eastern European countries showed between nine and 11 of these variables loading together in the first construct. France showed all 12 items in the same factor grouping, but spread across two factors. For all five countries, no other variables loaded on the “Product Description” construct.

Table 6.6.4 – Factor Structure (1992): Product Scales

Construct Variable	France 1992				Russia 1992				Hungary 1992				Czech R. 1992				Poland 1992			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Attractive	.78				.60				.60				.61				.61			
Innovative	.63				.57									.68			.41			
Tec. Advanced	.55	.52							.77				.49				.79			
Workmanship	.55	.55			.68			.54					.53				.79			
Reliable	.64				.78				.68				.58				.70			
Satisfaction	.52	.55			.77				.82				.61				.75			
Overall	.50	.51			.81				.70				.78				.86			
Good Quality	.42				.79				.72				.76				.70			
Proud to Own	.60				.67				.69				.80				.73			
Good Value	.62				.61			.50	.71				.60				.68			
Buy	.64				.77				.64				.69				.61			
Service	.74							.62												
Expensive																				
Know																				
Brand Names																				
Easy to Find																				
Cumulative % of Variance	62.383				62.465				53.432				61.440				61.778			

The second construct to emerge from the 1992 data was related to the market presence of the products. It was named “Market Presence” and comprised three variables – “Brand Names,” “Find,” and “Know.” The first two of these items loaded together in all five countries, while “Know” loaded on this construct in three countries (France, Hungary, Czech Republic). France and Poland had all three “Market Presence” variables loading together (France in one factor, Poland in two). Poland’s PCA analysis also indicated that the variables “Attractive,” “Innovative,” and “Technically Advanced” loaded together on one of the country’s “Market Presence” factors, suggesting that they may have been perceived by consumers as particularly important (or memorable) product attributes.

Finally, a third construct was identified that comprised only the variable “Expensive.” In two cases (France and Poland) this item loaded by itself in its factor. Russia, Hungary, and the Czech Republic had one or both of the variables “Innovative” and “Technically Advanced” also loading with “Expensive,” suggesting again that consumers may view these product attributes as special. For Poland, “Expensive” loaded with one of the country’s “Market Presence” factors.

1992 Product Constructs

Product Description: Attractive, Innovative, Technically advanced, Workmanship, Reliable, Satisfaction, Overall, Good Quality, Proud to Own, Good Value, Buy, Service

Market Presence: Know, Brand Names, Easy to Find

Expensive: Expensive

6.6.5 Product Scales (1995)

Three constructs emerged from the 1995 data. The total amount of variance explained by the factors ranged from 58.0 percent (Hungary) to 62.5 percent (France). The results are presented in Table 6.6.5. Like the 1992 sample, the first construct from the 1995 data represented various product attributes and was named "Product Description." It comprised the same 12 variables as the first construct in the 1992 sample – "Attractive," "Innovative," "Technically Advanced," "Workmanship," "Reliable," "Satisfaction," "Overall," "Good Quality," "Proud to Own," "Good Value," "Buy," and "Service". The Eastern European countries had between 10 and 12 of these items loading together in a single factor. For France, however, the 12 "Product Description" variables loaded together across two factors.

The second construct in this sample was also similar to the one identified in the 1992 data. It represented a "Market Presence" construct and comprised the same three items as those found in the second 1992 product factor ("Brand Names," "Find," and "Know"). As with the 1992 sample, these three items loaded together for France, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. For Russia and Poland, only the variables "Brand Names" and "Easy to Find" loaded together on the "Market Presence" construct (the item "Know" did not show a significant loading on any factor for these two countries). Similarly to the 1992 sample, the variables "Innovative" and "Technically Advanced" were found to load with the second construct for Russia, Hungary, and Poland, suggesting that the items may be perceived by consumers as having some affiliation with their level of familiarity with products from those countries.

Table 6.6.5 – Factor Structure (1995): Product Scales

Construct Variable	France 1995				Russia 1995				Hungary 1995				Czech R. 1995				Poland 1995			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Attractive	68				68				68				71				64			
Innovative	74					55			55				60				55			
Tec. Advanced	56					52		51	42	45			59				47	52		
Workmanship	74				61				70				79				74			
Reliable	69				60								74				70			
Satisfaction	62				78				72				83				80			
Overall	56				71				73				68				73			
Good Quality	56	53			85				80				77				77			
Proud to Own		53			77				71				68				75			
Good Value		69			63				67				64				67			
Buy	52	51			75				68				69				75			
Service		65			41			41				59	49				50			
Expensive				82				83				90				90				
Know			51	63																
Brand Names			73					95												
Easy to Find			76			65			42	-67			42					78		
						77			76				83					82		
Cumulative % of Variance	62.484				62.294				58.010				60.492				59.599			

The third construct to emerge from the analyses comprised the variable “Expensive” and was present in all five countries. In two instances (France and Poland) the variable also loaded with “Know.” For France, this may be indicative of the types of products that consumers associate with the country (e.g. wine, fashion, cosmetics – luxury items).

1995 Product Constructs

Product Description: Attractive, Innovative, Technically advanced, Workmanship, Reliable, Satisfaction, Overall, Good Quality, Proud to Own, Good Value, Buy, Service

Market Presence: Brand Names, Find, Know, Technically Advanced

Expensive: Expensive

6.6.6 Product Scales (2000)

Similarly to the other two samples, three constructs emerged from the 2000 data (the results are shown in Table 6.6.6). The total amount of variance explained by the factors ranged from 55.4 percent (Hungary) to 64.6 percent (Russia). The first construct represented product attributes and comprised 12 variables – “Attractive,” “Innovative,” “Technically Advanced,” “Workmanship,” “Reliable,” “Satisfaction,” “Overall,” “Good Quality,” “Proud to Own,” “Good Value,” “Buy,” and “Service”. As with the first factors from the 1992 and 1995 samples, this construct was named “Product Description.” For the three Central Eastern European countries (Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland) a minimum of 11 of the 12 items loaded together on the first construct. Also, for these countries, no other variable loaded on the first factor and none of the 12 variables included in the factor showed loadings above .50 anywhere else.

Table 6.6.6 – Factor Structure (2000): Product Scales

Construct Variable	France 2000				Russia 2000				Hungary 2000				Czech R. 2000				Poland 2000			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Attractive	.61				.78				.72				.71				.72			
Innovative	.69				.55				.55				.55				.61			
Tec. Advanced	.70					.53			.45				.52				.51			
Workmanship	.70				.51				.68				.74				.73			
Reliable	.65				.58				.77				.74				.71			
Satisfaction	.68				.64				.80				.77				.79			
Overall	.58				.66				.71				.75				.76			
Good Quality	.42			.49	.72				.74				.72				.77			
Proud to Own				.56	.67				.63				.64				.69			
Good Value		.73			.67				.69				.72				.62			
Buy		.55			.82				.71				.70				.75			
Service		.72									.46		.49				.44			
Expensive				.75							.82					.83				.77
Know	.42	.43																		
Brand Names	.71												.63							.55
Easy to Find	.60					.73		.89					.79							.71
						.65							.74							.85
Cumulative % of Variance	56.619				64.621				55.422				57.449				56.773			

This indicates that respondents consistently rated the Central Eastern European countries in the same way. Russia's results for the first construct were very similar, with 10 of the 12 "Product Description" variables loading together on one factor. France, however, showed a slightly differently factor grouping, with the 12 "Product Description" variables disbursed among three factors (8 of the 12 variables loaded together in the first factor).

The second construct to emerge from the 2000 data was also similar to constructs found in the 1992 and 1995 samples. It represented a "Market Presence" construct and included three variables – "Know," "Brand Names," and "Easy to Find." These three variables loaded together consistently on separate factors for the four Eastern European countries, although they did not do so for France. Results of France's PCA analysis showed that the "Market Presence" variables loaded with the "Product Description" items on the first factor. The distinct "Market Presence" factor for the Eastern European countries may be a reflection of consumers' lack of familiarity with Eastern European products. Consumers may have rated Eastern European products based on their overall impressions of the countries themselves (i.e. Han's halo effect – 1990), but may have rated the variables "Brands," "Easy to Find," and "Know" on their actual experience (or rather lack thereof) with them. Finally, two additional variables loaded on Russia's third factor ("technically advanced" and "Workmanship"), suggesting that consumers may have linked these items to their level of familiarity with Russian products. This would make sense, for example, if consumers evaluated Russian goods using reference products such as vodka, automobiles, or caviar.

Similarly to the 1992 and 1995 samples, the third construct from the 2000 data comprised only one variable – “Expensive.” For the Czech Republic and Poland, this variable did not load with any other item. For Russia and Hungary, however, “Expensive” loaded with “Service,” while for France, the variable loaded with “Good Quality” and “Proud to Own.”

2000 Product Constructs

Product Description: Attractive, Innovative, Technically advanced, Workmanship, Reliable, Satisfaction, Overall, Good Quality, Proud to Own, Good Value, Buy, Service

Market Presence: Brand Names, Find, Know

Expensive: Expensive

6.6.7 Summary – Factor Structure

Despite some variations, the results indicate a fairly consistent pattern of factor loadings across the three time periods under study. In total, five or six factors emerged from the country scales. Of these factors, four major constructs were identified in all three samples. The first construct was named “Affect” and comprised variables related to consumers’ feelings about a country and its people (e.g. “Like,” “Should Have Closer Ties With,” “Would Welcome Immigration From”). In each sample, the construct comprised the same six variables (with the exception of an additional variable – “Safe” – in the 1992 sample). The construct “Development” was also consistently identified. This factor represented consumer perceptions towards a country’s degree of industrial and social development. Although its composition varied somewhat in each sample, it always

contained a core set of 6 variables (“Rich,” “Stable,” “Ideal,” “Many Rights,” “Industrialized,” and “Educated”). A third common construct was found in the 1992 and 1995 samples. This construct was named “Politics” and “Disparity,” respectively, and consistently included the variables – “Western” and “Know About.” The fourth construct to emerge from the PCA analyses was present in each data set. It represented beliefs about a country’s people and included the variable “Hardworking” in each sample.

The product analyses showed even more similarities between the three samples than did the country analyses. A total of three or four factors emerged from the product scales. Of these, three main constructs were identified in each sample. The first was named “Product Description” and comprised various descriptive product measures (e.g. “Attractive,” “Good Workmanship”). In all three data sets, this construct comprised the same 12 variables. The second common construct represented consumers’ level of familiarity with products from the target countries. It also demonstrated a consistent pattern of variable loadings across the three samples. The final product construct contained only one variable in each time period – “Expensive.”

While some discrepancies were found in the composition of the factor groupings in each time period, the overall results indicate strong commonalities in the constructs that emerged from each sample. The null hypothesis that there will be no differences in the 2000 factor structure and those found in 1992 and 1995 was, therefore, not rejected.

6.7 PCI Model

The PCI model was tested on all five target countries using data obtained from the 2000 study. Hypotheses six through 21 represent proposed relationships between the model's latent constructs, all of which are positive (see section 3.2.2). These hypotheses were tested through analysis of covariance structures (structural equation modeling – SEM). SEM procedures represent “causal” processes that generate observations on multiple variables (Bentler, 1988 in Byrne, 1994). The causal processes under study are represented by a series of structural (i.e. regression) equations that can be modeled pictorially. The hypothesized model is tested statistically to determine the extent to which the resulting model-implied covariance matrix is consistent with a data-based covariance matrix (goodness of fit).

A full structural equation model comprises both a measurement model (which defines relations between the latent constructs and their measured variables) and a structural model (which defines relations among the latent constructs). AMOS (the SEM analysis package used to estimate the parameters of the PCI model) employs a maximum likelihood procedure to simultaneously estimate the measurement of these structural equation systems. The program generates a summary statistic with a chi-square distribution (which can be used to test the null hypothesis that the model is consistent with the data), provides evidence to support the validity of the model's measures, and – through the analysis of covariance structures – allows the estimation of regression coefficients of structural paths (Brill, 1994).

This study assessed the validity of the measured variables using standardized regression weights (R^2 values). R^2 represents the percentage of variance in the measured variable that is accounted for by the variance in the construct with which it is associated. The decision rule was to retain only those variables with R^2 values $> .20$ (if a variable showed R^2 values $< .20$ in at least three out of five countries, it was dropped from subsequent analyses). A fairly liberal R^2 value was chosen in order to balance fit and parsimony. To test the theory upon which the PCI model was developed, it was necessary to retain a large number of measures to ensure that the latent constructs were not compromised. Overall model fit, however, could be improved by removing those variables that were very poorly linked to the latent constructs.

The significance of the structural paths was determined by examining their critical ratios, which is comparable to a t statistic with infinite degrees of freedom. Overall model fit was judged based on four different fit indexes – Steiger's root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), the incremental fit index (IFI), and Brett's parsimonious fit index (PNFI). These indexes were chosen based on Loehlin's suggestion of supplementing RMSEA with one or two baseline line measures and at least one parsimonious index when assessing goodness of fit (1998). A chi-square statistic was also reported for each model, although it was not used to determine model fit because it is sensitive to sample size.

RMSEA is a discrepancy per degree of freedom test similar to a root mean square (Maruyama, 1998). Steiger (1989, p.81 in Loehlin, 1998) considers values below .10

“good” and below .05 “very good.” Loehlin (1998), predicts that RMSEA will become fairly standardized in the SEM field for describing quality of fit. TLI is a population-based criteria of model fit that assesses how well a particular model does in explaining a set of observed data compared to (an assortment of) other possible models (Maruyama, 1998). The typical range for TLI lies between zero and one, with values close to one indicating a very good fit (Arbuckle, 1997). TLI is a widely used baseline index as it is considered to be fairly consistent across sample size (Maruyama, 1998). IFI is another recommended population-based criteria (Byrne, 2001). IFI values close to one indicate a good fit. PNFI is a parsimonious fit index that takes into account the complexity (i.e. number of estimated parameters) of the hypothesized model in the assessment of overall model fit (Byrne, 2001). A PNFI value of one indicates perfect fit.

6.7.1 Initial Tests – 1st Run

Figure 6.7.1 shows a schematic presentation of the PCI model. The measured variables (scale items) are depicted as boxes and the unmeasured variables (latent constructs) as ellipses. Attached to each measured variable is a residual (error term) that represents the unexplained variance ($1 - R^2$). A residual is also associated with the prediction of each endogenous construct (designated “other” in the diagram). The paths between the error terms and the measured variables are fixed to a value of one (these paths are considered to be known because they are implicit in their prediction of one variable from another). The first of each set of regression paths associated with the constructs is also fixed to one (the selection of these paths is arbitrary and has no effect on the relative loadings of the measured variables or on overall model fit). The arrows that connect both the constructs

to the measured variables and the constructs to each other represent regression coefficients and indicate the impact of one variable on another.

Figure 6.7.1 – PCI Model

The purpose of the initial run of the five models was to test the validity of the measurement model. As mentioned earlier, the decision rule was to retain only those variables with R^2 values $> .20$ (an R^2 value less than $.20$ means that more than 80% of the variance in a particular variable is entirely unrelated to its construct). Table 6.7.1 presents the R^2 values obtained for each variable in all five model tests (see Appendix G for full results).

As shown in the table, seven measures consistently had R^2 values $< .20$ ("Know Country," "Individualistic," "Hardworking," "Aligned," "Expensive," "Good After Sales Service," and "Know Products"). All of these measures proved to be poorly linked to their relevant latent construct in at least four of the five target countries. The variable "individualistic" had particularly low R^2 values in all of the tests, suggesting that it contained considerable variance that was unrelated to the PEOPLE DESCRIPTION construct. Indeed, this variable proved to be so troublesome for Poland's PCI model that AMOS refused to provide a solution until the variable had been removed. Table 6.7.1 consequently does not provide R^2 values for either of Poland's two PEOPLE DESCRIPTION variables. The low R^2 values obtained for the variables "Know Country" and "Expensive" are consistent with Dowdles' (1997) findings. Her tests of the PCI model on data measuring Canadian views toward NAFTA and potential NAFTA countries also showed poor fit for these variables.

Table 6.7.1 – R² Values from the Initial Tests

Variable	France	Russia	Hungary	Czech Republic	Poland
Country Description					
Stable	.359	.307	.505	.534	.413
People have many rights	.251	.231	.389	.476	.352
Democratic	.302	.171	.381	.626	.465
Western culture	.192	.076	.238	.275	.219
Know country	.074	.000	.122	.235	.096
Ideal	.458	.544	.540	.627	.537
Safe	.529	.468	.488	.608	.551
People Description					
Trustworthy	.827	.383	.304	.718	1.000*
Individualistic	.008	.034	.001	.012	n/a
People Competence					
Educated	.736	.401	.129	.395	.378
Hardworking	.062	.004	.039	.137	.081
Active	.109	.075	.853	.371	.327
Country Competence					
Industrialized	.728	.062	.308	.548	.319
Rich	.248	1.462	.644	.431	.648
Country Evaluation					
Like	.565	.375	.456	.512	.628
Aligned with Canada	.153	.169	.089	.119	.094
Peaceful	.270	.391	.490	.478	.323
Relationship					
Welcome immigration from	.369	.504	.524	.507	.689
Should have closer ties with	.545	.428	.684	.585	.585
Favour investment in	.435	.401	.694	.672	.580
Product Beliefs					
Technically advanced	.235	.194	.211	.363	.303
Reliable	.485	.649	.624	.581	.479
Attractive	.345	.516	.417	.515	.608
Innovative	.328	.441	.405	.350	.365
Good quality	.361	.656	.318	.328	.416
Expensive	.052	.168	.006	.002	.026
Good workmanship	.643	.603	.329	.137	.405
Good after sales service	.092	.323	.114	.151	.165
Product Evaluation					
Good value	.173	.207	.263	.220	.172
Satisfied with	.676	.636	.607	.577	.592
Proud to own	.332	.422	.278	.215	.451
Good overall products	.544	.541	.260	.261	.338
Familiarity					
Recognizable brands	.577	.182	.644	.594	.719
Know a lot about	.395	.018	.082	.176	.070
Products are easy to find	.191	.660	.451	.371	.391
Willing to Buy					
Willing to buy	1.000*	1.000*	1.000*	1.000*	1.000*

*Only measured variable in construct

Values in bold represent R² < .20

6.7.2 Overall Model Fit – 1st Run vs. 2nd Run

A second set of tests was conducted on the PCI model minus the seven variables that were found to fit poorly within the measurement model (“Know Country,” “Individualistic,” “Hardworking,” “Aligned,” “Expensive,” “Good After Sales Service,” and “Know Products”). An eighth variable, “Industrialized,” was later dropped from Russia’s PCI model (R^2 value = .062) because (as was the case with the variable “Individualistic” in the initial run of Poland’s model) AMOS refused to provide a determinate solution of parameter estimation until the measure had been removed. Table 6.7.2 compares the overall fit of the initial and revised PCI models (i.e. the full measurement model vs. the PCI model minus the seven problematic variables) – it reports the results of the fit indexes, along with the standard chi-square test.

Table 6.7.2 – Comparison of Fit Indexes

Index	France		Russia		Hungary		Czech Republic		Poland	
	1 st Test	2 nd Test	1 st Test	2 nd Test	1 st Test	2 nd Test	1 st Test	2 nd Test	1 st Test	2 nd Test
χ^2	1690	1251	1450	855	1667	1127	1863	1339	1603	1162
df	579	363	579	337	579	363	579	363	546	363
p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
RMSEA	.081	.091	.071	.072	.080	.084	.087	.095	.081	.086
TLI	.962	.963	.734	.805	.696	.753	.719	.754	.959	.963
IFI	.967	.969	.759	.829	.724	.782	.744	.782	.965	.969
PNFI	.827	.798	.601	.665	.580	.633	.613	.647	.821	.797

As shown in the table, the initial tests of the PCI model yielded acceptable results. RMSEA values for the first tests were all below .10, which Steiger (1989, p. 81 in Loehlin, 1998) considers “good.” Although the chi-square values were quite large, results for the TLI, IFI, and PNFI indexes were very reasonable. These indexes describe how well, in a metric rather than a null hypothesis sense, a model accounts for the data. As mentioned earlier, for all three indexes, values close to 1 indicate good fit. TLI values for the initial model ranged from .696 (Hungary) to .962 (France), IFI values from .724 (Hungary) to .967, and PNFI values from .580 to .827 (France).

The results of the second round of tests (i.e. the PCI model minus the seven problematic variables) were slightly better than those obtained in the initial tests. The most significant changes occurred in the chi-squared values, which improved considerably. RMSEA values, however, deteriorated slightly although they remained in the acceptable range. Small improvements were made in both baseline measures (TLI and IFI) in all five models. The revised model registered higher values on the parsimonious index (PNFI) for Russia, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

Overall, the general model seems credible – there were few out of range estimates, the fit indexes were fairly consistent with each other, and model fit was acceptable. These results also indicate, however, that the model could be improved on. Improvement, however, may be difficult to achieve because any modifications made to the model will have to be based on a parsimony criterion. As mentioned earlier, a large number of measures and latent constructs must be retained in the PCI model in order to test the

theory upon which it was developed. Furthermore, one of the objectives of the PCI model analyses is to test for similarities across different samples – comparisons of this type require a common basis.

6.7.3 The Structural Model – 2nd Run

The strength of the structural relationships between the constructs was tested on the revised PCI model by judging discrepancy from zero in a traditional test of critical ratios of t 's. The critical ratio is obtained by dividing the parameter estimate by an estimate of its standard error. A significance level of .025 was chosen (rather than the traditional alpha of .05) in order to take into consideration the large number of parameters to be estimated. Those relationships with critical ratios exceeding 2.33 in magnitude, therefore, were deemed significant. Table 6.7.3 presents the critical ratios for the structural model. This section discusses the results obtained for hypotheses six through 21 (see Appendix H for results of the second run).

H₆: Country Description → Country Evaluation

The hypothesis that a positive relationship exists between consumers' beliefs about a country and their evaluation of that country was supported in all five model tests. Critical ratios for this structural path ranged from 4.546 (France) to 9.962 (Czech Republic). The result suggests that respondents may evaluate foreign countries based on their beliefs about the country's political system, level of stability, and overall quality of life.

Table 6.7.3 – Critical Ratios for the Structural Model

Hypothesis	France	Russia	Hungary	Czech Republic	Poland
H ₆ : Country Description → Country Evaluation	4.546	6.250	8.717	9.962	6.925
H ₇ : People Description → Country Evaluation	11.408	6.568	8.810	8.519	11.782
H ₈ : People Competence → Country Evaluation	0.308	1.246	-1.255	0.894	2.764
H ₉ : People Competence → Product Beliefs	0.298	-0.329	3.549	2.003	1.385
H ₁₀ : Country Competence → Product Beliefs	2.857	1.859	3.654	3.507	3.565
H ₁₁ : Country Competence → Country Evaluation	0.773	-4.170	-3.504	1.154	-3.567
H ₁₂ : Country Evaluation → Product Evaluation	-0.725	0.502	-1.968	-0.215	0.782
H ₁₃ : Country Evaluation → Relationship	8.854	8.078	8.951	9.599	12.586
H ₁₄ : Country Evaluation → Product Beliefs	3.385	5.114	4.587	5.507	6.050
H ₁₅ : Product Beliefs → Product Evaluation	5.437	7.002	7.218	6.951	6.506
H ₁₆ : Relationship → Product Evaluation	1.065	-0.105	1.811	-0.453	-0.933
H ₁₇ : Relationship → Willingness To Buy	4.006	4.049	3.604	4.146	0.784
H ₁₈ : Familiarity → Product Beliefs	5.791	5.219	4.997	5.826	5.760
H ₁₉ : Familiarity → Product Evaluation	-1.061	-0.710	-1.568	-2.354	-0.569
H ₂₀ : Familiarity → Willingness To Buy	0.485	0.557	1.270	2.598	-1.115
H ₂₁ : Product Evaluation → Willingness To Buy	3.686	6.205	6.203	5.804	6.323
Total # of Significant Relationships	9/16	9/16	11/16	11/16	10/16

H₇: People Description → Country Evaluation

The relationship between consumers' feelings toward a country's people and their overall evaluation of that country was found to be positive and significant for all five target countries. Critical ratios for this hypothesis ranged from 6.568 (Russia) to 11.782

(Poland). Since the PEOPLE DESCRIPTION construct contained only the variable “Trustworthy”, the conclusion that descriptive qualities of a country’s people contribute to country evaluation is not supported. The results do suggest, however, that consumer perceptions about the trustworthiness of a country’s people do impact feelings of affect toward that country.

H₈: People Competence → Country Evaluation

The hypothesis that a positive relationship exists between consumers’ beliefs about the abilities of a country’s people (“Educated” and “Active”) and their evaluation of that country was only supported in Poland’s structural model (C.R. = 2.764). The results for the other four countries were not significant. In general then, the perceived capabilities of a country’s people were not found to be predictive of consumers’ evaluative feelings toward the five target countries.

H₉: People Competence → Product Beliefs

The relationship between consumer beliefs about the competence of a country’s people and their beliefs about the country’s products was not significant. Only Hungary’s PCI model registered support for this hypothesis (C.R. = 3.549). Regardless of the country in question then (i.e. Western vs. Eastern European), perceptions toward a population’s capabilities do not affect attitudes toward various descriptive measures of a country’s products.

H₁₀: Country Competence → Product Beliefs

The hypothesis that consumers' beliefs about a country's competence are positively related to their beliefs about its products was supported in four cases (France, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland). Critical ratios obtained for these countries ranged from 2.857 (France) to 3.654 (Hungary). Russia did not have a significant result (critical ratio = 1.859). The positive support found for the relationship between COUNTRY COMPETENCE and PRODUCT BELIEFS suggests consumers may evaluate product attributes based on their perceptions of a country's degree of industrial development (e.g. "France is rich and industrialized, therefore its products are well-made").

H₁₁: Country Competence → Country Evaluation

The relationship between consumer attitudes toward a country's competence and their overall evaluation of that country was found to be significant for three countries – Russia (C.R. = -4.170), Hungary (C.R. = -3.504), and Poland (C.R. = -3.567). In all three cases, however, the relationship was negative, suggesting that consumers' evaluations of a country is not dependent on perceptions of that country's level of industrialization (i.e. consumers may give a country a poor rating on its level of industrialization but still evaluate it positively).

H₁₂: Country Evaluation → Product Evaluation

No support was found for the hypothesis that consumers' evaluations of a country are positively related to their evaluation of products from that country. None of the five countries registered significant results for this structural path. The relationship between consumers' overall attitudes toward the target countries and overall product evaluation was, therefore, indirect. As the results for hypothesis 14 will show, the structural relationship between COUNTRY EVALUATION and PRODUCT BELIEFS was found to be positive and significant for all five countries, confirming an indirect relationship between COUNTRY EVALUATION and PRODUCT EVALUATION.

H₁₃: Country Evaluation → Relationship

The hypothesis that a positive relationship exists between consumers' evaluation of a country and their desired level of interaction with that country was found to be significant for all five countries. Critical ratios for this structural path ranged from 8.078 (Russia) to 12.586 (Poland). The results suggest that consumers' evaluations of the target countries affect their interest in a range of relationships with them (i.e. "Should Have Closer Ties With," "Would Welcome Immigration From," and "Would Welcome Further Investment In").

H₁₄: Country Evaluation → Product Beliefs

The hypothesized relationship between COUNTRY EVALUATION and PRODUCT BELIEFS was supported in all five models (critical ratios ranged from 3.385 for France

to 6.050 for Poland). This structural path was not included in the model tested by Dowdles (1997). It was added to the present study to test for the existence of a halo effect (Han, 1990). One of the implications of the halo effect is that consumers may assess the characteristics of a country's products based on their overall image of that country – which is what the results of these tests suggest that consumers do. The results, however, indicate that a halo effect exists for all five countries even though consumers indicated that they knew more about French products than they did Eastern European products (France's mean score in 2000 on the variable "Know Products" was 3.80 vs. 2.26 to 2.42 for the Eastern European countries). While it is true, therefore, that consumers use country image to assess product attributes, they do so regardless of their level of familiarity with a country's products.

H₁₅: Product Beliefs → Product Evaluation

The hypothesized relationship between PRODUCT BELIEFS and PRODUCT EVALUATION was found to be positive and significant for all five countries. Critical ratios for this structural path ranged from 5.437 (France) to 7.218 (Hungary). Regardless of the country-of-origin, therefore, consumers' beliefs about the attributes of a country's products affect overall product evaluation (as measured by the variables "Good Value," "Good Overall," "Proud to Own," and "Satisfied").

H₁₆: Relationship → Product Evaluation

No support was found for the hypothesis that consumers' desired level of interaction with a country is positively related to their evaluation of that country's products. None of the countries registered significant results for this path. This suggests that product evaluations are not directly affected (either positively or negatively) by a desire, on the part of Canadian consumers, to have stronger relationships with the target countries.

H₁₇: Relationship → Willingness to Buy

The structural path between RELATIONSHIP and WILLINGNESS TO BUY was found to be significant for four countries (France, Russia, Hungary, and the Czech Republic). Critical ratios for this hypothesis ranged from 3.604 (Hungary) to 4.146 (Czech Republic). Poland was the only country for which the path was not significant (C.R. = 0.784). These results indicate that consumers are more enthusiastic about purchasing goods from those countries with which they envision Canada sharing a close relationship.

H₁₈: Familiarity → Product Beliefs

The hypothesis that consumers' familiarity with a country's products is positively related to their beliefs about products from that country was found to be significant for all five models. Critical ratios for this structural path ranged from 4.997 (Hungary) to 5.791 (France). These results suggest that when consumers are more familiar with a country's products (i.e. they are able to recognize country brands and find the products in stores), they have more positive beliefs about the products' attributes.

