1

PM-1 3 1/2" x 4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395 rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Microfilm - 2000 copies per year

Out of print - 2000 copies per year

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

**EASTERN EUROPE AND PRODUCT COUNTRY IMAGES:
ANALYSIS OF CANADIAN, AMERICAN AND
AUSTRALIAN CONSUMER PREFERENCES**

by

LESLIE T. SZAMOSI, B.Comm. (Honours)

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Management Studies

School of Business
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
August 29, 1995

copyright ©
1995, Leslie T. Szamosi

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

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

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

ISBN 0-612-08996-7

Canada

Name LESLIE THOMAS SZAMOSI

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION-MARKETING

SUBJECT TERM

0338

SUBJECT CODE

U-M-I

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language 0679
General 0289
Ancient 0290
Linguistics 0291
Modern 0401
Literature 0294
Classical 0295
Comparative 0297
Medieval 0298
Modern 0316
African 0591
American 0305
Asian 0352
Canadian (English) 0355
Canadian (French) 0593
English 0311
Germanic 0312
Latin American 0315
Middle Eastern 0313
Romance 0314
Slavic and East European

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion 0318
General 0321
Biblical Studies 0319
Clergy 0320
History of 0322
Philosophy of 0469
Theology 0323

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology 0324
Archaeology 0326
Cultural 0327
Physical 0310
Business Administration 0272
General 0770
Accounting 0454
Banking 0338
Management 0385
Marketing 0501
Canadian Studies 0503
Economics 0505
General 0508
Agricultural 0509
Commerce-Business 0510
Finance 0511
History 0358
Labor 0366
Theory 0351
History 0578
Folklore 0358
Geography 0366
Gerontology 0351
History 0578
General

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0333
United States 0337
History of Science 0585
Law 0398
Political Science 0615
General 0616
International Law and Relations 0617
Public Administration 0814
Recreation 0452
Social Work 0626
Sociology 0627
General 0938
Criminology and Penology 0631
Demography 0628
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0629
Individual and Family Studies 0630
Industrial and Labor Relations 0700
Public and Social Welfare 0344
Social Structure and Development 0709
Theory and Methods 0999
Transportation 0453
Urban and Regional Planning 0453
Women's Studies

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture 0473
General 0285
Agronomy 0475
Animal Culture and Nutrition 0476
Animal Pathology 0359
Food Science and Technology 0478
Forestry and Wildlife 0479
Plant Culture 0480
Plant Pathology 0817
Plant Physiology 0777
Range Management 0746
Wood Technology 0306
Biology 0287
General 0308
Anatomy 0309
Biostatistics 0379
Botany 0329
Cell 0353
Ecology 0369
Entomology 0793
Genetics 0410
Limnology 0307
Microbiology 0317
Molecular 0416
Neuroscience 0433
Oceanography 0821
Physiology 0778
Radiation 0472
Zoology 0786
Biophysics 0760
General 0425
Medical 0996

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry 0425
Geochemistry 0996

Geodesy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleobotany 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0935
Palynology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences 0566
General 0300
Audiology 0992
Chemotherapy 0567
Dentistry 0350
Education 0769
Hospital Management 0758
Human Development 0982
Immunology 0564
Medicine and Surgery 0347
Mental Health 0569
Nursing 0570
Nutrition 0380
Obstetrics and Gynecology 0354
Occupational Health and Therapy 0381
Ophthalmology 0571
Pathology 0419
Pharmacology 0572
Pharmacy 0382
Physical Therapy 0573
Public Health 0574
Radiology 0575
Recreation

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences 0485
Chemistry 0749
General 0486
Agricultural 0487
Analytical 0488
Biochemistry 0738
Inorganic 0490
Nuclear 0491
Organic 0494
Pharmaceutical 0495
Physical 0754
Polymer 0405
Mathematics 0605
Physics 0986
General 0606
Acoustics 0608
Astronomy and Astrophysics 0748
Atmospheric Science 0607
Atomic 0798
Electronics and Electricity 0759
Elementary Particles and High Energy 0609
Fluid and Plasma 0610
Molecular 0752
Nuclear 0756
Optics 0611
Radiation 0463
Solid State 0346
Statistics 0984
Applied Sciences 0346
Applied Mechanics 0984
Computer Science

Engineering 0537
General 0538
Aerospace 0539
Agricultural 0540
Automotive 0541
Biomedical 0542
Chemical 0543
Civil 0544
Electronics and Electrical 0348
Heat and Thermodynamics 0545
Hydraulic 0546
Industrial 0547
Marine 0794
Materials Science 0548
Mechanical 0743
Metallurgy 0551
Mining 0552
Nuclear 0549
Packaging 0554
Petroleum 0790
Sanitary and Municipal System Science 0428
Geotechnology 0796
Operations Research 0795
Plastics Technology 0994
Textile Technology

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

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

**EASTERN EUROPE AND PRODUCT COUNTRY IMAGES:
ANALYSIS OF CANADIAN, AMERICAN AND
AUSTRALIAN CONSUMER PREFERENCES**

submitted by Leslie T. Szamosi, B.Comm. (Honours)
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Management Studies

Co-Supervisors

Chair, School of Business

School of Business
Carleton University

August 29, 1995

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to investigate consumer attitudes towards East European countries and products from both a longitudinal (using Canadian data) and cross-sectional (using Canadian, Australian and American data) perspective. While Canadians views toward the countries of Eastern Europe have improved between 1990 and 1992, little has changed toward images of products. Differences are found in how Canadians, Australians and Americans rate the countries of Eastern Europe but not products. Further results indicated that the halo construct (i.e., views of nations help in predicting attitudes of products) may be too simplistic when evaluating developing countries. Respondent education is the best predictor of evaluations of foreign countries and products.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the love and support of a number of people. I would like to thank my mother Lorna, father Gabor, my sister Gillian, my Aunt Margaret, my Uncle Arthur, my Grandmother and my cousin Scott who have all stood by me through the years. I thank all my fellow MMS students for their encouragement and support and in particular André Lyn, Stephen Chow and Katerina Kalligatsi (in statistically random order of course!!) for their friendship and love. To all the faculty and staff at the School of Business who supported me the last two years I thank-you for letting me be a part of your lives and for a feeling of belonging. Particular thanks to Dr. Nick Papadopoulos, Dr. Louise Heslop and Dr. Debbie Compeau for seeing me through. And finally, but by no means least, I am indebted to my close friends Mike Holmes, Jim Lorbetskie, Carol Blackburn, John Hay, Rob MacDonald, Brenda Stelnicki (and little Kyle), Barb Klughart, James and Tanja Hanson and to Don and Dorothea Holmes and Bert and Norma Coughlin (my two sets of adopted Ontario parents).

THANK-YOU ALL!!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
LIST OF APPENDICES	viii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1 Development of PCI Research	5
2.1.1 Existence of PCI	5
2.1.2 Importance, Impact and Implications	6
2.1.3 Source of Effect	10
2.1.3.1 Stereotyping	11
2.1.3.2 Patriotism	12
2.1.3.3 Halo versus summary construct	13
2.1.4 PCI Research on Developing Nations	15
2.1.5 Cross-Cultural Research	17
2.1.6 Longitudinal Research	17
2.1.6.1 Replications of PCI Research	18
2.2 PCI and Eastern Europe	19
2.2.1 Introduction - Reason for Interest	19
2.2.2 Differences Among Countries	22
2.2.3 Previous PCI Research on Eastern Europe	26
2.3 Marketing Implications	28
2.4 Summary	28
3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES	30
3.1 Primary Objectives	30
3.2 Secondary Objectives	31

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	32
4.1 General Overview	32
4.2 Secondary Data Background	32
4.2.1 Research Design	33
4.2.3 Sample Units	33
4.2.4 Sample Frame	34
4.2.5 Sample Design	34
4.2.6 Sample Size	34
4.2.7 Data Collection and Response Rates	34
4.2.8 Study Countries	35
4.2.9 Research Instrument	35
4.3 Data Analysis Procedures	36
4.4 Pre-Analytic Process	39
5. TIME LINE	41
5.1 Political and Economic History in Recent Years	41
5.2 Events During Sampling	43
5.2.1 News in Australia	45
5.2.2 News in the U.S.A.	45
5.2.3 News in Canada	45
5.2.4 Summary	46
6. FINDINGS	47
6.1 Variable Reduction and Development	47
6.2 Descriptive Statistics	56
6.3 Canada 1992 vs. 1990	67
6.3.1 Hypothesis 1	67
6.3.1.2 Country scales	71
6.3.1.3 Product scales	75
6.3.2 Hypothesis 2	76
6.3.2.1 Country scales	78
6.3.2.2 Product scales	78
6.3.2.3 Concluding comments	79
6.4 Canada (1992) vs. Australia vs. U.S.A.	80
6.4.1 Hypothesis 3	80
6.4.1.1 Australia / U.S.A.	86
6.4.1.2 Australia / Canada	88
6.4.1.3 Canada / U.S.A.	89
6.4.1.4 Concluding comments	90
6.4.2 Hypothesis 4	91
6.4.2.1 Concluding comments	97

6.4.3 Hypothesis 5	97
6.5 Demographics	100
6.5.1 Hypothesis 6	101
6.5.1.1 Gender	103
6.5.1.2 Age	103
6.5.1.3 Income	105
6.5.1.4 Education	106
6.5.2 Summary	108
7. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	109
7.1 Descriptive Statistics	109
7.2 Canada 1992 versus 1990	110
7.4 Views of Products as Related to Country Attitudes	112
7.5 Alignment and Country Ratings	112
7.6 PCI and Demographics	113
8. RESEARCH LIMITATIONS	114
9. IMPLICATIONS	116
9.1 Implications Inside Eastern Europe	116
9.2 Implications Outside Eastern Europe	120
9.3 Implications for Marketing Researchers	122
10. RESEARCH DIRECTIONS	124
11. CONCLUSION	126
BIBLIOGRAPHY	128

LIST OF TABLES

Table 6.01	- Ratios of Number of Respondents to Number of Scales	49
Table 6.02	- Overall Mean Score By Respondent Country: Country Scales	58
Table 6.03	- Overall Mean Score By Respondent Country: Product Scales	60
Table 6.04	- Means By Subject Countries	62
Table 6.05	- Pairwise Multivariate Significance Testing	65
Table 6.06	- Comparison of Mean Scores: Canada 1992 vs. Canada 1990	68
Table 6.07	- ANOVA for Scale Summaries: Canada 1992 vs. Canada 1990	70
Table 6.08	- ANOVA Summary Constructs: Canada 1992 vs. Canada 1990	73
Table 6.09	- ANOVA Summary: Canada 1990, 1992	74
Table 6.10	- T-Test Summary: Canada 1992 vs. 1990	75
Table 6.11	- Mean Score Summaries	77
Table 6.12	- ONEWAY ANOVA: Canada (1992) - Australia - U.S.A.	82
Table 6.13	- ONEWAY Summary: Canada (1992) - Australia - U.S.A.	83
Table 6.14	- Summary of Pairwise Means: Number of Higher Scores	86
Table 6.15	- ONEWAY Pairwise Significance Summary (Duncan at .01)	87
Table 6.16	- Multiple Regression on "Good Overall Products"	93
Table 6.17	- Multiple Regression on "Willing to Buy"	94
Table 6.18	- Average Adjusted R-Squares: Summary Variables	96
Table 6.19	- Correlations with "Aligned With"	99
Table 6.20	- Significant Correlations: Country Scales and "Aligned With"	100
Table 6.21	- Wilk's Lambda Summary of Demographic Differences (Country and Product Scales)	102
Table 6.22	- Significant Age Categories: Wilk's Lambda	104
Table 6.23	- Education Categories Wilk's Lambda	107
Table 6.24	- Summary of Demographic Indicators	108

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.01	- Product-Country Matches and Mismatches	9
Figure 2.02	- East European Countries: Comparative Chances of Success	23

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - Research Instrument	134
APPENDIX B - Summary of Daily Newspaper Reviews	150
APPENDIX C - Principal Components Analysis (PCA) by Individual Country .	163
APPENDIX D - PCA Across All Respondent Countries	173
APPENDIX E - PCA Canada (1992), Australia, USA	175
APPENDIX F - Summary of Country and Product Mean Scores	177
APPENDIX G - ANOVA/T-Test Table of Canada 1992 vs 1990	187
APPENDIX H - ANOVA ("Know a Lot About", "Aligned With")	199
APPENDIX I - ONEWAY ANOVA Canada, 1992 vs. Australia vs. U.S.A. . .	201
APPENDIX J - Multiple Regression Equations	211
APPENDIX K - Selected Correlations (by "Aligned with")	214

1. INTRODUCTION

Well over 300 studies on country image and the effect of buyer perceptions of products 'made in' different countries have been published since the 1960's. Yet, despite the documented importance of product-country image (PCI) within a global economic context, only a small number of transnational studies have focused on consumer attitudes towards different countries and their products. Furthermore, country-of-origin research has primarily concentrated on perceptions of developed countries by those in developed countries.

The views of consumers in industrialized nations toward developing countries are likely to change as differences in industrial development and forms of government become less pronounced. The countries of Eastern Europe¹ represent emerging economies in a state of conversion within the global marketplace as they move out from under the political and economic veil of communism. Evolution on this scale is historic in its magnitude, with the important elements for success guided by foreign direct investment in manufacturing facilities for export. The majority of economic development activities in Eastern Europe will be based on new product development, production and export.

Unlike industrialized nations, the countries of Eastern Europe cannot rely solely on the strengths of their domestic consumer markets. Moreover, other less developed and newly

¹Eastern Europe is used to refer to the countries of Central and Eastern Europe including the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (C.I.S.), Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, the former Yugoslavia, Albania and Bulgaria.

industrialized countries do not have the financial capacity to absorb products produced in these countries. It is, therefore, imperative that Eastern Europe seeks to export to industrialized countries. Consequently, it is important to study how developed countries perceive Eastern Europe and the products of its countries because, for the near future, developed countries will be the main consumers of their exports.