H₁₉: Familiarity → Product Evaluation

The relationship between FAMILIARITY and PRODUCT EVALUATION was only found to be significant in the Czech Republic's PCI model (C.R. = -2.354). This hypothesis was, therefore, not supported, indicating that consumers do not directly base their evaluation of a country's products on either their familiarity with brands from that country or the market presence of the products themselves. Rather, an indirect effect exists between FAMILIARITY and PRODUCT EVALUATION through PRODUCT BELIEFS.

H₂₀: Familiarity → Willingness to Buy

As was the case with the previous hypothesis, the only country for which a relationship was found to exist between FAMILIARITY and WILLINGNESS TO BUY was the Czech Republic (C.R. = 2.598). The hypothesis was thus not supported in four out of five PCI models. These results suggest that product familiarity is only indirectly associated with the purchasing decision through consumer beliefs about descriptive measures of a country's products.

H₂₁: Product Evaluation → Willingness to Buy

The hypothesis that PRODUCT EVALUATION is positively related to WILLINGNESS TO BUY was found to be significant for all five countries. Critical ratios for this relationship ranged from 3.686 (France) to 6.323 (Poland). Consumers' overall

evaluation of a country's products is, therefore, positively related to their willingness to buy products from that country.

6.7.4 Summary

This section provides a brief review of the findings for each country. Table 6.7.4 summarizes the results of the hypothesis testing for all five structural models. As shown in the table, the results were fairly consistent across the five target countries, with support shown for the majority of the hypothesized relationships.

Table 6.7.4 – Incidence of Significant Relationships

Hypothesis	F	R	H	C	P
H ₆ : Country Description → Country Evaluation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
H ₇ : People Description → Country Evaluation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
H ₈ : People Competence → Country Evaluation	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	✓
H ₉ : People Competence → Product Beliefs	n.s.	n.s.	✓	n.s.	n.s.
H ₁₀ : Country Competence → Product Beliefs	✓	n.s.	✓	✓	✓
H ₁₁ : Country Competence → Country Evaluation	n.s.	x	x	n.s.	x
H ₁₂ : Country Evaluation → Product Evaluation	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
H ₁₃ : Country Evaluation → Relationship	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
H ₁₄ : Country Evaluation → Product Beliefs	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
H ₁₅ : Product Beliefs → Product Evaluation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
H ₁₆ : Relationship → Product Evaluation	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
H ₁₇ : Relationship → Willingness to Buy	✓	✓	✓	✓	n.s.
H ₁₈ : Familiarity → Product Beliefs	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
H ₁₉ : Familiarity → Product Evaluation	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	x	n.s.
H ₂₀ : Familiarity → Willingness to Buy	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	✓	n.s.
H ₂₁ : Product Evaluation → Willingness to Buy	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<hr/>					
✓	Means path was positive and hypothesis was supported at $p < .025$				
x	Means path was in opposite direction to prediction				
n.s.	Means path was not significant				

6.7.4.1 France

Figure 6.7.4.1 presents the revised model for France. The standardized factor loadings are illustrated (in normal font), along with the R^2 values for the measured variables (in bold). The structural paths that were not supported are represented by a dotted arrow.

Only two paths leading to the COUNTRY EVALUATION construct were found to be significant – COUNTRY DESCRIPTION and PEOPLE DESCRIPTION. This indicates that consumers formed their overall assessment of France based on general characteristics related to the country's economy, political system, and quality of life, along with their feelings about the trustworthiness of the country's people.

The two constructs related to the capabilities of France and French people (PEOPLE COMPETENCE and COUNTRY COMPETENCE) were not found to affect COUNTRY EVALUATION. The relationship between COUNTRY COMPETENCE and PRODUCT BELIEFS, however, was found to be significant, indicating that consumers relied, in part, on their perceptions regarding France's level of industrialization (as measured by the variables "Industrialized" and "Rich") to assess French product attributes.

The structural path between COUNTRY EVALUATION and PRODUCT BELIEFS was found to be significant, suggesting the presence of a halo effect (i.e. the use of country image to form product beliefs). Consumers' overall evaluation of France was also found to affect their desired level of interaction with the country.

The RELATIONSHIP construct was shown to affect only WILLINGNESS TO BUY. Finally, consumers' familiarity with French products was found to only indirectly affect PRODUCT EVALUATION and WILLINGNESS TO BUY through PRODUCT BELIEFS. Overall, nine of the 16 hypothesized relationships were supported.

6.7.4.2 *Russia*

Russia's revised PCI model is shown in Figure 6.7.4.2. Similarly to the French model, both COUNTRY DESCRIPTION and PEOPLE DESCRIPTION were found to affect COUNTRY EVALUATION. A third path leading to COUNTRY EVALUATION, however, was also found to be significant in Russia's model (COUNTRY COMPETENCE). This suggests that consumers based their overall evaluation of Russia on descriptive characteristics of the country and its people, along with the perceived capabilities of the country itself.

The path between COUNTRY COMPETENCE and COUNTRY EVALUATION was found to be negative. In contrast to France's PCI model, the relationship between COUNTRY COMPETENCE and PRODUCT BELIEFS was not supported. In fact, Russia was the only country for which this structural path was not significant. This outcome may be a reflection of Russia's poor performance in the economic and social spheres over the past decade. Consumers do not regard the country as highly developed and thus may find it difficult to evaluate Russian product attributes based on their perceptions of the country's competence.

Figure 6.7.4.2 – Revised PCI Model: Russia

The results obtained for the remaining structural paths were the same as those observed in France's model. Overall, nine of the 16 proposed paths were found to be significant.

6.7.4.3 Hungary

Figure 6.7.4.3 illustrates the revised PCI model for Hungary. In this model, three of the paths leading to COUNTRY EVALUATION were found to be significant – COUNTRY DESCRIPTION, PEOPLE DESCRIPTION, and COUNTRY COMPETENCE. This result indicates that consumers used a range of measures to form their overall evaluation of Hungary. The relationship between COUNTRY COMPETENCE and COUNTRY EVALUATION, however, was found to be negative. A halo effect was noted for Hungary (as it was for all of the target countries) as the relationship between COUNTRY EVALUATION and PRODUCT BELIEFS was consistently supported.

As with the French and Russian PCI models, the RELATIONSHIP construct was found to affect only WILLINGNESS TO BUY and the FAMILIARITY construct was shown to only indirectly affect PRODUCT EVALUATION and WILLINGNESS TO BUY through PRODUCT BELIEFS. In total, 11 of 16 hypothesized relationships were supported.

Figure 6.7.4.3 – Revised PCI Model: Hungary

6.7.4.4 Czech Republic

As shown in Figure 6.7.4.4, COUNTRY DESCRIPTION and PEOPLE DESCRIPTION were found to relate to COUNTRY EVALUATION, which in turn, was shown to influence PRODUCT BELIEFS and RELATIONSHIP. The Czech Republic's PCI model was the only one to register significant results for all three of the structural paths related to the FAMILIARITY construct. The strongest relationship was found between FAMILIARITY and PRODUCT BELIEFS (C.R. = 5.791 vs. -2.354 and 2.598 for PRODUCT EVALUATION and WILLINGNESS TO BUY, respectively). This path was also found to be positive and significant for the other four countries, suggesting that of the three proposed FAMILIARITY relationships, it is the most convincing description of the role of product familiarity on the buying decision. FAMILIARITY, that is, indirectly affects WILLINGNESS TO BUY through consumers' beliefs about the products' attributes and their overall evaluations of them.

The link between COUNTRY COMPETENCE and PRODUCT BELIEFS reveals the existence of a PCI effect (i.e. consumer beliefs about the Czech Republic's level of industrial development indirectly affects overall product evaluation through the PRODUCT BELIEFS construct). A PCI effect was also shown in the links between the COUNTRY DESCRIPTION, PEOPLE DESCRIPTION, COUNTRY EVALUATION, and PRODUCT BELIEFS constructs. The RELATIONSHIP construct was found to affect only WILLINGNESS TO BUY. Overall, 11 of the 16 hypothesized relationships were supported.

Figure 6.7.4.4 – Revised PCI Model: Czech Republic

6.7.4.5 Poland

Figure 6.7.4.5 presents the results of Poland's tests. Poland's PCI model was the only one in which all four constructs related to descriptive characteristics of a country and its people (COUNTRY DESCRIPTION, PEOPLE DESCRIPTION, PEOPLE COMPETENCE, and COUNTRY COMPETENCE) were found to affect COUNTRY EVALUATION. This indicates that Canadians evaluated Poland on a combination of country and people attributes. PRODUCT BELIEFS was found to be directly affected by COUNTRY COMPETENCE, COUNTRY EVALUATION, and FAMILIARITY, suggesting the existence of a PCI effect. The only relationship related to WILLINGNESS TO BUY that proved to be significant was the one leading from PRODUCT EVALUATION (Poland's PCI model was the only one in which a significant relationship was not found between RELATIONSHIP and WILLINGNESS TO BUY). A total of 11 of 16 structural paths were significant.

Figure 6.7.4.5 – Revised PCI Model: Poland

6.7.5 Conclusions: PCI Model

On the whole, the PCI model is credible. As mentioned earlier, there were few out of range estimates, the fit indexes were fairly consistent with each other, and overall fit was acceptable. In addition, only seven variables (out of a total of 36) proved to be problematic in the initial model tests. Figure 6.7.5.1 provides a summary of the findings for the structural model. In general, the results are consistent. The core PCI model developed by Papadopoulos and Heslop (COUNTRY DESCRIPTION, PRODUCT BELIEFS, PRODUCT EVALUATION, WILLINGNESS TO BUY) was corroborated across all five countries.

Figure 6.7.5.1: Summary of PCI Model Results

*Not in hypothesized direction

The Czech and Hungarian models had the most number of significant paths (11/16), while France and Russia registered the fewest (9/16). Poland's PCI model was found to have 10 significant structural paths. These findings are remarkably similar. Indeed, most of the hypothesized relationships that were supported were generally supported in all five models. The only two paths that were not significant in any model were those between COUNTRY EVALUATION and PRODUCT EVALUATION, and RELATIONSHIP and PRODUCT EVALUATION. This suggests that Canadian consumers' perceptions of the countries-of-origin directly affect their product beliefs and indirectly affect both their evaluations of products made in the countries and their willingness to buy them. WILLINGNESS TO BUY is also directly affected by consumers' desired relationship with the target countries, which is formed from country evaluations based on their perceptions of the countries and their people.

The COUNTRY EVALUATION construct was affected almost entirely by the COUNTRY DESCRIPTION and PEOPLE DESCRIPTION constructs. In fact, the two constructs related to the capabilities of a country and its people (PEOPLE COMPETENCE and COUNTRY COMPETENCE) loaded very poorly with COUNTRY EVALUATION. One possible explanation for this may be the low number of measured variables included in the "competence" constructs. Better results, for example, may be obtained with an expanded variable set. Another explanation may be that consumers simply perceive descriptive characteristics of the Eastern European countries and the capabilities of these countries differently (e.g. "Hungarians are well-educated and capable but Hungary is not an ideal country").

FAMILIARITY was found to affect only **PRODUCT BELIEFS** (results for its relationships with **PRODUCT EVALUATION** and **WILLINGNESS TO BUY** were generally insignificant). This indicates that consumers' level of familiarity with products from the target countries indirectly affects their willingness to buy them through both their beliefs regarding descriptive product attributes and their evaluations of the products themselves.

6.7.6 3rd Run

A final set of tests was run based on the results obtained in the analysis of the structural model. The hypothesized relationships that registered fewer than three significant results were dropped from this set of tests (see Table 6.7.3 and Figure 6.7.5.1):

People Competence → Country Evaluation	(1/5 significant paths)
People Competence → Product Beliefs	(1/5 significant paths)
Country Competence → Country Evaluation	(3/5 significant paths)
Country Evaluation → Product Evaluation	(0/5 significant paths)
Relationship → Product Evaluation	(0/5 significant paths)
Familiarity → Product Evaluation	(1/5 significant paths)
Familiarity → Willingness to Buy	(1/5 significant paths)

Although the relationship between **COUNTRY COMPETENCE** and **COUNTRY EVALUATION** was found to be significant for three countries (Russia, Hungary, and Poland), it too was dropped from the final run because all three significant results were negative and thus did not support the proposed relationship between the two constructs. Since both paths leading from the **PEOPLE COMPETENCE** construct were found to be insignificant, that construct was eliminated from the final model. Table 6.7.6.1 compares

the overall fit of the revised and final PCI models (see Appendix I for complete results of the final model).

Table 6.7.6.1 – Comparison of Fit Indexes

Index	France		Russia		Hungary		Czech Republic		Poland	
	2 nd Test	3 rd Test	2 nd Test	3 rd Test	2 nd Test	3 rd Test	2 nd Test	3 rd Test	2 nd Test	3 rd Test
χ^2	1251	926	855	766	1127	846	1339	1039	1162	943
df	363	317	337	293	363	317	363	317	363	317
p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
RMSEA	.091	.081	.072	.074	.084	.075	.095	.088	.086	.082
TLI	.963	.972	.805	.820	.753	.814	.754	.806	.963	.969
IFI	.969	.977	.829	.839	.782	.834	.782	.826	.969	.974
PNFI	.798	.809	.665	.688	.633	.685	.647	.693	.797	.806

As shown in the table, the results of the final round of tests (i.e. the PCI model minus the insignificant structural paths) were slightly better than those obtained in the second run. The chi-squared values, for example, improved considerably. Indeed, small improvements were made in all of the fit indexes. RMSEA values moved closer to .05 for every country except Russia (RMSEA values close to .05 are considered “great” while those between .05 and .10 “good”). Better results were also shown in all five models on the parsimonious index and on the two baseline indexes (values close to 1 indicate a good fit for these indexes). Figures 6.7.6.2 to 6.7.6.6 illustrate the final PCI model for each target country. The figures include standardized factor loadings, along with R^2 values for the measured variables.

Figure 6.7.6.2 – Final PCI Model: France

Figure 6.7.6.3 – Final PCI Model: Russia

Figure 6.7.6.4 – Final PCI Model: Hungary

Figure 6.7.6.5 – Final PCI Model: Czech Republic

Figure 6.7.6.6 -- Final PCI Model: Poland

To conclude, the results were encouraging. Although various aspects of the PCI model were found to be problematic, support was shown for the majority of the hypothesized relationships in all five country tests. Given that prior analysis of the 2000 data demonstrated that respondents rated France and French products differently than the Eastern-European countries and their products, the similarity of results obtained for the structural tests point to the generalizability of the PCI model. While further research may be needed to refine the model (e.g. by expanding the variable set to include additional measures related to the capabilities of a country and its people), the results indicate that the model provides a credible theory of PCI effects on buyer behaviour.

7.0 LIMITATIONS

While care was taken to limit any potential research error, various factors may have adversely impacted the validity of the results obtained. First, the study was conducted in the Ottawa-Hull region of Ontario to facilitate comparison to the existing data sets, which were collected in the same area. The region is a metropolitan one, and therefore the data may not be representative of the entire Canadian population. Data collected in urban areas, for example, may be biased in favor of foreign products because they are more readily available in cities than in less populated areas (Darling, 1995).

Another limiting factor was the possibility that the PCI effect may have been overemphasized as a result of excluding tangible product stimuli (Schooler, 1971). Without tangible products, consumers may have different references in mind when responding to the product-image measures. One of the intentions of this study, however, was to examine PCI issues in the context of products for which consumers have little or no information. Providing respondents with a tangible product to evaluate would thus have been counterproductive.

With all self-report measurement instruments, there is a risk of potential error. Respondents may, for example, be reluctant to express strong negative or positive feelings, selecting answers instead that they believe are socially acceptable. Respondents may also misinterpret certain questions or suffer from distractions while filling out the survey, thereby limiting their ability to respond accurately. To reduce the probability of

such errors occurring, the survey was worded in simple terms and ensured the anonymity of the respondents.

Finally, the PCI effects on buyer behavior may have been overestimated as a result of the use of a single-cue approach. Country-of-origin was the only information presented to respondents and thus the only basis for their evaluations. This method has been criticized for yielding significant cue effects that may not exist in real world situations (Bilkey and Nes, 1982). Schellinck (1986), for example, found that the PCI effect decreases in importance when several product cues are included in the evaluation. The main objective of the study however, was not to test for the existence of country-of-origin effects, but rather to assess changes in consumer attitudes and perceptions towards selected countries and their products at various points in time.

8.0 CONCLUSIONS

This study examined Canadian consumers' attitudes toward selected Eastern European countries and their products. New data was collected in 2000 and was compared to samples from previous studies conducted in 1992 and 1995. The thesis had two main objectives – to examine changes in consumer perceptions toward various Eastern European countries and their products between 1992 and 2000 and to test a PCI model of country-of-origin effects on buyer behaviour. Other objectives included an assessment of the comparative rankings of the countries and their products, an evaluation of the relationship between generalized product evaluations and product specific evaluations, and a comparison of the factor structures shown in all three time periods. The following sections provide a summary of the study's results.

8.1 Longitudinal Analysis

The research found that Canadians in all three samples rated France most favorably, Russia least favorably, and the three Central Eastern European countries somewhere between these two extremes. In general, France was given an average score one point higher than the Eastern European countries (e.g. France's average score on the country items was 5.32 vs. 3.60 to 4.45 for the Eastern European countries in 2000). This suggests that Canadians do not consider Eastern European countries to be at par with Western nations in terms of their level of industrial development, political economy, quality of life, and manufacturing capabilities. Despite the significant transformations

that have occurred in Eastern Europe over the past ten years, therefore, the region still appears to suffer from negative associations.

For the country scales, Canadian perceptions toward France and the three Central Eastern European countries generally improved between 1992 and 2000, while Russia's image deteriorated. During the period 1992-1995, the images of France and Hungary remained constant, while those of Russia, the Czech Republic, and Poland declined slightly. The largest number of significant changes occurred between 1995 and 2000, all of which were positive. In particular, higher scores were given in 2000 to variables related to consumers' desired level of interaction with the countries (e.g. "Would Welcome Immigration From," "Should Have Closer Ties With," "Aligned with Canada"). This suggests that Canadians have positive feelings toward Eastern Europe and would like Canada to have a closer relationship with the region. No significant changes were observed in respondents' level of familiarity with Eastern Europe between 1992 and 2000. One possible explanation for this result may be that Canadians still do not have much experience with the region.

For the product scales, the largest amount of significant changes occurred between 1992 and 2000. The image of French products, however, was found to remain constant across all three time periods. The changes observed in consumer ratings of products from Eastern Europe were positive, suggesting that Canadians have gained confidence in the region's ability to produce good quality products. Poland registered the highest number

of significant changes (12 out of 20 variables), indicating an important shift in consumer perceptions toward the country.

8.2 Comparative Rankings

As mentioned earlier, France was consistently given the highest overall rating on the country scales, while Russia was consistently given the lowest overall rating. Hungary's position was also consistent in all three samples – its ordinal ranking was fourth. In 1992, the Czech Republic was awarded the second highest ranking. In 1995 and 2000, however, Poland had taken its place in second position. This result is perhaps not surprising given Poland's sound macro-economic policies and commitment to democracy. The research implies that Canadian consumers may view Poland as an emerging leader in Eastern Europe.

The ordinal rankings for the product scales were similar to those of the country scales. French products were perceived as "best" by respondents in all three samples and Russian products were consistently rated the lowest. Products from the Czech Republic also maintained a constant rating (second). Polish products, however, were evaluated more favorably in 2000 than they were in 1995 and 1992, improving that country's ordinal ranking from fourth to third position. Given that consumer knowledge about Polish products did not improve between 1992 and 2000, this result may be correlated to Poland's strong country image.

8.3 Generalized vs. Product Specific Evaluations

Consumer ratings of various product categories (Shoes, Radios, Microwaves/Computers, Luggage/Furniture) followed a pattern similar to that observed for the country and product scales. France received the highest scores on all products, Russia the lowest, and the three Central Eastern European countries were rated between the two extremes. Although all five target countries registered improvements in product category ratings between 1992 and 2000, all were given consistently low scores on the "Microwave/Computers" category. This suggests that consumers perceive the target countries' ability to produce "good quality" products that are technically sophisticated as lower than their ability to make products such as shoes and furniture.

The results of the comparison between the four product categories (Shoes, Radio, Microwave/Computer, Luggage/Furniture) and the three global product measures ("Quality," "Overall," and each country's average score on the 16 product scale items) indicated that a relationship may exist between consumers' generalized product evaluations and product specific evaluations. The four Eastern European countries, for example, registered increasingly higher ratings on the four product categories between 1992 and 1995, along with correspondingly higher ratings on the three global product measures. Product-specific images, therefore, were found to increase in line with global product image.

8.4 Factor Structure

While some differences in factor groupings were noted within and across the three samples, a consistent pattern of factor loadings was observed across the three time periods under study for both the country and product scales. For the country scales, for example, four factor groupings emerged in each sample (three of which – “Affect,” “Development,” and “People” – were present in some form in all three data sets). Results for the products scales showed even more similarity across the three time periods, with the same three variable groupings emerging in each sample (“Product Description,” “Market Presence,” and “Expensive”).

8.5 PCI Model

The results of the PCI model tests were encouraging. Only seven measurement variables were removed from the initial model and overall fit was acceptable. In addition, the core PCI model developed by Papadopoulos and Heslop (COUNTRY DESCRIPTION, PRODUCTS BELIEFS, PRODUCT EVALUATION, WILLINGNESS TO BUY) was corroborated across all five countries. In total, nine of the 16 hypothesized structural relationships were found to be significant (i.e. the paths were positive and significant for three or more countries). The proposed relationships between the constructs related to the capabilities of a country and its people (PEOPLE COMPETENCE and COUNTRY COMPETENCE) and overall country evaluation were not supported. COUNTRY EVALUATION was thus affected almost entirely by the COUNTRY DESCRIPTION and PEOPLE DESCRIPTION constructs. The FAMILIARITY construct was found to

only indirectly affect consumers' willingness to buy products through both their beliefs regarding descriptive product attributes and their evaluations of the products themselves. Positive support was found for the proposed relationship between RELATIONSHIP and WILLINGNESS TO BUY, suggesting that consumers may prefer to purchase goods from countries with which they envision Canada sharing a close relationship.

As mentioned earlier, the PEOPLE COMPETENCE and COUNTRY COMPETENCE constructs did not perform well within the structural model. Further research, therefore, may be required to determine whether better results could be obtained by expanding the variable set to include additional capability measures. While a halo effect was observed (consumers were found to evaluate product attributes based on their feelings about the target countries) Han's theory (1990) was not supported. Consumers were found to rely on their beliefs about the target countries and their people (e.g. level of stability, economic wealth) to form product beliefs regardless of their level of familiarity with the countries. The similarity of the results obtained for the French and Eastern European models is indicative of the generalizability of the PCI model across countries that consumers have been shown to perceive differently. Overall, the research shows that the PCI model provides a credible theory of the effects of country-of-origin on buyer behaviour.

9.0 RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

In Canada and other developed nations, the level of imports has expanded due to a reduction in trade barriers and restrictions achieved through the WTO, and the proliferation of regional trade agreements. With the explosive growth of information technologies, the expansion of international trade, and the rapid diffusion of knowledge, there may be a sense that the world is being unified. Johansson (1993) suggests that these developments may lead some observers to believe that the country-of-origin effect will vanish as people grow more understanding of foreign cultures, and jettison their perceived stereotypes. In actual fact, however, the reverse may be true. Increased globalization may create a greater appreciation of the actual differences between countries. In all likelihood, countries will increasingly specialize in the activities that they do best. As a result, PCI effects will become more pronounced and their resulting implications more important.

9.1 Implications for Eastern European Firms

One of the most basic strategic implications for business practitioners is the decision either to promote or downplay the country-of-origin effect (Papadopoulos, 1993). Lampert and Jaffe (1996) suggest that a firm's success or failure in penetrating a foreign market is a function of relative advantage, marketing effort, and its perceived country and industry image. It is thus imperative for producers to be aware of foreign consumers' perceptions of both their products and countries-of-origin. Such information will enable

firms to identify their strong and weak points in various markets and to develop appropriate marketing strategies (Morello, 1993).

The results of this study indicate that Canadian consumers view French products favorably. In all three time periods under study, French products received higher ratings than did Eastern European products, suggesting that goods produced in Western nations may have an advantage over those produced elsewhere. French producers, therefore, may want to accentuate the country of origin in advertising (Wang and Lamb, 1983). Similarly, packaging and labeling can be used to enhance the desirability of a particular brand.

Given that the Eastern European countries and their products were consistently rated less favorably than France and French products by consumers in all three samples, Eastern European producers may choose to place less emphasis on country-of-origin information. In addition, they may wish to distance themselves from Russia, which consistently received the lowest scores on both the country and product scales.

To improve the image of their products in foreign markets, Eastern European producers may consider mounting joint marketing campaigns with the region's governments aimed at promoting the countries and businesses of Eastern Europe. The results of the PCI model analysis showed that Canadian perceptions toward the target countries and their people indirectly affected their willingness to buy goods from the countries through product beliefs. Exposure to positive information about Eastern Europe may improve

Canadian attitudes toward the region and may help to create positive country-of-origin associations. The post-war changes in the images of several East-Asian countries provide examples of the success that some countries have had at developing more favourable national images.

Eastern European producers may also consider following Japan's example by moving gradually from penetration-priced, medium-quality products to higher-quality and higher-priced products with increasing levels of technological sophistication (Heslop and Papadopoulos, 1993). Nebenzahl and Jaffe (1993) suggest that reducing prices may also balance negative country attitudes. Other strategies may include partnerships with local host-country institutions or risk-reducing efforts such as free samples and references (Nes and Ghauri, 1998).

9.2 Implications for Western Firms

Western companies may benefit from an understanding of domestic attitudes toward Eastern Europe if they are contemplating locating production in that region. Johansson (1993) argues that a manufacturing shift to a country with a more favourable image will translate into some advantage – specifically, into a higher evaluative product rating. Consequently, moving production location to a less developed country with a less favourable image may have the opposite effect (i.e. a reduction in perceived brand value).

The present study confirmed past research that found Eastern European product images to be less favourable than Western product images (Chasin and Jaffe, 1979; Lumpkin *et al.*,

1992; Darling, 1995; Papadopoulos *et al.*, 1997). This may pose a problem for those Western businesses that wish to establish an export base in Eastern Europe, as production in that region may cause a potential loss in brand name value. In certain cases, however, a strong brand name may override the country-of-origin effect. Some mature and well-known brands, for example, inherently contain country-of-origin information and may provide the assurance needed to accept a less favourable origin image (Samiee, 1994).

Over the next decade, Western firms will increasingly face competition from Eastern Europe. Although they presently enjoy an advantage in the form of consumer awareness and positive country-of-origin association, Western producers would be well advised to pay attention to the region. As the results of this study indicated, consumer perceptions toward Eastern Europe have improved since 1992. As the political and economic conditions in Eastern Europe improve, therefore, Eastern Europe will increase its production capabilities and goods from the region will begin to penetrate Western markets.

9.3 Implications for Government

Governments can improve the images of their countries through various means such as communication campaigns, trade initiatives, and industry-wide incentives. Eastern-European countries may find these types of strategies beneficial in both enhancing the perceived image of exports from the region and attracting much-needed foreign direct investment. Wee, Lim, and Tan (1993) suggest that images of countries can be measured, and that investors do hold different impressions of various countries as

potential investment locations. An understanding of Western consumers' perceptions toward both the countries and products of Eastern Europe may assist the region's governments in developing appropriate packages of investment incentives and more effective marketing strategies to attract FDI.

Eastern European governments may also consider improving their relationships with Western countries. The results of this thesis suggest that Canadians prefer to buy goods from countries with whom they are interested in sharing a relationship (e.g. immigration, investment). This form of goodwill on the part of Canadians toward nations with which they interact may translate into improved sales in the Canadian market.

9.4 Implications for Future Research

The results of the longitudinal analysis showed very little change in consumer attitudes toward Eastern Europe between 1992 and 2000. A decade after the fall of Soviet Communism, therefore, a notable difference in Canadian perceptions toward France, a Western nation, and the four Eastern European countries continues to exist.

Eastern Europe presents a unique opportunity for those in the field of marketing research who study Product-Country Images. It is the only region in the world that shares commonalities with both developed and developing countries. The historical influence of Soviet Communism and its associated stereotypes also contribute to Eastern Europe's distinctiveness.

To date, few studies have measured Western perceptions of Eastern Europe, and even fewer studies have collected longitudinal data in this area. This suggests the need to probe further into an examination of the ways in which country and product images change over time. Repetitions of this study should be undertaken to track consumer attitudes toward Eastern Europe during its continued transformation. Studies conducted in five-year intervals, for example, would enable researchers to assess the impact of such events as admittance in the European Union and increased globalization on Canadian perceptions toward the region. Other areas of interest might include continued analysis of consumers' level of familiarity with the countries of Eastern Europe and their degree of product knowledge.

Further contributions to the country-of-origin literature may include a comparison of the PCI model across different points in time. A longitudinal analysis of this type would provide researchers with a better understanding of how the relationship between country image, product image, and purchase intention changes over time.

The results of the PCI model were very encouraging. Overall model fit was acceptable and most of the hypothesized structural relationships were supported when tested using structural equation modeling techniques. In addition, the similarity of results obtained for the five target countries points to the model's generalizability. Overall, the PCI model provides a very sound basis for further research. An in-depth exploration of both the direct and indirect effects observed in this study may lead toward a more comprehensive model of PCI effects on buyer behaviour.

The tests of the structural model showed that the two constructs related to the capabilities of a country and its people (COUNTRY COMPETENCE and PEOPLE COMPETENCE) were not predictive of either of the constructs to which they were linked (COUNTRY EVALUATION and PRODUCT BELIEFS). Since COUNTRY COMPETENCE and PEOPLE COMPETENCE contained only two measured variables each, further research may be necessary to determine whether better results can be obtained by expanding the variable set to include additional capability measures.

The results of the PCI model analysis did not support Han's (1990) expectations of a country familiarity-based hypothesis (i.e. consumers infer the quality of a foreign brand based on their general perceptions of the source country). The halo effect was observed for all five countries, suggesting that consumers use country information to form product images regardless of their level of familiarity with a country's products. Additional tests of the model, therefore, may be necessary to determine the circumstances under which a halo effect may be found.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, Sadrudin A., Alain d'Astous, and Saïd Zouiten (1993), "Personality Variables and the Made-in Concept." in *Product-Country Images*. Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise A. Heslop, eds. Binghamton, N.Y.: The Haworth Press, 197-222.
- Arbuckle, James L. (1997), *Amos User's Guide Version 3.6*. Chicago : SmallWaters Corporation.
- Bamossy, Gary J., Jozsef Beracs, Louise A. Heslop, and Nicolas Papadopoulos (1988), "East Meets West: A Country of Origin Analysis of Western Products by Hungarian and Dutch Consumers." paper presented at the Second International Marketing Development Conference, Budapest: Association of Consumer Research (July), 149-152.
- Baughn, C. Christopher and Attila Yaprak (1993), "Mapping Country-of-Origin Research: Recent Developments and Emerging Avenues." in *Product-Country Images*. Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise A. Heslop, eds. Binghamton, N.Y.: The Haworth Press, 89-115.
- Bilkey, Warren J. and Erik Nes (1983), "Country-of-Origin Effects on Product Evaluations." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 8 (Spring/Summer), 89-99.
- Bodenhasuen, Galen V. and Robert S. Wyer, Jr. (1985), "Effects of Stereotypes on Decision Making and Information-Processing Strategies." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48(2), 267-282.
- Brill, Jonathan E. (1994), "Beyond Managerial Opportunism: Supplier Power and Managerial Compliance in a Franchised Marketing Channel." *Journal of Business Research*, 30, 211-223.
- Brown, Rupert (1988), *Group Processes: Dynamics Within and Between Groups*. New York: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Bruning, Edward R. and Michael Y. Hu (1991), "The Role of Ethnocentrism in Consumer Choice: An Integrative Analysis." paper presented at the ASAC Marketing Conference, Niagara Falls, Ontario, 20-29.
- Business Eastern Europe (2000), "Eastern Europe: Let it Grow." *The Economist Intelligence Unit* (April 10), 3.
- Byrne, Barbara M. (1994), *Structural Equation Modeling with EQS an EQS Windows*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Byrne, Barbara M. (2001), *Structural Equation Modeling with AMOS: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Canada Year Book (1999), "Downtown Canada." *Communications Division of Statistics Canada*, Minister of Industry.

Cattin, Philippe, Alain Jolibert, and Colleen Lohnes (1982), "A Cross-Cultural Study of Made-In Concepts." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 13 (Winter), 131-141.

Chao, Paul (1989), "Export And Reverse Investment: Strategic Implications for Newly Industrialized Countries." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 20 (Spring), 75-91.

Chasin, J.B. and E.D. Jaffe (1979), "Industrial Buyer Attitudes Toward Goods Made in Eastern Europe." *Columbia Journal of World Business*, 14 (Summer), 74-81.

Cheung, Wah-Leung and Luther (Trey) Denton (1995), "National Stereotypes and Product Evaluations About Japan and the United States: A Hong Kong Perspective." *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 7(4), 59-79.

Country Monitor, "Eastern Europe: The Next Ten Years," *The Economist Intelligence Unit*, November 17, 1999.

Country Monitor, "Eastern Europe: More Promising Decade", *The Economist Intelligence Unit*, January 12, 2000.

Country Monitor, "Eastern Europe: Let it Grow," *The Economist Intelligence Unit*, April 10, 2000.

Crawford, John C. and James R. Lumpkin (1993), "Environmental Influences on Country-of-Origin Bias." in *Product-Country Images*. Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise A. Heslop, eds. Binghampton, N.Y.: The Haworth Press, 341-356.

Darling, John R. and Frederic B. Kraft (1977), "A Competitive Profile of Products and Associated Marketing Practices of Selected European and non-European Countries." *European Journal of Marketing*, 11(7), 519-531.

Darling, John R. (1988), "A Longitudinal Analysis of the Competitive Profile of Products and Associated Marketing Practices of Selected European and Non-European Countries." *European Journal of Marketing*, 21(3), 17-29.

Darling, John R. (1990), "A Study of Changes in Finnish Consumer Attitudes Toward the Products and Associated Marketing Practices of Selected Countries, 1975-1990." *The Finnish Journal of Business Economics*, (Fall), 175-187.

Darling, John R. (1995), "Changes in Finnish Consumer Attitudes Toward the Products and Associated Marketing Practices of Various Selected Countries, 1975 to 1995." *Finnish Journal of Business Economics*, (Spring), 1-22.

Dowdles, Melissa (1997), "Nafta: A Comparison of Canadian Consumer and Retail Buyer Product Country Images." unpublished Master's Thesis, School of Business, Carleton University.

Erickson, Gary M., Johny K. Johansson, and Paul Chao (1984), "Image Variables in Multi-Attribute Product Evaluations: Country-of-Origin Effects." *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 11 (September), 694-699.

Gaedeke, Ralph (1973), "Consumer Attitudes Toward Products 'Made-in' Developing Countries." *Journal of Retailing*, 49 (Summer), 13-24.

Graby, Françoise (1993), "Countries as Corporate Entities in International Markets." in *Product-Country Images*. Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise A. Heslop, eds. Binghampton, N.Y.: The Haworth Press, 257-283.

Gundlach, Erich and Peter Nunnenkamp (1998), "Some Consequences of Globalization for Developing Countries." in *Globalization, Trade and Foreign Direct Investment*. John H. Dunning, ed. Oxford: Elsevier Science, 153-174.

Guriev, Sergei and Barry W. Ickes (2000), "Microeconomic Aspects of Economic Growth in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union, 1950-2000." Orion, http://orion.forumone.com/gdnet/files.fcgi/193_Guriev_Ickes2.pdf, (July).

Han, C. Min (1989), "Country Image: Halo or Summary Construct?" *Journal of Marketing Research*, 26 (May), 222-229.

Han, C. Min (1990), "Testing the Role of Country Image in Consumer Choice Behavior." *European Journal of Marketing*, 24(6), 24-40.

Healey, Nigel M. (1994), "The Transition Economies of Central and Eastern Europe." *The Columbia Journal of World Business*, (Spring), 63-70.

Heslop, Louise A. and Nicolas Papadopoulos (1993), "But Who Knows Where and When?: Reflections on the Images of Countries and Their Products", in *Product-Country Images*. Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise A. Heslop, eds. Binghampton, N.Y.: The Haworth Press, 39-75.

Heslop, Louise A., John Liefeld, and Marjorie Wall (1987), "An Experimental Study of the Impact of Country-of-Origin Information." in *Marketing*. R. E. Turner, ed. Toronto, ON: Administrative Sciences Association of Canada, Marketing Division, (June), 196-205.

Heslop, Louise A., John Liefeld, and Nicolas Papadopoulos (1993), "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Cues and Consumer Characteristics on Product Evaluations and Choice." *Marketing*, 14, 113-122.

Howard, Donald G. (1990), "Understanding How American Consumers Formulate Their Attitudes About Foreign Products." *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 2(2), 7-24.

Huston, Ted L. and George Levinger (1978), "Interpersonal Attraction and Relationships." *Annual Review of Psychology*, 29, 115-156.

International Monetary Fund (IMF), "World Economic Outlook, May 2000: Asset Prices and the Business Cycle." *IMF Publications* (Washington, D.C.)

Iyer, Gopalkrishnan R. and Lance A. Masters (1999), "The Emergence of Markets and Marketing Systems in Transition Economies of Europe and Central Asia." *Journal of East-West Business*, 5 (1/2), 5-23.

Johansson, Johny K. (1993), "Missing a Strategic Opportunity: Managers' Denial of Country-of-Origin Effect." in *Product-Country Images*. Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise A. Heslop, eds. Binghampton, N.Y.: The Haworth Press, 77-86.

Johansson, Johny K., Susan P. Douglas, and Ikujiro Nonada (1985), "Assessing the Impact of Country of Origin on Product Evaluations: A New Methodological Perspective." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 12, 388-396.

Johansson, Johny K. and Israel D. Nebenzahl (1986), "Multinational Production: Effect on Brand Value." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 17 (Fall), 101-126.

Johansson, Johny K., Ilkka A. Ronkainen, and Michael R. Czinkota (1994), "Negative Country-Of-Origin Effects: The Case of the New Russia." *Journal of International Business Studies*, (First Quarter), 157-177.

Jones, Russell A., and Richard D. Ashmore (1973), "The Structure of Intergroup Perception: Categories and Dimensions in Views of Ethnic Groups and Adjectives Used in Stereotype Research." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 25(3), 428-438.

Korabi, Tarif and David G. Grieve (1990), "Doing Business in Eastern Europe: A Survival Guide." *Canadian Business Review*, (Summer), 22-25.

Kotler, Philip, Donald H. Haider, and Irving Rein (1993), *Marketing Places: Attracting Investment, Industry, and Tourism to Cities, States, and Nations*. New York: The Free Press.

Lampert, Shlomo I., and Eugene D. Jaffe (1996), "Country of Origin Effects on International Market Entry." *Journal of Global Marketing*, 10(2), 27-52.

Li, Zhan G., Shenzhao Fu, and L. William Murray (1997), "Country and Product Images: The Perceptions of Consumers in the People's Republic of China." *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 10(1/2), 115-139.

Liefeld, John P. (1993), "Experiments on Country-of-Origin Effects: Review and Meta-Analysis of Effect Size", in *Product-Country Images*. Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise A. Heslop, eds. Binghamton, N.Y.: The Haworth Press, 117-158.

Locke, Vance and Iain Walker (1999), "Stereotyping, Processing Goals, and Social Identity: Inveterate and Fugacious Characteristics of Stereotypes." in *Social Identity and Social Cognition*. Dominic Abrams and Michael A. Hogg, eds. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell Publishers, 164-182.

Loehlin, John C. (1998), *Latent Variable Models: An Introduction to Factor, Path, and Structural Analysis* (third ed.). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Lumpkin, James, Charles Madden, Sheb L. True, and Daniel Rajaratham (1992), "Willingness to Buy From Eastern Bloc Countries: U.S. Consumers Before and After Glasnost." in *European Advances in Consumer Research*. W.F. Van Raaj and G. Bamossy, eds. Amsterdam: Association for Consumer Research.

Mackenzie, Scott B. (2001), "Opportunities for Improving Consumer Research through Latent Variable Structural Equation Modeling." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28 (June), 159-166.

Martin, Ingrid M. and Sevgin Eroglu (1993), "Measuring a Multi-Dimensional Construct: Country Image." *Journal of Business Research*, 28, 191-210.

Maruyama, Geoffrey M. (1998), *Basics of Structural Equation Modeling*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Melich, Jiri S. (2000), "The Relationship Between the Political and the Economic in the Transformations in Eastern Europe: Continuity and Discontinuity and the Problem of Models." *East European Quarterly*, 34(2), 131-157.

Morello, Gabrielle (1993), "International Product Competitiveness and the 'Made-In' Concept." in *Product-Country Images*. Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise A. Heslop, eds. Binghamton, N.Y.: The Haworth Press, 285-309.

Nagashima, Akira (1970), "A Comparison of Japanese and U.S. Attitudes Towards Foreign Products." *Journal of Marketing*, 34 (January), 68-74.

Nagashima, Akira (1977), "A Comparative 'Made-in' Product Image Survey Among Japanese Businessmen." *Journal of Marketing*, 6(1), 95-100.

Nebenzahl, Israel D., and Eugene D. Jaffe (1993), "Estimating Demand Functions from the Country-of-Origin Effect." in *Product-Country Images*. Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise A. Heslop, eds. Binghamton, N.Y.: The Haworth Press, 159-178.

Nebenzahl, Israel D. and Eugene D. Jaffe (1996), "Measuring the Joint Effect of Brand and Country Image in Consumer Evaluation of Global Products." *International Marketing Review*, 13(4), 5-22.

Nebenzahl, Israel D., Eugene D. Jaffe, and Shlomo I. Lampert (1997), "Towards a Theory of Country Image Effect on Product Evaluation." *Management International Review*, 37, 27-49.

Nes, Erik and Warren J. Bilkey (1993), "A Multi-Cue Test of Country-of-Origin Theory." in *Product-Country Images*. Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise A. Heslop, eds. Binghampton, N.Y.: The Haworth Press, 179-195.

Nes, Erik B. and Pervez N. Ghauri (1998), "Country of Origin Effects on Industrial Products Coming from Eastern Europe." *Journal of East-West Business*, 4(1/2), 129-140.

Nincic, Miroslav and Bruce Russett (1979), "The Effect of Similarity and Interest on Attitudes Toward Foreign Countries." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 43, 68-78.

Papadopoulos, Nicolas and Louise A. Heslop, eds. (1993), *Product-Country Images*. Binghampton, N.Y.: The Haworth Press.

Papadopoulos, Nicolas, Judith Marshall, and Louise A. Heslop (1988), "Strategic Implications of Product and Country Images: A Modeling Approach." *Marketing Productivity*. Amsterdam: European Society for Opinion and Marketing Research; 41st Research Congress (September) 69-90.

Papadopoulos, Nicolas, Louise A. Heslop, and Gary J. Bamossy (1990), "A Comparative Analysis of Domestic Versus Imported Products." *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 7(4), 283-294.

Papadopoulos, Nicolas (1993), "What Country Images Are and Are Not." in *Product-Country Images*. Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise A. Heslop, eds. Binghampton, N.Y.: The Haworth Press, 3-38.

Papadopoulos, Nicolas, Louise A. Heslop, and David Bennett (1993), "National Image Correlates of Product Stereotypes: A Study of Attitudes Towards East European Countries." *European Advances in Consumer Research*, 1, 206-213.

Papadopoulos, Nicolas, Louise A. Heslop, and Gary Bamossy (1994), "An International Comparative Analysis of Consumer Attitudes Toward Canada and Canadian Products." *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 3, 224-239.

Papadopoulos, Nicolas, Louise A. Heslop, Leslie Szamosi, and Richard Ettenson (1997), "Czech Made' or Check Mate? An Assessment of the Competitiveness of East European Products." *Marketing: Progress, Prospects, Perspectives*. Coventry: U.K.: European Marketing Academy (May), 993-101.

- Rutland, Peter (1999), "The Meaning of 1989." *Transition*, (January), 23-28.
- Samiee, Saeed (1994), "Customer Evaluation of Products in a Global Market." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25(3), 579-604.
- Schellinck, D.A. (1986), "An Exploratory Study into the Impact of Country-of-Origin as a Cue in Product Choice." paper presented at the Proceedings of the Administrative Science Association of Canada, Annual Conference, Whistler, B.C., 181-190.
- Schooler, Robert D. (1965), "Product Bias in the Central American Common Market." *Journal of Marketing Research*, (November), 394-397.
- Schooler, Robert D. and Don H. Sunoo (1971), "Bias Phenomena Attendant to the Marketing of Foreign Goods in the U.S." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 2 (Spring), 71-80.
- Seaton, Bruce and Ronal H. Vogel (1985), "Brand, Price, and Country of Manufacture as Factors in the Perception of Product Quality." paper presented at the Academy of International Business Annual Meeting, New York (October), 17-28.
- Sekaran, Uma (1983), "Methodological and Theoretical Issues and Advancements in Cross-Cultural Research." *Journal of International Business Studies*, (Fall), 61-73.
- Shimp, Terence A. and Subhash Sharma (1987), "Consumer Ethnocentrism: Construction and Validation of the CETSCALE." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24, 280-289.
- Shimp, Terence A., Saeed Samiee, and Thomas J. Madden (1993), "Countries and Their Products: A Cognitive Structure Perspective." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 21(4), 323-330.
- Stephan, Walter G. and Cookie White Stephan (1996), "Predicting Prejudice." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20(3), 409-426.
- Stevens, James (1996). *Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences: Third Edition*. Mahwah, NJ; Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Szamosi, Leslie, Louise A. Heslop, Nicolas Papadopoulos, and Richard Ettenson (1995), "A Comparison of Australian and Canadian Consumer Evaluations of the Products and Countries of Eastern Europe." paper presented at the Seventh Bi-Annual World Marketing Congress, Melbourne, Australia (July), 1-16.
- Thomas, D. Roland (1992), "Interpreting Discriminant Functions: A Data Analytic Approach." *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 27(3), 335-362.
- Tims, Albert R. and Mark M. Miller (1986), "Determinants of Attitudes Toward Foreign Countries." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10(4), 471-484.

United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (1999), "Economic Survey of Europe," *United Nations Publications* (Geneva, Switzerland).

United Nations (1999), "World Investment Report 1999: Foreign Direct Investment and the Challenge of Development." *United Nations Publication* (Geneva, Switzerland).

Walkenhorst, Peter (2000), "Foreign Direct Investment, Technological Spillovers and the Agricultural Transition in Eastern Europe." *Post-Communist Economies*, 12(1), 61-75.

Wang, Chih-Kang and Charles W. Lamb, Jr. (1980), "Foreign Environmental Factors Influencing American Consumers' Predispositions toward European Products." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 8 (Fall), 345-356.

Wang, Chih-Kang and Charles W. Lamb, Jr. (1983), "The Impact of Selected Environmental Forces Upon Consumers' Willingness to Buy Foreign Products." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 11 (Winter), 71-84.

Wee, Chow Hou, David T.E. Lim, and Gilbert Y.W. Tan (1993), "The Image of Countries as Locations of Investment." in *Product-Country Images*. Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise A. Heslop, eds. Binghampton, N.Y.: The Haworth Press, 311-340.

Wood, Van R. and John R. Darling (1992), "The Marketing Challenges of the Newly Independent Republics: Product Competitiveness in Global Markets." *Journal of International Marketing*, 1, 77-102.

APPENDIX A – QUESTIONNAIRE

INTERNATIONAL TRADE: THE QUALITY OF PRODUCTS FROM FOREIGN NATIONS

Dear Survey Respondent,

As a consumer in today's complex marketplace, where products are available from all over the world, you are faced with many and often difficult buying decisions. Understanding how consumers evaluate products is important so that producers can better serve their markets.

This survey is carried out by researchers of the School of Business of Carleton University, as part of a major study that is done every few years in Canada, the U.S., Australia, and other countries. Its purpose is to understand better the views of consumers about products made in various countries. In this survey we are particularly interested in your views about France and Eastern Europe.

You are one of a few selected respondents who are being asked to give their opinion based on a random sample of the area. To obtain a correct statistical representation of the region, it is important that each questionnaire be completed and returned. We also kindly ask that you please answer all the questions.

You can be assured that your answers will remain completely confidential. Your name or any other identifying information does not appear on the questionnaire. We will use only the combined data from all respondents in our statistical analysis. If you would like to comment on any questions or the overall theme of the survey, please feel free to do so in the margins or on the back cover. We will read your comments carefully and take them into account.

We will be pleased to provide you with a summary of the survey's findings once our analysis is complete. To ensure that your responses will remain anonymous, however, do not provide your address with the questionnaire. If you would like to receive the summary, please drop us a separate note at the address below with your name and address.

Thanks a lot for your help!

Dr. Louise A. Heslop
Professor of Marketing

Dr. Nicolas Papadopoulos
Professor of International Business

Co-coordinators, The IKON Research Group
School of Business, Carleton University
1125 Col. By Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1S 5B6

INTERNATIONAL TRADE: THE QUALITY OF PRODUCTS FROM FOREIGN NATIONS

SECTION I. Countries and Their People

This section examines how you feel about five countries and their people: France, Russia, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland. Your opinions are very important to the study and highly valued, whether you consider yourself knowledgeable about these countries or not.

On each of the following pages you will find a different country to be judged along a set of scales which have descriptive words on their left and right sides. To answer each scale, simply put an "X" in the space that is closest to your opinion.

For example, if your opinion is very closely related to the word on the left, please mark the scale as follows:

Rich : X : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : Poor

Or, if the country is only slightly related to the word on the right:

Rich : _ : _ : _ : _ : X : _ : _ : Poor

And so on.

Important Notes

- Please put all your "X" marks in the middle of spaces, not on the dividing line. For example:

THIS

Rich : _ : _ : X : _ : _ : _ : _ : Poor

NOT THIS

Rich : _ : _ : X : _ : _ : _ : _ : Poor

- Please be sure to answer every scale for every country.
- You should work at a fairly high speed through this questionnaire. There is no need to look back and forth through the pages, or to worry and puzzle over individual items. There is no "right" answer. We value your opinion and it is your first impression, your immediate "feeling" about the scales, that counts. You should look at each scale as separate from the rest and judge each country independently from one scale to the other.

FRANCE AND THE FRENCH

Industrialized	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Industrialized
Educated people	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Uneducated people
Non-Western culture	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Western culture
I know little about France and the French	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I know a lot about France and the French
Stable	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Unstable
Rich	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor
Autocratic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Democratic
Not an ideal country	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	An ideal country
Dangerous	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Safe
Passive people	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Active people
I would not welcome more immigration from France	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I would welcome more immigration from France
People have many rights	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People have few rights
I dislike France	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I like France
Aggressive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Peaceful
Aligned with Canada	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not aligned with Canada
We should not have closer ties with France	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	We should have closer ties with France
Not trustworthy people	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Trustworthy people
People are very hardworking	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People are not very hardworking
Individualistic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Group oriented
I would not favour further Canadian investment in France	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I would favour further Canadian investment in France

RUSSIA AND THE RUSSIANS

Industrialized	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Industrialized
Educated people	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Uneducated people
Non-Western culture	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Western culture
I know little about Russia and the Russians	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I know a lot about Russia and the Russians
Stable	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Unstable
Rich	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor
Autocratic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Democratic
Not an ideal country	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	An ideal country
Dangerous	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Safe
Passive people	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Active people
I would not welcome more immigration from Russia	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I would welcome more immigration from Russia
People have many rights	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People have few rights
I dislike Russia	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I like Russia
Aggressive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Peaceful
Aligned with Canada	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not aligned with Canada
We should not have closer ties with Russia	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	We should have closer ties with Russia
Not trustworthy people	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Trustworthy people
People are very hardworking	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People are not very hardworking
Individualistic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Group oriented
I would not favour further Canadian investment in Russia	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I would favour further Canadian investment in Russia

HUNGARY AND THE HUNGARIANS

Industrialized	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Industrialized
Educated people	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Uneducated people
Non-Western culture	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Western culture
I know little about Hungary and the Hungarians	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I know a lot about Hungary and the Hungarians
Stable	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Unstable
Rich	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor
Autocratic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Democratic
Not an ideal country	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	An ideal country
Dangerous	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Safe
Passive people	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Active people
I would not welcome more immigration from Hungary	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I would welcome more immigration from Hungary
People have many rights	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People have few rights
I dislike Hungary	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I like Hungary
Aggressive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Peaceful
Aligned with Canada	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not aligned with Canada
We should not have closer ties with Hungary	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	We should have closer ties with Hungary
Not trustworthy people	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Trustworthy people
People are very hardworking	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People are not very hardworking
Individualistic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Group oriented
I would not favour further Canadian investment in Hungary	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I would favour further Canadian investment in Hungary

CZECH REPUBLIC AND THE CZECHS

Industrialized	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Industrialized
Educated people	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Uneducated people
Non-Western culture	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Western culture
I know little about the Czech Republic and the Czechs	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I know a lot about the Czech Republic and the Czechs
Stable	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Unstable
Rich	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor
Autocratic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Democratic
Not an ideal country	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	An ideal country
Dangerous	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Safe
Passive people	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Active people
I would not welcome more im- migration from the Czech Republic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I would welcome more im- migration from the Czech Republic
People have many rights	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People have few rights
I dislike the Czech Republic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I like the Czech Republic
Aggressive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Peaceful
Aligned with Canada	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not aligned with Canada
We should not have closer ties with the Czech Republic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	We should have closer ties with the Czech Republic
Not trustworthy people	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Trustworthy people
People are very hardworking	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People are not very hardworking
Individualistic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Group oriented
I would not favour further Canadian investment in the Czech Republic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I would favour further Canadian investment in the Czech Republic

POLAND AND THE POLES

Industrialized	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Industrialized
Educated people	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Uneducated people
Non-Western culture	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Western culture
I know little about Poland and the Poles	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I know a lot about Poland and the Poles
Stable	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Unstable
Rich	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor
Autocratic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Democratic
Not an ideal country	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	An ideal country
Dangerous	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Safe
Passive people	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Active people
I would not welcome more immigration from Poland	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I would welcome more immigration from Poland
People have many rights	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People have few rights
I dislike Poland	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I like Poland
Aggressive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Peaceful
Aligned with Canada	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not aligned with Canada
We should not have closer ties with Poland	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	We should have closer ties with Poland
Not trustworthy people	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Trustworthy people
People are very hardworking	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People are not very hardworking
Individualistic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Group oriented
I would not favour further Canadian investment in Poland	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I would favour further Canadian investment in Poland

SECTION II. The Countries' Products

This section examines how you feel about the products made in the same countries – France, Russia, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland.

- It does not matter whether or not you have had personal experience with the products from the country in question. Your general impressions are important.
- By "products" we mean both physical products and services.
- On each of the following pages you will find the products of a different country to judge along a set of scales, as before. Once again, simply put an "X" in the middle of the space that is closest to your opinion.
- Please remember to answer every scale for every country, and do not omit any.

PRODUCTS OF FRANCE

Unattractive :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Attractive
 Good value for the money :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Poor value for the money
 Not willing to buy :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Willing to buy
 Imitative :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Innovative
 Good quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Poor quality
 Unrecognizable brands :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Recognizable brands
 Expensive :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Inexpensive
 Know a lot about :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Know little about
 Unreliable :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Reliable
 Proud to own :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Not proud to own
 Not technically advanced :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Technically advanced
 Good after sales service :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Poor after sales service
 Products are hard to find :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Products are easy to find
 Poor workmanship :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good workmanship
 Not satisfied with :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Satisfied with

Compared to products made in any other country (not only those included in this questionnaire) how would you rate the products of France?

Good overall products :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Poor overall products

And how would you rate the quality of the following specific products made in France?

Shoes: Poor quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good quality

Clock radios: Poor quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good quality

Personal computers: Poor quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good quality

Furniture: Poor quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good quality

PRODUCTS OF RUSSIA

Unattractive :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Attractive
 Good value for the money :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Poor value for the money
 Not willing to buy :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Willing to buy
 Imitative :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Innovative
 Good quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Poor quality
 Unrecognizable brands :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Recognizable brands
 Expensive :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Inexpensive
 Know a lot about :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Know little about
 Unreliable :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Reliable
 Proud to own :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Not proud to own
 Not technically advanced :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Technically advanced
 Good after sales service :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Poor after sales service
 Products are hard to find :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Products are easy to find
 Poor workmanship :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good workmanship
 Not satisfied with :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Satisfied with

Compared to products made in any other country (not only those included in this questionnaire) how would you rate the products of Russia?

Good overall products :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Poor overall products

And how would you rate the quality of the following specific products made in Russia?

Shoes: Poor quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good quality

Clock radios: Poor quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good quality

Personal computers: Poor quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good quality

Furniture: Poor quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good quality

PRODUCTS OF HUNGARY

Unattractive :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Attractive
 Good value for the money :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Poor value for the money
 Not willing to buy :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Willing to buy
 Imitative :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Innovative
 Good quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Poor quality
 Unrecognizable brands :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Recognizable brands
 Expensive :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Inexpensive
 Know a lot about :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Know little about
 Unreliable :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Reliable
 Proud to own :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Not proud to own
 Not technically advanced :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Technically advanced
 Good after sales service :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Poor after sales service
 Products are hard to find :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Products are easy to find
 Poor workmanship :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good workmanship
 Not satisfied with :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Satisfied with

Compared to products made in any other country (not only those included in this questionnaire) how would you rate the products of Hungary?

Good overall products :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Poor overall products

And how would you rate the quality of the following specific products made in Hungary?

Shoes: Poor quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good quality

Clock radios: Poor quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good quality

Personal computers: Poor quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good quality

Furniture: Poor quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good quality

PRODUCTS OF THE CZECH REPUBLIC

- Unattractive :__::__: : Attractive
- Good value for the money :__::__: : Poor value for the money
- Not willing to buy :__::__: : Willing to buy
- Imitative :__::__: : Innovative
- Good quality :__::__: : Poor quality
- Unrecognizable brands :__::__: : Recognizable brands
- Expensive :__::__: : Inexpensive
- Know a lot about :__::__: : Know little about
- Unreliable :__::__: : Reliable
- Proud to own :__::__: : Not proud to own
- Not technically advanced :__::__: : Technically advanced
- Good after sales service :__::__: : Poor after sales service
- Products are hard to find :__::__: : Products are easy to find
- Poor workmanship :__::__: : Good workmanship
- Not satisfied with :__::__: : Satisfied with

Compared to products made in any other country (not only those included in this questionnaire) how would you rate the products of the Czech Republic?

Good overall products :__::__: : Poor overall products

And how would you rate the quality of the following specific products made in the Czech Republic?

Shoes: Poor quality :__::__: : Good quality

Clock radios: Poor quality :__::__: : Good quality

Personal computers: Poor quality :__::__: : Good quality

Furniture: Poor quality :__::__: : Good quality

PRODUCTS OF POLAND

Unattractive :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Attractive
 Good value for the money :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Poor value for the money
 Not willing to buy :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Willing to buy
 Imitative :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Innovative
 Good quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Poor quality
 Unrecognizable brands :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Recognizable brands
 Expensive :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Inexpensive
 Know a lot about :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Know little about
 Unreliable :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Reliable
 Proud to own :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Not proud to own
 Not technically advanced :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Technically advanced
 Good after sales service :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Poor after sales service
 Products are hard to find :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Products are easy to find
 Poor workmanship :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good workmanship
 Not satisfied with :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Satisfied with

Compared to products made in any other country (not only those included in this questionnaire) how would you rate the products of Poland?