A gap currently exists in understanding PCI from a transnational perspective, as well as how PCI affects countries with emerging free market economies, as observed by those in developed nations. This study utilizes both cross-sectional and longitudinal data to analyze Canadian, American and Australian consumer perceptions towards both the products and countries of Eastern Europe. The dramatic and historical geographic, economic and political changes in Eastern Europe over the past ten years have likely impacted perceptions of these countries and their products by those in developed nations. Most Western countries have positioned themselves to ensure that the transition of Eastern Europe to a market economy is successful following the political changes that have occurred in the region (i.e., movement away from communism). With the recent events that have occurred in Eastern Europe there is reason to believe that perceptions of the region are changing. Through a comparison of attitudes in the immediate post-communist era, this study investigates perceptions toward East European countries and products and how they may have changed.

Understanding these attitudes and changes is important for investor decision making, for marketers facing increased competition from East European firms, as well as for East European firms interested in knowing how their products are viewed in developed nations. For the foreseeable future, countries in Eastern Europe will have to rely heavily on Western industrialists to survive through the infusion of capital, the formation of joint venture and licensing partnerships, and as a ready market for product exports. PCI will be a critical determining factor in strategy development.

The main purpose of this study is to determine if consumer perceptions of the products and countries of Eastern Europe are changing (within Canada) and whether there is image consistency among the industrialized countries tested (Canada, Australia and the U.S.A.) toward the region. The intention of the research is also to update the PCI literature, provide directions for future research, and attempt to study demographic generalizations which were identified by Bilkey and Nes (1982) as important to the PCI literature.

This thesis is divided into eleven chapters. The next chapter includes a review of the relevant literature regarding the existence of the product-country image effect. Its importance and source is discussed with particular attention paid to cross-cultural and longitudinal research and the emergence of Eastern Europe. Chapter three outlines the research objectives. Chapter four details the research methodology that was followed. Chapter five overviews the key events occurring in Eastern Europe during data collection. Chapter six presents the data analysis and results of this study. Chapter seven

summarizes the findings. Chapter eight details the research limitations. Chapter nine presents the implications of the findings. Chapter ten outlines the future research directions identified, and chapter eleven summarizes the study's conclusions.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Development of PCI Research

The country-of-origin effect in consumer behaviour, here referred to as product-country image (PCI), deals with the 'portrait' a consumer evokes when presented with information such as where a product was made, assembled, designed or conceived. According to Papadopoulos (1993), such information can often be found embedded in a brand name, a manufacturer's name, product advertising or packaging, and on the traditional "made-in" label that often is physically affixed to products. Bilkey and Nes (1982), Johansson and Nebenzahl (1986), and Han and Terpstra (1988), among others, provide evidence regarding the existence and nature of the effect of the PCI cue.

Studies on country image and the effect of perceptions of products made in different countries have been found in the marketing literature since the 1960's. PCI was formally recognized, and perhaps even 'legitimized', as an important factor in international marketing strategy development with the 1993 publication of *Product-Country Images: Impact and Role in International Marketing*, by Papadopoulos and Heslop, the first book of its kind in this subject area.

2.1.1 Existence of PCI

Nagashima (1970) is cited as contributing one of the first, most widely accepted, cross-cultural image measure studies that commented on country image bias. In comparing the

views of Japanese and American businessmen, Nagashima found the 'made-in the U.S.A.' label not as highly regarded by the Japanese as American business people believed it to be. His research uncovered the need to further understand country image and its implications from a strategic marketing standpoint. Researchers have sought to add to the literature by studying attitudes and beliefs about both developed and, to an extent, less developed countries. These studies provided initial evidence regarding the existence and nature of the effect of the PCI cue.

2.1.2 Importance, Impact and Implications

Research emphasis on PCI information is not intended to downplay the importance of other consumer decision making cues but seeks to enhance overall understanding of behaviour. Hong and Wyer (1990) found that consumers perceive the PCI cue as another product attribute, among the others available (e.g., colour, size etc.), that assists in the purchase decision making process. Researchers such as Liefield and Wall (1992), Lim and Kim (1992), and Chao (1993) studied various combinations of decision making cues in an attempt to understand behaviour and uncover the methodology behind cue utilization, its function and importance. Wall, Liefield, and Heslop (1991), among others, have attempted to broaden knowledge of the impact of PCI by presenting research respondents with both intrinsic and extrinsic cues to evaluate in experimental purchasing situations. In such research the PCI cue is still found to be an attribute used in product purchase intention determination and product evaluations.

Johansson and Nebenzahl (1986) contend that the PCI cue represents country specific advantages in the same way brand name represents corporate specific advantages given that it can carry the same weight as a dependable brand name. For example, in the last three decades Japan has consistently been assessed as producing high quality, technically advanced products. Consequently, new Japanese products with unknown brand names can benefit from this strategic marketing advantage. However, country specific advantages can also pose a hindrance to expansion. For example, if North Americans identify France as being associated with high performance, luxury car production, the ability of French manufacturers to market a compact, economy car in North America will be tenuous at best (e.g., Le Car). This may be due in part to consumers questioning variations in known information or stereotypes.

Bilkey and Nes (1982) summarized that perceptions toward a country or its people have significant effects on consumer attitudes towards individual brands made, or perceived to be made, in that country. In certain situations, research has found that brand name can be a more important information cue than 'made-in' for consumers. Ahmed and d'Astous (1993) found that, although PCI was an important factor in an automobile purchase, brand information was a more critical factor. However it must be asserted that, among the other factors noted above, PCI may be indicated indirectly through the brand name or directly (or indirectly) in the producer's company name. Companies must understand the implications of PCI in planning production and communicating information about their products to buyers.

Until recently a product was typically manufactured in the country where the firm was originally located. Due to the effects of global competition, more and more manufacturing operations are being located in regions throughout the world. It is not uncommon to find a product carrying a national brand name (e.g., Sony - Japan) to be made in a second country (e.g., Mexico). In studying the effects of PCI and brand name cues on consumer evaluations of so called "bi-national" situations, Han and Terpstra (1988) contradicted the widely held belief of the predominance of brand name in consumer evaluations of product quality. They found that PCI had a greater effect than brand name on evaluations of bi-national products.

Morello (1993) stresses that in constructing marketing strategies in the 1990's, both countries and companies need to better understand their strengths and weaknesses in different markets in order to properly assess their opportunities and threats. Morello's research framework revolves around an analysis based on macro-economic, competitiveness and 'made-in' image factors. The macro-economic evaluation of the export target country (including economic trends, culture, population and business demographics, finance and regulations) provides insight into the risks and potentials of doing business in that country. Competitiveness research (SWOT analysis) examines the current positioning of products from the exporting country in the target country and which commodities are 'typical' exports to the target. Finally, analysis of the 'made-in' concept from the exporting country determines the image of the country, its people and products,

and its influence on branding and consumer choice. Based on this three stage analysis, communication strategy can be effectively developed and instituted.

Roth and Romeo (1992) constructed a matrix for product-country match determination (Figure 2.1) allowing for the assessment of customer purchase intentions and assists in managing PCI effects. One's position on the grid assists in marketing strategy development decisions based on product and country information along a dimension such as "Quality" or "Technical Advancement". Bennett (1991) found France to be associated with both good quality and technically advanced products while Russia was perceived as weak with regard to both variables. If, for example, these two dimensions were important for evaluating computers but not luggage, the grid can be used to evaluate the likely effectiveness to marketing these products from the two countries.

Figure 2.01 - Product-Country Matches and Mismatches

[Roth and Romeo 1992]

		Country Image Dimensions	
		Positive	Negative
Dimensions as Product Features	Important	favourable match I	unfavourable match II
	Not Important	favourable mismatch III	unfavourable mismatch IV

A product-country match occurs when the perceived strengths of a country are important features for the product category. For example, in Cell I a favourable situation exists for French computers while in Cell II Russian computers are an unfavourable match. In Cell III, French luggage would indicate a favourable country image but one that is unimportant to the purchase decision while Russian luggage might be slotted to Cell IV due to a poor image and unimportant product features.

This analysis can be conducted and replicated based on PCI information and allows the necessary steps to be taken to capitalize on a situation (if there is a positive match) or adopt the changes necessary for success (e.g., downplay "made-in", transfer major component production to a country with a favourable image, improve quality etc.). It appears possible for a foreign exporter with an unfavourable image to improve the perceived quality of its products by relocating production facilities to a developed country and emphasizing 'made-in' [e.g., Ahmed and d'Astous (1993) found a Lada made in Canada or Belgium received a higher rating than one made in Russia]. However, no marketplace examples of this situation having occurred could be easily identified.

2.1.3 Source of Effect

Stereotyping, patriotism and knowledge of a particular country have been identified in the marketing literature as three key factors directly influencing PCI.

2.1.3.1 Stereotyping

Stereotyping represents fixed or conventional traits that lack individuality. They serve to shape attitudes which consumer researchers believe are important predictors of behaviour and influence purchase decision making processes. Bilkey and Nes (1982) found stereotyping influences to be present in both industrial and consumer purchasing decisions. Papadopoulos (1993) writes, "Stereotyped images can be useful or can result in ugly consequences . . . (the fact is) . . . they exist and serve to influence people's behaviour" (p. 6).

According to Tajfel and Forgas (1981), stereotype perceptions are formed from interactions with people of different nations which, in turn, influences perceptions toward those nations. In an ever expanding global marketplace, these interactions will become more frequent and likely affect attitudes either positively or negatively. Consumers are exposed to products, services and people from around the world, thereby broadening their knowledge base but not necessarily easing preconceived stereotypes. McGee and Spiro (1991) found that even the nationality of a sales representative could affect purchase intentions, including attitudes toward the representative, presentation of the product, and the company itself. It appears that, despite increased country knowledge and a society seemingly more sensitive to the potential negative influences of stereotypes, such stereotypes still continue to exist and influence behaviour.

In marketing it can be advantageous to segment specific groups that are identified as having preconceived notions toward imports in order to target communications and products more effectively. Consumer demographics include such factors as gender, income or education characteristics which are utilized as benchmarks for market segmentation and differentiation. Forgas and O'Driscoll (1984) identified a strong relationship between demographic characteristics and nation perception. Bilkey and Nes (1982) documented the need to study demographic characteristics of PCI cue users due to the lack of concrete conclusions in this area of the research. Researchers have found support for differences by gender [Schooler 1971; Wall and Heslop 1986; Dickerson 1987; Sharma et al. 1995], age [Schooler 1971; Damanpour 1993], education [Bennett 1991; Lumpkin et al. 1992; Damanpour 1993; Sharma et al. 1995], and income [Damanpour 1993; Sharma et al. 1995] in PCI evaluations. Although statistical correlations have been identified from such demographic data, there has been little consistency of results both across and within studies.

2.1.3.2 Patriotism

PCI information can assist in enhancing and inducing nationalist sentiment and can alter traditional buying habits. Baughan and Yaprak (1993) contend that a consumer's patriotic emotions are reflected in a willingness to purchase domestic products over foreign produced goods. However, researchers such as Ettenson, Wagner and Gaeth (1988) found consumers who respond positively to a "Made at Home" campaign may be doing so on social/patriotic grounds and that views may not reflect true buying patterns. Wall and

Heslop (1986) established that consumers would be willing to pay higher prices for domestic products if the quality was believed to be equal to that of imports. Researchers such as Gaedeke (1973), Lillis and Narayana (1974), Chasin and Jaffe (1979) and Darling (1990) have all found significant preferences for domestic products. However, these findings are contradicted by researchers such as Nagashima (1970, 1977), Bannister and Saunders (1978), Wall and Heslop (1986), Han and Terpstra (1988), and Papadopoulos, Heslop and Bamossy (1990) who found numerous examples of preferences for foreign over domestic products. Papadopoulos and Heslop (1993) point out that as consumption becomes a global phenomenon, domestic producers and suppliers cannot rely on domestic consumers to grant them favours over imports.

2.1.3.3 Halo versus summary construct

When consumers are unfamiliar with a country's products, the 'made-in' concept has been found to serve as a 'halo' from which consumers infer product attributes. Gleitman (1986) describes the halo effect as a tendency to accept that people who have one positive (or negative) attribute must have others as well. This concept has been incorporated into the marketing literature to help explain certain consumer preferences toward products from specific countries. The halo effect contends that when consumers know little about the product and a lot about the country in which it was made, the views of the country dictate views about the products.

The halo effect assists in explaining why goods from less preferred nations have a more difficult time being considered in the evoked set. Wang and Lamb (1980) concluded that a direct relationship exists between the willingness to buy from a foreign country and that country's economic development and political freedom. Nations seen in a positive way are believed to produce good products. Kaynak (1989) studied PCI attitudes in an emerging country (China) and established that attitudes were related to historic ties, proximity, political and other environmental factors that did not relate directly to the products. There is a strong halo effect in product attribute ratings associated with developing countries according to Han (1989). Cordell (1992) confirmed this finding and concluded that consumers were more concerned with PCI information when the product carried an unfamiliar brand name.

When a firm flies the 'made-in' flag of a country in marketing a product or service, it is relying upon positive consumer attitudes that are formed when such an association is made. Conversely, when a firm downplays 'made-in' and focuses on other product characteristics it is drawing away attention from what might be perceived as a negative selling feature. Not only does country information have a direct effect on product evaluations but, according to Erickson, Johansson and Chao (1984), it has also been judged to affect the evaluation of other product attributes including workmanship and reliability. They suggest that PCI affects beliefs, not attitudes, and that inferences are drawn by consumers based on everyday experiences and events that influence perceptions.

In contrast to the halo effect, the summary construct recognizes that consumers often know a lot about products from various countries but little about the countries themselves. In this case, knowledge of products transposes itself to knowledge of countries. Han (1989) contended that country image may become a construct that summarizes consumer beliefs about product attributes and can directly affect attitudes toward a brand from that country. As a consumer becomes familiar with a country's products, country image may summarize beliefs about product attributes thereby directly affecting attitudes toward the brand.