Good overall products :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Poor overall products

And how would you rate the quality of the following specific products made in Poland?

Shoes: Poor quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good quality

Clock radios: Poor quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good quality

Personal computers: Poor quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good quality

Furniture: Poor quality :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good quality

SECTION III.

Evaluation of other East European Countries

Over the last five years, other East European countries have begun to export more products. How would you rate the quality of exports from:

(As a reminder, please answer as before by placing an "X" in the middle of the space that most closely represents your opinion. It does not matter whether or not you have personal experience with the products from the country in question. Your general impressions are important.)

Bulgaria: Good quality :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ : Poor quality

Romania: Good quality :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ : Poor quality

Albania: Good quality :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ : Poor quality

Ukraine: Good quality :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ : Poor quality

Slovakia: Good quality :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ : Poor quality

Slovenia: Good quality :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ : Poor quality

Croatia: Good quality :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ : Poor quality

SECTION IV. Background Information

This last section asks for some background information which will help us classify the answers we receive. Please be assured that your responses are given anonymously and will be used only to analyse the data statistically.

Please answer this section by putting an "X" in the appropriate space.

1. Are you a male _____ or a female _____ ?

2. In which bracket is your age?

Less than 20 _____	45-49 years _____
20-24 years _____	50-54 years _____
25-29 years _____	55-59 years _____
30-34 years _____	60-64 years _____
35-39 years _____	65 or more _____
40-44 years _____	

3. What is your educational level?

Grade school _____	College graduate _____
Some high school _____	Some university _____
High school graduate _____	University graduate _____
Some college _____	Other (please specify) _____

4. In which range is the total income of your household?

Under \$24,999 _____	\$65,000-\$74,999 _____
\$25,000-\$44,999 _____	\$75,000-\$99,999 _____
\$45,000-\$64,999 _____	Over \$100,000 _____

5. Lastly, this question is intended to give us an idea of the information sources from which you learned about the countries in this questionnaire. For each country, please put an "X" next to any source of information which may have played a role in shaping your views; you may check as many sources for each country as applies in your case.

	<u>France</u>	<u>Russia</u>	<u>Hungary</u>	<u>Czech Rep.</u>	<u>Poland</u>
a. Things I learned in school	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Things I learned from the media (TV, radio, newspapers, magazines, etc.)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. I have family roots in the country (immigrated from it, or have relatives or friends who live there)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. I do not have roots in the country, but I have travelled or lived there	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Other (please specify - use additional space below if necessary)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Would you like to make any additional comments? Your opinion counts, and anything you might want to add about this survey will be very valuable. You may comment on the countries included in the survey, their products, or any other country or its products that interests you. Please use this space and feel free to attach additional sheets if necessary.

Your contribution to this international research effort is very greatly appreciated.

THANK YOU!

APPENDIX B – DOUBLY MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Overall Four Country Multivariate Tests – Country Profiles

Test Name	Value	F	Hyp. Df	Error df	Sig.
Wilks' Lambda	.182	15.881 ^a	60.000	212.000	.000

a. Exact Statistic

Overall Four Country Multivariate Analysis – Product Profiles

Test Name	Value	F	Hyp. Df	Error df	Sig.
Wilks' Lambda	.467	5.249 ^a	48.000	221.000	.000

a. Exact Statistic

TWO GROUP WITHIN SUBJECTS ANALYSIS (COUNTRY PROFILES)

Russia/Hungary Multivariate Tests

Test Name	Value	F	Hyp. Df	Error df	Sig.
Wilks' Lambda	.271	34.791 ^a	20.000	259.000	.000

a. Exact Statistic

Russia/Czech Republic Multivariate Tests

Test Name	Value	F	Hyp. Df	Error df	Sig.
Wilks' Lambda	.361	23.249 ^a	20.000	263.000	.000

a. Exact Statistic

Russia/Poland Multivariate Tests

Test Name	Value	F	Hyp. Df	Error df	Sig.
Wilks' Lambda	.246	40.084 ^a	20.000	262.000	.000

a. Exact Statistic

Hungary/Czech Republic Multivariate Tests

Test Name	Value	F	Hyp. Df	Error df	Sig.
Wilks' Lambda	.708	5.399 ^a	20.000	262.000	.000

a. Exact Statistic

Hungary/Poland Multivariate Tests

Test Name	Value	F	Hyp. Df	Error df	Sig.
Wilks' Lambda	.709	5.379 ^a	20.000	262.000	.000

a. Exact Statistic

Poland/Czech Republic Multivariate Tests

Test Name	Value	F	Hyp. Df	Error df	Sig.
Wilks' Lambda	.770	3.948 ^a	20.000	265.000	.000

a. Exact Statistic

TWO GROUP WITHIN SUBJECTS ANALYSIS (PRODUCT PROFILES)

Russia/Hungary Multivariate Tests

Test Name	Value	F	Hyp. Df	Error df	Sig.
Wilks' Lambda	.613	10.391 ^a	16.000	263.000	.000

a. Exact Statistic

Russia/Czech Republic Multivariate Tests

Test Name	Value	F	Hyp. Df	Error df	Sig.
Wilks' Lambda	.547	13.728 ^a	16.000	265.000	.000

a. Exact Statistic

Russia/Poland Multivariate Tests

Test Name	Value	F	Hyp. Df	Error df	Sig.
Wilks' Lambda	.609	10.697 ^a	16.000	267.000	.000

a. Exact Statistic

Hungary/Czech Republic Multivariate Tests

Test Name	Value	F	Hyp. Df	Error df	Sig.
Wilks' Lambda	.887	2.064 ^a	16.000	260.000	.010

a. Exact Statistic

Hungary/Poland Multivariate Tests

Test Name	Value	F	Hyp. Df	Error df	Sig.
Wilks' Lambda	.943	1.006 ^a	16.000	264.000	.451

a. Exact Statistic

Poland/Czech Republic Multivariate Tests

Test Name	Value	F	Hyp. Df	Error df	Sig.
Wilks' Lambda	.912	1.598 ^a	16.000	265.000	.069

a. Exact Statistic

TWO GROUP UNIVARIATE TESTS (COUNTRY PROFILES)

Russia/Hungary Univariate Tests

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Indus	1.000	.303	.213	.645
Educ	1.000	7.806	7.302	.007
Western	1.000	56.781	39.051	.000
Know	1.000	78.281	63.039	.000
Stable	1.000	503.405	363.880	.000
Rich	1.000	127.758	136.214	.000
Democ	1.000	129.679	103.055	.000
Ideal	1.000	248.000	248.000	.000
Safe	1.000	339.113	359.291	.000
Active	1.000	6.452	5.509	.020
Immig	1.000	22.480	28.212	.000
Rights	1.000	181.226	192.459	.000
Like	1.000	23.701	31.861	.000
Peaceful	1.000	233.550	223.155	.000
Aligned	1.000	78.281	97.058	.000
Ties	1.000	3.959	3.909	.049
Trust	1.000	51.185	50.581	.000
Work	1.000	1.211	.714	.399
Indiv	1.000	36.136	34.657	.000
Invest	1.000	20.136	20.667	.000

Russia/Czech Republic Univariate Tests

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Indus	1.000	37.147	32.396	.000
Educ	1.000	26.730	33.535	.000
Western	1.000	100.920	82.833	.000
Know	1.000	12.466	10.799	.001
Stable	1.000	438.170	260.227	.000
Rich	1.000	174.198	188.357	.000
Democ	1.000	147.564	108.660	.000
Ideal	1.000	289.797	286.041	.000
Safe	1.000	274.269	204.218	.000
Active	1.000	44.666	34.243	.000
Immig	1.000	29.859	28.433	.000
Rights	1.000	174.198	134.291	.000
Like	1.000	28.496	35.400	.000
Peaceful	1.000	135.564	106.506	.000
Aligned	1.000	105.187	96.997	.000
Ties	1.000	2.827	2.490	.116
Trust	1.000	63.111	62.362	.000
Work	1.000	5.943	4.130	.043
Indiv	1.000	42.447	28.979	.000
Invest	1.000	31.253	31.788	.000

Russia/Poland
Univariate Tests

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Indus	1.000	33.766	24.439	.000
Educ	1.000	13.113	15.047	.000
Western	1.000	122.640	101.400	.000
Know	1.000	3.278	3.803	.052
Stable	1.000	602.640	462.860	.000
Rich	1.000	166.021	174.740	.000
Democ	1.000	227.241	176.025	.000
Ideal	1.000	326.314	338.123	.000
Safe	1.000	427.449	398.979	.000
Active	1.000	24.271	16.748	.000
Immig	1.000	39.894	40.021	.000
Rights	1.000	266.922	264.963	.000
Like	1.000	60.683	63.433	.000
Peaceful	1.000	254.683	197.795	.000
Aligned	1.000	158.512	148.479	.000
Ties	1.000	12.511	11.433	.001
Trust	1.000	98.752	90.610	.000
Work	1.000	6.816	4.371	.037
Indiv	1.000	54.300	42.478	.000
Invest	1.000	50.640	46.072	.000

Hungary/Czech Republic
Univariate Tests

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Indus	1.000	30.427	31.196	.000
Educ	1.000	5.363	6.665	.010
Western	1.000	6.383	6.130	.014
Know	1.000	29.965	31.181	.000
Stable	1.000	2.560	1.679	.196
Rich	1.000	3.590	3.837	.051
Democ	1.000	.574	.493	.483
Ideal	1.000	1.816	2.064	.152
Safe	1.000	4.433	4.172	.042
Active	1.000	19.177	23.346	.000
Immig	1.000	.782	1.140	.287
Rights	1.000	.0018	.002	.967
Like	1.000	.144	.240	.625
Peaceful	1.000	12.215	12.159	.001
Aligned	1.000	3.752	4.875	.028
Ties	1.000	.144	.217	.642
Trust	1.000	.454	.584	.446
Work	1.000	10.787	9.964	.002
Indiv	1.000	.512	.588	.444
Invest	1.000	1.390	2.237	.136

Hungary/Poland **Univariate Tests**

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Indus	1.000	26.390	29.125	.000
Educ	1.000	.640	.942	.333
Western	1.000	13.730	14.545	.000
Know	1.000	50.640	41.993	.000
Stable	1.000	6.383	5.409	.021
Rich	1.000	1.704	2.168	.142
Democ	1.000	13.420	12.361	.001
Ideal	1.000	5.170	6.794	.010
Safe	1.000	3.433	4.183	.042
Active	1.000	5.761	6.330	.012
Immig	1.000	4.612	7.009	.009
Rights	1.000	8.938	8.826	.003
Like	1.000	9.191	15.391	.000
Peaceful	1.000	1.108	1.160	.282
Aligned	1.000	14.683	18.942	.000
Ties	1.000	2.298	3.850	.051
Trust	1.000	7.723	11.114	.001
Work	1.000	11.348	9.388	.002
Indiv	1.000	2.172	2.594	.108
Invest	1.000	8.199	12.672	.000

Poland/Czech Republic **Univariate Tests**

Variable	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Indus	1.000	.253	.248	.619
Educ	1.000	2.668	3.561	.060
Western	1.000	.928	1.065	.303
Know	1.000	3.712	3.365	.068
Stable	1.000	15.174	10.061	.002
Rich	1.000	.296	.316	.574
Democ	1.000	8.112	6.623	.011
Ideal	1.000	1.475	1.624	.204
Safe	1.000	17.896	21.851	.000
Active	1.000	4.386	4.892	.028
Immig	1.000	1.279	1.728	.190
Rights	1.000	10.133	9.348	.002
Like	1.000	8.596	12.431	.000
Peaceful	1.000	21.228	21.171	.000
Aligned	1.000	3.712	4.874	.028
Ties	1.000	4.042	5.547	.019
Trust	1.000	5.502	9.273	.003
Work	1.000	.395	.420	.518
Indiv	1.000	.507	.533	.466
Invest	1.000	2.949	4.156	.042

TWO GROUP UNIVARIATE TESTS (PRODUCT PROFILES)

Russia/Hungary Univariate Tests

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Attractive	1.000	118.367	116.634	.000
Good value	1.000	32.179	26.095	.000
Willing to buy	1.000	78.281	62.676	.000
Innovative	1.000	33.636	32.711	.000
Good quality	1.000	98.970	92.163	.000
Brand	1.000	.0018	.002	.969
Expensive	1.000	10.625	13.194	.000
Know about	1.000	5.823	6.897	.009
Reliable	1.000	90.726	103.041	.000
Proud to own	1.000	51.792	49.958	.000
Tech advanced	1.000	16.862	18.055	.000
Service	1.000	19.384	21.081	.000
Easy to find	1.000	13.254	15.306	.000
Workmanship	1.000	70.258	77.081	.000
Satisfied with	1.000	38.201	59.395	.000
Good overall	1.000	90.726	95.983	.000

Russia/Czech Republic Univariate Tests

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Attractive	1.000	176.557	162.649	.000
Good value	1.000	24.358	17.988	.000
Willing to buy	1.000	91.689	64.861	.000
Innovative	1.000	63.560	58.942	.000
Good quality	1.000	85.340	66.903	.000
Brand	1.000	7.518	4.930	.027
Expensive	1.000	21.141	23.272	.000
Know about	1.000	3.765	3.262	.072
Reliable	1.000	129.715	119.363	.000
Proud to own	1.000	76.982	61.233	.000
Tech advanced	1.000	34.379	29.159	.000
Service	1.000	26.484	24.513	.000
Easy to find	1.000	27.359	25.229	.000
Workmanship	1.000	108.557	93.542	.000
Satisfied with	1.000	69.758	81.302	.000
Good overall	1.000	136.528	120.985	.000

Russia/Poland
Univariate Tests

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Attractive	1.000	103.470	100.779	.000
Good value	1.000	27.606	18.718	.000
Willing to buy	1.000	69.265	55.691	.000
Innovative	1.000	36.129	39.896	.000
Good quality	1.000	68.567	63.829	.000
Brand	1.000	3.420	2.495	.115
Expensive	1.000	11.880	16.175	.000
Know about	1.000	.346	.319	.572
Reliable	1.000	92.652	100.550	.000
Proud to own	1.000	53.491	46.918	.000
Tech advanced	1.000	19.110	18.399	.000
Service	1.000	16.283	15.849	.000
Easy to find	1.000	31.253	29.850	.000
Workmanship	1.000	69.966	82.716	.000
Satisfied with	1.000	44.666	65.660	.000
Good overall	1.000	95.095	104.385	.000

Hungary/Czech Republic
Univariate Tests

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Attractive	1.000	4.350	6.989	.009
Good value	1.000	.799	1.128	.289
Willing to buy	1.000	.261	.312	.577
Innovative	1.000	2.219	2.958	.087
Good quality	1.000	.306	.374	.541
Brand	1.000	6.306	7.016	.009
Expensive	1.000	2.094	4.176	.042
Know about	1.000	.219	.288	.592
Reliable	1.000	2.219	4.871	.028
Proud to own	1.000	3.196	4.888	.028
Tech advanced	1.000	3.196	4.376	.037
Service	1.000	.587	.910	.341
Easy to find	1.000	1.973	2.706	.101
Workmanship	1.000	2.755	4.146	.043
Satisfied with	1.000	3.668	8.419	.004
Good overall	1.000	6.306	10.826	.001

Hungary/Poland
Univariate Tests

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Attractive	1.000	.402	.417	.519
Good value	1.000	.302	.355	.552
Willing to buy	1.000	.179	.187	.665
Innovative	1.000	.0875	.128	.721
Good quality	1.000	3.302	4.146	.043
Brand	1.000	1.029	1.472	.226
Expensive	1.000	.0018	.003	.957
Know about	1.000	2.857	3.494	.063
Reliable	1.000	.216	.481	.488
Proud to own	1.000	.114	.156	.694
Tech advanced	1.000	.0016	.021	.884
Service	1.000	.000	.000	1.000
Easy to find	1.000	1.945	2.449	.119
Workmanship	1.000	.0018	.003	.957
Satisfied with	1.000	.302	.642	.424
Good overall	1.000	.350	.473	.492

Poland/Czech Republic
Univariate Tests

Variable	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Attractive	1.000	8.228	7.559	.006
Good value	1.000	.514	.626	.429
Willing to buy	1.000	1.297	1.194	.275
Innovative	1.000	4.628	6.582	.011
Good quality	1.000	.861	.886	.347
Brand	1.000	1.601	1.777	.184
Expensive	1.000	2.057	3.535	.061
Know about	1.000	2.057	2.881	.091
Reliable	1.000	2.306	3.154	.077
Proud to own	1.000	2.057	2.021	.156
Tech advanced	1.000	2.569	2.908	.089
Service	1.000	.400	.619	.432
Easy to find	1.000	.028	.033	.856
Workmanship	1.000	3.765	6.157	.014
Satisfied with	1.000	2.569	4.782	.030
Good overall	1.000	3.290	4.719	.031

APPENDIX C – T-TESTS (MANOVA FOLLOW-UP)

Country Image

France (2000 vs. 1995)

Pairwise F-statistic = 2.905 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Indust.	2000	296	6.18	.98	.0571	2.419	598	.016	.0862
	1995	304	5.97	1.12	.0644				
Educated	2000	296	6.20	.85	.0492	3.533	597	.000	.0760
	1995	303	5.93	1.01	.0578				
Western Culture	2000	294	5.13	1.91	.11	1.042	591	.298	.16
	1995	299	4.96	1.89	.11				
Know About	2000	296	4.50	1.55	.0903	3.114	598	.002	.13
	1995	304	4.10	1.63	.0934				
Stable	2000	295	5.83	1.10	.0640	4.558	596	.000	.0960
	1995	303	5.39	1.24	.0714				
Rich	2000	296	5.66	.99	.0575	5.887	598	.000	.0840
	1995	304	5.16	1.07	.0611				
Democ.	2000	294	5.39	1.53	.0890	.395	594	.693	.13
	1995	302	5.34	1.57	.0902				
Ideal Country	2000	296	4.98	1.30	.0757	2.207	597	.028	.11
	1995	303	4.75	1.29	.0741				
Safe	2000	296	5.45	1.13	.0657	2.853	597	.004	.0962
	1995	303	5.17	1.22	.0701				
Active	2000	296	5.33	1.32	.0768	2.413	596	.016	.11
	1995	302	5.06	1.43	.0821				
Welcome Immig.	2000	296	5.39	1.56	.0906	3.764	598	.000	.13
	1995	304	4.89	1.67	.0959				
Many Rights	2000	295	5.74	1.41	.0821	2.141	597	.033	.12
	1995	304	5.48	1.54	.0884				
I like	2000	296	5.73	1.36	.0791	2.740	598	.006	.12
	1995	304	5.41	1.45	.0833				
Peaceful	2000	296	4.98	1.51	.0878	2.130	597	.034	.13
	1995	303	4.71	1.63	.0934				
Aligned With	2000	295	4.90	1.55	.0902	.596	594	.552	.13
	1995	301	4.82	1.63	.0942				
Closer Ties	2000	296	5.13	1.44	.0837	1.644	597	.101	.12
	1995	303	4.92	1.59	.0915				
Trust-worthy	2000	294	5.32	1.28	.0745	2.555	594	.011	.11
	1995	302	5.03	1.45	.0836				
Hard-working	2000	296	4.82	1.47	.0854	1.217	598	.224	.12
	1995	304	4.67	1.42	.0812				
Indiv.	2000	295	4.77	1.51	.0877	.312	596	.755	.13
	1995	303	4.73	1.64	.0944				
Favor Invest.	2000	296	4.96	1.52	.0883	3.785	597	.000	.13
	1995	303	4.46	1.73	.0993				

* equal variances assumed

France (2000 vs. 1992)

Pairwise F-statistic = 2.008 (Sig. = .006)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Indust.	2000	296	6.18	.98	.0571	2.161	537	.031	.0851
	1992	243	5.99	.98	.0631				
Educated	2000	296	6.20	.85	.0492	2.749	538	.006	.0785
	1992	244	5.98	.98	.0625				
Western Culture	2000	294	5.13	1.91	.11	-1.094	536	.274	.16
	1992	244	5.30	1.73	.11				
Know About	2000	296	4.50	1.55	.0903	.725	538	.469	.13
	1992	244	4.41	1.42	.0906				
Stable	2000	295	5.83	1.10	.0640	3.156	537	.002	.0995
	1992	244	5.52	1.21	.0774				
Rich	2000	296	5.66	.99	.0575	3.670	536	.000	.0883
	1992	242	5.33	1.05	.0678				
Democ.	2000	294	5.39	1.53	.0890	.232	535	.816	.13
	1992	243	5.36	1.41	.0907				
Ideal Country	2000	296	4.98	1.30	.0757	1.880	535	.061	.11
	1992	241	4.78	1.23	.0791				
Safe	2000	296	5.45	1.13	.0657	2.571	538	.010	.0967
	1992	244	5.20	1.10	.0706				
Active	2000	296	5.33	1.32	.0768	1.896	538	.059	.11
	1992	244	5.11	1.27	.0814				
Welcome Immig.	2000	296	5.39	1.56	.0906	1.448	538	.148	.14
	1992	244	5.19	1.57	.10				
Many Rights	2000	295	5.74	1.41	.0821	2.322	535	.021	.12
	1992	242	5.45	1.46	.0939				
I like	2000	296	5.73	1.36	.0791	1.332	538	.183	.11
	1992	244	5.57	1.28	.0819				
Peaceful	2000	296	4.98	1.51	.0878	1.478	538	.140	.13
	1992	244	4.79	1.51	.0964				
Aligned With	2000	295	4.90	1.55	.0902	-.587	537	.557	.13
	1992	244	4.98	1.51	.0966				
Closer Ties	2000	296	5.13	1.44	.0837	-.581	538	.562	.12
	1992	244	5.20	1.41	.0904				
Trust-worthy	2000	294	5.32	1.28	.0745	.421	534	.674	.11
	1992	242	5.27	1.29	.0832				
Hard-working	2000	296	4.82	1.47	.0854	1.285	538	.199	.12
	1992	244	4.66	1.36	.0870				
Indiv.	2000	295	4.77	1.51	.0877	-1.319	535	.188	.13
	1992	242	4.95	1.53	.0982				
Favor Invest.	2000	296	4.96	1.52	.0883	-.243	538	.808	.13
	1992	244	4.99	1.56	.10				

* equal variances assumed

Russia (2000 vs. 1995)

Pairwise F-statistic = 2.075 (Sig. = .004)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Indust.	2000	296	4.38	1.52	.0884	1.046	598	.296	.13
	1995	304	4.24	1.71	.0980				
Educated	2000	206	4.60	1.34	.0781	3.787	598	.000	.11
	1995	304	4.17	1.46	.0836				
Western Culture	2000	295	2.99	1.55	.0900	1.169	595	.243	.13
	1995	302	2.83	1.63	.0938				
Know About	2000	296	3.21	1.53	.0888	.803	598	.423	.13
	1995	304	3.11	1.55	.0888				
Stable	2000	296	2.39	1.19	.0691	.663	597	.507	.11
	1995	303	2.32	1.44	.0830				
Rich	2000	296	2.52	1.09	.0631	1.472	598	.142	.0897
	1995	304	2.38	1.11	.0637				
Democ.	2000	294	3.02	1.41	.0825	1.391	595	.165	.12
	1995	303	2.85	1.49	.0858				
Ideal Country	2000	296	2.33	1.13	.0659	1.616	598	.107	.0969
	1995	304	2.17	1.24	.0709				
Safe	2000	295	2.59	1.09	.0635	-1.713	597	.087	.0992
	1995	304	2.76	1.32	.0759				
Active	2000	295	4.17	1.46	.0851	1.487	595	.138	.12
	1995	302	3.99	1.49	.0855				
Welcome Immig.	2000	296	4.58	1.59	.0925	2.162	596	.031	.14
	1995	302	4.29	1.75	.10				
Many Rights	2000	295	2.73	1.16	.0676	1.951	594	.051	.0994
	1995	301	2.54	1.26	.0728				
I like	2000	295	4.40	1.32	.0766	1.116	597	.265	.11
	1995	304	4.28	1.32	.0759				
Peaceful	2000	295	3.36	1.24	.0722	2.532	597	.012	.10
	1995	304	3.10	1.25	.0715				
Aligned With	2000	296	3.20	1.31	.0762	-.048	597	.962	.11
	1995	303	3.20	1.38	.0792				
Closer Ties	2000	296	4.72	1.39	.0811	.744	598	.457	.12
	1995	304	4.63	1.50	.0860				
Trust-worthy	2000	293	4.22	1.34	.0781	.339	594	.734	.11
	1995	303	4.18	1.31	.0753				
Hard-working	2000	295	4.85	1.53	.0890	-.977	596	.329	.13
	1995	303	4.98	1.62	.0931				
Indiv.	2000	296	3.43	1.48	.0860	.910	597	.363	.12
	1995	303	3.32	1.54	.0883				
Favor Invest.	2000	296	4.33	1.67	.0969	.055	597	.956	.14
	1995	303	4.32	1.68	.0964				

* equal variances assumed

Russia (2000 vs. 1992)

Pairwise F-statistic = 5.443 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Indust.	2000	296	4.38	1.52	.0884	3.355	537	.001	.14
	1992	243	3.92	1.63	.10				
Educated	2000	296	4.60	1.34	.0781	2.181	536	.030	.12
	1992	242	4.34	1.48	.0952				
Western Culture	2000	295	2.99	1.55	.0900	1.518	533	.130	.13
	1992	240	2.79	1.39	.0895				
Know About	2000	296	3.21	1.53	.0888	-1.165	537	.244	.13
	1992	243	3.36	1.48	.0949				
Stable	2000	296	2.39	1.19	.0691	2.534	537	.012	.10
	1992	243	2.13	1.22	.0786				
Rich	2000	296	2.52	1.09	.0631	2.038	537	.042	.0982
	1992	243	2.32	1.19	.0763				
Democ.	2000	294	3.02	1.41	.0825	.239	535	.812	.12
	1992	243	2.99	1.35	.0865				
Ideal Country	2000	296	2.33	1.13	.0659	-.630	536	.529	.10
	1992	242	2.39	1.25	.0805				
Safe	2000	295	2.59	1.09	.0635	-7.016	536	.000	.11
	1992	243	3.35	1.41	.0905				
Active	2000	295	4.17	1.46	.0851	2.096	536	.037	.13
	1992	243	3.89	1.59	.10				
Welcome Immig.	2000	296	4.58	1.59	.0925	-2.469	536	.014	.14
	1992	242	4.93	1.68	.11				
Many Rights	2000	295	2.73	1.16	.0676	-.149	535	.881	.11
	1992	242	2.75	1.27	.0819				
I like	2000	295	4.40	1.32	.0766	-3.178	535	.002	.11
	1992	242	4.76	1.26	.0812				
Peaceful	2000	295	3.36	1.24	.0722	-2.071	536	.039	.11
	1992	243	3.59	1.41	.0904				
Aligned With	2000	296	3.20	1.31	.0762	-1.658	534	.098	.12
	1992	240	3.40	1.49	.0961				
Closer Ties	2000	296	4.72	1.39	.0811	-3.224	537	.001	.13
	1992	243	5.14	1.60	.10				
Trust-worthy	2000	293	4.22	1.34	.0781	-3.763	533	.000	.12
	1992	242	4.67	1.43	.0916				
Hard-working	2000	295	4.85	1.53	.0890	.852	536	.395	.14
	1992	243	4.74	1.67	.11				
Indiv.	2000	296	3.43	1.48	.0860	2.030	537	.043	.13
	1992	243	3.17	1.48	.0951				
Favor Invest.	2000	296	4.33	1.67	.0969	-4.781	537	.000	.14
	1992	243	5.00	1.59	.10				

* equal variances assumed

Russia (1995 vs. 1992)

Pairwise F-statistic = 3.744 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test ^a			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Indust.	1995	304	4.24	1.71	.0980	2.207	545	.028	.14
	1992	243	3.92	1.63	.10				
Educated	1995	304	4.17	1.46	.0836	-1.327	544	.185	.13
	1992	242	4.34	1.48	.0952				
Western Culture	1995	302	2.83	1.63	.0938	.324	540	.746	.13
	1992	240	2.79	1.39	.0895				
Know About	1995	304	3.11	1.55	.0888	-1.935	545	.054	.13
	1992	243	3.36	1.48	.0949				
Stable	1995	303	2.32	1.44	.0830	1.655	544	.098	.12
	1992	243	2.13	1.22	.0786				
Rich	1995	304	2.38	1.11	.0637	.689	545	.491	.0987
	1992	243	2.32	1.19	.0763				
Democ.	1995	303	2.85	1.49	.0858	-1.112	544	.267	.12
	1992	243	2.99	1.35	.0865				
Ideal Country	1995	304	2.17	1.24	.0709	-2.068	544	.039	.11
	1992	242	2.39	1.25	.0805				
Safe	1995	304	2.76	1.32	.0759	-5.002	545	.000	.12
	1992	243	3.35	1.41	.0905				
Active	1995	302	3.99	1.49	.0855	.734	543	.464	.13
	1992	243	3.89	1.59	.10				
Welcome Immig.	1995	302	4.29	1.75	.10	-4.347	542	.000	.15
	1992	242	4.93	1.68	.11				
Many Rights	1995	301	2.54	1.26	.0728	-1.915	541	.056	.11
	1992	242	2.75	1.27	.0819				
I like	1995	304	4.28	1.32	.0759	-4.264	544	.000	.11
	1992	242	4.76	1.26	.0812				
Peaceful	1995	304	3.10	1.25	.0715	-4.343	545	.000	.11
	1992	243	3.59	1.41	.0904				
Aligned With	1995	303	3.20	1.38	.0792	-1.584	541	.114	.12
	1992	240	3.40	1.49	.0961				
Closer Ties	1995	304	4.63	1.50	.0860	-3.792	545	.000	.13
	1992	243	5.14	1.60	.10				
Trust-worthy	1995	303	4.18	1.31	.0753	-4.146	543	.000	.12
	1992	242	4.67	1.43	.0916				
Hard-working	1995	303	4.98	1.62	.0931	1.721	544	.086	.14
	1992	243	4.74	1.67	.11				
Indiv.	1995	303	3.32	1.54	.0883	1.137	544	.256	.13
	1992	243	3.17	1.48	.0951				
Favor Invest.	1995	303	4.32	1.68	.0964	-4.840	544	.000	.14
	1992	243	5.00	1.59	.10				