Stereotypes, patriotism and knowledge of a country are under continual review and reconstruction as more knowledge is gained. As multinational production becomes more the norm than the exception and developing nations become key players in the global marketplace, these key factors will play even larger roles in market strategy and planning.

2.1.4 PCI Research on Developing Nations

Little PCI research has been conducted on developing nations. However, researchers working in this area have begun uncovering a unique set of perceptions related to developing countries.

According to Han (1990), country image may play a greater role in consumer attitudes toward products from a developed country, than from a developing country, provided consumers are more familiar with the country's products. Witt and Rao (1992) found a

lower perceived risk in the purchase of products made in developed countries versus the same products made in newly industrialized countries. Lee, Kim and Miller (1992) state that it is important for new market economies to understand the possible biases of buyers towards a source country, as such attitudes may be critical in determining the success or failure of ventures. Gaedeke (1973) found that products from less developed countries were evaluated as being of poor quality. However, he noted that PCI attitudes did not significantly affect opinions about the quality of widely known U.S. branded products made in developing countries. This is a critical factor that countries trying to entice investment must take into consideration in developing their own marketing strategies.

Although attitudes on products and brands vary from country to country, with continued globalization, tastes are becoming more homogeneous. Yip (1992) describes "global products" as one of the core strategies in developing a total global strategy. Consumers demand a level of quality consistency between branded product offerings found around the world. Firms with global mandates spend much time and effort locating manufacturing and development facilities to take advantage of country advantages. Many nations provide incentives to firms looking to relocate or expand their production or R&D divisions. These incentives, on the surface, may lower costs, but country image itself may hinder product acceptance. Before expansion, careful consideration of host-country images in consumer countries must be evaluated.

2.1.5 Cross-Cultural Research

Researchers have shown that consumers have significantly different global perceptions about products made in different countries. Most cross-cultural PCI research has centred on evaluations of two or more countries by those in one country (e.g., Canadians evaluating the U.S.A., Japan, and Germany). The most comprehensive cross-country, cross-cultural evaluation of national stereotypes was conducted by Papadopoulos and Heslop (1993) in which consumers in eight countries evaluated the people and products of six countries. This research showed a degree of consistency in the underlying dimensions consumers use in assessing products (product integrity, price/value, market presence and, to a lesser extent, response) and a country's people (belief, affect and link).

2.1.6 Longitudinal Research

The study of PCI perceptions in static, one-time, cross-sectional studies can be restrictive and diminish generalizability. Gleitman (1986) argues that attitudes and beliefs are under continual assault and are being reshaped through everyday experiences. One merely has to observe the historical changes since World War II in perceptions of Japan and its products as confirmed by Nagashima (1977) and Darling and Wood (1990). Thus, it can be argued that even extremely poor perceptions of products and countries can be dramatically altered with a well constructed, long term plan or through other external factors (e.g., political, geographical changes).

As documented earlier, PCI attitudes are shaped by stereotypes, among other factors. Beliefs held by consumers are under continual, although often subtle, reevaluation and change. Doyle, Beaudet and Aboud (1988) established that biases change relative to respondent age and are related to increased flexibility in understanding ethnic traits. Attitudes toward ethnic groups change with experience and knowledge of these groups. It is critical for marketers to understand how cultural and product stereotypes, over time, may bias purchasing decisions to the benefit or detriment of a manufacturer, investor or supplier.

2.1.6.1 Replications of PCI Research

One of the major problems with replicative research is the length of time required to complete a full study and analysis. When it comes to research on developing countries, political, economic and/or geographic boundary changes are not uncommon. However, given the relative importance of the information, potential marketing opportunities may be lost if the research is not done.

Few replicative PCI studies can be found in the literature. Nagashima (1977) replicated his 1970 study to test for changes over time in perceptions of American and Japanese products. He found the image of products made in the U.S.A., as viewed by Japanese businessmen, had diminished considerably while images of Japanese and German products had improved. 'Top-of-mind' product listings based on the 'made-in' factor (i.e., list five

products made in the U.S., Japan, Germany etc.) showed dramatic changes for American and Japanese products but consistent results for German products.

In Finland, Darling and Wood (1990) measured perceptions of American and Japanese consumer products in 1975, 1980 and 1985. Darling and Wood found that perceptions towards both American and Japanese products and marketing practises had improved. However, despite the U.S. having initial competitive advantages, perceptions toward Japanese products improved substantially and were rated higher in the later study in all categories tested.

Both of these study sets incorporate two of the largest economic superpowers, with testing undertaken during periods of dramatic worldwide economic change. The changes occurring in Eastern Europe and other developing countries today are just as significant in their magnitude and worthy of similar study.

2.2 PCI and Eastern Europe

2.2.1 Introduction - Reason for Interest

The Crossborder Monitor (April 1993) contends that Eastern Europe's future depends upon how the individual countries will blend themselves into the global marketplace. Cash injections from developed nations and organizations such as the International Monetary Fund (I.M.F.) and the World Bank are seen as short term solutions to the

problems faced in the area. Trade is seen as a key factor to assisting the long term economic survival of these countries. Without a strong trading infrastructure, Eastern Europe will remain dependent on financial and economic assistance from the West because, unlike North America, they cannot build on the strengths of their domestic consumer markets.

East European consumers do not have high disposable incomes and their domestic markets, though changing rapidly, are underdeveloped and economically weak. Other less developed and newly industrialized countries do not have the financial capacity to absorb significant quantities of products produced in Eastern Europe. Therefore, it is important to study how developed countries perceive the products of Eastern Europe because, for the near future, developed countries will be the main consumers of their exports. Despite the current state of domestic markets in Eastern Europe, companies continue to invest in the region with the hope of growing with consumer demand as the development takes place.

Multinational corporations such as Pepsi, Coca-Cola and Unilever have invested hundreds of millions of dollars in countries such as Poland. These companies have provided themselves with almost instant marketshare in consumer products for the region without providing tangible, export oriented production. However, the majority of development activities in Eastern Europe will be based on new product development, production and export. The Crossborder Monitor (October, 1993) reported that RJR Nabisco recently

signed a joint venture with the Vranje Tobacco Combine in Slovakia to produce Winchester brand cigarettes for export specifically to the United States. This form of investment is becoming more prevalent as economic structures become more suitable and stable for investors.

Despite the influx of capital, negative attitudes in Western countries toward Eastern Europe are long entrenched. Terms like the "iron curtain" and "cold war" have come to symbolize this region and its insistence on the benefits of communist principles. Multinationals see Eastern Europe as the next business frontier but must be aware of the attitudes of consumers in Western markets to both their ventures and production output. The opportunities in Eastern Europe are immense, but long term planning is critical.

According to McMillan (1992), foreign direct investment (FDI) in Eastern Europe will bring with it technical, managerial and marketing skills that should eventually improve export competitiveness. Eastern Europe will be in direct competition with not only traditional exporting countries but also other developing nations and Third World exporting countries that have been provided with advanced production facilities by multinationals seeking lower labour cost advantages. Steps must be taken to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of each East European country's product offerings for export. The rationale for firms entering Eastern Europe for its potential as an exporting region are much different. Nigh and Smith (1989) report the interest of East European countries in generating joint ventures that are readily exchangeable for commonly traded currencies.

These countries are looking for export opportunities that provide payment in European or American currencies.

2.2.2 Differences Among Countries

The U.N. (1992) describes the countries of Eastern Europe as "new" market economies as they are in a transition phase from the old central planning system. According to Stevens-Ströhm (1993) the requirements for successful transitions are FDI, the development of export markets, and the establishment of political and legal frameworks conducive to market economies. The key to the entire process is competitiveness in the global economy as other nations attempt to showcase and enhance their strengths to combat the threat Eastern Europe presents in the battle for investment funds.

Kraljic (1990) proposed a model documenting the chances for success of East European nations, as they embarked on the road to change, using a 1990 "starting" position (Figure 2.2). On the vertical axis, "Readiness and Ability to Change" symbolizes the commitment of leaders and people of the country as measured by the scope of reforms, experience with reforms, national homogeneity, quality of leadership and traditions/emotions symbolic of the country. On the horizontal axis, "Economic Development Potential" measures include the industry structure, skills, infrastructure, foreign debt, natural resources and exports in convertible currency.

Figure 2.02 - East European Countries: Comparative Chances of Success

[Kraljic 1990]

Kraljic's starting position perspective is based on the "gaps" perceived in key indicators of success such as technology, productivity, marketing and capital as they relate to Economic Development Potential and Readiness to Change. In reviewing this 1990 representation, it is interesting to note that Poland has received more FDI than Czechoslovakia, the U.S.S.R., Bulgaria, Romania and the former Yugoslavia despite its poor "starting" position on the Economic Development Potential axis. The mitigating factors seem to have been Poland's relatively stable political situation and willingness to adopt reforms which thereby reinforced a more stable investing environment.

There are perception difficulties from within Eastern Europe that infer a negative halo in being associated with the region. Stewart (1992) explains that Hungary no longer wishes to be associated with Eastern Europe and instead refers to itself as belonging to Central

Europe. To be associated with the 'old' Eastern Europe is detrimental as perceived by the countries themselves. Countries, such as Hungary, are attempting to join the European Union as a means of distancing themselves from Eastern Europe as well as reaping the economic benefits of being associated with the Union itself.

The economic and political evolution in Eastern Europe came at a difficult time, as Western economies entered into recessions and their governments were pressured to put domestic economies and interests first. In the U.S., some members of Congress attempted to tie aid to Eastern Europe to changes in domestic welfare programs and government policies. The U.N. (1992) reports that, since 1989, industrialized countries have pledged nearly \$45 billion to help speed economic recovery but only 20% had been disbursed in the first three years. Government subsidies offered to foreign investors to undertake low cost, production seeking, export oriented strategies have increased FDI flows. However, restrictions protecting domestic East European firms from foreign ownership and the stalling of changes in banking systems have decreased FDI flows according to Brewer (1993).

Investment in Eastern Europe has propelled countries such as Hungary and Poland towards economic autonomy and onto the global stage as a competitive threat. According to Rogers and Mathews (1991), by the end of 1990, \$374 million had been directly invested in Poland and \$1.24 billion in Hungary. Stevens-Ströhmman (1993) reports that Hungary has received more than 50% of the FDI invested in Eastern Europe. Hungary

is seen as a good investment location due to its ability and willingness to change as well as its position as the most important East European trading partner of the former Soviet Union. Hungary represents a more stable investment location due to its opening itself to Western goods and investment at an earlier stage than its East European counterparts. Hisrich and Jones (1992) contend that the understanding gained by dealing with one country will facilitate trade with other former COMECON (Council for Mutual and Economic Assistance) countries.

Changes in the make-up of Eastern Europe, including the break-up of the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia, the re-unification of Germany, and the ongoing conflict in the former Yugoslavia will lead to changes in the way business is conducted in these 'reshaped' areas. Through the various communication media the entire reform process in the region has been followed and scrutinized worldwide. The countries of Eastern Europe have been 'under the microscope' as this transformation has occurred. Consumers are very much aware of the positive and negative events that have occurred which will, in turn, affect their beliefs about these countries. Due to the complete top-down political, economic and social change taking place in countries such as Russia, Poland, Hungary, and the Czech and Slovak Republics, consumer attitudes will most likely be 'reformed' given the halo effect discussed earlier.

2.2.3 Previous PCI Research on Eastern Europe

With the emergence of Eastern Europe as a potential economic power, researchers have begun exploring the potential success of these countries and their products. One of the original attitude studies on Eastern Europe was completed by Chasin and Jaffe (1979). At the time they found a very poor image of East European products. As well as reporting a negative halo effect, they suggested that, in order to succeed, an "Americanization" of the image of these countries and a shift in perception of product attributes would have to transpire before any possible chances for export success could occur.

Recently there has been an increasing interest shown in the emergence of Eastern Europe and its potential economic breakthrough into the global marketplace by researchers such as Lumpkin, Madden, True, and Rajaratnam (1992) and Papadopoulos, Heslop, and Bennett (1993) among others. Lumpkin, Madden, True and Rajaratnam (1992) tested U.S. consumer attitudes toward buying products from Eastern Europe and found that perceptions had changed since an earlier (1982) study by Lumpkin, Crawford and Kim (1985). Consumers appeared to be more willing to buy such products.

Papadopoulos, Heslop and Beracs (1990) conducted the first PCI study from within Eastern Europe as part of their eight-country study. Despite limited experience with Western products, Hungarians held distinct PCI perceptions. Papadopoulos, Heslop and Bennett (1993) completed a study of Canadian consumer evaluations in 1990 of Eastern

European countries and their products. Their study suggested that attitudes toward their products were related to views of these nations (i.e., a halo effect) under the assumption that little is known about products from these nations. The more positive feelings are toward a country, the more likely it is that a positive relationship may be formed toward its products. Opinions about a country can assist in predicting judgements about products from that country.

If a "Westernization" is currently transpiring in Eastern Europe, there should be a shift in the perception of product attributes and an even stronger willingness to purchase from these countries. It is almost as if these countries are becoming 'more like us' (i.e., no longer Communists). The economic and technological diversity of a consumer goods infrastructure is slowly emerging in Eastern Europe. Their leaders are participating more actively in world peace affairs and are being portrayed as globally sensitive. Travellers are visiting the previously 'closed' countries of Eastern Europe, and people from these countries are visiting the West, thereby increasing exposure to the people and culture. According to Pool (1965) some travel is undertaken to acquire information, and hence images are formed from those objects about which information is sought. Papadopoulos and Heslop (1986) found that the primary effect of travel on PCI was the narrowing of the gap between perceptions of countries and what things are actually like. With the increase in the number of cultural, business and academic exchanges with Eastern Europe, it is likely that perceptions of the countries and products of Eastern Europe might be expected to change and most probably to improve.

2.3 Marketing Implications

Hooley (1993) suggests that in industrialized countries, product quality considerations usually come first followed by price while in evaluating less developed eastern countries, price considerations are followed by quality. Thus, expensive products from the East can be stereotyped into a "poor" purchase when the quality level is an issue. However, inexpensive products may be at a competitive advantage when quality is not an issue.

The Morello (1993) and Roth and Romeo (1992) models discussed earlier assist in the determination of market planning and strategy. Such models will become crucial for East European nations seeking to attract new investments and firms looking towards expanding production. For corporations considering investment in developing countries, the consequences of such modelling have to be considered as steps are taken to assist or encourage East European countries in their economic development. Negligence in addressing such information could potentially result in product or even corporate failure due to non-consideration of events or of opportunities lost when a competitive advantage exists.

2.4 Summary

The literature has shown that PCI is an important cue in the consumer decision making process and that it involves much more than simply the concept of 'made-in'. Consumer attitudes towards products and countries can be major determining factors in the success

or failure of ventures. Globalization has elevated and enhanced the need to study and understand the consequences of PCI as products become more universally standardized. There must be a "fit" between the PCI and product characteristics.

East European countries represent economies that are in a state of transition within the global marketplace. The critical elements for success will be guided by foreign direct investment in manufacturing facilities for export. As well, expansion of export through the influx of foreign capital for development purposes will be crucial to long term self-sufficiency. Western nations have pledged millions of dollars to ensure this transition takes place. As Eastern Europe emerges as an economic force and more is learned about these countries, views will shift. This research utilizes both longitudinal and cross-sectional data to analyze attitudes toward the countries and products of Eastern Europe in order to determine what, if any, these shifts have been and their implications.

3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

3.1 Primary Objectives

Few PCI studies have evaluated longitudinal changes or evaluated cross-cultural image perceptions. This research attempts to establish relationships between perceptions / beliefs and the target countries toward East European products and countries. As a result, two primary objectives evolved in the study.

The first objective was to determine how Canadian views toward Eastern Europe had changed between 1990 and 1992, a critical period immediately following the introduction of political and economic reform measures (longitudinal analysis). The following null hypotheses were proposed:

H_{1A}: The images of Canadians toward the countries of Eastern Europe have not changed over the two year period.

H_{1B}: The images of Canadians toward the products of Eastern Europe have not changed over the two year period.

H_{2A}: Canadians do not know more about individual East European countries than they did at the end of the two year period.

H_{2B}: Canadians do not know more about individual East European products than they did at the end of the two year period.

The second primary objective was to evaluate PCI data from a transnational perspective using Canadian, Australian and American data utilizing both between and within subject analysis. The following null hypotheses were proposed:

H_{3A}: There will be no difference in Canadian, Australian and American images of East European countries.

H_{3B}: There will be no difference in Canadian, Australian and American images of East European products.

H₄: Views of East European products will not be related to attitudes toward those countries.

H₅: People who view East European countries as aligned with their own country will not rate East European countries higher than those who do.

3.2 Secondary Objectives

A secondary set of objectives was established to investigate demographic correlates of attitudes toward East European countries. Demographic characteristics of respondents within a country will be related to perceptions of the products of Eastern Europe. The following null hypothesis was suggested based on earlier research:

H₆: There will be no difference in the ratings of the countries (products) of Eastern Europe across respondents of different gender, age, income or education levels.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 General Overview

The research undertaken was a secondary data analysis study based on a set of *ex post facto* surveys designed to measure the attitudes of Canadians, Americans and Australians towards the products and countries of Eastern Europe. Of the two main sections that follow, the first presents the methodology of the four studies on which this research was based, and the second discusses the methodology of this study itself.

This research utilizes four existing data sets based on surveys conducted in Canada in 1990 and 1992, and Australia and the United States in 1992. The data allowed for, and was subjected to, both longitudinal (Canadian data only) and cross-sectional analysis using descriptive and parametric statistical techniques.

4.2 Secondary Data Background

The databases used in this research were developed as part of an ongoing project on Eastern Europe by Papadopoulos and Heslop. The data was collected under their direction by Bennett (Canada, 1990), Ettenson (U.S.A., May 1992), Mort (Australia, January 1992) and Papadopoulos and Heslop (Canada, July 1992).

4.2.1 Research Design

The questionnaires administered in all four studies included sections to measure: a) attitudes toward countries, b) attitudes towards products from these nations, c) specific product evaluations and d) basic demographic information. Questionnaires also included respondent perceptions of the general quality of German products following reunification and on the break-up of the U.S.S.R., as well as a section asking subjects to identify some of the factors which may have played a role in their target country assessment. The Australian, American and Canadian (1992) questionnaires also included a comparison of views towards Russia versus the U.S.S.R., as well as the 'new' Yugoslavia.

4.2.2 Sample Population

The data utilized was collected from individuals living in households in Ottawa for Canada (1990, 1992), Brisbane / Gold Coast for Australia (1992), and Baltimore for the United States (1992).

4.2.3 Sample Units

City blocks within each city were randomly selected. From the chosen blocks individual households were selected.

4.2.4 Sample Frame

Following the selection of city blocks, households were randomly chosen within the selected blocks and provided with a questionnaire to complete. In the case of Canada (1990) and Australia (1992), two versions of the questionnaire were administered as described below.

4.2.5 Sample Design

Households were selected by area probability sampling from within the different metropolitan areas of the host countries.

4.2.6 Sample Size

The usable number of questionnaires available from each study are as follows: Canada (1990) - 305, Canada (1992) - 244, Australia (1992) - 291, and United States (1992) - 259.

4.2.7 Data Collection and Response Rates

The drop off/pick-up technique was utilized in all studies due to its potential to yield higher response rates and the potential to collect the data in a shorter period of time. The response rates of the four studies varied between 60 and 80%.

4.2.8 Study Countries

The East European countries studied include: Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland in all studies, the U.S.S.R. in the Canada 1990 study only [replaced with Russia for all other studies], and Yugoslavia only in the Canada 1990 and Australia studies. France was utilized as a "Western" benchmark country for comparison in all studies. Given their technological advancement, export orientation and political desire to become a part of the global community, attitudes towards these East European countries are of great interest due to the dramatic geographic boundary and political changes that occurred within this area over the period of study [i.e., the U.S.S.R. split into Russia and other countries that formed the much looser association of the Commonwealth of Independent States (C.I.S.); breakup and resulting war in Yugoslavia (not studied after this period); breakup of Czechoslovakia].

4.2.9 Research Instrument

In all studies a self-administered questionnaire developed by Papadopoulos and Heslop was utilized (see Appendix A). The country scales were developed by the principal investigators based on their earlier research and the marketing and social psychology literature. A total of 20 semantic differential scales were chosen from a list of over 100 such scales used in past research to test how subjects felt about the countries and their people. The product scales comprised 16 items derived from previous product scales found in the literature. All four studies used the same questionnaires but minor additions

were made by researchers administering the study in each country to address their interest in further information. Specific product categories evaluated on 'quality' for each country included microwave ovens, shoes, clock radios and luggage. These products were chosen to represent a range of product risk and manufacturing complexity.

Due to the potential length of the questionnaire had each subject been asked to rate all East European countries and products, two versions were utilized in both the Canadian (1990) and Australian studies. In both versions, subjects rated both France (for comparison purposes) and Russia/U.S.S.R. (due to its relative importance) while one version added Poland and Yugoslavia and the other Czechoslovakia and Hungary. In the Canadian (1992) and American studies, Yugoslavia was dropped due to its high level of instability and the remaining five countries (France, Russia, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland) were included in a single version of the questionnaire.

4.3 Data Analysis Procedures

For comparing hypotheses across countries (either cross-sectional or longitudinal), univariate statistics were utilized. This was due to the fact that the Canada 1990 and Australian studies utilized a split sample technique whereby respondents could evaluate France and Russia plus either Hungary and Czechoslovakia or Poland and Yugoslavia. These combinations represented two separate survey groupings. If multivariate statistics had been utilized, comparisons would have been limited to direct country to country

discussion and not across countries due to the fact respondents did not evaluate all subject countries.

Univariate statistics (ANOVA and T-Test) allowed for a cleaner, more understandable method of analyzing the PCI effect despite losing some statistical power. In clear situations where multivariate techniques could have been utilized (e.g., a comparison of Canada 1992 and the U.S.A.) it was decided that univariate techniques would still be used in order to provide for comparison with results gathered from testing that required univariate analysis (Canada 1992 / U.S.A. and Australia). A multivariate technique (MANOVA) was used in testing demographic hypothesis, as the analysis was undertaken within each respondent study and thus it was not necessary to utilize univariate statistics.

Due to a number of hypotheses requiring multiple T-Tests and analysis of variance (ANOVA), the levels of significance used in testing variables were adjusted using the Bonferroni technique. The overall alpha level for multiple comparisons was set at .15 with the individual country scales set at .008 (.15 / 20) and the product scales set at .010 (.15 / 16). This technique helps in assuring the overall Type I error rate for the set of univariate tests will be less than 15%. Stevens (1992) suggests using a more lenient alpha to enhance power but also advises treating differences on individual scales with more caution.

According to Milligan, Wong and Thompson (1987), when testing using ANOVA the standard statistical routines are non-robust for unequal cell size cases. If the smaller N has the larger variance, the F test is too liberal leading to increased Type I error rates (rejecting H_0 when it is true). This situation is more critical for small sample sizes. Tabachnik and Fidell (1989) state that there is no optimal method for dealing with such situations but that the simplest strategy is to randomly delete cases from cells with greater N until all cells are equal.

If group sizes are approximately equal (largest group < 1.5 size of the smallest group) then actual Type I error is very close to the normal rate error rated according to Stevens (1992). However, throughout this study it was decided that in any tests where an unequal N in cells could cause error difficulties, the procedure would be run three times so as to compensate for effects associated with deleting cases. SPSS-X does not allow for the selection or deletion of specific cases. Thus, it was decided to utilize a command called SEED which gives a random start point upon which to delete a specific number or percentage of cases from the analysis.

The random starting point can be chosen from the numbers 1 to 2,147,483,647. The researcher asked three subjects to choose a number between the two extremes. The random SEEDs chosen were 40, 2700, 1000701. It was decided that in order for a variable (composite or individual) to be deemed significant it would have to be

statistically significant under all three 'runs' of the test procedure. It was felt that such rigid criteria would give stronger validity to the results given.

Multiple regression analysis was used to determine how images of countries may predict attitudes toward a country. Originally twenty variables (individual country scales) were used in testing. The number of predictor variables was reduced using principal components analysis (specific factors are analyzed in the Findings and Discussion section).

4.4 Pre-Analytic Process

Each of the data sets was made available for analysis. Before combining the data sets into a single analysis file, each set was independently tested to ensure similar coding procedures had been utilized. This process was critical due to the fact that individuals from three countries were involved in collecting and coding the data. Standard mean and frequency outputs were compared with published descriptions to ensure accuracy, reliability and clarity. This procedure revealed certain scales that had not been reversed in the data sets provided through the recoding procedure. Given that each data set was in a system file format, this was not surprising as such files are usually used as a base from which to work and other procedures, such as recoding the data and combining variables, can be done elsewhere.

Following the review of the data, a manual assessment of the variable names was conducted. In order to undertake either cross-sectional or longitudinal analysis it was critical to ensure that the variable names were the same across data sets to avoid confusion in writing analysis code or in analyzing output. It was found that there were discrepancies in how the researchers had named variables for their data files. After analysis of the data sets, it was decided that the Canada (1990) study variable names would be used as the baseline upon which to rename the variables from the other studies.

New files were developed that imported the independent system files and then recoded and renamed the variables. These new files were then treated as the working files so as not to contaminate or accidentally erase or alter the original system files. At this point, the four files of equivalent data were combined into a single file for analysis. From this file, any data from the four data sets could still be independently extracted for analysis or any combination thereof. An SPSS-X map of the data was used to ensure that variable names were equivalent. A check was made again using the mean and frequency counts generated earlier to ensure that the data had been combined properly and none had been lost in the transformation. From this combined file an output file was created that became the working file used in the analysis.

5. TIME LINE

As has been discussed, over the last ten years, dramatic changes have occurred in Eastern Europe. Since 1989, major shifts have occurred in the borders of East European countries. The U.S.S.R. has been divided into the C.I.S., Czechoslovakia has split into two republics and Yugoslavia has been divided by a continuing war. In this section a review of the critical events occurring between 1989 and 1990 that led to the downfall of communism is discussed as well as the events unfolding in Eastern Europe during the sampling period.

5.1 Political and Economic History in Recent Years

"Economies in transition" best describes the current situation in Eastern Europe. Taucher (1992) points out the lack of production and manufacturing supply and infrastructure (especially in the former U.S.S.R.), and the poor marketing, finance and cost control skills in Eastern Europe. Russia is viewed as lagging far behind the lead countries of Eastern Europe in its transition phase to a market economy despite beginning the process of joint-venture partnerships in 1987. Such deficiencies continue to present enormous opportunities for Western suppliers while also hindering the expansion of those requiring an infrastructure of material inputs. Hünnerber (1990) chronicles the 'steps to freedom' in the eight Eastern European countries up to 1990, and the Western retail operations that have 'invaded' these countries. Some of the key events that occurred in the immediate post-communist period to 1990 (in the countries being studied) include:

Czechoslovakia	November 1989	retreat of government
	December 1989	election of Havel as President
	June 1990	first free democratic elections
Hungary	February 1989	dropping the monopoly of power by the Communist Party
	October 1989	declaration of the 'Republic of Hungary'
	March 1990	first free democratic elections
Poland	June 1989	first free democratic elections
	August 1989	election of Mazowiecki as first Non Communist Party Minister
	December 1989	declaration of the 'Republic of Poland' and dropping the monopoly of power by the Communist Party
	January 1990	dissolution of the Communist Party
Soviet Union	November 1989	law on freedom of journey and emigration (passed May 1991)
	February 1990	dropping the monopoly of power by the Communist Party
	March 1990	election of Gorbachev for President

The changes that occurred within the years 1989 and 1990 are staggering. Between forty and seventy years of historical power were overhauled in a very short period of time. As the transformations developed, Western suppliers recognized pent-up consumer demand and began the process of full-scale investment. Investment in Eastern Europe has exploded and will continue to be strong in the foreseeable future. However, questions remain concerning how countries such as Bulgaria and Romania, among others, will fare against those countries that readily adopted economic and political reforms (e.g., those which continue to progress towards decreasing restrictions on foreign investment and control).