* equal variances assumed

Hungary (2000 vs. 1995)

Pairwise F-statistic = 1.742 (Sig. = .023)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Indust.	2000	296	4.45	1.38	.0803	1.613	594	.107	.12
	1995	300	4.26	1.43	.0827				
Educated	2000	296	4.84	1.30	.0755	3.778	594	.000	.11
	1995	300	4.44	1.27	.0735				
Western Culture	2000	295	3.61	1.61	.0938	1.743	592	.082	.13
	1995	299	3.38	1.59	.0919				
Know About	2000	296	2.46	1.53	.0887	1.894	595	.059	.12
	1995	301	2.23	1.44	.0832				
Stable	2000	296	4.25	1.42	.0827	3.528	594	.000	.11
	1995	300	3.84	1.37	.0790				
Rich	2000	295	3.47	1.23	.0717	2.762	592	.006	.0979
	1995	299	3.20	1.15	.0668				
Democ.	2000	296	3.96	1.32	.0770	1.847	594	.065	.11
	1995	300	3.76	1.36	.0782				
Ideal Country	2000	296	3.64	1.24	.0718	2.798	595	.005	.10
	1995	301	3.35	1.32	.0762				
Safe	2000	294	4.14	1.16	.0676	1.737	592	.083	.0957
	1995	300	3.98	1.17	.0677				
Active	2000	296	4.36	1.20	.0699	2.127	593	.034	.10
	1995	299	4.15	1.26	.0726				
Welcome Immig.	2000	296	4.94	1.48	.0863	3.495	595	.001	.13
	1995	301	4.49	1.64	.0944				
Many Rights	2000	294	3.85	1.27	.0740	.840	592	.401	.17
	1995	300	3.71	2.65	.15				
I like	2000	295	4.81	1.17	.0681	1.926	593	.055	.0919
	1995	300	4.64	1.07	.0617				
Peaceful	2000	295	4.62	1.28	.0745	2.195	593	.029	.10
	1995	300	4.40	1.17	.0675				
Aligned With	2000	296	3.90	1.22	.0707	3.268	594	.001	.0996
	1995	300	3.58	1.21	.0701				
Closer Ties	2000	296	4.89	1.22	.0712	2.559	593	.011	.11
	1995	299	4.62	1.37	.0795				
Trust-worthy	2000	294	4.80	1.17	.0682	1.039	592	.299	.0924
	1995	300	4.71	1.08	.0625				
Hard-working	2000	295	4.77	1.41	.0824	-.027	592	.979	.12
	1995	299	4.77	1.41	.0813				
Indiv.	2000	296	3.95	1.27	.0741	.058	594	.954	.10
	1995	300	3.94	1.24	.0718				
Favor Invest.	2000	296	4.70	1.43	.0833	2.106	594	.036	.12
	1995	300	4.45	1.53	.0885				

* equal variances assumed

Hungary (2000 vs. 1992)

Pairwise F-statistic = 2.871 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Indust.	2000	296	4.45	1.38	.0803	3.454	538	.001	.12
	1992	244	4.03	1.42	.0906				
Educated	2000	296	4.84	1.30	.0755	4.201	537	.000	.11
	1992	243	4.37	1.29	.0827				
Western Culture	2000	295	3.61	1.61	.0938	.084	535	.933	.14
	1992	242	3.60	1.60	.10				
Know About	2000	296	2.46	1.53	.0887	.518	538	.604	.13
	1992	244	2.40	1.37	.0875				
Stable	2000	296	4.25	1.42	.0827	3.980	536	.000	.13
	1992	242	3.75	1.47	.0948				
Rich	2000	295	3.47	1.23	.0717	4.453	537	.000	.10
	1992	244	3.01	1.12	.0717				
Democ.	2000	296	3.96	1.32	.0770	1.806	535	.071	.12
	1992	241	3.75	1.34	.0861				
Ideal Country	2000	296	3.64	1.24	.0718	4.227	537	.000	.11
	1992	243	3.19	1.26	.0811				
Safe	2000	294	4.14	1.16	.0676	1.804	532	.072	.11
	1992	240	3.95	1.31	.0845				
Active	2000	296	4.36	1.20	.0699	.323	535	.747	.10
	1992	241	4.33	1.20	.0772				
Welcome Immig.	2000	296	4.94	1.48	.0863	-.487	538	.626	.13
	1992	244	5.00	1.57	.10				
Many Rights	2000	294	3.85	1.27	.0740	2.748	532	.006	.11
	1992	240	3.55	1.28	.0826				
I like	2000	295	4.81	1.17	.0681	-.062	537	.951	.0991
	1992	244	4.82	1.11	.0714				
Peaceful	2000	295	4.62	1.28	.0745	1.337	535	.182	.11
	1992	242	4.48	1.28	.0824				
Aligned With	2000	296	3.90	1.22	.0707	3.451	535	.001	.11
	1992	241	3.52	1.33	.0854				
Closer Ties	2000	296	4.89	1.22	.0712	-1.987	537	.047	.11
	1992	243	5.12	1.38	.0887				
Trust-worthy	2000	294	4.80	1.17	.0682	-.874	531	.383	.10
	1992	239	4.89	1.15	.0747				
Hard-working	2000	295	4.77	1.41	.0824	-.438	534	.662	.12
	1992	241	4.82	1.32	.0847				
Indiv.	2000	296	3.95	1.27	.0741	1.468	535	.143	.11
	1992	241	3.78	1.26	.0814				
Favor Invest.	2000	296	4.70	1.43	.0833	-1.041	536	.298	.13
	1992	242	4.83	1.50	.0963				

* equal variances assumed

Hungary (1995 vs. 1992)

Pairwise F-statistic = 2.353 (Sig. = .001)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Indust.	1995	300	4.26	1.43	.0827	1.883	542	.060	.12
	1992	244	4.03	1.42	.0906				
Educated	1995	300	4.44	1.27	.0735	.660	541	.509	.11
	1992	243	4.37	1.29	.0827				
Western Culture	1995	299	3.38	1.59	.0919	-1.557	539	.115	.14
	1992	242	3.60	1.60	.10				
Know About	1995	301	2.23	1.44	.0832	-1.358	543	.175	.12
	1992	244	2.40	1.37	.0875				
Stable	1995	300	3.84	1.37	.0790	.780	540	.436	.12
	1992	242	3.75	1.47	.0948				
Rich	1995	299	3.20	1.15	.0668	1.882	541	.060	.0983
	1992	244	3.01	1.12	.0717				
Democ.	1995	300	3.76	1.36	.0782	.048	539	.961	.12
	1992	241	3.75	1.34	.0861				
Ideal Country	1995	301	3.35	1.32	.0762	1.464	542	.144	.11
	1992	243	3.19	1.26	.0811				
Safe	1995	300	3.98	1.17	.0677	.249	538	.803	.11
	1992	240	3.95	1.31	.0845				
Active	1995	299	4.15	1.26	.0726	-1.696	538	.090	.11
	1992	241	4.33	1.20	.0772				
Welcome Immig.	1995	301	4.49	1.64	.0944	-3.692	543	.000	.14
	1992	244	5.00	1.57	.10				
Many Rights	1995	300	3.71	2.65	.15	.863	538	.389	.19
	1992	240	3.55	1.28	.0826				
I like	1995	300	4.64	1.07	.0617	-1.948	542	.052	.0939
	1992	244	4.82	1.11	.0714				
Peaceful	1995	300	4.40	1.17	.0675	-.681	540	.496	.11
	1992	242	4.48	1.28	.0824				
Aligned With	1995	300	3.58	1.21	.0701	.492	539	.623	.11
	1992	241	3.52	1.33	.0854				
Closer Ties	1995	299	4.62	1.37	.0795	-4.172	540	.000	.12
	1992	243	5.12	1.38	.0887				
Trust-worthy	1995	300	4.71	1.08	.0625	-1.909	537	.057	.0967
	1992	239	4.89	1.15	.0747				
Hard-working	1995	299	4.77	1.41	.0813	-.414	538	.679	.12
	1992	241	4.82	1.32	.0847				
Indiv.	1995	300	3.94	1.24	.0718	1.438	539	.151	.11
	1992	241	3.78	1.26	.0814				
Favor Invest.	1995	300	4.45	1.53	.0885	-2.959	540	.003	.13
	1992	242	4.83	1.50	.0963				

* equal variances assumed

Czech Republic (2000 vs. 1995)

Pairwise F-statistic = 2.062 (Sig. = .004)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Indust.	2000	296	4.92	1.43	.0830	2.493	597	.013	.12
	1995	303	4.61	1.53	.0880				
Educated	2000	296	5.03	1.32	.0769	2.947	597	.003	.11
	1995	303	4.71	1.34	.0770				
Western Culture	2000	295	3.84	1.67	.0973	2.851	596	.005	.14
	1995	303	3.46	1.63	.0938				
Know About	2000	296	2.93	1.58	.0919	1.043	597	.297	.13
	1995	303	2.79	1.63	.0937				
Stable	2000	295	4.13	1.58	.0918	3.813	596	.000	.13
	1995	303	3.64	1.54	.0882				
Rich	2000	295	3.62	1.27	.0742	3.301	595	.001	.11
	1995	302	3.27	1.31	.0752				
Democ.	2000	296	4.04	1.51	.0878	2.978	597	.003	.12
	1995	303	3.68	1.46	.0836				
Ideal Country	2000	295	3.75	1.34	.0779	3.645	596	.000	.11
	1995	303	3.34	1.36	.0783				
Safe	2000	296	3.98	1.39	.0809	1.908	597	.057	.12
	1995	303	3.76	1.44	.0825				
Active	2000	296	4.72	1.22	.0708	1.254	596	.210	.10
	1995	302	4.59	1.26	.0723				
Welcome Immig.	2000	296	5.01	1.38	.0801	.874	596	.383	.24
	1995	302	4.80	3.95	.23				
Many Rights	2000	296	3.85	1.46	.0849	.981	596	.327	.21
	1995	302	3.65	3.24	.19				
I like	2000	295	4.84	1.29	.0750	2.287	595	.023	.10
	1995	302	4.60	1.22	.0701				
Peaceful	2000	296	4.32	1.38	.0803	2.679	596	.008	.11
	1995	302	4.02	1.43	.0821				
Aligned With	2000	296	4.05	1.27	.0741	4.063	595	.000	.10
	1995	301	3.62	1.29	.0742				
Closer Ties	2000	296	4.86	1.38	.0801	2.451	596	.015	.12
	1995	302	4.58	1.47	.0844				
Trust-worthy	2000	295	4.85	1.13	.0659	2.499	595	.013	.24
	1995	302	4.61	1.23	.0706				
Hard-working	2000	295	5.00	1.33	.0777	2.311	596	.021	.26
	1995	303	4.74	1.46	.0837				
Indiv.	2000	296	4.02	1.30	.0755	.939	596	.348	.11
	1995	302	3.92	1.38	.0795				
Favor Invest.	2000	296	4.80	1.52	.0882	2.325	597	.020	.13
	1995	303	4.50	1.66	.0955				

* equal variances assumed

Czech Republic (2000 vs. 1992)

Pairwise F-statistic = 3.672 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Indust.	2000	296	4.92	1.43	.0830	2.498	536	.013	.13
	1992	242	4.60	1.50	.0966				
Educated	2000	296	5.03	1.32	.0769	1.916	535	.056	.11
	1992	241	4.81	1.30	.0835				
Western Culture	2000	295	3.84	1.67	.0973	.541	533	.589	.14
	1992	240	3.76	1.65	.11				
Know About	2000	296	2.93	1.58	.0919	.887	536	.376	.13
	1992	242	2.81	1.39	.0891				
Stable	2000	295	4.13	1.58	.0918	1.987	535	.047	.14
	1992	242	3.86	1.56	.10				
Rich	2000	295	3.62	1.27	.0742	3.430	535	.001	.11
	1992	242	3.25	1.22	.0787				
Democ.	2000	296	4.04	1.51	.0878	2.266	534	.024	.13
	1992	240	3.76	1.38	.0888				
Ideal Country	2000	295	3.75	1.34	.0779	3.249	534	.001	.11
	1992	241	3.39	1.20	.0770				
Safe	2000	296	3.98	1.39	.0809	-1.534	536	.126	.12
	1992	242	4.16	1.26	.0809				
Active	2000	296	4.72	1.22	.0708	2.283	535	.023	.10
	1992	241	4.48	1.18	.0762				
Welcome Immig.	2000	296	5.01	1.38	.0801	-1.283	536	.200	.12
	1992	242	5.17	1.51	.0972				
Many Rights	2000	296	3.85	1.46	.0849	2.328	536	.020	.12
	1992	242	3.57	1.35	.0870				
I like	2000	295	4.84	1.29	.0750	-2.775	535	.006	.10
	1992	242	5.13	1.10	.0709				
Peaceful	2000	296	4.32	1.38	.0803	-1.906	535	.057	.12
	1992	241	4.55	1.31	.0846				
Aligned With	2000	296	4.05	1.27	.0741	2.437	535	.015	.11
	1992	241	3.78	1.21	.0777				
Closer Ties	2000	296	4.86	1.38	.0801	-2.495	536	.013	.12
	1992	242	5.16	1.32	.0847				
Trust-worthy	2000	295	4.85	1.13	.0659	-1.697	534	.090	.0981
	1992	241	5.02	1.13	.0726				
Hard-working	2000	295	5.00	1.33	.0777	1.036	534	.301	.12
	1992	241	4.88	1.32	.0853				
Indiv.	2000	296	4.02	1.30	.0755	1.551	532	.122	.11
	1992	238	3.84	1.30	.0846				
Favor Invest.	2000	296	4.80	1.52	.0882	-1.080	535	.281	.13
	1992	241	4.95	1.51	.0975				

* equal variances assumed

Czech Republic (1995 vs. 1992)

Pairwise F-statistic = 3.284 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Indust.	1995	303	4.61	1.53	.0880	.112	543	.911	.13
	1992	242	4.60	1.50	.0966				
Educated	1995	303	4.71	1.34	.0770	-.902	542	.367	.11
	1992	241	4.81	1.30	.0835				
Western Culture	1995	303	3.46	1.63	.0938	-2.164	541	.031	.14
	1992	240	3.76	1.65	.11				
Know About	1995	303	2.79	1.63	.0937	-.167	543	.868	.13
	1992	242	2.81	1.39	.0891				
Stable	1995	303	3.64	1.54	.0882	-1.615	543	.107	.13
	1992	242	3.86	1.56	.10				
Rich	1995	302	3.27	1.31	.0752	.215	542	.830	.11
	1992	242	3.25	1.22	.0787				
Democ.	1995	303	3.68	1.46	.0836	-.612	541	.541	.12
	1992	240	3.76	1.38	.0888				
Ideal Country	1995	303	3.34	1.36	.0783	-.383	542	.702	.11
	1992	241	3.39	1.20	.0770				
Safe	1995	303	3.76	1.44	.0825	-3.392	543	.001	.12
	1992	242	4.16	1.26	.0809				
Active	1995	302	4.59	1.26	.0723	1.053	541	.293	.11
	1992	241	4.48	1.18	.0762				
Welcome Immig.	1995	302	4.80	3.95	.23	-1.387	542	.166	.27
	1992	242	5.17	1.51	.0972				
Many Rights	1995	302	3.65	3.24	.19	.373	542	.709	.22
	1992	242	3.57	1.35	.0870				
I like	1995	302	4.60	1.22	.0701	-5.215	542	.000	.10
	1992	242	5.13	1.10	.0709				
Peaceful	1995	302	4.02	1.43	.0821	-4.464	541	.000	.12
	1992	241	4.55	1.31	.0846				
Aligned With	1995	301	3.62	1.29	.0742	-1.507	540	.132	.11
	1992	241	3.78	1.21	.0777				
Closer Ties	1995	302	4.58	1.47	.0844	-4.774	542	.000	.12
	1992	242	5.16	1.32	.0847				
Trust-worthy	1995	302	4.61	1.23	.0706	-3.991	541	.000	.10
	1992	241	5.02	1.13	.0726				
Hard-working	1995	303	4.74	1.46	.0837	-1.197	542	.232	.12
	1992	241	4.88	1.32	.0853				
Indiv.	1995	302	3.92	1.38	.0795	.622	538	.534	.12
	1992	238	3.84	1.30	.0846				
Favor Invest.	1995	303	4.50	1.66	.0955	-3.222	542	.001	.14
	1992	241	4.95	1.51	.0975				

* equal variances assumed

Poland (2000 vs. 1995)

Pairwise F-statistic = 2.382 (Sig. = .001)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Indust.	2000	296	4.89	1.35	.0786	1.748	598	.081	.12
	1995	304	4.68	1.50	.0862				
Educated	2000	296	4.91	1.23	.0715	3.449	598	.001	.11
	1995	304	4.54	1.36	.0782				
Western Culture	2000	293	3.90	1.55	.0903	2.744	594	.006	.13
	1995	303	3.54	1.65	.0950				
Know About	2000	296	3.07	1.58	.0921	.750	598	.454	.13
	1995	304	2.97	1.59	.0911				
Stable	2000	296	4.46	1.33	.0771	5.064	598	.000	.11
	1995	304	3.91	1.32	.0760				
Rich	2000	296	3.57	1.17	.0677	3.806	598	.000	.0938
	1995	304	3.21	1.13	.0650				
Democ.	2000	296	4.27	1.39	.0808	2.942	598	.003	.11
	1995	304	3.94	1.33	.0760				
Ideal Country	2000	296	3.83	1.19	.0693	3.275	598	.001	.10
	1995	304	3.50	1.28	.0735				
Safe	2000	296	4.31	1.21	.0701	1.802	598	.072	.0958
	1995	304	4.14	1.14	.0654				
Active	2000	296	4.56	1.25	.0728	1.460	598	.145	.10
	1995	304	4.41	1.26	.0722				
Welcome Immig.	2000	296	5.10	1.43	.0832	2.809	598	.005	.12
	1995	304	4.76	1.51	.0869				
Many Rights	2000	295	4.10	1.29	.0752	4.230	596	.000	.10
	1995	303	3.66	1.26	.0724				
I like	2000	295	5.06	1.19	.0694	3.298	597	.001	.0963
	1995	304	4.75	1.17	.0668				
Peaceful	2000	296	4.70	1.29	.0751	1.935	597	.053	.10
	1995	303	4.50	1.21	.0695				
Aligned With	2000	296	4.22	1.23	.0716	3.382	598	.001	.10
	1995	304	3.88	1.26	.0725				
Closer Ties	2000	296	5.02	1.27	.0740	2.542	598	.011	.11
	1995	304	4.74	1.39	.0798				
Trust-worthy	2000	295	5.03	1.17	.0681	1.170	596	.243	.0937
	1995	303	4.92	1.12	.0645				
Hard-working	2000	296	5.07	1.42	.0826	1.536	597	.125	.12
	1995	303	4.89	1.44	.0829				
Indiv.	2000	296	4.08	1.33	.0775	1.959	598	.051	.11
	1995	304	3.88	1.24	.0713				
Favor Invest.	2000	296	4.94	1.37	.0794	2.436	598	.015	.12
	1995	304	4.65	1.52	.0873				

* equal variances assumed

Poland (2000 vs. 1992)

Pairwise F-statistic = 5.472 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Indust.	2000	296	4.89	1.35	.0786	2.779	536	.006	.12
	1992	242	4.55	1.48	.0950				
Educated	2000	296	4.91	1.23	.0715	3.641	538	.000	.11
	1992	244	4.49	1.43	.0916				
Western Culture	2000	293	3.90	1.55	.0903	.213	533	.831	.13
	1992	242	3.88	1.52	.0977				
Know About	2000	296	3.07	1.58	.0921	-.824	538	.410	.14
	1992	244	3.18	1.58	.10				
Stable	2000	296	4.46	1.33	.0771	7.620	538	.000	.11
	1992	244	3.58	1.33	.0849				
Rich	2000	296	3.57	1.17	.0677	7.412	538	.000	.0975
	1992	244	2.85	1.08	.0691				
Democ.	2000	296	4.27	1.39	.0808	2.143	538	.033	.12
	1992	244	4.02	1.35	.0861				
Ideal Country	2000	296	3.83	1.19	.0693	5.161	538	.000	.10
	1992	244	3.30	1.21	.0774				
Safe	2000	296	4.31	1.21	.0701	1.073	538	.284	.10
	1992	244	4.20	1.16	.0743				
Active	2000	296	4.56	1.25	.0728	-.236	538	.814	.11
	1992	244	4.59	1.22	.0783				
Welcome Immig.	2000	296	5.10	1.43	.0832	.023	538	.981	.13
	1992	244	5.10	1.56	.0997				
Many Rights	2000	295	4.10	1.29	.0752	5.168	537	.000	.11
	1992	244	3.51	1.35	.0866				
I like	2000	295	5.06	1.19	.0694	-.050	537	.960	.11
	1992	244	5.07	1.24	.0796				
Peaceful	2000	296	4.70	1.29	.0751	1.230	537	.219	.11
	1992	243	4.56	1.32	.0847				
Aligned With	2000	296	4.22	1.23	.0716	3.669	537	.000	.11
	1992	243	3.81	1.37	.0882				
Closer Ties	2000	296	5.02	1.27	.0740	-.769	538	.442	.11
	1992	244	5.11	1.33	.0849				
Trust-worthy	2000	295	5.03	1.17	.0681	-.420	537	.675	.10
	1992	244	5.07	1.17	.0750				
Hard-working	2000	296	5.07	1.42	.0826	1.788	537	.074	.12
	1992	243	4.85	1.47	.0942				
Indiv.	2000	296	4.08	1.33	.0775	3.511	537	.000	.12
	1992	243	3.68	1.33	.0856				
Favor Invest.	2000	296	4.94	1.37	.0794	-.700	537	.484	.12
	1992	243	5.03	1.49	.0957				

* equal variances assumed

Poland (1995 vs. 1992)

Pairwise F-statistic = 2.516 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Indust.	1995	304	4.68	1.50	.0862	1.054	544	.292	.13
	1992	242	4.55	1.48	.0950				
Educated	1995	304	4.54	1.36	.0782	.425	546	.671	.12
	1992	244	4.49	1.43	.0916				
Western Culture	1995	303	3.54	1.65	.0950	-2.411	543	.016	.14
	1992	242	3.88	1.52	.0977				
Know About	1995	304	2.97	1.59	.0911	-1.541	546	.124	.14
	1992	244	3.18	1.58	.10				
Stable	1995	302	3.91	1.32	.0760	2.862	546	.004	.11
	1992	244	3.58	1.33	.0849				
Rich	1995	304	3.21	1.13	.0650	3.831	546	.000	.0954
	1992	244	2.85	1.08	.0691				
Democ.	1995	304	3.94	1.33	.0760	-.631	546	.529	.11
	1992	244	4.02	1.35	.0861				
Ideal Country	1995	304	3.50	1.28	.0735	1.900	546	.058	.11
	1992	244	3.30	1.21	.0774				
Safe	1995	304	4.14	1.14	.0654	-.634	546	.526	.0988
	1992	244	4.20	1.16	.0743				
Active	1995	304	4.41	1.26	.0722	-1.638	546	.102	.11
	1992	244	4.59	1.22	.0783				
Welcome Immig.	1995	304	4.76	1.51	.0869	-2.543	546	.011	.13
	1992	244	5.10	1.56	.0997				
Many Rights	1995	303	3.66	1.26	.0724	1.326	545	.186	.11
	1992	244	3.51	1.35	.0866				
I like	1995	304	4.75	1.17	.0668	-3.129	546	.002	.10
	1992	244	5.07	1.24	.0796				
Peaceful	1995	303	4.50	1.21	.0695	-.542	544	.588	.11
	1992	243	4.56	1.32	.0847				
Aligned With	1995	304	3.88	1.26	.0725	.598	545	.550	.11
	1992	243	3.81	1.37	.0882				
Closer Ties	1995	304	4.74	1.39	.0798	-3.101	546	.002	.12
	1992	244	5.11	1.33	.0849				
Trust-worthy	1995	303	4.92	1.12	.0645	-1.545	545	.123	.0985
	1992	244	5.07	1.17	.0750				
Hard-working	1995	303	4.89	1.44	.0829	.346	544	.729	.13
	1992	243	4.85	1.47	.0942				
Indiv.	1995	304	3.88	1.24	.0713	1.803	545	.072	.11
	1992	243	3.68	1.33	.0856				
Favor Invest.	1995	304	4.65	1.52	.0873	-2.881	545	.004	.13
	1992	243	5.03	1.49	.0957				

* equal variances assumed

Product Image**Russia (2000 vs. 1992)**

Pairwise F-statistic = 2.943 (Sig. = .000)

Variable	Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test ^a			
	N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	Df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Attractive 2000	296	3.26	1.37	.0795	3.858	531	.000	.12
1992	237	2.80	1.33	.0866				
Good Value 2000	296	3.89	1.47	.0855	3.424	531	.001	.13
1992	237	3.43	1.61	.10				
Willing to Buy 2000	296	3.61	1.60	.0927	2.133	531	.033	.14
1992	237	3.31	1.64	.11				
Innovative 2000	296	3.32	1.33	.0771	3.618	530	.000	.12
1992	236	2.90	1.35	.0877				
Good Quality 2000	296	3.39	1.34	.0778	2.541	531	.011	.12
1992	237	3.09	1.37	.0892				
Recog. Brands 2000	295	2.89	1.54	.0895	2.372	530	.018	.13
1992	237	2.58	1.49	.0966				
Expensive 2000	295	3.45	1.32	.0771	-.085	530	.932	.12
1992	237	3.46	1.35	.0876				
Know About 2000	296	2.42	1.42	.0823	-.784	533	.434	.12
1992	239	2.51	1.39	.0899				
Reliable 2000	296	3.27	1.29	.0749	.412	530	.681	.11
1992	236	3.22	1.25	.0814				
Proud to Own 2000	296	3.40	1.42	.0824	.401	531	.689	.12
1992	237	3.35	1.40	.0910				
Tech. Advanced 2000	296	3.45	1.37	.0797	-.240	531	.811	.13
1992	237	3.48	1.60	.10				
Good Service 2000	294	3.33	1.38	.0803	1.855	528	.064	.12
1992	236	3.11	1.38	.0896				
Easy to Find 2000	295	2.81	1.35	.0783	2.359	530	.019	.11
1992	237	2.54	1.28	.0832				
Work-manship 2000	295	3.50	1.29	.0751	1.752	530	.080	.12
1992	237	3.30	1.36	.0885				
Satisfied With 2000	294	3.54	1.17	.0684	1.107	529	.269	.10
1992	237	3.43	1.20	.0782				
Good Overall 2000	292	3.27	1.25	.0733	1.741	525	.082	.11
1992	235	3.08	1.28	.0837				

^a equal variances assumed

Russia (1995 vs. 1992)

Pairwise F-statistic = 1.707 (Sig. = .040)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Attractive	1995	303	3.04	1.35	.0775	2.044	538	.041	.12
	1992	237	2.80	1.33	.0866				
Good Value	1995	303	3.64	1.56	.0898	1.499	538	.134	.14
	1992	237	3.43	1.61	.10				
Willing to Buy	1995	302	3.35	1.70	.0975	.297	537	.767	.14
	1992	237	3.31	1.64	.11				
Innovative	1995	302	3.16	1.39	.0799	2.153	536	.032	.12
	1992	236	2.90	1.35	.0877				
Good Quality	1995	302	3.27	1.40	.0803	1.549	537	.122	.12
	1992	237	3.09	1.37	.0892				
Recog. Brands	1995	303	2.74	1.53	.0879	1.230	538	.219	.13
	1992	237	2.58	1.49	.0966				
Expensive	1995	301	3.68	1.39	.0804	1.818	536	.070	.12
	1992	237	3.46	1.35	.0876				
Know About	1995	303	2.55	1.58	.0906	.282	540	.778	.13
	1992	239	2.51	1.39	.0899				
Reliable	1995	303	3.26	1.32	.0756	.324	537	.746	.11
	1992	236	3.22	1.25	.0814				
Proud to Own	1995	303	3.22	1.51	.0865	-.986	538	.325	.13
	1992	237	3.35	1.40	.0910				
Tech. Advanced	1995	303	3.38	1.52	.0876	-.696	538	.487	.14
	1992	237	3.48	1.60	.10				
Good Service	1995	302	3.19	1.40	.0804	.624	536	.533	.12
	1992	236	3.11	1.38	.0896				
Easy to Find	1995	303	2.75	1.33	.0761	1.913	538	.056	.11
	1992	237	2.54	1.28	.0832				
Work-manship	1995	303	3.43	1.36	.0780	1.098	538	.273	.12
	1992	237	3.30	1.36	.0885				
Satisfied With	1995	303	3.41	1.27	.0727	-.127	538	.899	.11
	1992	237	3.43	1.20	.0782				
Good Overall	1995	297	3.14	1.27	.0738	.573	530	.567	.11
	1992	235	3.08	1.28	.0837				