5.2 Events During Sampling

In the questionnaires distributed as part of this research, respondents were asked to indicate factors that may have played a role in their assessment of the countries evaluated. Of the factors affecting the base of information, information learned "through the media" dominated. For the East European countries tested, in Canada (1992) between 78.2% and 91.5% indicated the media as their key information source, in Australia between 87.5% and 95.9% and in the U.S.A. between 73.9% and 91.8% respectively. The next closest factor was "things learned in school" which varied between 46.1% and 63.8% for Canada (1992), 41.7% and 59.1% for Australia and 46.3% and 67.3% for the U.S.A.

Methodological concerns regarding the potential effects of the Diaspora (dispersion of people from their native home) did not materialize, as few respondents indicated having roots in the countries being studied or friends from the regions. An average 8.2% of Canadian (1992) respondents indicated having roots or friends in the East European countries studied while 10.3% of Americans and .3% of Australians indicated the same. It is important to note that Diaspora may play a significant role (either positive or negative) in such studies but in the areas sampled for this study it does not appear to be as critical a factor as the others identified above.

In order to determine possible historical influences upon respondents during surveying periods, newspapers commonly read by people in the areas surveyed were reviewed. This was intended to provide documentation of information on Eastern Europe that was

available to respondents during the time surveying took place. The reviews did not include the Canada 1990 study as it was not used in the cross-sectional comparisons and the majority of the significant events that occurred are documented by Hünérber (1990) and described above. The newspapers chosen provide a combination of both local and international event coverage and are the most popular sources of newspaper information in their respective areas.

Survey	Newspaper Reviewed	Dates Reviewed	Actual Month(s) of Surveying
Australia 1992	Courier-Mail	November 1991 - January 1992	December 1991 and January 1992
U.S.A. 1992	Washington Post	April - May 1992	May 1992
Canada 1992	Ottawa Citizen	June - July 1992	July 1992

Within the newspapers of each country, daily information was provided on the war in the former Yugoslavia. This information included the detailed movement of troops and international resolve to end the conflict. Due to the massive amount of information provided and the fact that no resolution to the conflict occurred during the sampling period, no daily information is provided in the summaries. For both the U.S.A. and Canada, there was ongoing information provided regarding the conflict in Azerbaijan, including the various political manoeuvring of the parties involved. Again, no daily information is provided in the summaries.

5.2.1 News in Australia

Information on the transformations occurring in Russia and the ex-Soviet states dominated the reports presented. Key events reported:

- events leading up to and the transition from Gorbachev to Yeltsin
- Ukrainians struggle and vote for independence
- general suffering of the Russian people through the winter
- struggle in Georgia for independence
- ongoing search for new Polish Prime Minister

5.2.2 News in the U.S.A.

Russia received the bulk of articles published. The vast majority were concerned with the political instability within the entire region. Key events reported:

- Russia and Ukraine struggle over control of the fleet in the Black Sea
- Russian parliament in disarray: generally viewed as unstable
- Russia and Republics join the I.M.F. and World Bank.
- unrest in former ex-Soviet states threatens stability of C.I.S.
- economies of Hungary and Poland seen as strong

5.2.3 News in Canada

From June 1 until June 14 the "Earth Summit" in Rio De Janeiro, Brazil received almost daily updates; although Eastern Europe was not discussed directly, there was much mention of developing countries and their place within the global community. From July 25 onward, full Olympic Games coverage was provided. The majority of information

centred around the breakup of Czechoslovakia and the issue of stability within the ex-Soviet states. Key events reported:

- Czechs and Slovaks vote on fate of union; agree to amicable split
- Yeltsin - Bush / Mulroney meetings; receives most favoured trade status in Canada
- Russian threat heightens tensions in embattled republics
- Canada to take thousands of Bosnian refugees
- In Poland, Walesa endorses first woman PM after month of internal political upheaval

5.2.4 Summary

There is little question of the fact that the media in all the newspapers reviewed were predominantly interested in the political stability of the region. Overall, little information made it to press regarding the other countries of Eastern Europe unless it was politically based. This being said, the Australian newspapers talked very little about their own country's involvement in Eastern Europe but rather about other the resolve of other countries in the area, primarily that of the U.S. Canadian and American newspapers discussed their own governments dedication and commitment to helping as well as the work of other nations. Furthermore, the two North American papers dealt more with the economic and social aspects of Eastern Europe and the changes occurring.

6. FINDINGS

This chapter describes the analysis undertaken to test the proposed null hypotheses. It is separated into sections describing and analyzing: the development of independent variables, the general statistics from the four independent studies, a longitudinal comparison of the Canadian data sets and a cross-sectional comparison of Canadian, Australian and American respondents. Within each sub-heading, wherever possible, conclusions are drawn.

6.1 Variable Reduction and Development

Principal component analysis (PCA), as a variable reduction method, aids not only in understanding how different variables group together and what the underlying constructs are, but also in generating composite variables for input to further data analysis techniques such as multiple regression analysis. By reducing the number of variables, more parsimonious results and greater clarity can be achieved. It is likely that the 20 country (or 16 product scales) variables used in testing were not likely measuring 20 (16) different constructs. According to Stevens (1992), for regression analysis in particular, too many predictor variables relative to the number of observations may undermine the stability of the regression equations. Stevens (1992) points out the importance of working with as small a set of predictors as possible such that the ratio (N/K) of sample size (N) to the number of predictor variables (K) is, optimally, a minimum of 15/1.

PCA was used to reduce the number of predictor variables and to discover how the variables related to each other. Tabachnik and Fidell (1989) state that when there are no hypotheses about the variables prior to data collection, PCA is an appropriate strategy.

Before proceeding with the analysis of variables, PCA was administered to each data set independently and then again using a combined data file with Canada (1992), Australia and U.S. data. The Kaiser Criterion of inclusion was used for variable retention. Factors with eigenvalues greater than one were retained. Following Stevens' (1992) recommendation, varimax rotation of the component variables was utilized. With this methodology, each variable tends to load high on a smaller number of factors and lower on the remaining thus making interpretation of the resulting factors easier to understand.

The composite predictors used were derived based on the procedure used by Bennett (1991). The descriptions on both the country and product scales are subjective and based upon what the groupings of individual scales appear to signify.

Tabachnik and Fidell (1989) state that, as a rule of thumb, only variables with a .30 loading or above should be interpreted and that the actual loading cutoff is open to discussion. It was decided that loadings above .40 would be interpreted, which produces fair to good interpretation results. This loading level has been used in other PCI studies [Bennett (1991); Papadopoulos and Heslop (1993)]. Visual inspection of the data, following trials of PCA, showed that a higher cutoff (e.g., 50%) would have resulted in

the loss of too many variables and a lower cutoff would not have made any significant change to the number of items within a factor. Table 6.01 summarizes the ratios found in this study following PCA.

Table 6.01 - Ratios of Number of Respondents to Number of Scales

Country Scales

Country	N*	K	Original N/K	New K	New N/K
Canada, 1990	136	20	7/1	13	11/1
Canada, 1992	244	20	12/1	13	19/1
Australia	145	20	7/1	14	10/1
U.S.A.	259	20	13/1	12	22/1

Product Scales

Country	N*	K	Original N/K	New K	New N/K
Canada, 1990	136	16	9/1	7	19/1
Canada, 1992	244	16	15/1	6	41/1
Australia	145	16	9/1	8	18/1
U.S.A.	259	16	16/1	6	43/1

* Sample size is approximate as total sample size is larger, but smaller sample subsets result from the use of two questionnaire versions

The composite variables were generated by the researcher and are intended to describe combinations of individual scales through the use of a single explanatory variable. On the country scales, the composite variables were assigned using previous research by

Bennett (1991) as a benchmark. On the product side, the summary variables were partially evaluated using the works of Nagashima (1970) and Papadopoulos, Heslop and Bamossy (1990) as a baseline and then designated accordingly.

The first PCA conducted evaluated the data from each study independently with the loading scores summarized in Appendix C. In order for variables to be included in a factor, they were required to load 80% of the time (i.e., present in 4 or more of the 5 rated [target] countries) in the rater country data set. From this, the following independent predictor variables for the country scales were identified for each respondent country:

Factor Name Assigned	Scales Loading Together
CANADA 1990 & 1992	
Affiliation	Ties Investment Immigration Like Trustworthy
Technical Advancement	Industrialized Educated
Security	Stable Rich
Political Ideology	Rights Autocratic
AUSTRALIA	
Affiliation	Ties Investment Immigration Like Trustworthy
Technical Advancement	Industrialized Educated
Security	Stable Rich

U.S.A.

Affiliation	Ties Investment Immigration Like Trustworthy
Technical Advancement / Security	Industrialized Educated Stable Rich
Political Ideology	Rights Autocratic

In comparing across the respondent countries for the country scales, it is interesting to note that all the factor or scale groupings are remarkably consistent and present within each country with the exception of the Political Ideology factor which is not present in the Australian analysis. A further analysis of this exclusion by Australians found this factor grouping only in the evaluation of Hungary. This suggests that Canadians and Americans may be more sensitive to evaluating this aspect of a country, possibly due to the foreign policy influences of the U.S. government which are highly affected by political and ideological matters. Despite the Americans combining the Technical Advancement and Security composite variables, the underlying factors were similar to those of Canadians, further emphasizing the similarities between the two nations.

Adding to the consistency of composites identified was the fact that the same variables on the country scales emerged in both Canadian data sets. Canadians in both time periods evaluated the subject countries using the same underlying structures. This finding enhances the reliability of the testing scales. PCA was then conducted in a similar manner on the product scales to develop factors for further interpretability and testing of the data. The following structures emerged:

Factor Name Assigned	Scales Loading Together
CANADA 1990	
Engineering / Experience	Workmanship Overall Summary Attractive Satisfaction Reliability Innovative Buy
Design	Quality Proud
Market Presence	Brand Find Knowledge
Prestige	Service Proud
CANADA 1992	
Engineering / Experience / Design	Workmanship Overall Summary Attractive Satisfaction Reliability Proud Quality Value Buy
Market Presence	Brand Find Knowledge
AUSTRALIA	
Evaluation	Attractive Value Overall Summary Quality
Market Presence	Brand Find Knowledge
Purchase Outcome	Buy Proud Service Satisfaction
U.S.A.	
Engineering / Experience / Design	Workmanship Overall Summary Proud Satisfaction Reliability Quality Value
Market Presence	Brand Find Knowledge
Engineering / Availability	Innovative Find

The product scales revealed less consistency than the country scales in the underlying structure of the data sets. The Market Presence composite was the only common variable that emerged across all respondent countries. Canadians and Americans appear to combine more variables into overall product assessment, whereas Australians separated Evaluation and Purchase Outcome factors into different elements, and neither included Engineering-Design scales ("Reliability", "Workmanship"). In comparing the Canada (1992) and the U.S. composite factors, the only individual scale excluded on the Engineering scale in the U.S. was "Attractive".

The Canadian data sets, despite displaying similar underlying constructs on the country scale evaluations, deviate somewhat on the product scale evaluation, indicating a possible change in how such variables are evaluated. In the second Canadian (1992) study, the two Design scales (Quality, Proud) were combined with Engineering-Experience.

The new N/K ratios combined with Stevens' (1992) other recommendations and criteria using component loadings (components with four or more loadings above .60 are reliable regardless of sample size) indicates that the PCA has provided a relatively stable base from which to proceed with the analysis of the data.

As a matter of interest to this researcher, PCA was administered to the entire data set to observe the underlying constructs of all respondent countries combined. This interest stems from the suggestions of previous researchers (undocumented) that, in studies of this

type, PCA should be administered across all respondent countries and not on individual ones. The resultant PCA is shown in Appendix D. The same criteria as used in the first PCA were used in identifying factors. The following composite variables emerged:

Factor Name Assigned	Scales Loading Together
COUNTRY SCALES:	
Affiliation	Ties Investment Immigration Like Trustworthy
Technical Advancement	Industrialized Educated
Security	Stable Rich
Political Ideology	Rights Autocratic
Safety	Dangerous Aggressive
PRODUCT SCALES:	
Engineering / Experience	Workmanship Overall Summary Attractive Satisfaction Reliability Proud Value Buy
Market Presence	Brand Find Knowledge

The combined country and product scale PCA is similar to that from the individual respondent PCA discussed earlier. The addition of the composite variable termed Safety indicates overall security as an important aspect of the tested countries.

Next, the data sets, with the exception of the Canada 1990 data, were combined and a second PCA conducted as shown in Appendix E. This analysis was undertaken because all three of these data sets were to be used in cross-sectional analysis and had been

collected in the same year. A comparison of the individual factor analysis versus the combined was important in order to gain an understanding of differences and similarities. Initially the same criteria as the first PCA were to be used. However, for the product scales, given that a very large number of variables loaded together for Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland making nearly all combinations of variables possible, it was decided that variables would have to load in all of the target countries. Thus, the following factors from the cumulative data set emerged:

COUNTRY SCALES:

Affiliation	Ties	Investment	Immigration	Like
	Trustworthy			
Technical Advancement / Security	Industrialized	Educated	Stable	Rich
Form of Political Ideology	West	Autocratic		

PRODUCT SCALES:

Analysis too Speculative: No definitive factors (Rotation would not Converge)

From the combined PCA it is interesting to note that the country scale composite predictors closely approximate that of the U.S.A. with the exception of Political Ideology which is slightly altered. For the product scales in the East European countries, all variables loaded together, and there was therefore little to be gained from analyzing summary variables.

The comparison of the two extra runs of PCA indicates that the respondent countries evaluate the subject nations from different underlying perspectives. This suggests that combining the data sets for PCA would result in the loss of critical information from within each study. A combination of the data for analysis becomes of little value due to the fact that factors vary between respondent countries. Thus, regressions must be undertaken separately. Therefore, it was decided to proceed with regression and other analysis using the composite predictors identified for each individual respondent country.

6.2 Descriptive Statistics

As an initial starting point for the analysis of respondent country perceptions of the products and countries of Eastern Europe, a summary of the mean scores was produced (Appendix F). A series of within-subject pairwise tests was conducted to examine whether respondents evaluated East European countries differently than France, a Western 'reference' country.

Even though it was rated highest overall and received the largest mean scores on nearly all country scales, in some situations France was judged to be not significantly different than its East European counterparts. France was rated similarly on the "Immigration", "Ties", "Hardworking", and "Investment" scales compared to the East European countries. As well, both Canadian studies rated France the same as Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland on the "Peaceful" scales. In some cases France was significantly different from East European countries and had a lower mean score. Canadians (1990) gave

Czechoslovakia a significantly higher score than France on the "Immigration" scale, and Australians did the same when evaluating Russia on the "Hardworking" scale and the U.S.A. in evaluating Russia on the "Individualistic" and "Investment" scales.

On the product scales, France was again rated highest with very few non-significant results found. The Canada (1992) study, was the only one where all scales were found to be significantly different. For Hungary, respondent countries, apart from Canada (1992), rated French products as not significantly different on the "Value" scale. For both the Australian and U.S. studies, the "Value" scale was not significant for both Poland and Czechoslovakia as well.

Mean summaries are provided such that ranking scores and descriptive analysis can be conducted from either the respondent or target country perspective and on the totals of both the country and product scales. Table 6.02 summarizes these findings (with rankings) for the country scales as well as indicating the number of highest and lowest scores given to East European countries.

Respondents from Canada (1992) held the most positive perceptions of the countries of Eastern Europe with the U.S.A. and Canada (1990) close behind. Australia had the lowest differentiation in mean scores (.42) while Canada (1990) had the highest (.72). When France is included, the Americans had the lowest differentiation in mean score (1.19). When evaluating East European countries, Canadians (1992) were always the

most positive on the Affiliation factor ["Immigration", "Like", "Ties", "Trustworthy", "Investment"] and "Educated" scale.

Table 6.02 - Overall Mean Score By Respondent Country: Country Scales

	1990 <u>Canada</u>		1992 <u>Canada</u>		<u>Australia</u>		<u>U.S.A.</u>	
France	5.07	(1)	5.20	(1)	4.76	(1)	4.89	(1)
Czechoslovakia	4.23	(2)	4.25	(2)	3.67	(3)	4.00	(3)
Poland	3.98	(3)	4.22	(3)	3.77	(2)	4.18	(2)
Hungary	3.91	(4)	4.06	(4)	3.57	(4)	3.98	(4)
Russia	3.51	(5)	3.68	(5)	3.35	(5)	3.70	(5)
Overall Mean (EE only)	3.91		4.05		3.59		3.97	
Rank ^a	3		1		4		2	
Difference between Largest & Smallest Scores	1.56		1.52		1.41		1.19	
Difference between Largest & Smallest EF Scores	.72		.57		.42		.48	

**Number of Highest and Lowest Scores: Country Scales
(East European Countries Only)**

	1990 <u>Canada</u>		1992 <u>Canada</u>		<u>Australia</u>		<u>U.S.A.</u>	
	<u>Hi</u>	<u>Lo</u>	<u>Hi</u>	<u>Lo</u>	<u>Hi</u>	<u>Lo</u>	<u>Hi</u>	<u>Lo</u>
Czechoslovakia	17	--	11	1	5.5	1	2	2
Poland	2	--	8	1	10.5	2	14	1
Hungary	--	4	--	1	2	5.5	--	4
Russia	1	16	1	17	2	11.5	4	13

^a Ranking of scores by respondent country

On the other hand, Australians rated East European countries much lower than the other respondent countries tested and were always the least positive on the Affiliation factor, "Know a Lot About", "Peaceful", "Ideal Country", and "Individualistic" scales. Thus, Canadians (1992) are the most positive and Australians the least positive on the composite

variable Affiliation. Australia's 'negativeness' may be due in part to its geographic distance from the target countries.

Russia received, by far, the greatest number of low scores from the respondent countries. Despite their positive attitude toward the countries of Eastern Europe, Canadians (1992) ranked Russia last on 17 country scales with Canada (1990) a close second with 16 lowest scores. The two Canadian studies showed several strong shifts on the country scales, with Hungary losing 3 low scores over the intervening period while Czechoslovakia lost 6 high scores and Poland gained 6.

Table 6.03 summarizes the means generated (with rankings) for the product scales, as well as indicating the number of highest and lowest scores attributed to East European countries. The mean scores on the product scales show a distinct contrast to those of the country scales but the country ranks have remained approximately the same. On the country scales the overall difference (i.e., subtraction of the smallest from the largest scores) was .37 (1.56-1.19) while comparing only the East European country differences the score was .24 (.72-.48). On the product side the scores were .53 (1.85-1.32) and .46 (.84-.38) respectively. This suggests that it may be easier or more acceptable to differentiate on products rather than people or countries although it is doubtful that respondents knew more about the products.

Table 6.03 - Overall Mean Score By Respondent Country: Product Scales

	1990 <u>Canada</u>	1992 <u>Canada</u>	<u>Australia</u>	<u>U.S.A.</u>
France	4.90 (1)	4.87 (1)	4.83 (1)	4.67 (1)
Czechoslovakia	3.89 (2)	3.73 (2)	3.67 (2)	3.73 (3)
Poland	3.47 (4)	3.56 (3)	3.52 (3)	3.80 (2)
Hungary	3.65 (3)	3.68 (4)	3.48 (4)	3.72 (4)
Russia	3.05 (5)	3.10 (5)	3.18 (5)	3.35 (5)
Overall Mean (EE only)	3.52	3.52	3.46	3.65
Rank ^a	2	2	4	1
Difference between Largest & Smallest Scores	1.85	1.77	1.65	1.32
Difference between Largest & Smallest EE Scores	.84	.63	.49	.38

**Number of Highest or Lowest Scores: Product Scales
(East European Countries Only)**

	1990 <u>Canada</u>		1992 <u>Canada</u>		<u>Australia</u>		<u>U.S.A.</u>	
	<u>Hi</u>	<u>Lo</u>	<u>Hi</u>	<u>Lo</u>	<u>Hi</u>	<u>Lo</u>	<u>Hi^b</u>	<u>Lo</u>
Czechoslovakia	15	--	11	1	15	--	3.5	1
Poland	1	1	--	--	1	1	10.5	--
Hungary	--	1	5	1	--	2	3	--
Russia	--	14	--	14	--	13	--	15

^a Ranking of scores by respondent country

^b Does not add to 16 due to tie^c

The respondent countries' overall mean product scores of East European countries were within 5% of each other, versus 11% on the country scales. The Americans showed the highest score, the two Canadian studies tied, and the Australians again had the lowest score. The Americans had the smallest of the differentiation scores for East European countries (.38) and for all countries overall (1.31), while Canada (1990) had the highest in both (.84 and 1.85) respectively.

Despite the general consensus in the mean scores among the respondent countries, there were some substantial differences when evaluating the high and low scores given. Russian products were rated lowest the greatest majority of the time and were never rated highest. Czechoslovakia received by far the majority of high scores in the Canadian (1990, 1992) and Australian studies. However, the Americans rated Polish products as superior with the largest majority of high scores, with the other three studies showing only slightly positive attitudes toward them. In comparing the two Canadian studies, Czechoslovakia showed a loss of 4 high scores while Hungary showed a gain of 5 high scores, perhaps indicating a switch of preferences between the two subject countries on some variables due to the political turmoil in Czechoslovakia at the time.

The U.S. respondents showed the smallest differentiation in mean scores on both the country and product scales when compared to the other respondent countries. This could be due to the fact that Americans have a more homogenous or 'global' outlook due to an 'us' versus 'them' philosophy (i.e., America competes against the world not just individual countries).

Not only is it important to describe the data and analyze how the respondent countries rated the subject countries, but it is also important to view the subject countries and how they rank. Tables 6.02 and 6.03 describe how each respondent country rated each subject country. Table 6.04 summarizes the same mean scores from both of these Tables from the perspective of the subject countries (i.e., how do the subject countries rate when

respondent country mean scores are pooled). Rankings are based solely on the East European countries as they form the underlying basis of this study.

Table 6.04 - Means By Subject Countries

Country Scales

	France	Russia	Hungary	Czechosl.	Poland
Canada, 1990	5.07 (2)	3.51 (3)	3.91 (3)	4.23 (2)	3.98 (3)
Canada, 1992	5.20 (1)	3.68 (2)	4.06 (1)	4.25 (1)	4.22 (1)
Australia	4.76 (4)	3.35 (4)	3.57 (4)	3.67 (4)	3.77 (4)
U.S.A.	4.89 (3)	3.70 (1)	3.98 (2)	4.00 (3)	4.18 (2)
Overall Mean	4.98	3.56	3.88	4.04	4.04
Rank (EE only)	n/a	4	3	1	1

Product Scales

	France	Russia	Hungary	Czechosl.	Poland
Canada, 1990	4.90 (1)	3.05 (4)	3.65 (3)	3.89 (1)	3.47 (4)
Canada, 1992	4.87 (2)	3.10 (3)	3.68 (2)	3.73 (2)	3.56 (2)
Australia	4.83 (3)	3.18 (2)	3.48 (4)	3.67 (4)	3.52 (3)
U.S.A.	4.67 (4)	3.35 (1)	3.72 (1)	3.73 (2)	3.80 (1)
Overall Mean	4.82	3.17	3.63	3.76	3.59
Rank (EE only)	n/a	4	2	1	3

On the country scales, as was to be expected, France received the highest overall mean score. Nearly every variable high score was given to the French apart from the "Favour Investment In" scale where they were rated highest by the Australians but lost out to Russia (from the U.S.A.), Poland (from Canada 1992) and Czechoslovakia (from Canada 1990). France received the lowest scores on the "Hardworking" (from Canada 1990, 1992 and Australia) and on the "Individualistic" and "Favour Investment In" (from the U.S.A.)

variable scales. Within Eastern Europe, Czechoslovakia and Poland received the highest mean country scale scores while Hungary placed third and Russia fourth.

On the product scales, again France was rated superior to that of its East European counterparts by placing first on all of the variables across all respondent countries. A more homogeneous perspective evolves when evaluating the product scales for the East European countries compared to the country scales. However, it appears that, although Poland is perceived positively from a country and people perspective, it is behind Hungary and Czechoslovakia in terms of developing products of interest. Czechoslovakia was the only country where Canadian views on both the country and product scales did not increase but yet the scores remained the highest overall.

In Table 6.05, a complete doubly multivariate analysis summary is provided. According to Thomas (1983) a doubly multivariate analysis technique is appropriate when several variables are being measured across more than one treatment (or occasion). In determining the level of significance, for the Canada (1992) and U.S.A. studies, overall multivariate significance was set at .008 (.05 / 6 pairwise combinations). For the Canada (1990) and Australia studies the methodology followed by Bennett (1991) was utilized due to the split samples. Significance for the within-subject comparisons was set at .017 (.05 / 3 pairwise combinations) and at .05 for the between-subjects comparisons due to their poor statistical power.

Overall, on the country scale side, of a possible total of 24 within-subject tests, 24 differences were found and, of 8 between-subjects tests, 7 significant differences were found. Respondents hold differing views about the East European countries. To control for Type I error at each individual scale, significance levels were set at .01, thereby limiting overall alpha to .20 for the country scales and .16 for the product scales. As can be further seen in Table 6.05, the percentage of times a variable differentiated between East European countries varied dramatically between subject countries. Of the research undertaken in 1992, Australians differentiated the least (40.5%) on the country scales across the East European countries and Canadians the most (48.3%). It is interesting to note the higher degree of overall differentiation Canadians used in 1992 versus 1990 which may be due, in part, to the inclusion of Yugoslavia in the 1990 study and the political changes that occurred in the region.

On the product scale side, 16 out of 24 within subjects tests were significant but only 3 of 8 between subjects tests were. In total, 19 of 31 tests (63%) were significant. Although the proportion of different profiles was less than the country scales, there is enough evidence to suggest that subject countries rated the products from the different East European countries as different (i.e., held different views). As with the country scales, the percentage of times an individual variable differentiated between East European countries varied considerably between subject countries. The Australians showed much less differentiation (21.3%) than all other countries while Canadians again differentiated most (61.5%), almost three times as high as the Australians.