* equal variances assumed

Hungary (2000 vs. 1992)

Pairwise F-statistic = 1.866 (Sig. = .020)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	Df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Attractive	2000	295	4.18	1.16	.0678	1.138	532	.256	.0997
	1992	239	4.06	1.12	.0726				
Good Value	2000	296	4.33	1.07	.0622	1.971	533	.049	.0979
	1992	239	4.14	1.19	.0771				
Willing to Buy	2000	295	4.33	1.37	.0798	.190	531	.849	.12
	1992	238	4.30	1.40	.0907				
Innovative	2000	296	3.84	1.15	.0670	.476	531	.634	.10
	1992	237	3.79	1.20	.0781				
Good Quality	2000	295	4.22	1.04	.0603	2.405	531	.017	.0930
	1992	238	4.00	1.11	.0717				
Recog. Brands	2000	296	2.90	1.36	.0792	.338	532	.735	.12
	1992	238	2.86	1.41	.0919				
Expensive	2000	295	3.74	1.02	.0595	-.263	530	.793	.0908
	1992	237	3.76	1.06	.0691				
Know About	2000	295	2.27	1.41	.0820	-.468	532	.640	.12
	1992	239	2.33	1.33	.0860				
Reliable	2000	296	4.05	.96	.0557	1.553	531	.121	.0837
	1992	237	3.92	.96	.0625				
Proud to Own	2000	296	3.96	1.14	.0660	.111	530	.912	.10
	1992	236	3.94	1.17	.0765				
Tech. Advanced	2000	294	3.77	1.23	.0719	2.387	529	.017	.10
	1992	237	3.52	1.14	.0743				
Good Service	2000	295	3.71	1.04	.0606	.775	530	.439	.0975
	1992	237	3.63	1.21	.0783				
Easy to Find	2000	296	3.13	1.33	.0775	2.218	533	.027	.12
	1992	239	2.87	1.34	.0864				
Work-manship	2000	296	4.19	.97	.0562	2.944	532	.003	.0900
	1992	238	3.92	1.11	.0720				
Satisfied With	2000	295	4.07	.89	.0515	1.018	531	.309	.0815
	1992	238	3.99	.99	.0644				
Good Overall	2000	290	4.04	1.01	.0593	1.747	525	.081	.0884
	1992	237	3.89	1.01	.0657				

* equal variances assumed

Czech Republic (2000 vs. 1992)

Pairwise F-statistic = 7.366 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test ^a			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	Df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Attractive	2000	296	4.34	1.31	.0763	2.583	532	.010	.11
	1992	238	4.05	1.30	.0844				
Good Value	2000	296	4.24	1.14	.0664	1.244	532	.214	.10
	1992	238	4.11	1.27	.0821				
Willing to Buy	2000	296	4.39	1.51	.0876	.142	532	.887	.13
	1992	238	4.37	1.53	.0991				
Innovative	2000	296	4.00	1.15	.0666	3.127	530	.002	.10
	1992	236	3.68	1.19	.0778				
Good Quality	2000	296	4.15	1.18	.0685	.125	531	.900	.10
	1992	237	4.14	1.16	.0755				
Recog. Brands	2000	295	3.12	1.47	.0858	.850	531	.396	.13
	1992	238	3.00	1.53	.0994				
Expensive	2000	296	3.85	1.05	.0611	9.327	535	.000	.10
	1992	241	2.90	1.30	.0839				
Know About	2000	294	2.26	1.34	.0780	-2.585	533	.010	.12
	1992	241	2.56	1.39	.0895				
Reliable	2000	296	4.18	1.03	.0596	1.513	532	.131	.0900
	1992	238	4.05	1.04	.0677				
Proud to Own	2000	296	4.11	1.24	.0720	.605	532	.546	.11
	1992	238	4.05	1.21	.0783				
Tech. Advanced	2000	296	3.91	1.29	.0749	1.867	531	.062	.11
	1992	237	3.70	1.26	.0817				
Good Service	2000	296	3.77	1.04	.0604	2.274	531	.023	.0923
	1992	237	3.56	1.08	.0703				
Easy to Find	2000	296	3.24	1.28	.0744	1.449	532	.148	.12
	1992	238	3.07	1.40	.0907				
Work-manship	2000	296	4.35	1.12	.0652	1.629	532	.104	.0975
	1992	238	4.19	1.12	.0725				
Satisfied With	2000	296	4.23	.86	.0500	.699	532	.485	.0822
	1992	238	4.17	1.04	.0674				
Good Overall	2000	296	4.25	1.04	.0614	1.397	522	.163	.0946
	1992	236	4.11	1.12	.0728				

^a equal variances assumed

Czech Republic (1995 vs. 1992)

Pairwise F-statistic = 6.094 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Attractive	1995	301	4.03	1.22	.0702	-.188	537	.851	.11
	1992	238	4.05	1.30	.0844				
Good Value	1995	300	4.10	1.25	.0722	-.154	536	.878	.11
	1992	238	4.11	1.27	.0821				
Willing to Buy	1995	300	4.18	1.46	.0843	-1.492	536	.136	.13
	1992	238	4.37	1.53	.0991				
Innovative	1995	300	3.86	1.22	.0703	1.701	534	.089	.11
	1992	236	3.68	1.19	.0778				
Good Quality	1995	300	4.05	1.26	.0727	-.844	535	.399	.11
	1992	237	4.14	1.16	.0755				
Recog. Brands	1995	301	3.10	1.47	.0845	.736	537	.462	.13
	1992	238	3.00	1.53	.0994				
Expensive	1995	301	3.85	1.13	.0653	9.066	540	.000	.10
	1992	241	2.90	1.30	.0839				
Know About	1995	299	2.59	1.50	.0865	.194	538	.846	.13
	1992	241	2.56	1.39	.0895				
Reliable	1995	300	4.00	1.11	.0642	-.492	536	.623	.0940
	1992	238	4.05	1.04	.0677				
Proud to Own	1995	300	3.94	1.34	.0773	-1.022	536	.307	.11
	1992	238	4.05	1.21	.0783				
Tech. Advanced	1995	299	3.77	1.28	.0742	.584	534	.560	.11
	1992	237	3.70	1.26	.0817				
Good Service	1995	301	3.68	1.10	.0636	1.341	536	.180	.0950
	1992	237	3.56	1.08	.0703				
Easy to Find	1995	299	3.24	1.35	.0779	1.423	535	.155	.12
	1992	238	3.07	1.40	.0907				
Work-Manship	1995	301	4.16	1.13	.0654	-.337	537	.736	.0978
	1992	238	4.19	1.12	.0725				
Satisfied With	1995	301	4.09	1.06	.0609	-.871	537	.384	.0910
	1992	238	4.17	1.04	.0674				
Good Overall	1995	296	4.06	1.10	.0638	-.555	530	.579	.0966
	1992	236	4.11	1.12	.0728				

* equal variances assumed

Poland (2000 vs. 1995)

Pairwise F-statistic = 2.006 (Sig. = .011)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Attractive	2000	296	4.11	1.43	.0834	2.530	595	.012	.11
	1995	301	3.83	1.24	.0715				
Good Value	2000	296	4.32	1.20	.0695	2.510	595	.012	.0987
	1995	301	4.07	1.22	.0701				
Willing to Buy	2000	296	4.31	1.46	.0850	.824	596	.410	.12
	1995	302	4.21	1.47	.0847				
Innovative	2000	296	3.81	1.10	.0641	1.297	594	.195	.0957
	1995	300	3.69	1.23	.0710				
Good Quality	2000	296	4.11	1.14	.0665	2.305	595	.022	.0959
	1995	301	3.89	1.20	.0690				
Recog. Brands	2000	296	3.01	1.38	.0799	-.373	596	.710	.11
	1995	302	3.06	1.43	.0823				
Expensive	2000	296	3.74	1.03	.0597	.742	593	.459	.0867
	1995	299	3.68	1.09	.0628				
Know About	2000	296	2.37	1.37	.0796	-1.512	596	.131	.12
	1995	302	2.55	1.51	.0867				
Reliable	2000	296	4.10	1.03	.0600	2.363	594	.018	.0880
	1995	300	3.89	1.11	.0643				
Proud to Own	2000	296	4.01	1.20	.0695	2.011	595	.045	.10
	1995	301	3.81	1.27	.0731				
Tech. Advanced	2000	296	3.80	1.17	.0677	3.785	594	.000	.0962
	1995	300	3.44	1.18	.0683				
Good Service	2000	296	3.70	1.10	.0637	.586	596	.558	.0917
	1995	302	3.65	1.15	.0659				
Easy to Find	2000	296	3.27	1.29	.0751	1.499	594	.134	.11
	1995	301	3.11	1.34	.0773				
Work-Manship	2000	296	4.21	1.09	.0633	1.973	594	.049	.0914
	1995	301	4.03	1.14	.0659				
Satisfied With	2000	296	4.12	.99	.0576	2.260	596	.024	.0846
	1995	302	3.93	1.07	.0618				
Good Overall	2000	296	4.10	1.05	.0614	1.782	590	.075	.0895
	1995	301	3.94	1.13	.0649				

* equal variances assumed

Poland (2000 vs. 1992)

Pairwise F-statistic = 2.833 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Attractive	2000	296	4.11	1.43	.0834	4.574	535	.000	.12
	1992	241	3.57	1.26	.0809				
Good Value	2000	296	4.32	1.20	.0695	2.854	536	.004	.11
	1992	242	4.02	1.24	.0799				
Willing to Buy	2000	296	4.31	1.46	.0850	3.695	536	.000	.13
	1992	242	3.83	1.54	.0992				
Innovative	2000	296	3.81	1.10	.0641	4.317	535	.000	.0983
	1992	241	3.39	1.17	.0752				
Good Quality	2000	296	4.11	1.14	.0665	2.574	536	.010	.10
	1992	242	3.85	1.20	.0772				
Recog. Brands	2000	296	3.01	1.38	.0799	1.453	536	.147	.12
	1992	242	2.83	1.47	.0947				
Expensive	2000	296	3.74	1.03	.0597	.491	535	.624	.0957
	1992	241	3.69	1.19	.0766				
Know About	2000	296	2.37	1.37	.0796	-.811	536	.418	.12
	1992	242	2.47	1.45	.0930				
Reliable	2000	296	4.10	1.03	.0600	2.066	535	.039	.0936
	1992	241	3.90	1.13	.0731				
Proud to Own	2000	296	4.01	1.20	.0695	1.908	535	.057	.11
	1992	241	3.81	1.28	.0825				
Tech. Advanced	2000	296	3.80	1.17	.0677	3.253	535	.001	.11
	1992	241	3.46	1.28	.0823				
Good Service	2000	296	3.70	1.10	.0637	2.053	534	.041	.0967
	1992	240	3.50	1.14	.0733				
Easy to Find	2000	295	3.27	1.29	.0751	2.407	534	.016	.12
	1992	241	3.00	1.39	.0893				
Work-manship	2000	295	4.21	1.09	.0633	3.256	534	.001	.0962
	1992	241	3.90	1.13	.0729				
Satisfied With	2000	296	4.12	.99	.0576	2.100	536	.036	.0894
	1992	242	3.93	1.08	.0694				
Good Overall	2000	291	4.10	1.05	.0614	3.118	529	.002	.0961
	1992	240	3.80	1.17	.0752				

* equal variances assumed

Poland (1995 vs. 1992)

Pairwise F-statistic = 2.064 (Sig. = .008)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.	SE Diff
Attractive	1995	301	3.83	1.24	.0715	2.423	540	.016	.11
	1992	241	3.57	1.26	.0809				
Good Value	1995	301	4.07	1.22	.0701	.502	541	.616	.11
	1992	242	4.02	1.24	.0799				
Willing to Buy	1995	302	4.21	1.47	.0847	2.938	542	.003	.13
	1992	242	3.83	1.54	.0992				
Innovative	1995	300	3.69	1.23	.0710	2.883	539	.004	.10
	1992	241	3.39	1.17	.0752				
Good Quality	1995	301	3.89	1.20	.0690	.386	541	.700	.10
	1992	242	3.85	1.20	.0772				
Recog. Brands	1995	302	3.06	1.43	.0823	1.771	542	.077	.13
	1992	242	2.83	1.47	.0947				
Expensive	1995	299	3.68	1.09	.0628	-.177	538	.860	.0981
	1992	241	3.69	1.19	.0766				
Know About	1995	302	2.55	1.51	.0867	.622	542	.534	.13
	1992	242	2.47	1.45	.0930				
Reliable	1995	300	3.89	1.11	.0643	-.150	539	.881	.0972
	1992	241	3.90	1.13	.0731				
Proud to Own	1995	301	3.81	1.27	.0731	.014	540	.989	.11
	1992	241	3.81	1.28	.0825				
Tech. Advanced	1995	300	3.44	1.18	.0683	-.194	539	.846	.11
	1992	241	3.46	1.28	.0823				
Good Service	1995	302	3.65	1.15	.0659	1.468	540	.143	.0987
	1992	240	3.50	1.14	.0733				
Easy to Find	1995	301	3.11	1.34	.0773	.995	540	.320	.12
	1992	241	3.00	1.39	.0893				
Work-manship	1995	301	4.03	1.14	.0659	1.350	540	.178	.0984
	1992	241	3.90	1.13	.0729				
Satisfied With	1995	302	3.93	1.07	.0618	-.037	542	.971	.0929
	1992	242	3.93	1.08	.0694				
Good Overall	1995	301	3.94	1.13	.0649	1.416	539	.157	.0990
	1992	240	3.80	1.17	.0752				

^a equal variances assumed

APPENDIX D – MANOVA FOLLOW-UP (PRODUCT CATEGORIES)

France (1995 vs. 1992)

Pairwise Multivariate F = 75.821 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig	SE Diff
Shoes	1995	301	5.17	1.39	.0800	8.795	537	.000	.11
	1992	238	4.19	1.14	.0740				
Radio	1995	300	4.23	1.04	.0598	-9.766	538	.000	.11
	1992	240	5.26	1.42	.0915				
Micro/Comp.	1995	300	4.07	1.17	.0673	-2.090	536	.037	.10
	1992	238	4.28	1.15	.0748				
Lugg/Furn.	1995	299	4.93	1.27	.0733	-1.841	537	.066	.11
	1992	240	5.14	1.36	.0875				

*equal variances assumed

France (2000 vs. 1992)

Pairwise Multivariate F = 77.495 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig	SE Diff
Shoes	2000	296	5.38	1.22	.0708	11.566	532	.000	.10
	1992	238	4.19	1.14	.0740				
Radio	2000	295	4.40	1.13	.0659	-7.756	533	.000	.11
	1992	240	5.26	1.42	.0915				
Micro/Comp.	2000	295	4.16	1.21	.0703	-1.176	531	.240	.10
	1992	238	4.28	1.15	.0748				
Lugg/Furn.	2000	295	5.10	1.24	.0724	-.355	533	.723	.11
	1992	240	5.14	1.36	.0875				

*equal variances assumed

Russia (2000 vs. 1995)

Pairwise Multivariate F = 4.001 (Sig. = .003)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig	SE Diff
Shoes	2000	296	3.28	1.25	.0728	2.034	594	.042	.11
	1995	300	3.07	1.31	.0758				
Radio	2000	295	3.24	1.22	.0713	1.495	593	.135	.11
	1995	300	3.09	1.29	.0744				
Micro/Comp.	2000	295	2.94	1.34	.0779	-.162	593	.872	.10
	1995	300	2.95	1.34	.0774				
Lugg/Furn.	2000	296	3.70	1.35	.0782	2.910	594	.004	.10
	1995	300	3.38	1.30	.0753				

*equal variances assumed

Russia (2000 vs. 1992)

Pairwise Multivariate F = 10.408 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig	SE Diff
Shoes	2000	296	3.28	1.25	.0728	3.041	526	.002	.11
	1992	232	2.94	1.30	.0856				
Radio	2000	295	3.24	1.22	.0713	2.011	528	.045	.11
	1992	235	3.02	1.37	.0894				
Micro/Comp.	2000	295	2.94	1.34	.0779	-.365	527	.716	.12
	1992	234	2.98	1.36	.0891				
Lugg/Furn.	2000	296	3.70	1.35	.0782	4.810	528	.000	.12
	1992	234	3.12	1.38	.0900				

*equal variances assumed

Hungary (2000 vs. 1995)

Pairwise Multivariate F = 4.267 (Sig. = .002)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig	SE Diff
Shoes	2000	296	4.09	1.11	.0645	2.983	592	.003	.0958
	1995	298	3.80	1.22	.0708				
Radio	2000	295	3.84	1.04	.0604	3.642	591	.000	.0880
	1995	298	3.52	1.10	.0640				
Micro/Comp.	2000	295	3.38	1.15	.0668	2.090	591	.037	.0949
	1995	298	3.18	1.16	.0674				
Lugg/Furn.	2000	295	4.23	1.10	.0642	3.742	591	.000	.0957
	1995	298	3.87	1.22	.0708				

*equal variances assumed

Hungary (1995 vs. 1992)

Pairwise Multivariate F = 15.581 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig	SE Diff
Shoes	1995	298	3.80	1.22	.0708	4.021	531	.000	.41
	1992	235	3.39	1.10	.0719				
Radio	1995	298	3.52	1.10	.0640	-2.382	532	.018	-.24
	1992	236	3.76	1.24	.0805				
Micro/Comp.	1995	298	3.18	1.16	.0674	-3.061	532	.002	-.30
	1992	236	3.48	1.09	.0709				
Lugg/Furn.	1995	298	3.87	1.22	.0708	1.086	532	.278	.11
	1992	236	3.75	1.20	.0783				

*equal variances assumed

Hungary (2000 vs. 1992)

Pairwise Multivariate F = 20.885 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig	SE Diff
Shoes	2000	296	4.09	1.11	.0645	7.203	531	.000	.0967
	1992	235	3.39	1.10	.0719				
Radio	2000	295	3.84	1.04	.0604	.799	529	.425	.0987
	1992	236	3.76	1.24	.0805				
Micro/Comp.	2000	295	3.38	1.15	.0668	-1.055	529	.292	.0980
	1992	236	3.48	1.09	.0709				
Lugg/Furn.	2000	295	4.23	1.10	.0642	4.715	529	.000	.10
	1992	236	3.75	1.20	.0783				

*equal variances assumed

Czech Republic (1995 vs. 1992)

Pairwise Multivariate F = 15.384 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig	SE Diff
Shoes	1995	299	3.94	1.28	.0742	4.222	534	.000	.11
	1992	237	3.49	1.12	.0729				
Radio	1995	298	3.70	1.16	.0673	-1.942	533	.053	.11
	1992	237	3.91	1.34	.0870				
Micro/Comp.	1995	298	3.32	1.26	.0729	-2.392	533	.017	.10
	1992	237	3.57	1.12	.0730				
Lugg/Furn.	1995	298	3.95	1.17	.0679	1.009	533	.313	.10
	1992	237	3.84	1.24	.0808				

*equal variances assumed

Czech Republic (2000 vs. 1992)

Pairwise Multivariate F = 20.738 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig	SE Diff
Shoes	2000	296	4.18	1.17	.0678	6.855	531	.000	.0100
	1992	237	3.49	1.12	.0729				
Radio	2000	295	3.88	1.09	.0633	-.318	530	.751	.11
	1992	237	3.91	1.34	.0870				
Micro/Comp.	2000	295	3.46	1.18	.0685	-1.003	530	.316	.10
	1992	237	3.57	1.12	.0730				
Lugg/Furn.	2000	295	4.19	1.09	.0635	3.447	530	.001	.10
	1992	237	3.84	1.24	.0808				

*equal variances assumed

Poland (2000 vs. 1995)

Pairwise Multivariate F = 2.371 (Sig. = .051)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig	SE Diff
Shoes	2000	295	4.00	1.14	.0665	2.439	592	.015	.10
	1995	299	3.75	1.29	.0747				
Radio	2000	294	3.79	1.03	.0601	2.883	591	.004	.0904
	1995	299	3.53	1.17	.0674				
Micro/Comp.	2000	295	3.37	1.17	.0683	1.183	592	.070	.0987
	1995	299	3.19	1.23	.0711				
Lugg/Furn.	2000	295	4.13	1.11	.0649	3.030	592	.003	.0955
	1995	299	3.84	1.21	.0700				

*equal variances assumed

Poland (1995 vs. 1992)

Pairwise Multivariate F = 13.858 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig	SE Diff
Shoes	1995	299	3.75	1.29	.0747	3.800	537	.000	.11
	1992	240	3.34	1.19	.0768				
Radio	1995	299	3.53	1.17	.0674	-.900	537	.368	.11
	1992	240	3.62	1.30	.0840				
Micro/Comp.	1995	299	3.19	1.23	.0711	-2.544	537	.011	.11
	1992	240	3.46	1.20	.0776				
Lugg/Furn.	1995	299	3.84	1.21	.0700	2.146	537	.032	.11
	1992	240	3.61	1.28	.0828				

*equal variances assumed

Poland (2000 vs. 1992)

Pairwise Multivariate F = 18.454 (Sig. = .000)

Variable		Group Statistics				Independent Samples Test*			
		N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig	SE Diff
Shoes	2000	295	4.00	1.14	.0665	6.478	533	.000	.10
	1992	240	3.34	1.19	.0768				
Radio	2000	294	3.79	1.03	.0601	1.634	532	.103	.10
	1992	240	3.62	1.30	.0840				
Micro/Comp.	2000	295	3.37	1.17	.0683	-.869	533	.385	.10
	1992	240	3.46	1.20	.0776				
Lugg/Furn.	2000	295	4.13	1.11	.0649	5.020	533	.000	.10
	1992	240	3.61	1.28	.0828				

*equal variances assumed

APPENDIX E – PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

France 2000

	Shoes	Radio	Micro/Comp	Lugg/Furn
“Quality”	.437**	.247**	.133**	.386**
“Overall”	.534**	.320**	.278**	.525**

Russia 2000

	Shoes	Radio	Micro/Comp	Lugg/Furn
“Quality”	.412**	.389**	.360**	.397**
“Overall”	.360**	.434**	.352**	.364**

Hungary 2000

	Shoes	Radio	Micro/Comp	Lugg/Furn
“Quality”	.317**	.243**	.263**	.355**
“Overall”	.245**	.358**	.370**	.308**

Czech Republic 2000

	Shoes	Radio	Micro/Comp	Lugg/Furn
“Quality”	.394**	.370**	.263**	.399**
“Overall”	.429**	.388**	.348**	.399**

Poland 2000

	Shoes	Radio	Micro/Comp	Lugg/Furn
“Quality”	.388**	.404**	.300**	.384**
“Overall”	.361**	.346**	.332**	.332**

Legend

****** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

(Continued)

France 1995

	Shoes	Radio	Micro/Comp	Lugg/Furn
"Quality"	.465**	.257**	.191**	.378**
"Overall"	.430**	.293**	.262**	.404**

Russia 1995

	Shoes	Radio	Micro/Comp	Lugg/Furn
"Quality"	.488**	.492**	.378**	.479**
"Overall"	.532**	.528**	.479**	.470**

Hungary 1995

	Shoes	Radio	Micro/Comp	Lugg/Furn
"Quality"	.348**	.331**	.263**	.395**
"Overall"	.329**	.355**	.274**	.363**

Czech Republic 1995

	Shoes	Radio	Micro/Comp	Lugg/Furn
"Quality"	.404**	.460**	.328**	.429**
"Overall"	.325**	.386**	.335**	.432**

Poland 1995

	Shoes	Radio	Micro/Comp	Lugg/Furn
"Quality"	.453**	.492**	.392**	.485**
"Overall"	.423**	.469**	.400**	.440**

Legend

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

(Continued)

France 1992

	Shoes	Radio	Micro/Comp	Lugg/Furn
"Quality"	.519**	.374**	.384**	.565**
"Overall"	.426**	.440**	.469**	.545**

Russia 1992

	Shoes	Radio	Micro/Comp	Lugg/Furn
"Quality"	.240**	.306**	.322**	.288**
"Overall"	.394**	.488**	.488**	.449**

Hungary 1992

	Shoes	Radio	Micro/Comp	Lugg/Furn
"Quality"	.368**	.363**	.360**	.356**
"Overall"	.511**	.472**	.489**	.490**

Czech Republic 1992

	Shoes	Radio	Micro/Comp	Lugg/Furn
"Quality"	.420**	.417**	.351**	.371**
"Overall"	.533**	.443**	.454**	.488**

Poland 1992

	Shoes	Radio	Micro/Comp	Lugg/Furn
"Quality"	.502**	.478**	.536**	.478**
"Overall"	.523**	.489**	.522**	.540**

Legend

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

APPENDIX F – FACTOR ANALYSIS

France (Country Scales)

Factor	France (2000)		France (1995)		France (1992)	
1	Immigration	.697	Ideal	.523	Immigration	.805
	Like	.778	Safe	.442	Like	.632
	Peaceful	.441	Immigration	.638	Ties	.789
	Ties	.792	Like	.773	Trust	.605
	Trust	.690	Peaceful	.567	Invest	.758
	Invest	.752	Align	.441		
			Ties	.799		
			Trust	.783		
			Invest	.751		
Eigenvalue	6.491		6.116		5.912	
% Of Variance	32.455		30.580		29.562	
2	Indus.	.637	Indust.	.839	Indust.	.780
	Educated	.619	Educated	.808	Educated	.761
	Stable	.705	Stable	.530	Stable	.656
	Rich	.795	Rich	.664	Rich	.741
	Rights	.571				
	Align	.454				
Eigenvalue	1.634		1.980		2.049	
% Of Variance	8.169		9.901		10.245	
3	Democ.	.532	Democ.	.743	Ideal	.634
	Ideal	.625	Ideal	.456	Safe	.660
	Safe	.657	Safe	.585	Like	.475
	Active	.765	Rights	.400	Peaceful	.707
			Peaceful	.402	Trust	.488
			Align	.461		
Eigenvalue	1.331		1.345		1.354	
% Of Variance	6.654		6.725		6.771	
4	Rights	.405	Western	.728	Rights	.651
	Peaceful	.598	Know	.563	Align	.527
	Align	.519	Active	.506	Hardworking	.673
	Hardworking	.640			Individ.	.649
Eigenvalue	1.233		1.152		1.166	
% Of Variance	6.164		5.761		5.832	
5	Western	.600	Rights	.543	Western	.538
	Know	.833	Hardworking	.572	Know	.750
			Individ.	.696	Democratic	.644
Eigenvalue	1.035		1.107		1.113	
% Of Variance	5.176		5.535		5.564	
6	Individ.	.898			Active	.785
Eigenvalue	1.005				1.012	
% Of Variance	5.026				5.062	
Cumulative % of Variance	63.644		58.501		63.035	

Factor Analysis – Russia (Country Scales)

Factor	Russia (2000)		Russia (1995)		Russia (1992)	
1	Immig.	.760	Immig.	.750	Safe	.477
	Like	.708	Like	.756	Immig.	.688
	Peaceful	.457	Peaceful	.508	Like	.677
	Ties	.750	Ties	.776	Peaceful	.443
	Trust	.574	Trust	.763	Ties	.682
	Invest	.688	Invest	.806	Trust	.738
					Invest	.774
Eigenvalue		4.793	4.730		4.362	
% Of Variance		23.963	23.652		21.809	
2	Stable	.698	Stable	.699	West	.549
	Rich	.659	Rich	.572	Stable	.670
	Ideal	.755	Rights	.526	Rich	.536
	Safe	.754	Peaceful	.470	Democratic	.734
			Align	.591	Ideal	.662
					Rights	.683
Eigenvalue		1.985	2.170		2.713	
% Of Variance		9.927	10.848		13.567	
3	Western	.500	Western	.675	Indust.	.822
	Know	.510	Know	.670	Educated	.763
	Democ.	.604	Democ.	.561	Rich	.481
	Rights	.478	Ideal	.494		
	Peaceful	.402				
	Align	.669				
Eigenvalue		1.591	1.466		1.600	
% Of Variance		7.955	7.332		8.001	
4	Indust.	.724	Indust.	.833	Know	.530
	Educated	.740	Educated	.802	Safe	.483
	Know	.431			Peaceful	.427
	Rich	.438			Hardwork	.660
Eigenvalue		1.209	1.286		1.349	
% Of Variance		6.044	6.431		6.746	
5	Active	.510	Ideal	.503	Active	.795
	Hardworking	.850	Safe	.511	Align	.574
			Active	.745	Hardworking	.417
Eigenvalue		1.181	1.203		1.153	
% Of Variance		5.906	6.013		5.3766	
6	Individ.	.838	Hardworking	.749		
			Individ.	.650		
Eigenvalue		1.000	1.070			
% Of Variance		5.002	5.348			
Cumulative % of Variance		58.796	59.624		55.889	

Factor Analysis – Hungary (Country Scales)