Table 6.05 - Pairwise Multivariate Significance Testing**Country Differences (max = 20)**

	Canada (1990)		Canada (1992)		Australia		U.S.A.	
	No.	p	No.	p	No.	p	No.	p
Within Subjects								
Russia / Czechoslovakia	16	.000	16	.000	11	.000	15	.000
Russia / Poland	12	.000	14	.000	12	.000	14	.000
Russia / Yugoslavia	12	.000	n/a		7	.000	n/a	
Russia / Hungary	11	.000	11	.000	13	.000	11	.000
Hungary / Czechoslovakia	5	.000	6	.000	3	.003	2	.000
Hungary / Poland	n/a		6	.000	n/a		5	.000
Poland / Czechoslovakia	n/a		5	.000	n/a		9	.000
Poland / Yugoslavia	4	.000	n/a		12	.000	n/a	
Between Subjects								
Czechoslovakia / Yugo	9	.000	n/a		9	.000	n/a	
Czechoslovakia / Poland	6	.000	n/a		3	.000	n/a	
Hungary / Poland	4	.000	n/a		5	.000	n/a	
Hungary / Yugoslavia	-	.060	n/a		6	.000	n/a	

Product Differences (max = 16)

	Canada (1990)		Canada (1992)		Australia		U.S.A.	
	No.	p	No.	p	No.	p	No.	p
Within Subjects								
Russia / Czechoslovakia	15	.000	14	.000	11	.000	14	.000
Russia / Poland	11	.000	12	.000	10	.000	13	.000
Russia / Yugoslavia	11	.000	n/a		6	.000	n/a	
Russia / Hungary	10	.000	14	.000	7	.000	13	.000
Hungary / Czechoslovakia	-	.074	6	.000	-	.052	-	.323
Hungary / Poland	n/a		3	.000	n/a		-	.024
Poland / Czechoslovakia	n/a		10	.000	n/a		-	.039
Poland / Yugoslavia	-	.285	n/a		-	.974	n/a	
Between Subjects								
Czechoslovakia / Poland	9	.012	n/a		-	.738	n/a	
Hungary / Poland	-	.542	n/a		-	.862	n/a	
Czechoslovakia / Yugo	4	.026	n/a		-	.534	n/a	
Hungary / Yugoslavia	-	.931	n/a		-	.985	n/a	

Number of Significant Differences ($p < .01$)

	Canada (1990) max 10	Canada (1992) max 6	Australia max 10	U.S.A. max 6
Country Scales				
Stability	7 (70%)	4 (67%)	6 (60%)	4 (67%)
Democratic	6 (60%)	5 (83%)	6 (60%)	5 (83%)
Rich	6 (60%)	5 (83%)	5 (50%)	3 (50%)
Know a Lot About	6 (60%)	5 (83%)	3 (30%)	5 (83%)
Ideal	6 (60%)	3 (50%)	4 (40%)	3 (50%)
Active	6 (60%)	3 (50%)	3 (30%)	2 (33%)
Like	5 (50%)	4 (67%)	2 (20%)	2 (33%)
Safe	4 (40%)	4 (67%)	8 (80%)	4 (67%)
Industrialized	4 (40%)	4 (67%)	4 (40%)	4 (67%)
Peaceful	4 (40%)	3 (50%)	6 (60%)	4 (67%)
Rights	4 (40%)	3 (50%)	5 (50%)	4 (67%)
Individualistic	4 (40%)	3 (50%)	4 (40%)	3 (50%)
Educated	4 (40%)	3 (50%)	3 (30%)	0 --
Western	4 (40%)	3 (50%)	2 (20%)	3 (50%)
Trustworthy	4 (40%)	2 (33%)	4 (40%)	4 (67%)
Investment	2 (20%)	0 --	4 (40%)	1 (17%)
Aligned	1 (10%)	4 (67%)	3 (30%)	3 (50%)
Immigration	1 (10%)	0 --	3 (30%)	2 (33%)
Hardworking	1 (10%)	0 --	0 --	0 --
Ties	0 --	0 --	6 (60%)	0 --
Mean	3.95 39.5%	2.90 48.3%	4.05 40.5%	2.80 46.6%
Product Scales				
Workmanship	6 (60%)	5 (83%)	3 (30%)	3 (57%)
Imitative	6 (60%)	5 (83%)	2 (20%)	3 (50%)
Satisfaction	5 (50%)	5 (83%)	4 (40%)	3 (50%)
Attractive	5 (50%)	5 (83%)	4 (40%)	3 (50%)
Overall	5 (50%)	5 (83%)	2 (20%)	3 (50%)
Willing to Buy	4 (40%)	5 (83%)	4 (40%)	3 (50%)
Quality	4 (40%)	4 (67%)	4 (40%)	3 (50%)
Proud	4 (40%)	4 (67%)	3 (30%)	0 --
Reliability	4 (40%)	3 (50%)	3 (30%)	3 (50%)
Value	4 (40%)	3 (50%)	1 (10%)	3 (50%)
Easy to Find	3 (30%)	4 (67%)	1 (10%)	3 (50%)
Service	3 (30%)	3 (50%)	2 (20%)	3 (50%)
Brand	3 (30%)	2 (33%)	1 (10%)	3 (50%)
Tech. Advanced	3 (30%)	1 (17%)	0 --	1 (17%)
Expensive	1 (10%)	4 (67%)	0 --	0 --
Know a Lot About	0 --	1 (17%)	0 --	3 (50%)
Mean	3.75 37.5%	3.69 61.5%	2.13 21.3%	2.50 41.7%

6.3 Canada 1992 vs. 1990

The first research objective was to determine how Canadian views may have changed towards both the countries and products of Eastern Europe over an intervening two year period. Two hypotheses were developed and tested using longitudinal analysis.

6.3.1 Hypothesis 1

The images of Canadians toward the countries (products) of Eastern Europe have changed over the two year period.

In comparing the simple mean scores of the two studies on the country scales shown in Table 6.06, Canadians seem to have become more positive toward all the subject countries, including France. However, as can be seen in the mean scores for the Canadian studies (Appendix F) all subject countries were seen to be less "Hardworking" with Poland, France and Czechoslovakia also seen to be less "Active" and less "Peaceful". All the East European countries achieved increases in mean scores with Czechoslovakia achieving the fewest number of increases and Poland the highest. Czechoslovakia's lower number of increases in country scores and larger increase in number of lower mean scores may have been due in part to its internal political problems (independence vote for splitting into the Czech and Slovak Republics) during the time of the 1992 testing.

Table 6.06 - Comparison of Mean Scores: Canada 1992 versus Canada 1990

Country	Country Scales		Product Scales	
	No. of Higher Mean Scores	No. of Lower Mean Scores	No. of Higher Mean Scores	No. of Lower Mean Scores
France	13	7	7	9
Russia	15	5	11	5
Hungary	16	4	9	7
Czechoslovakia ^a	10	9	3	12
Poland	17	3	13	3
Total EE Only	58 (73%)	21 (26%)	37 (58%)	27 (42%)
Total	81 (81%)	28 (28%)	44 (55%)	36 (45%)

^a Does not add to 20 and 16 because of ties in both the country and product scales

On the product scales, increases in mean score were present but not to a large extent. France and Czechoslovakia were the only countries to show a greater number of lower than higher scores between the respondent groups. Canadians were less positive towards the "Value", "Quality" and "Reliability" of French goods among other variables. Czechoslovakian products showed the fewest number of higher scores while Poland achieved the most number of positive changes.

A straight comparison of means, although important from a base perspective in analyzing the data, does not test for statistical significance in the changes that are occurring. As can be observed from the description of means in Table 6.04, Canadians in 1992 rated all the subject countries higher on the country scales and on three of the five product scales

compared to 1990. There is a more positive response to the countries tested but in order to test this hypothesis statistical significance must be found.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized to determine if there was a significant difference between the two Canadian studies. A new variable was created that summed all the scores for each respondent on both the country and product scales (e.g., individual country and product scores for France, Russia etc.) in order to determine whether there were significant differences between the overall scores. Alpha (α) was set at .013 (.05 / 4 subject countries) for these tests as both the product and country scales were to be tested independently (see Table 6.07). It was decided that the subject country would be rated as significant if, in three independent ANOVA tests, the alpha value was found to be less than .01.

On the overall summation of the country scales, Russia and Poland were found to have been rated differently while there were minor significant differences associated with Hungary and none associated with France and Czechoslovakia. Given that for Hungary all three significance levels approach .013, it is concluded that three of the four East European countries were rated differently on the country scales for the two Canadian studies.

Table 6.07 - ANOVA for Scale Summaries: Canada 1992 vs. Canada 1990**Country Scales**

Variable (Country Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .013$
Overall Country Scale Sum	.008	.000	.002	✓✓✓
France Sum	.082	.019	.066	
Russia Sum	.009	.000	.000	✓✓✓
Hungary Sum	.004	.020	.029	✓
Czechoslovakia Sum	.195	.527	.801	
Poland Sum	.000	.000	.003	✓✓✓

Product Scales

Variable (Product Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .013$
Overall Product Scale Sum	.613	.446	.445	
France Sum	.681	.956	.689	
Russia Sum	.682	.945	.626	
Hungary Sum	.404	.401	.444	
Czechoslovakia Sum	.043	.028	.026	
Poland Sum	.130	.098	.174	

On the product scales there were no consistent significant differences found. On two iterations of the ANOVA tests, Czechoslovakian product scales approached significance. It could be argued that with a slightly higher alpha value Czechoslovakian products may be judged to be significantly different.

Further statistical analysis was undertaken in order to test the null hypothesis and determine whether Canadians had changed their images of the countries and products of Eastern Europe on individual scales between 1990 and 1992. Thirteen independent variables were tested (4 composite factors from the PCA and the 9 remaining unique factors). Given the number of individual scales it was important to ensure that a full analysis was conducted to uncover all pertinent information behind the data. A series of ANOVA and T-Tests were administered to the data. Due to the split sample technique used in the Canada 1990 study, a mismatch of sample sizes required that multiple tests be performed to improve confidence levels.

6.3.1.2 Country scales

ANOVA was first carried out using the composite variables identified in the PCA (see Table 6.08). Both of the Canadian studies had equivalent summary factor variables (i.e., Affiliation, Technical Advancement, Security and Political Ideology) allowing for a comparison across all subject countries. For this testing an alpha of .038 was used (.15 / 4 predictor variables). For Russia the Affiliation composite variable was significant, for Hungary the Political Ideology, and for Poland the Security and Political Ideology

variables. For Czechoslovakia, some instances of significance were found but, using the criteria outlined in the methodology, the differences could not be classified as fully significant. Both the Affiliation and Technical Advancement variables for Poland were extremely close to being significant and could arguably be included as a result of this testing procedure. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_{1A} : The images of Canadians toward the countries of Eastern Europe have not changed over the two year period) was rejected on the country scales. Although not statistically startling or as positive as one may like, Canadian images toward the countries of Eastern Europe have changed from 1990 to 1992 and have improved positively.

Given that 58 individual variables had higher mean scores and 21 variables had lower mean scores (from Table 6.06), it appears that the changes in image have been positive. Against the backdrop of, generally, no change in evaluations of France, the composite variables Affiliation and Political Ideology show the most consistent change within Eastern Europe and Technical Advancement the least. There have been dramatic changes in the former two, but the latter takes both time and capital to change. In evaluating the 20 negative changes, the countries in Eastern Europe are seen as less safe (composite variable Security) and three of four target countries were seen as less "Active" and all were viewed as less "Hardworking".

Table 6.08 - ANOVA Summary Constructs: Canada 1992 vs. Canada 1990

Country	Country Scale Summary Variable	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .038$
France	Affiliation	.093	.035	.049	✓
	Technical Advancement	.120	.036	.094	
	Security	.128	.039	.062	
	Political Ideology	.738	.845	.692	
Russia	Affiliation	.000	.00	.000	✓✓✓
	Technical Advancement	.161	.424	.389	
	Security	.000	.000	.001	✓✓✓
	Political Ideology	.000	.000	.000	✓✓✓
Hungary	Affiliation	.091	.170	.201	
	Technical Advancement	.018	.120	.125	✓
	Security	.537	.332	.194	
	Political Ideology	.000	.000	.008	✓✓✓
Czechosl	Affiliation	.413	.814	.938	
	Technical Advancement	.870	.994	.847	
	Security	.553	.333	.426	
	Political Ideology	.004	.013	.160	✓✓
Poland	Affiliation	.010	.011	.049	✓✓
	Technical Advancement	.001	.016	.074	✓✓
	Security	.000	.001	.001	✓✓✓
	Political Ideology	.001	.000	.004	✓✓✓

As shown in Table 6.09, further ANOVA testing on each of the individual country scales showed very few differences at a significance of .008 (.15 / 20 scales). For France the "Immigration" scale was found to be significant, Russia "Stability", "Democracy", "Immigration", "Like" and "Investment" and Poland "Rich" and "Like".

Table 6.09 - ANOVA Summary: Canada 1990, 1992

	<u>Country Scales</u>		<u>Product Scales</u>	
	Number of Significant Differences (max 20)	P	Number of Significant Differences (max 16)	P
France	1	.008	0	.010
Russia	6	.008	0	.010
Hungary	0	.008	0	.010
Czechoslovakia	0	.008	0	.010
Poland	2	.008	0	.010

T-Tests were used as a confirmatory process to the ANOVA's. As can be seen in Table 6.10 on the country scales, Russia had the most number of significant differences between the respondent groups. Of these 8 differences, 2 were on scales where the mean score had decreased ("Stability" and "Rich"). These scales were identified earlier in the composite variable Security. Given the political turmoil surrounding Russia, its feuding with member states such as the Ukraine, and continuing pleas for foreign investment, it is not surprising that the mean scores for these variables decreased and were significant. All other significant differences from all countries were due to increases in mean score.

Table 6.10 - T-Test Summary: Canada 1992 vs. 1990

<u>Country Scales</u>			<u>Product Scales</u>	
	Number of Significant Differences (max 20)	P	Number of Significant Differences (max 16)	P
France	2	.008	0	.010
Russia	7	.008	0	.010
Hungary	1	.008	0	.010
Czechoslovakia	1	.008	1	.010
Poland	5	.008	0	.010

6.3.1.3 Product scales

The only product scale composite variable common to both respondent groups was Market Presence. ANOVA testing showed no significant difference between the studies for this variable or any of the individual scales (Table 6.09). Over time, Canadian consumers appear to have held relatively stable views regarding the products from Eastern Europe. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_{1B} : The images of Canadians toward the products of Eastern Europe have changed over the two year period) was not rejected on the product scales. Canadian images toward the products of Eastern Europe have not changed from 1990 to 1992.

These results contradict those of Lumpkin, Madden, True and Rajaratnam (1992) who found U.S. consumers more willing to purchase from Eastern Bloc countries following their 1982 study. On the "Willing to Buy" scale no significant difference was found between the two Canadian studies. The discrepancies could be due, in part, to the length

of time between the duplication of the studies (i.e., 1982 versus 1992 against 1990 versus 1992).