Factor	Hungary (2000)		Hungary (1995)		Hungary (1992)	
1	Indust.	.668	Immig.	.760	Safe	.536
	Educated	.693	Like	.708	Immig.	.820
	Western	.487	Peaceful	.492	Like	.570
	Stable	.708	Ties	.813	Peaceful	.581
	Rich	.790	Trust	.737	Ties	.810
	Democ.	.652	Invest	.753	Trust	.790
	Ideal	.712			Invest	.680
	Safe	.684				
	Rights	.628				
	Peaceful	.412				
	Align	.453				
Eigenvalue	6.666		6.010		5.752	
% Of Variance	33.329		30.052		28.761	
2	Immigration	.777	Stable	.657	Indust.	.823
	Like	.674	Rich	.585	Educated	.852
	Peaceful	.591	Democ.	.509	Stable	.618
	Ties	.857	Ideal	.580	Rich	.608
	Trust	.541	Safe	.636	Ideal	.435
	Invest	.822	Rights	.492		
			Peaceful	.498		
			Align	.572		
Eigenvalue	2.187		1.873		1.982	
% Of Variance	10.937		9.366		9.912	
3	Active	.672	Indust.	.838	Western	.443
	Hardworking	.776	Educated	.758	Know	.520
			Stable	.412	Ideal	.466
			Rich	.494	Rights	.528
					Hardworking	-.626
Eigenvalue	1.164		1.302		1.491	
% Of Variance	5.819		6.510		7.455	
4	Western	.444	Western	.529	Democratic	.686
	Individ.	.781	Know	.713	Rights	.446
			Hardworking	-.499	Align	.675
					Individ.	.659
Eigenvalue	1.105		1.205		1.415	
% Of Variance	5.523		6.025		7.077	
5			Active	.484	Know	.431
			Hardworking	.497	Active	.848
			Individ.	.763	Like	.633
Eigenvalue			1.103		1.248	
% Of Variance			5.514		6.242	
Cumulative % of Variance	55.608		57.468		59.446	

Factor Analysis – Czech Republic (Country Scales)

Factor	Czech Republic (2000)		Czech Republic (1995)		Czech Republic (1992)	
1	Indust.	.540	Ideal	.410	Indust.	.652
	Educated	.603	Safe	.424	Educated	.687
	Western	.525	Immig.	.798	West	.479
	Know	.411	Like	.739	Stable	.752
	Stable	.793	Peaceful	.502	Rich	.769
	Rich	.784	Ties	.827	Ideal	.656
	Democ.	.733	Trust	.744	Safe	.523
	Ideal	.673	Invest	.843	Rights	.433
	Safe	.709				
	Rights	.613				
	Peaceful	.618				
Eigenvalue	8.224		7.109		6.382	
% Of Variance	41.120		35.547		31.910	
2	Immig.	.748	Indust.	.761	Immig.	.836
	Like	.736	Educated	.760	Like	.507
	Peaceful	.475	Stable	.707	Ties	.688
	Ties	.802	Rich	.752	Trust	.436
	Trust	.661	Democ.	.449	Invest	.794
	Invest	.799	Ideal	.542		
			Safe	.553		
			Peaceful	.407		
			Align	.414		
Eigenvalue	1.721		1.757		2.128	
% Of Variance	8.608		8.787		10.642	
3	Indust.	.566	Democ.	.441	Safe	.640
	Educated	.578	Ideal	.414	Like	.535
	Western	.421	Safe	.479	Peaceful	.744
	Active	.640	Rights	.674	Ties	.451
	Align	.506	Peaceful	.454	Trust	.636
	Hardworking	.533	Align	.410		
Eigenvalue	1.176		1.285		1.411	
% Of Variance	5.879		6.423		7.054	
4	Individ.	.848	Know	.678	Know	.527
			Active	.728	Democratic	.606
					Rights	.610
					Align	.722
Eigenvalue	1.089		1.234		1.298	
% Of Variance	5.443		6.172		6.488	
5			Hardworking	.757	Active	.488
			Individ.	.750	Hardworking	.754
					Individ.	.642
Eigenvalue			1.139		1.059	
% Of Variance			5.697		5.295	
Cumulative % of Variance	61.045		62.627		61.388	

Factor Analysis – Poland (Country Scales)

Factor	Poland (2000)		Poland (1995)		Poland (1992)	
1	Indust.	.486	Immig.	.834	Safe	.637
	Educated	.516	Like	.718	Immig.	.767
	Western	.448	Peaceful	.478	Like	.793
	Stable	.740	Ties	.838	Peaceful	.736
	Rich	.721	Trust	.638	Ties	.827
	Democ.	.606	Invest	.818	Trust	.822
	Ideal	.635			Invest	.648
	Safe	.527				
	Rights	.740				
	Align	.594				
Eigenvalue	6.758		5.881		5.819	
% Of Variance	33.788		29.406		29.097	
2	Immig.	.846	Stable	.593	Stable	.759
	Like	.787	Rich	.410	Rich	.806
	Peaceful	.485	Democ.	.481	Ideal	.613
	Ties	.813	Ideal	.595	Rights	.528
	Trust	.692	Safe	.685		
	Invest	.788	Rights	.659		
			Peaceful	.571		
			Align	.536		
Eigenvalue	2.163		2.105		1.984	
% Of Variance	10.813		10.525		9.918	
3	Indust.	.652	Indust.	.772	Democratic	.567
	Educated	.580	Educated	.729	Align	.624
	Active	.711	Stable	.505	Hardwork	.600
	Hardworking	.420	Rich	.644	Individ.	.539
Eigenvalue	1.311		1.398		1.545	
% Of Variance	6.555		6.990		7.725	
4	West	.409	Western	.773	Indust.	.832
	Know	.810	Know	.721	Educated	.708
	Peaceful	.443				
Eigenvalue	1.057		1.192		1.179	
% Of Variance	5.287		5.958		5.895	
5	Individ.	.807	Active	.515	Western	.473
			Hardworking	.674	Know	.772
			Individ.	-.447	Hardworking	-.465
Eigenvalue	1.048		1.030		1.037	
% Of Variance	5.239		5.150		5.184	
Cumulative % of Variance	61.682		58.029		57.819	

Factor Analysis – France (Product Scales)

Factor	France (2000)		France (1995)		France (1992)	
1	Attractive	.609	Attractive	.679	Attractive	.776
	Innovative	.686	Buy	.519	Buy	.644
	Quality	.422	Innovative	.740	Innovative	.627
	Brands	.706	Quality	.562	Quality	.419
	Know	.423	Reliable	.687	Reliable	.636
	Reliable	.646	Tech Adv.	.564	Proud	.600
	Tech. Adv	.700	Workmanship	.744	Tech Adv.	.545
	Find	.602	Satisfied	.623	Workmanship	.554
	Workmanship	.700	Overall	.563	Satisfied	.524
	Satisfied	.675			Overall	.498
	Overall	.583				
Eigenvalue	6.632		6.545		6.804	
% Of Variance	41.448		40.904		42.525	
2	Value	.727	Value	.686	Value	.618
	Buy	.553	Buy	.512	Reliable	.437
	Know	.429	Quality	.533	Tech Adv.	.522
	Proud	.482	Proud	.532	Service	.741
	Service	.724	Service	.652	Workmanship	.551
	Satisfied	.466	Overall	.434	Satisfied	.550
	Overall	.401			Overall	.510
Eigenvalue	1.303		1.257		1.111	
% Of Variance	8.146		7.856		6.944	
3	Attractive	.402	Brand	.727	Brand	.646
	Quality	.494	Know	.506	Know	.654
	Expensive	.754	Tech Adv.	.412	Find	.801
	Proud	.564	Find	.758		
	Find	-.431	Satisfied	.413		
Eigenvalue	1.124		1.154		1.052	
% Of Variance	7.025		7.212		6.576	
4			Expensive	.822	Quality	.537
			Know	.625	Expensive	.892
Eigenvalue			1.042		1.014	
% Of Variance			6.511		6.337	
Cumulative % of Variance	56.619		62.484		62.383	

Factor Analysis – Russia (Product Scales)

Factor	Russia (2000)		Russia (1995)		Russia (1992)	
1	Attractive	.780	Attract	.679	Attractive	.603
	Value	.673	Value	.625	Value	.613
	Buy	.822	Buy	.753	Buy	.767
	Innovative	.547	Quality	.852	Innovative	.571
	Quality	.718	Reliable	.599	Quality	.788
	Reliable	.584	Proud	.768	Reliable	.778
	Proud	.665	Service	.414	Proud	.672
	Service	.348	Workmanship	.605	Workmanship	.684
	Workmanship	.509	Satisfied	.777	Satisfied	.770
	Satisfied	.640	Overall	.706	Overall	.810
	Overall	.660				
Eigenvalue	6.927		6.374		6.236	
% Of Variance	43.296		39.837		38.976	
2	Innovative	.466	Innovative	.546	Brands	.690
	Brands	.732	Brands	.652	Find	.733
	Reliable	.435	Reliable	.465		
	Tech Adv.	.533	Tech Adv.	.517		
	Find	.651	Find	.774		
	Workmanship	.512	Workmanship	.417		
	Satisfied	.420				
Eigenvalue	1.266		1.351		1.508	
% Of Variance	7.910		8.444		9.427	
3	Quality	.409	Expensive	.831	Expensive	.835
	Expensive	.815	Tech Adv.	.507	Tech Adv.	.540
	Service	.702	Service	.411		
	Overall	.436				
Eigenvalue	1.139		1.223		1.185	
% Of Variance	7.120		7.645		7.406	
4	Know	.893	Know	.949	Value	.501
					Know	.669
					Service	.624
Eigenvalue	1.007		1.019		1.065	
% Of Variance	6.295		6.368		6.656	
Cumulative % of Variance	64.621		62.294		62.465	

Factor Analysis – Hungary (Product Scales)

Factor	Hungary (2000)		Hungary (1995)		Hungary (1992)	
1	Attract	.717	Attract	.683	Attractive	.604
	Value	.687	Value	.671	Value	.711
	Buy	.714	Buy	.680	Buy	.641
	Innovative	.545	Innovative	.545	Quality	.723
	Quality	.738	Quality	.795	Reliable	.676
	Reliable	.766	Proud	.713	Proud	.688
	Proud	.631	Tech Adv.	.424	Workmanship	.767
	Tech Adv.	.450	Workmanship	.697	Satisfied	.819
	Workmanship	.678	Satisfied	.721	Overall	.700
	Satisfied	.799	Overall	.728		
	Overall	.712				
Eigenvalue	6.045		5.524		5.832	
% Of Variance	37.781		34.527		36.451	
2	Brands	.751	Innovative	.410	Brands	.679
	Know	.660	Brands	.758	Know	.779
	Tech Adv.	.424	Know	.416	Find	.686
	Find	.752	Tech Adv.	.450		
			Find	.825		
Eigenvalue	1.592		1.508		1.457	
% Of Variance	9.953		9.425		9.105	
3	Expensive	.818	Know	-.670	Innovative	.749
	Service	.457	Service	.587	Expensive	.602
					Service	.530
Eigenvalue	1.230		1.224		1.260	
% Of Variance	7.688		7.652		7.876	
4			Expensive	.901		
Eigenvalue			1.025			
% Of Variance			6.406			
Cumulative % of Variance	55.422		58.010		53.432	

Factor Analysis – Czech Republic (Product Scales)

Factor	Czech Republic (2000)		Czech Republic (1995)		Czech Republic (1992)	
1	Attractive	.713	Attractive	.712	Attract	.608
	Value	.721	Value	.643	Value	.801
	Buy	.700	Buy	.694	Buy	.603
	Innovative	.553	Innovative	.602	Quality	.775
	Quality	.722	Quality	.773	Reliable	.533
	Reliable	.736	Reliable	.737	Proud	.758
	Proud	.639	Proud	.683	Service	.688
	Tech Adv.	.522	Tech Adv.	.585	Workmanship	.490
	Service	.488	Service	.490	Satisfied	.575
	Workmanship	.743	Workmanship	.792	Overall	.605
	Satisfied	.772	Satisfied	.831		
	Overall	.745	Overall	.681		
Eigenvalue	6.569		7.151		7.184	
% Of Variance	41.059		44.695		44.902	
2	Brand	.787	Innovative	.447	Attractive	.480
	Know	.626	Brand	.825	Buy	.462
	Find	.739	Know	.418	Innovative	.683
			Reliable	.450	Expensive	.682
			Tech Adv.	.444	Reliable	.442
			Find	.804	Tech Adv.	.585
					Workmanship	.410
					Overall	.482
Eigenvalue	1.415		1.378		1.383	
% Of Variance	8.846		8.613		8.647	
3	Expensive	.828	Expensive	.900	Brand	.713
					Know	.688
					Find	.857
					Workmanship	.453
					Satisfied	.418
Eigenvalue	1.207		1.149		1.263	
% Of Variance	7.544		7.184		7.891	
Cumulative % of Variance	57.449		60.492		61.440	

Factor Analysis – Poland (Product Scales)

Factor	Poland (2000)		Poland (1995)		Poland (1992)	
1	Attractive	.719	Attractive	.644	Attractive	.608
	Value	.615	Value	.666	Value	.734
	Buy	.754	Buy	.748	Buy	.678
	Innovative	.605	Innovative	.553	Innovative	.412
	Quality	.773	Quality	.771	Quality	.856
	Reliable	.708	Reliable	.700	Reliable	.793
	Proud	.689	Proud	.754	Proud	.702
	Tech Adv.	.512	Tech Adv.	.468	Service	.607
	Service	.435	Service	.498	Workmanship	.788
	Workmanship	.733	Workmanship	.744	Satisfied	.702
	Satisfied	.789	Satisfied	.802	Overall	.752
	Overall	.759	Overall	.729		
Eigenvalue	6.524		7.020		7.067	
% Of Variance	40.773		43.873		44.171	
2	Brand	.711	Attractive	.426	Attractive	.553
	Know	.545	Innovative	.521	Innovative	.699
	Find	.849	Brand	.781	Brand	.667
			Reliable	.470	Tech Adv.	.763
			Tech Adv.	.585	Find	.569
			Find	.824		
Eigenvalue	1.365		1.386		1.513	
% Of Variance	8.528		8.665		9.459	
3	Expensive	.773	Expensive	.855	Expensive	-.501
			Know	-.510	Know	.748
					Find	.605
Eigenvalue	1.195		1.130		1.304	
% Of Variance	7.472		7.062		8.147	
Cumulative % of Variance	56.773		59.599		61.778	

APPENDIX G – MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD ESTIMATES (1ST RUN)

Regression Weights: France

Path	Unstandardized Estimate	Standard Error	Critical Ratio	Standardized Estimate
Country Evaluati ← Country Description	0.397	0.089	4.455	0.284
Country Evaluati ← Country Competence	0.139	0.085	1.633	0.126
Country Evaluati ← People Competence	0.261	0.115	2.269	0.205
Country Evaluati ← People Description	0.581	0.465	1.249	0.732
Product Beliefs ← Country Evaluation	0.091	0.037	2.468	0.144
Product Beliefs ← Familiarity	0.454	0.063	7.251	0.795
Relationship ← Country Evaluation	0.874	0.102	8.538	0.901
Product Beliefs ← Country Competence	0.099	0.055	1.792	0.142
Product Beliefs ← People Competence	0.136	0.065	2.093	0.169
Product Evaluation ← Product Beliefs	1.017	0.194	5.240	0.987
Product Evaluation ← Relationship	0.179	0.134	1.329	0.265
Product Evaluation ← Country Evaluation	-0.126	0.130	-0.971	-0.194
Product Evaluation ← Familiarity	-0.005	0.066	-0.081	-0.009
Willing to Buy ← Product Evaluation	0.908	0.315	2.884	0.392
Willing to Buy ← Relationship	0.406	0.108	3.756	0.260
Willing to Buy ← Familiarity	0.111	0.176	0.632	0.082
Rights ← Country Description	1.071	0.158	6.778	0.501
Democratic ← Country Description	1.267	0.175	7.263	0.549
Western ← Country Description	1.265	0.208	6.086	0.439
Know ← Country Description	0.640	0.160	3.997	0.272
Like ← Country Evaluation	1.000			0.752
Align ← Country Evaluation	0.637	0.105	6.081	0.392
Value ← Product Evaluation	1.000			0.416
Overall ← Product Evaluation	1.295	0.189	6.864	0.737
Satisfied ← Product Evaluation	1.400	0.198	7.086	0.822
Innovative ← Product Beliefs	1.143	0.140	8.182	0.573
Attractive ← Product Beliefs	1.000			0.587
Reliable ← Product Beliefs	1.236	0.131	9.418	0.696
Tech Adv. ← Product Beliefs	1.053	0.147	7.166	0.485
Service ← Product Beliefs	0.580	0.122	4.742	0.303
Workmanship ← Product Beliefs	1.345	0.130	10.316	0.802
Expensive ← Product Beliefs	0.437	0.120	3.634	0.228
Ties ← Relationship	1.095	0.119	9.197	0.738
Invest ← Relationship	1.048	0.122	8.589	0.659
Know ← Familiarity	1.000			0.628
Industrialized ← Country Competence	1.000			0.853
Rich ← Country Competence	0.588	0.269	2.183	0.498
Hardworking ← People Competence	0.503	0.213	2.361	0.249
Educated ← People Competence	1.000			0.858
Ideal ← Country Description	1.334	0.160	8.348	0.677
Safe ← Country Description	1.244	0.144	8.658	0.727
Active ← People Competence	0.602	0.235	2.565	0.331
Peaceful ← Country Evaluation	0.809	0.100	8.055	0.520
Proud to Own ← Product Evaluation	1.225	0.196	6.252	0.576
Buy ← Willing to Buy	1.000			1.000
Immigration ← Relationship	1.000			0.608
Quality ← Product Beliefs	1.284	0.151	8.475	0.600
Stable ← Country Description	1.000			0.599
Individualistic ← People Description	0.113	0.112	1.008	0.087
Brand ← Familiarity	1.122	0.122	9.159	0.760
Find ← Familiarity	0.633	0.102	6.209	0.437
Trust ← People Description	1.000			0.910

Regression Weights: Russia

Path	Unstandardized Estimate	Standard Error	Critical Ratio	Standardized Estimate
Country Evaluati ← Country Description	0.830	0.128	6.502	0.668
Country Evaluati ← Country Competence	-0.419	0.128	-3.275	-0.195
Country Evaluati ← People Competence	0.363	0.195	1.860	0.378
Country Evaluati ← People Description	0.563	0.322	1.749	0.602
Product Beliefs ← Country Evaluation	0.454	0.093	4.885	0.381
Product Beliefs ← Familiarity	2.955	1.553	1.903	0.569
Relationship ← Country Evaluation	1.084	0.141	7.683	0.787
Product Beliefs ← Country Competence	0.177	0.119	1.487	0.069
Product Beliefs ← People Competence	-0.061	0.100	-0.617	-0.054
Product Evaluation ← Product Beliefs	0.693	0.097	7.155	1.013
Product Evaluation ← Relationship	0.043	0.051	0.853	0.073
Product Evaluation ← Country Evaluation	-0.005	0.072	-0.069	-0.006
Product Evaluation ← Familiarity	-0.147	0.228	-0.644	-0.041
Willing to Buy ← Product Evaluation	1.422	0.227	6.272	0.597
Willing to Buy ← Relationship	0.358	0.083	4.304	0.254
Willing to Buy ← Familiarity	0.513	0.641	0.800	0.061
Rights ← Country Description	0.887	0.141	6.304	0.481
Democratic ← Country Description	0.937	0.167	5.621	0.414
Western ← Country Description	0.663	0.166	3.990	0.276
Know ← Country Description	0.017	0.152	0.113	0.007
Like ← Country Evaluation	1.000			0.612
Align ← Country Evaluation	0.658	0.112	5.863	0.411
Value ← Product Evaluation	1.000			0.455
Overall ← Product Evaluation	1.542	0.201	7.679	0.736
Satisfied ← Product Evaluation	1.483	0.187	7.912	0.797
Innovative ← Product Beliefs	0.897	0.081	11.112	0.664
Attractive ← Product Beliefs	1.000			0.719
Reliable ← Product Beliefs	1.055	0.078	13.535	0.806
Tech Adv. ← Product Beliefs	0.617	0.084	7.327	0.440
Service ← Product Beliefs	0.839	0.088	9.481	0.568
Workmanship ← Product Beliefs	1.047	0.080	13.034	0.777
Expensive ← Product Beliefs	0.570	0.084	6.827	0.410
Ties ← Relationship	0.808	0.090	9.025	0.654
Invest ← Relationship	0.934	0.106	8.812	0.633
Know ← Familiarity	1.000			0.133
Industrialized ← Country Competence	1.000			0.250
Rich ← Country Competence	3.459	3.625	0.954	1.209
Hardworking ← People Competence	0.120	0.159	0.751	0.066
Educated ← People Competence	1.000			0.633
Ideal ← Country Description	1.269	0.156	8.145	0.737
Safe ← Country Description	1.195	0.151	7.887	0.684
Active ← People Competence	0.477	0.253	1.887	0.273
Peaceful ← Country Evaluation	0.976	0.119	8.178	0.626
Proud to Own ← Product Evaluation	1.372	0.188	7.285	0.650
Buy ← Willing to Buy	1.000			1.000
Immigration ← Relationship	1.000			0.710
Quality ← Product Beliefs	1.100	0.081	13.600	0.810
Stable ← Country Description	1.000			0.554
Individualistic ← People Description	-0.312	0.161	-1.941	-0.184
Brand ← Familiarity	3.569	1.899	1.879	0.426
Find ← Familiarity	6.006	3.208	1.873	0.812
Trust ← People Description	1.000			0.619

Regression Weights: Hungary

Path	Unstandardized Estimate	Standard Error	Critical Ratio	Standardized Estimate
Country Evaluati ← Country Description	0.551	0.063	8.779	0.698
Country Evaluati ← Country Competence	-0.203	0.065	-3.129	-0.195
Country Evaluati ← People Competence	-0.171	0.093	-1.836	-0.100
Country Evaluati ← People Description	1.065	2.500	0.426	0.895
Product Beliefs ← Country Evaluation	0.322	0.066	4.876	0.350
Product Beliefs ← Familiarity	0.807	0.222	3.642	0.460
Relationship ← Country Evaluation	0.985	0.115	8.570	0.735
Product Beliefs ← Country Competence	0.293	0.074	3.980	0.306
Product Beliefs ← People Competence	0.353	0.110	3.200	0.225
Product Evaluation ← Product Beliefs	0.761	0.105	7.232	1.044
Product Evaluation ← Relationship	0.089	0.044	2.006	0.177
Product Evaluation ← Country Evaluation	-0.147	0.064	-2.300	-0.219
Product Evaluation ← Familiarity	-0.173	0.098	-1.766	-0.135
Willing to Buy ← Product Evaluation	1.231	0.198	6.211	0.492
Willing to Buy ← Relationship	0.256	0.072	3.578	0.204
Willing to Buy ← Familiarity	0.258	0.215	1.199	0.081
Rights ← Country Description	0.822	0.085	9.642	0.623
Democratic ← Country Description	0.808	0.085	9.551	0.617
Western ← Country Description	0.791	0.104	7.630	0.488
Know ← Country Description	0.528	0.096	5.504	0.350
Like ← Country Evaluation	1.000			0.675
Align ← Country Evaluation	0.455	0.099	4.614	0.299
Value ← Product Evaluation	1.000			0.513
Overall ← Product Evaluation	1.133	0.170	6.654	0.510
Satisfied ← Product Evaluation	1.279	0.152	8.427	0.779
Innovative ← Product Beliefs	0.951	0.101	9.389	0.636
Attractive ← Product Beliefs	1.000			0.645
Reliable ← Product Beliefs	0.958	0.086	11.133	0.790
Tech Adv. ← Product Beliefs	0.794	0.112	7.068	0.460
Service ← Product Beliefs	0.493	0.093	5.313	0.338
Workmanship ← Product Beliefs	0.726	0.084	8.606	0.574
Expensive ← Product Beliefs	0.111	0.090	1.227	0.076
Ties ← Relationship	0.940	0.073	12.839	0.827
Invest ← Relationship	1.108	0.086	12.896	0.833
Know ← Familiarity	1.000			0.286
Industrialized ← Country Competence	1.000			0.555
Rich ← Country Competence	1.330	0.350	3.805	0.803
Hardworking ← People Competence	0.606	0.214	2.831	0.197
Educated ← People Competence	1.000			0.359
Ideal ← Country Description	0.897	0.080	11.197	0.735
Safe ← Country Description	0.844	0.097	10.709	0.698
Active ← People Competence	2.381	1.077	2.211	0.924
Peaceful ← Country Evaluation	1.131	0.113	10.033	0.700
Proud to Own ← Product Evaluation	1.090	0.160	6.805	0.527
Buy ← Willing to Buy	1.000			1.000
Immigration ← Relationship	1.000			0.724
Quality ← Product Beliefs	0.791	0.093	8.474	0.564
Stable ← Country Description	1.000			0.711
Individualistic ← People Description	-0.073	0.118	-0.623	-0.039
Brand ← Familiarity	2.619	0.653	4.012	0.802
Find ← Familiarity	2.142	0.521	4.109	0.672
Trust ← People Description	1.000			0.552

Regression Weights: Czech Republic

Path	Unstandardized Estimate	Standard Error	Critical Ratio	Standardized Estimate
Country Evaluati ← Country Description	0.540	0.055	9.912	0.748
Country Evaluati ← Country Competence	0.049	0.046	1.063	0.062
Country Evaluati ← People Competence	0.130	0.064	2.021	0.128
Country Evaluati ← People Description	0.426	0.374	1.137	0.494
Product Beliefs ← Country Evaluation	0.313	0.065	4.797	0.303
Product Beliefs ← Familiarity	0.762	0.151	5.035	0.529
Relationship ← Country Evaluation	0.859	0.093	9.218	0.790
Product Beliefs ← Country Competence	0.200	0.064	3.122	0.243
Product Beliefs ← People Competence	0.242	0.079	3.061	0.231
Product Evaluation ← Product Beliefs	0.653	0.093	7.046	1.102
Product Evaluation ← Relationship	-0.041	0.056	-0.725	-0.072
Product Evaluation ← Country Evaluation	0.014	0.064	0.214	0.022
Product Evaluation ← Familiarity	-0.163	0.072	-2.255	-0.191
Willing to Buy ← Product Evaluation	1.375	0.228	6.044	0.514
Willing to Buy ← Relationship	0.322	0.086	3.724	0.214
Willing to Buy ← Familiarity	0.302	0.159	1.898	0.132
Rights ← Country Description	0.863	0.076	11.394	0.690
Democratic ← Country Description	1.023	0.078	13.093	0.791
Western ← Country Description	0.762	0.088	8.614	0.525
Know ← Country Description	0.656	0.083	7.940	0.484
Like ← Country Evaluation	1.000			0.715
Align ← Country Evaluation	0.508	0.094	5.421	0.345
Value ← Product Evaluation	1.000			0.469
Overall ← Product Evaluation	1.218	0.191	6.369	0.510
Satisfied ← Product Evaluation	1.160	0.150	7.746	0.760
Innovative ← Product Beliefs	0.736	0.076	9.662	0.592
Attractive ← Product Beliefs	1.000			0.718
Reliable ← Product Beliefs	0.822	0.066	12.426	0.762
Tech Adv. ← Product Beliefs	0.841	0.086	9.832	0.602
Service ← Product Beliefs	0.452	0.071	6.338	0.388
Workmanship ← Product Beliefs	0.880	0.073	12.125	0.743
Expensive ← Product Beliefs	0.051	0.074	0.694	0.043
Ties ← Relationship	1.064	0.092	11.556	0.765
Invest ← Relationship	1.242	0.103	12.094	0.820
Know ← Familiarity	1.000			0.419
Industrialized ← Country Competence	1.000			0.740
Rich ← Country Competence	0.814	0.236	3.443	0.656
Hardworking ← People Competence	0.602	0.148	4.063	0.370
Educated ← People Competence	1.000			0.628
Ideal ← Country Description	0.928	0.071	13.100	0.792
Safe ← Country Description	0.930	0.072	12.906	0.780
Active ← People Competence	0.893	0.202	4.425	0.609
Peaceful ← Country Evaluation	1.026	0.097	10.597	0.692
Proud to Own ← Product Evaluation	1.072	0.179	6.000	0.463
Buy ← Willing to Buy	1.000			1.000
Immigration ← Relationship	1.000			0.712
Quality ← Product Beliefs	0.736	0.079	9.347	0.573
Stable ← Country Description	1.000			0.731
Individualistic ← People Description	0.144	0.140	1.033	0.109
Brand ← Familiarity	1.923	0.345	5.572	0.771
Find ← Familiarity	1.288	0.233	5.539	0.609
Trust ← People Description	1.000			0.847

Regression Weights: Poland

Path	Unstandardized Estimate	Standard Error	Critical Ratio	Standardized Estimate
Country Evaluati ← Country Description	0.504	0.068	7.395	0.478
Country Evaluati ← Country Competence	-0.259	0.072	-3.584	-0.220
Country Evaluati ← People Competence	0.345	0.095	3.636	0.290
Country Evaluati ← People Description	0.445	0.039	11.358	0.589
Product Beliefs ← Country Evaluation	0.423	0.072	5.874	0.396
Product Beliefs ← Familiarity	1.452	0.386	3.759	0.548
Relationship ← Country Evaluation	1.087	0.090	12.078	0.869
Product Beliefs ← Country Competence	0.289	0.085	3.402	0.230
Product Beliefs ← People Competence	0.117	0.092	1.281	0.092
Product Evaluation ← Product Beliefs	0.524	0.081	6.486	1.035
Product Evaluation ← Relationship	-0.046	0.054	-0.850	-0.105
Product Evaluation ← Country Evaluation	0.049	0.070	0.706	0.091
Product Evaluation ← Familiarity	-0.082	0.094	-0.874	-0.061
Willing to Buy ← Product Evaluation	2.085	0.333	6.261	0.739
Willing to Buy ← Relationship	0.057	0.069	0.824	0.046
Willing to Buy ← Familiarity	-0.237	0.266	-0.890	-0.062
Rights ← Country Description	0.919	0.108	8.524	0.594
Democratic ← Country Description	1.112	0.117	9.515	0.682
Western ← Country Description	0.889	0.128	6.950	0.468
Know ← Country Description	0.575	0.121	4.750	0.310
Like ← Country Evaluation	1.000			0.792
Align ← Country Evaluation	0.416	0.084	4.931	0.307
Value ← Product Evaluation	1.000			0.415
Overall ← Product Evaluation	1.399	0.223	6.271	0.582
Satisfied ← Product Evaluation	1.467	0.211	6.946	0.760
Innovative ← Product Beliefs	0.667	0.063	10.512	0.604
Attractive ← Product Beliefs	1.000			0.780
Reliable ← Product Beliefs	0.706	0.058	12.281	0.692
Tech Adv. ← Product Beliefs	0.646	0.068	9.480	0.551
Service ← Product Beliefs	0.455	0.067	6.842	0.407
Workmanship ← Product Beliefs	0.710	0.064	11.139	0.636
Expensive ← Product Beliefs	0.172	0.065	2.656	0.161
Ties ← Relationship	0.826	0.060	13.791	0.765
Invest ← Relationship	0.883	0.064	13.724	0.762
Know ← Familiarity	1.000			0.265
Industrialized ← Country Competence	1.000			0.565
Rich ← Country Competence	1.227	0.337	3.638	0.805
Hardworking ← People Competence	0.536	0.167	3.216	0.285
Educated ← People Competence	1.000			0.614
Ideal ← Country Description	1.024	0.102	10.024	0.733
Safe ← Country Description	1.050	0.104	10.115	0.743
Active ← People Competence	0.948	0.233	4.067	0.572
Peaceful ← Country Evaluation	0.788	0.084	9.380	0.568
Proud to Own ← Product Evaluation	1.568	0.236	6.639	0.671
Buy ← Willing to Buy	1.000			1.000
Immigration ← Relationship	1.000			0.830
Quality ← Product Beliefs	0.735	0.065	11.323	0.645
Stable ← Country Description	1.000			0.643
Brand ← Familiarity	3.218	0.834	3.861	0.848
Find ← Familiarity	2.293	0.586	3.912	0.625
Trust ← People Description	1.000			1.000

APPENDIX H – MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD ESTIMATES (2nd RUN)

Regression Weights: France

Path	Unstandardized Estimate	Standard Error	Critical Ratio	Standardized Estimate
Country Evaluati ← People Description	0.498	0.044	11.408	0.657
Country Evaluati ← Country Description	0.419	0.092	4.546	0.287
Country Evaluati ← Country Competence	0.066	0.086	0.773	0.050
Country Evaluati ← People Competence	0.057	0.185	0.308	0.102
Product Beliefs ← Country Evaluation	0.124	0.037	3.385	0.204
Product Beliefs ← Familiarity	0.357	0.062	5.791	0.743
Relationship ← Country Evaluation	0.857	0.097	8.854	0.908
Product Beliefs ← Country Competence	0.195	0.068	2.857	0.240
Product Beliefs ← People Competence	0.010	0.035	0.298	0.031
Product Evaluation ← Product Beliefs	1.075	0.198	5.437	1.055
Product Evaluation ← Relationship	0.144	0.135	1.065	0.220
Product Evaluation ← Country Evaluation	-0.093	0.128	-0.725	-0.151
Product Evaluation ← Familiarity	-0.056	0.053	-1.061	-0.114
Willing to Buy ← Product Evaluation	0.968	0.263	3.686	0.413
Willing to Buy ← Relationship	0.411	0.103	4.006	0.269
Willing to Buy ← Familiarity	0.056	0.115	0.485	0.049
Rights ← Country Description	1.045	0.157	6.672	0.491
Democratic ← Country Description	1.242	0.173	7.180	0.541
Western ← Country Description	1.216	0.206	5.907	0.423
Trust ← People Description	1.000			1.000
Like ← Country Evaluation	1.000			0.782
Value ← Product Evaluation	1.000			0.413
Overall ← Product Evaluation	1.306	0.193	6.782	0.740
Satisfied ← Product Evaluation	1.407	0.201	6.987	0.822
Innovative ← Product Beliefs	1.141	0.139	8.213	0.575
Attractive ← Product Beliefs	1.000			0.590
Reliable ← Product Beliefs	1.233	0.130	9.459	0.698
Tech Adv. ← Product Beliefs	1.061	0.146	7.246	0.491
Workmanship ← Product Beliefs	1.342	0.129	10.369	0.804
Ties ← Relationship	1.085	0.115	9.409	0.740
Invest ← Relationship	1.043	0.118	8.806	0.666
Industrialized ← Country Competence	1.000			0.736
Rich ← Country Competence	0.789	0.255	3.092	0.577
Educated ← People Competence	1.000			2.049
Ideal ← Country Description	1.359	0.161	8.455	0.692
Safe ← Country Description	1.242	0.143	8.869	0.729
Proud to Own ← Product Evaluation	1.224	0.199	6.158	0.572
Buy ← Willing to Buy	1.000			1.000
Immigration ← Relationship	1.000			0.617
Quality ← Product Beliefs	1.266	0.150	8.426	0.594
Stable ← Country Description	1.000			0.602
Active ← People Competence	0.107	0.345	0.310	0.140
Peaceful ← Country Evaluation	0.778	0.095	8.225	0.521
Find ← Familiarity	0.566	0.094	6.021	0.466
Brand ← Familiarity	1.000			0.806

Regression Weights: Russia

Path	Unstandardized Estimate	Standard Error	Critical Ratio	Standardized Estimate
Country Evaluati ← People Description	0.246	0.037	6.568	0.396
Country Evaluati ← Country Description	0.788	0.126	6.250	0.590
Country Evaluati ← Country Competence	-0.193	0.046	-4.170	-0.240
Country Evaluati ← People Competence	0.252	0.202	1.246	0.307
Product Beliefs ← Country Evaluation	0.437	0.085	5.114	0.387
Product Beliefs ← Familiarity	0.858	0.164	5.219	0.601
Relationship ← Country Evaluation	1.065	0.132	8.078	0.828
Product Beliefs ← Country Competence	0.092	0.049	1.859	0.101
Product Beliefs ← People Competence	-0.022	0.066	-0.329	-0.023
Product Evaluation ← Product Beliefs	0.689	0.098	7.002	1.021
Product Evaluation ← Relationship	-0.007	0.062	-0.105	-0.011
Product Evaluation ← Country Evaluation	0.042	0.084	0.502	0.055
Product Evaluation ← Familiarity	-0.048	0.068	-0.710	-0.050
Willing to Buy ← Product Evaluation	1.478	0.238	6.205	0.623
Willing to Buy ← Relationship	0.336	0.083	4.049	0.239
Willing to Buy ← Familiarity	0.096	0.173	0.557	0.042
Rights ← Country Description	0.871	0.142	6.151	0.470
Democratic ← Country Description	0.911	0.168	5.435	0.400
Western ← Country Description	0.661	0.168	3.938	0.274
Like ← Country Evaluation	1.000			0.654
Value ← Product Evaluation	1.000			0.455
Overall ← Product Evaluation	1.518	0.199	7.622	0.727
Satisfied ← Product Evaluation	1.469	0.186	7.877	0.793
Innovative ← Product Beliefs	0.887	0.079	11.262	0.666
Attractive ← Product Beliefs	1.000			0.729
Reliable ← Product Beliefs	1.034	0.076	13.681	0.802
Tech Adv. ← Product Beliefs	0.609	0.083	7.352	0.440
Workmanship ← Product Beliefs	1.028	0.078	13.167	0.773
Ties ← Relationship	0.817	0.089	9.146	0.661
Invest ← Relationship	0.941	0.106	8.895	0.636
Ideal ← Country Description	1.290	0.160	8.056	0.746
Safe ← Country Description	1.213	0.155	7.830	0.691
Active ← People Competence	0.312	0.253	1.237	0.225
Proud to Own ← Product Evaluation	1.350	0.187	7.221	0.641
Buy ← Willing to Buy	1.000			1.000
Immigration ← Relationship	1.000			0.708
Quality ← Product Beliefs	1.074	0.078	13.691	0.803
Stable ← Country Description	1.000			0.552
Trust ← People Description	1.000			1.000
Educated ← People Competence	1.000			0.794
Peaceful ← Country Evaluation	0.867	0.107	8.120	0.594
Find ← Familiarity	1.561	0.334	4.676	0.777
Brand ← Familiarity	1.000			0.439
Rich ← Country Competence	1.000			1.000

Regression Weights: Hungary

Path	Unstandardized Estimate	Standard Error	Critical Ratio	Standardized Estimate
Country Evaluati ← People Description	0.336	0.038	8.810	0.487
Country Evaluati ← Country Description	0.552	0.063	8.717	0.667
Country Evaluati ← Country Competence	-0.254	0.072	-3.504	-0.218
Country Evaluati ← People Competence	-0.107	0.085	-1.255	-0.085
Product Beliefs ← Country Evaluation	0.289	0.063	4.587	0.329
Product Beliefs ← Familiarity	0.306	0.061	4.997	0.453
Relationship ← Country Evaluation	0.975	0.109	8.951	0.758
Product Beliefs ← Country Competence	0.271	0.074	3.654	0.266
Product Beliefs ← People Competence	0.390	0.110	3.549	0.355
Product Evaluation ← Product Beliefs	0.738	0.102	7.218	1.015
Product Evaluation ← Relationship	0.087	0.048	1.811	0.175
Product Evaluation ← Country Evaluation	-0.129	0.066	-1.968	-0.202
Product Evaluation ← Familiarity	-0.056	0.036	-1.568	-0.114
Willing to Buy ← Product Evaluation	1.227	0.198	6.203	0.493
Willing to Buy ← Relationship	0.254	0.070	3.604	0.205
Willing to Buy ← Familiarity	0.103	0.081	1.270	0.084
Rights ← Country Description	0.822	0.086	9.602	0.624
Democratic ← Country Description	0.807	0.085	9.497	0.617
Western ← Country Description	0.778	0.104	7.487	0.481
Trust ← People Description	1.000			1.000
Like ← Country Evaluation	1.000			0.706
Value ← Product Evaluation	1.000			0.515
Overall ← Product Evaluation	1.113	0.170	6.568	0.502
Satisfied ← Product Evaluation	1.264	0.151	8.380	0.776
Innovative ← Product Beliefs	0.942	0.100	9.385	0.634
Attractive ← Product Beliefs	1.000			0.651
Reliable ← Product Beliefs	0.954	0.085	11.212	0.794
Tech Adv. ← Product Beliefs	0.783	0.112	7.009	0.456
Workmanship ← Product Beliefs	0.718	0.084	8.589	0.572
Ties ← Relationship	0.937	0.072	12.989	0.828
Invest ← Relationship	1.102	0.085	13.034	0.832
Industrialized ← Country Competence	1.000			0.522
Rich ← Country Competence	1.502	0.433	3.470	0.853
Educated ← People Competence	1.000			0.516
Ideal ← Country Description	0.894	0.081	11.101	0.733
Safe ← Country Description	0.850	0.079	10.721	0.704
Active ← People Competence	1.153	0.368	3.136	0.643
Proud to Own ← Product Evaluation	1.066	0.159	6.700	0.518
Buy ← Willing to Buy	1.000			1.000
Immigration ← Relationship	1.000			0.729
Quality ← Product Beliefs	0.782	0.093	8.445	0.561
Stable ← Country Description	1.000			0.712
Find ← Familiarity	0.817	0.143	5.725	0.669
Peaceful ← Country Evaluation	1.071	0.105	10.221	0.693
Brand ← Familiarity	1.000			0.801

Regression Weights: Czech Republic

Path	Unstandardized Estimate	Standard Error	Critical Ratio	Standardized Estimate
Country Evaluati ← People Description	0.330	0.039	8.519	0.436
Country Evaluati ← Country Description	0.541	0.054	9.962	0.728
Country Evaluati ← Country Competence	0.056	0.048	1.154	0.067
Country Evaluati ← People Competence	0.060	0.067	0.894	0.056
Product Beliefs ← Country Evaluation	0.356	0.065	5.507	0.353
Product Beliefs ← Familiarity	0.452	0.078	5.826	0.537
Relationship ← Country Evaluation	0.865	0.090	9.599	0.812
Product Beliefs ← Country Competence	0.229	0.065	3.507	0.274
Product Beliefs ← People Competence	0.165	0.082	2.003	0.154
Product Evaluation ← Product Beliefs	0.660	0.095	6.951	1.116
Product Evaluation ← Relationship	-0.027	0.060	-0.453	-0.049
Product Evaluation ← Country Evaluation	-0.015	0.069	-0.215	-0.025
Product Evaluation ← Familiarity	-0.105	0.045	-2.354	-0.211
Willing to Buy ← Product Evaluation	1.303	0.224	5.804	0.486
Willing to Buy ← Relationship	0.356	0.086	4.146	0.237
Willing to Buy ← Familiarity	0.249	0.096	2.598	0.187
Rights ← Country Description	0.851	0.075	11.332	0.685
Democratic ← Country Description	1.017	0.077	13.154	0.792
Western ← Country Description	0.746	0.088	8.492	0.517
Like ← Country Evaluation	1.000			0.734
Value ← Product Evaluation	1.000			0.472
Overall ← Product Evaluation	1.230	0.192	6.422	0.518
Satisfied ← Product Evaluation	1.173	0.151	7.785	0.769
Innovative ← Product Beliefs	0.737	0.075	9.766	0.596
Attractive ← Product Beliefs	1.000			0.721
Reliable ← Product Beliefs	0.829	0.065	12.652	0.772
Tech Adv. ← Product Beliefs	0.850	0.085	10.037	0.613
Workmanship ← Product Beliefs	0.886	0.072	12.322	0.752
Ties ← Relationship	1.061	0.090	11.773	0.768
Invest ← Relationship	1.236	0.100	12.335	0.820
Industrialized ← Country Competence	1.000			0.739
Rich ← Country Competence	0.818	0.210	3.885	0.658
Ideal ← Country Description	0.921	0.070	13.310	0.791
Safe ← Country Description	0.930	0.071	13.040	0.785
Proud to Own ← Product Evaluation	1.083	0.179	6.054	0.471
Buy ← Willing to Buy	1.000			1.000
Immigration ← Relationship	1.000			0.718
Quality ← Product Beliefs	0.733	0.078	9.407	0.575
Stable ← Country Description	1.000			0.735
Trust ← People Description	1.000			1.000
Educated ← People Competence	1.000			0.625
Active ← People Competence	0.954	0.474	2.012	0.648
Peaceful ← Country Evaluation	1.005	0.093	10.817	0.693
Find ← Familiarity	0.805	0.129	6.249	0.659
Brand ← Familiarity	1.000			0.695

Regression Weights: Poland

Path	Unstandardized Estimate	Standard Error	Critical Ratio	Standardized Estimate
Country Evaluati ← Country Description	0.466	0.067	6.925	0.430
Country Evaluati ← Country Competence	-0.262	0.074	-3.567	-0.223
Country Evaluati ← People Competence	0.252	0.091	2.764	0.244
Country Evaluati ← People Description	0.476	0.040	11.782	0.611
Product Beliefs ← Country Evaluation	0.419	0.069	6.050	0.403
Product Beliefs ← Familiarity	0.414	0.072	5.760	0.525
Relationship ← Country Evaluation	1.096	0.087	12.586	0.888
Product Beliefs ← Country Competence	0.306	0.086	3.565	0.250
Product Beliefs ← People Competence	0.107	0.078	1.385	0.100
Product Evaluation ← Product Beliefs	0.515	0.079	6.506	1.018
Product Evaluation ← Relationship	-0.057	0.061	-0.933	-0.133
Product Evaluation ← Country Evaluation	0.061	0.078	0.782	0.115
Product Evaluation ← Familiarity	-0.015	0.026	-0.569	-0.037
Willing to Buy ← Product Evaluation	2.112	0.334	6.323	0.749
Willing to Buy ← Relationship	0.053	0.067	0.784	0.044
Willing to Buy ← Familiarity	-0.083	0.075	-1.115	-0.074
Rights ← Country Description	0.919	0.108	8.517	0.595
Democratic ← Country Description	1.105	0.117	9.457	0.679
Western ← Country Description	0.869	0.128	6.805	0.458
Like ← Country Evaluation	1.000			0.807
Value ← Product Evaluation	1.000			0.415
Overall ← Product Evaluation	1.394	0.223	6.254	0.580
Satisfied ← Product Evaluation	1.470	0.212	6.943	0.772
Innovative ← Product Beliefs	0.662	0.063	10.461	0.602
Attractive ← Product Beliefs	1.000			0.783
Reliable ← Product Beliefs	0.703	0.057	12.266	0.691
Tech Adv. ← Product Beliefs	0.643	0.068	9.449	0.549
Workmanship ← Product Beliefs	0.712	0.063	11.217	0.640
Ties ← Relationship	0.823	0.058	14.121	0.769
Invest ← Relationship	0.877	0.063	13.993	0.763
Industrialized ← Country Competence	1.000			0.582
Rich ← Country Competence	1.155	0.301	3.843	0.780
Educated ← People Competence	1.000			0.728
Ideal ← Country Description	1.033	0.103	10.067	0.741
Safe ← Country Description	1.046	0.104	10.066	0.741
Active ← People Competence	0.707	0.238	2.967	0.505
Proud to Own ← Product Evaluation	1.553	0.235	6.607	0.665
Buy ← Willing to Buy	1.000			1.000
Immigration ← Relationship	1.000			0.836
Quality ← Product Beliefs	0.732	0.065	11.305	0.644
Stable ← Country Description	1.000			0.644
Trust ← People Description	1.000			1.000
Peaceful ← Country Evaluation	0.765	0.081	9.419	0.564
Brand ← Familiarity	1.000			0.889
Find ← Familiarity	0.643	0.104	6.207	0.591

APPENDIX I – MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD ESTIMATES (3rd RUN)

Regression Weights: France

Path	Unstandardized Estimate	Standard Error	Critical Ratio	Standardized Estimate
Country Evaluati ← People Description	0.522	0.045	11.733	0.656
Country Evaluati ← Country Description	0.580	0.101	5.757	0.382
Product Beliefs ← Country Evaluation	0.144	0.033	4.360	0.250
Product Beliefs ← Familiarity	0.349	0.061	5.687	0.716
Product Beliefs ← Country Competence	0.279	0.074	3.779	0.323
Product Evaluation ← Product Beliefs	1.018	0.163	6.240	0.981
Relationship ← Country Evaluation	0.840	0.091	9.186	0.909
Willing to Buy ← Product Evaluation	1.059	0.187	5.661	0.456
Willing to Buy ← Relationship	0.420	0.089	4.704	0.280
Rights ← Country Description	1.041	0.154	6.757	0.494
Democratic ← Country Description	1.227	0.170	7.233	0.539
Western ← Country Description	1.195	0.202	5.911	0.420
Trust ← People Description	1.000			1.000
Like ← Country Evaluation	1.000			0.798
Value ← Product Evaluation	1.000			0.417
Overall ← Product Evaluation	1.314	0.191	6.882	0.747
Satisfied ← Product Evaluation	1.418	0.200	7.092	0.830
Innovative ← Product Beliefs	1.135	0.140	8.134	0.570
Attractive ← Product Beliefs	1.000			0.588
Reliable ← Product Beliefs	1.235	0.131	9.421	0.698
Tech Adv. ← Product Beliefs	1.068	0.147	7.248	0.492
Workmanship ← Product Beliefs	1.342	0.130	10.312	0.803
Ties ← Relationship	1.111	0.113	9.792	0.762
Invest ← Relationship	1.062	0.116	9.150	0.684
Industrialized ← Country Competence	1.000			0.689
Rich ← Country Competence	0.900	0.229	3.929	0.616
Ideal ← Country Description	1.356	0.158	8.606	0.697
Safe ← Country Description	1.216	0.139	8.749	0.720
Proud to Own ← Product Evaluation	1.218	0.196	6.223	0.573
Buy ← Willing to Buy	1.000			1.000
Immigration ← Relationship	1.000			0.624
Quality ← Product Beliefs	1.267	0.151	8.385	0.593
Stable ← Country Description	1.000			0.607
Peaceful ← Country Evaluation	0.779	0.089	8.728	0.541
Find ← Familiarity	0.579	0.096	6.009	0.468
Brand ← Familiarity	1.000			0.792

Regression Weights: Russia

Path	Unstandardized Estimate	Standard Error	Critical Ratio	Standardized Estimate
Country Evaluati ← People Description	0.254	0.040	6.348	0.423
Country Evaluati ← Country Description	0.724	0.126	5.741	0.557
Product Beliefs ← Country Evaluation	0.446	0.083	5.412	0.381
Product Beliefs ← Familiarity	0.848	0.163	5.207	0.586
Product Beliefs ← Country Competence	0.065	0.046	1.404	0.071
Product Evaluation ← Product Beliefs	0.677	0.089	7.622	1.008
Relationship ← Country Evaluation	1.010	0.140	7.222	0.794
Willing to Buy ← Product Evaluation	1.535	0.208	7.373	0.650
Willing to Buy ← Relationship	0.351	0.077	4.542	0.240
Rights ← Country Description	0.878	0.144	6.100	0.471
Democratic ← Country Description	0.929	0.171	5.447	0.405
Western ← Country Description	0.671	0.170	3.946	0.276
Like ← Country Evaluation	1.000			0.648
Value ← Product Evaluation	1.000			0.455
Overall ← Product Evaluation	1.518	0.199	7.613	0.726
Satisfied ← Product Evaluation	1.476	0.187	7.880	0.796
Innovative ← Product Beliefs	0.881	0.078	11.297	0.665
Attractive ← Product Beliefs	1.000			0.733
Reliable ← Product Beliefs	1.029	0.075	13.769	0.802
Tech Adv. ← Product Beliefs	0.605	0.082	7.360	0.440
Workmanship ← Product Beliefs	1.018	0.077	13.183	0.770
Ties ← Relationship	0.820	0.097	8.462	0.644
Invest ← Relationship	0.965	0.115	8.374	0.634
Ideal ← Country Description	1.305	0.165	7.929	0.749
Safe ← Country Description	1.213	0.158	7.697	0.687
Proud to Own ← Product Evaluation	1.350	0.187	7.213	0.640
Buy ← Willing to Buy	1.000			1.000
Immigration ← Relationship	1.000			0.689
Quality ← Product Beliefs	1.070	0.078	13.796	0.803
Stable ← Country Description	1.000			0.548
Trust ← People Description	1.000			1.000
Peaceful ← Country Evaluation	0.845	0.115	7.371	0.570
Find ← Familiarity	1.580	0.343	4.608	0.780
Brand ← Familiarity	1.000			0.436
Rich ← Country Competence	1.000			1.000

Regression Weights: Hungary

Path	Unstandardized Estimate	Standard Error	Critical Ratio	Standardized Estimate
Country Evaluati ← People Description	0.341	0.040	8.467	0.539
Country Evaluati ← Country Description	0.421	0.059	7.137	0.548
Product Beliefs ← Country Evaluation	0.322	0.068	4.721	0.323
Product Beliefs ← Familiarity	0.307	0.062	4.971	0.428
Product Beliefs ← Country Competence	0.350	0.078	4.500	0.377
Product Evaluation ← Product Beliefs	0.671	0.087	7.733	0.945
Relationship ← Country Evaluation	0.966	0.121	7.953	0.731
Willing to Buy ← Product Evaluation	1.315	0.189	6.967	0.532
Willing to Buy ← Relationship	0.257	0.073	3.503	0.194
Rights ← Country Description	0.838	0.088	9.527	0.631
Democratic ← Country Description	0.817	0.087	9.365	0.619
Western ← Country Description	0.791	0.106	7.445	0.484
Trust ← People Description	1.000			1.000
Like ← Country Evaluation	1.000			0.679
Value ← Product Evaluation	1.000			0.521
Overall ← Product Evaluation	1.122	0.167	6.728	0.512
Satisfied ← Product Evaluation	1.281	0.149	8.576	0.787
Innovative ← Product Beliefs	0.943	0.096	9.804	0.651
Attractive ← Product Beliefs	1.000			0.666
Reliable ← Product Beliefs	0.959	0.082	11.742	0.811
Tech Adv. ← Product Beliefs	0.786	0.107	7.346	0.473
Workmanship ← Product Beliefs	0.718	0.080	8.954	0.587
Ties ← Relationship	0.943	0.078	12.056	0.816
Invest ← Relationship	1.109	0.092	12.088	0.820
Industrialized ← Country Competence	1.000			0.599
Rich ← Country Competence	1.143	0.274	4.166	0.744
Ideal ← Country Description	0.904	0.083	10.861	0.734
Safe ← Country Description	0.855	0.082	10.460	0.701
Proud to Own ← Product Evaluation	1.070	0.156	6.838	0.525
Buy ← Willing to Buy	1.000			1.000
Immigration ← Relationship	1.000			0.707
Quality ← Product Beliefs	0.782	0.089	8.812	0.577
Stable ← Country Description	1.000			0.705
Find ← Familiarity	0.849	0.152	0.152	0.682
Peaceful ← Country Evaluation	1.041	0.118	0.118	0.645
Brand ← Familiarity	1.000			0.785

Regression Weights: Czech Republic

Path	Unstandardized Estimate	Standard Error	Critical Ratio	Standardized Estimate
Country Evaluati ← People Description	0.334	0.038	8.674	0.423
Country Evaluati ← Country Description	0.587	0.056	10.461	0.758
Product Beliefs ← Country Evaluation	0.372	0.061	6.051	0.378
Product Beliefs ← Familiarity	0.281	0.069	4.066	0.343
Product Beliefs ← Country Competence	0.403	0.074	5.447	0.495
Product Evaluation ← Product Beliefs	0.575	0.076	7.555	0.988
Relationship ← Country Evaluation	0.863	0.086	10.052	0.823
Willing to Buy ← Product Evaluation	1.623	0.232	6.995	0.599
Willing to Buy ← Relationship	0.272	0.078	3.500	0.184
Rights ← Country Description	0.852	0.075	11.373	0.686
Democratic ← Country Description	1.017	0.077	13.181	0.792
Western ← Country Description	0.749	0.088	8.545	0.520
Like ← Country Evaluation	1.000			0.748
Value ← Product Evaluation	1.000			0.467
Overall ← Product Evaluation	1.234	0.192	6.417	0.515
Satisfied ← Product Evaluation	1.190	0.153	7.797	0.769
Innovative ← Product Beliefs	0.740	0.075	9.879	0.603
Attractive ← Product Beliefs	1.000			0.724
Reliable ← Product Beliefs	0.837	0.065	12.876	0.783
Tech Adv. ← Product Beliefs	0.856	0.084	10.214	0.622
Workmanship ← Product Beliefs	0.895	0.071	12.553	0.763
Ties ← Relationship	1.062	0.087	12.193	0.777
Invest ← Relationship	1.238	0.097	12.788	0.828
Industrialized ← Country Competence	1.000			0.765
Rich ← Country Competence	0.762	0.175	4.352	0.635
Ideal ← Country Description	0.920	0.070	13.139	0.789
Safe ← Country Description	0.930	0.071	13.063	0.785
Proud to Own ← Product Evaluation	1.097	0.180	6.095	0.473
Buy ← Willing to Buy	1.000			1.000
Immigration ← Relationship	1.000			0.727
Quality ← Product Beliefs	0.734	0.077	9.506	0.579
Stable ← Country Description	1.000			0.735
Trust ← People Description	1.000			1.000
Peaceful ← Country Evaluation	1.004	0.088	11.379	0.707
Find ← Familiarity	0.739	0.128	5.762	0.634
Brand ← Familiarity	1.000			0.728

Regression Weights: Poland

Path	Unstandardized Estimate	Standard Error	Critical Ratio	Standardized Estimate
Country Evaluati ← Country Description	0.429	0.067	6.415	0.402
Country Evaluati ← People Description	0.498	0.042	11.937	0.652
Product Beliefs ← Country Evaluation	0.428	0.065	6.626	0.394
Product Beliefs ← Familiarity	0.419	0.071	5.918	0.512
Product Beliefs ← Country Competence	0.308	0.082	3.749	0.310
Product Evaluation ← Product Beliefs	0.502	0.071	7.091	0.991
Relationship ← Country Evaluation	1.100	0.090	12.202	0.887
Willing to Buy ← Product Evaluation	1.999	0.292	6.846	0.716
Willing to Buy ← Relationship	0.064	0.061	1.048	0.052
Rights ← Country Description	0.922	0.109	8.480	0.595
Democratic ← Country Description	1.113	0.118	9.437	0.682
Western ← Country Description	0.873	0.128	6.795	0.459
Like ← Country Evaluation	1.000			0.800
Value ← Product Evaluation	1.000			0.424
Overall ← Product Evaluation	1.397	0.218	6.423	0.591
Satisfied ← Product Evaluation	1.476	0.207	7.130	0.782
Innovative ← Product Beliefs	0.665	0.062	10.778	0.614
Attractive ← Product Beliefs	1.000			0.790
Reliable ← Product Beliefs	0.703	0.056	12.571	0.701
Tech Adv. ← Product Beliefs	0.644	0.066	9.705	0.560
Workmanship ← Product Beliefs	0.714	0.062	11.531	0.651
Ties ← Relationship	0.822	0.059	13.835	0.763
Invest ← Relationship	0.881	0.064	13.814	0.762
Industrialized ← Country Competence	1.000			0.734
Rich ← Country Competence	0.730	0.188	3.877	0.622
Ideal ← Country Description	1.035	0.104	9.994	0.739
Safe ← Country Description	1.051	0.105	10.017	0.742
Proud to Own ← Product Evaluation	1.562	0.230	6.792	0.678
Buy ← Willing to Buy	1.000			1.000
Immigration ← Relationship	1.000			0.832
Quality ← Product Beliefs	0.735	0.063	11.654	0.657
Stable ← Country Description	1.000			0.642
Trust ← People Description	1.000			1.000
Peaceful ← Country Evaluation	0.768	0.084	9.192	0.558
Brand ← Familiarity	1.000			0.877
Find ← Familiarity	0.660	0.104	6.338	0.598