In running T-Tests across all product scales, only one significant difference was found (see Table 6.10). This was for Czechoslovakia and the "Expensive" variable. Canadians in 1992 evaluated such products as significantly less expensive (lower mean score). Even if the alpha level were raised to .15, the level set before the Bonferroni technique is used, of the 80 scales tested only 8 more would become significant. Therefore, it can be concluded that little has changed in Canadians attitudes toward products from the subject countries tested.

6.3.2 Hypothesis 2

Canadian consumers know more about individual East European countries (products) than they did at the end of the two year period.

In order to test this hypothesis, a series of ANOVA and T-Tests were administered to the country scales of "Know a Lot About" and "Aligned With" and the product scales of "Know a Lot About" and "Easy to Find". It was felt that these scales best measured respondents' knowledge with regard to the East European countries tested. Appendix H summarizes the ANOVA and T-Test results. Alpha was set at .013 (.05 / 4) for this testing procedure.

Table 6.11 - Mean Score Summaries

Country Scales:	Canada 1990	Canada 1992	Difference	T-Test p-value
Know A Lot About:				
France	4.08	4.41	+ .33	.011
Russia	3.26	3.36	+ .10	.437
Hungary	2.42	2.40	- .02	.901
Czechoslovakia	2.70	2.81	+ .11	.445
Poland	2.84	3.18	+ .34	.024
Aligned With:				
France	4.84	4.98	- .14	.311
Russia	3.29	3.40	+ .11	.379
Hungary	3.47	3.52	+ .05	.712
Czechoslovakia	3.79	3.78	- .01	.982
Poland	3.72	3.81	+ .09	.556
Product Scales:				
Know A Lot About:				
France	3.53	3.58	+ .05	.717
Russia	2.40	2.51	+ .11	.341
Hungary	2.32	2.33	+ .01	.928
Czechoslovakia	2.50	2.56	+ .06	.691
Poland	2.39	2.47	+ .08	.595
Easy to Find:				
France	4.09	4.20	+ .11	.401
Russia	2.55	2.54	- .01	.885
Hungary	2.90	2.87	- .03	.879
Czechoslovakia	3.32	3.07	- .25	.107
Poland	2.93	3.00	+ .07	.635

6.3.2.1 Country scales

As can be seen in Table 6.11, the mean score differences on the scales tested are relatively stable. France and Poland showed the largest absolute increases in mean scores on the "Know a Lot About" scale, with Hungary registering the only negative change in mean score. On the "Aligned With" scale, France again received the largest increase, with Russia and Poland receiving the largest increases within Eastern Europe. Czechoslovakia had the only negative difference.

No significant changes were found in the ANOVA testing across all the subject countries on the two scale variables. The T-Tests showed both France and Poland approaching significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_{2A} : Canadians do not know more about the countries of Eastern Europe than they did two years ago) regarding the country scales was not rejected. It appears Canadians do not feel that they know more about individual East European countries.

6.3.2.2 Product scales

On the product scale side, the lack of significant findings is very much similar to that found on the country scales. Russian products received the largest absolute increase in mean score for "Know a Lot About", with Poland and Czechoslovakian close behind. On the "Easy to Find" scale, France and Poland had positive changes in mean score.

Hungary, Russia and Czechoslovakia all had negative changes with the latter having, by far, the largest decrease at .25.

However, it still appears that views of products constitute very stable perceptions in the minds of Canadians as discussed in the earlier hypothesis. ANOVA and T-Tests confirm the lack of significance in these scales. Canadians do not know more about the products of Eastern Europe than they did two years ago and the null hypothesis (H_{2B} : Canadians do not know more about the products of Eastern Europe than they did two years ago) was not rejected.

6.3.2.3 Concluding comments

When evaluating the mean scale score differences in Table 6.11 for both country and product scales (East Europe only), increases outnumber decreases 11 to 5 signifying that respondents have more positive perceptions on the scales tested. It is somewhat surprising that significance was not found in the testing undertaken on the "Knowledge" scale given the enormous amount of information available to respondents (i.e., newspapers, television etc.) regarding the breakup of the U.S.S.R. and the other changes occurring in Eastern Europe. It could be that Canadians' knowledge of Eastern Europe is not enhanced by further information on the political and economic changes occurring. It is possible that, although Canadians do have more information, due to the radical changes taking place they do not feel that they, in fact, know more relatively.

6.4 Canada (1992) vs. Australia vs. U.S.A.

The second set of research objectives was to determine if, in 1992, there were differences in how subjects from Canada, Australia and the U.S.A. rated the countries of Eastern Europe.

6.4.1 Hypothesis 3

There will be differences in Canadian, Australian and American images of East European countries (products).

In order to test this hypothesis, a series of ANOVA tests were conducted. For this hypothesis, the interest is in testing across all the dependent, overall summary scores of all the respondent countries (independent variables) at the same time to observe differences. ANOVA tests only identify whether there is a difference across respondent countries and not where it occurs. Multiple comparison procedures protect against identifying too many differences as significant and help avoid some of the comparison problems (e.g., T-Tests) whereby some may appear significant even when all population means are equal. The ONEWAY ANOVA allows testing across respondent countries for differences as well as distinguishing where the differences occur. ONEWAY analysis was conducted but the lowest alpha level SPSS-X would administer for pairwise significance was .01. The ONEWAY technique was used in determining where the differences occurred and then whether the scale was significant across respondent countries.

The alpha level of significance was set at .013 (.05 / 4 subject countries) for each individual subject country as independence of each country was being evaluated. It was decided that, as in Hypothesis 1, significance must occur in all three iterations of the ONEWAY commands. The data tables for Hypothesis 3 can be found in Appendix I.

For the ONEWAY analysis on the country scales, significant differences between the respondent countries were found on all iterations. It was concluded, therefore, that the respondent countries have significantly different views of the subject countries on the country scales. The ONEWAY command assists in identifying where the between independent variable differences occur. The results of the analysis are found in Table 6.12. For all the East European countries tested there appears to be an evaluation difference associated with Australia. The only significant difference between Canada and the U.S. was in rating France.

On the product scale summary indicators, Russia was found to be the only country where the respondent countries differed. There appears to be a measure of consistency in how products from these countries are viewed. Russian products were rated differently between Canada and the U.S. The Australian differences found on the country scales were no longer present to the same extent. Consistency in product ratings is found in the analysis.

Table 6.12 - ONEWAY ANOVA: Canada (1992) - Australia - U.S.A.

Variable (Country Scale Summaries)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .013$	Pairwise Signif.
France	.000 (AB)	.000 (AB)	.000 (AB)	✓✓✓	A B
Russia	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	✓✓✓	A C
Hungary	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	✓✓✓	A C
Czechoslovakia	.000 (ABC)	.000 (ABC)	.000 (AC)	✓✓✓	A C
Poland	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	✓✓✓	A C

Variable (Product Scale Summaries)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .013$	Pairwise Signif.
France	.047	.027	.061		
Russia	.004 (A)	.001 (A)	.004 (A)	✓✓✓	A
Hungary	.019	.034	.008 (C)	✓	
Czechoslovakia	.818	.900	.799		
Poland	.023	.003 (AB)	.001 (AB)	✓✓	

DUNCAN test at .01 (Values are F Probabilities): Perfect Sample Sizes

Significant Differences:

A: Canada & Australia

B: Canada & U.S.A.

C: Australia & U.S.A.

With the between country differences identified, the next step was to identify for which scales such differences occurred for all paired countries. Again, the ONEWAY ANOVA was utilized to test for differences across all respondent countries simultaneously and to identify differences from within each test (i.e., Canada/U.S.A. Canada/Australia, and Australia/U.S.A.).

The only composite variable common to all countries was Affiliation. The ONEWAY ANOVA for this variable was significant at $p < .000$. ANOVA analysis on the individual country scales yielded a total of 39 significant differences, regarding East European countries, out of a possible 80 as summarized in Table 6.13. The highest number of differences between the subject countries was found for Russia. For all the East European countries the scales of "Immigration", "Rights", "Like", "Individualistic", and "Investment" were tested to be significant. The scales of "Safe", "Trust", and "Ties" were significant for Russia, Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

Table 6.13 - ONEWAY Summary: Canada (1992) - Australia - U.S.A.

	<u>Country Scales</u>		<u>Product Scales</u>	
	Number of Significant Differences (max 20)	P	Number of Significant Differences (max 16)	P
France	11	.008	5	.010
Russia	11	.008	4	.010
Hungary	9	.008	2	.010
Czechoslovakia	10	.008	2	.010
Poland	9	.008	1	.010
Total EE only	39 (49%)		9 (14%)	
Overall Total	50 (50%)		14 (20%)	

Despite the overall percentage of significant differences uncovered being relatively low (49%), there were a large number of country scales that would be considered significant if less rigid criteria had been used (i.e., ONEWAY ANOVA need not be significant 3 consecutive times). Although it would be 'pushing the limit', a case could be made that up to 15 other scales may be significant thereby increasing the overall percentage to 68% (54 out of 80 country scales). For example, for Poland there were 5 scales that could be construed as significant. Given that ONEWAY analysis showed significant differences among all three respondent countries, that the only composite variable common to all countries was significant (i.e., "Affiliation"), that the number of significant individual scales may vary between 49% and 68%, and that the country summary scales were significant across all respondent countries, the null hypothesis (H_{3A} : Image perceptions of East European countries are not different among Canada, Australia and the U.S.) should be rejected. It appears that there are differences in the way the respondent countries view the subject countries.

The only composite variable on the product scales common across all respondent countries was Market Presence. This variable was found to be not significant in all ONEWAY testing. However, Hungary and Poland approached significance. On the individual product scales, the "Willing to Buy" scale was considered significant for all the subject countries including France. The "Attractive Products" scale was significant for Hungary while both Czechoslovakia and Russia showed significance on the "Expensive" scale. France was the only country where the variable "Satisfaction" was rated differently

between Canada, Australia and the U.S.A. Given the lack of significant differences in the ONEWAY analysis (minor exception of Russia only on the summation of the product scales), and the ONEWAY ANOVA between country testing, the null hypothesis (H_{3B} : Image perceptions of East European products are not different among Canada, Australia and the U.S.) was not rejected on the product scales. It appears that there is fairly high consistency in how respondent countries rate the products of Eastern Europe.

In the Wang and Lamb (1980) study identified earlier, on a five point "Willingness to Buy" scale, U.S. respondents rated Poland and the U.S.S.R. at 3.21 (64.2%) and 2.22 (44.4%) respectively. On the seven point "Willingness to Buy" scale used in this study, Americans scored highest for these two countries and rated Poland at 4.17 (59.6%) and Russia at 3.58 (51.1%). Acknowledging the differences in the measurement scale size, over the 12 year intervening period, Americans appear more willing to purchase products from Russia and less willing to do so from Poland.

The next stage of analysis involved summarizing pairwise testing, again using the ONEWAY output and the Duncan range across the three country combinations (i.e., Australia/U.S., Canada/U.S., and Canada/Australia). Table 6.14 summarizes the mean score differences differentiated by highest score and Table 6.15 summarizes the pairwise ONEWAY distinctions. By undertaking this step specific between and within country contrasts emerge and assist in explaining the variations found.

2

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

6.4.1.1 Australia / U.S.A.

On the country scales, U.S. respondents were more positive towards the subject countries and in particular toward the East European countries where their scores were higher on 68 of the 80 scales associated with these countries. A total of 32 significant differences were found. The scales of "Immigration", "Rights", and "Individualistic" were consistently rated differently between Australian and American respondents across all East European countries with the Americans being more positive on these scales.

Table 6.14 - Summary of Pairwise Means: Number of Higher Scores

<u>Country Scales</u>	<u>Aus</u>	<u>U.S.</u>	<u>Aus</u>	<u>Can</u>	<u>Can</u>	<u>U.S.</u>
	<u>Aus</u>	<u>U.S.</u>	<u>Aus</u>	<u>Can</u>	<u>Can</u>	<u>U.S.</u>
France	9	11	4	16	17	3
Russia	5	15	7	13	11	9
Hungary	2	18	1	19	11	9
Czechoslovakia	3	17	1	19	19	1
Poland	2	18	1	19	11	9
Total (EE only)	12	68	10	70	52	28
<u>Product Scales</u>						
France	13	7	9	11	14	6
Russia	3	13	12	4	1	15
Hungary	1	18	1	15	7	9
Czechoslovakia	5	11	4	12	10	6
Poland	0	16	5	9	0	16
Total (EE only)	9	55	22	42	18	46

On the product scales, mean score summaries showed U.S. respondents with a larger number of higher scores related to the subject countries from Eastern Europe (53 versus 11 out of a maximum 64 scales). However, in ONEWAY analysis few differences were found at the alpha level of .010. France, the Western reference country, had the highest number of differences of all the subject countries. The differences occurred on the "Willing to Buy", "Technically Advanced", "Workmanship", "Satisfaction" and "Overall Evaluation" scales. In fact, despite there being only a small number of differences, the "Willing to Buy" scale, which represents future buying intentions, was also found to be significant for Hungary and Poland. No differences were associated with the evaluation of Russian or Czechoslovakian products.

Table 6.15 - ONEWAY Pairwise Significance Summary (Duncan at .01)

<u>Country Scales</u>	<u>Australia / U.S.A.</u>	<u>Australia / Canada</u>	<u>Canada / U.S.A.</u>
France	6	10	7
Russia	10	10	3
Hungary	8	7	1
Poland	8	7	0
Czechoslovakia	6	11	4
<u>Product Scales</u>			
France	5	1	3
Russia	0	0	2
Hungary	2	2	0
Poland	2	0	0
Czechoslovakia	0	2	1

6.4.1.2 Australia / Canada

As identified with the Australia / U.S. comparison, Canadians held the majority of higher mean scores towards the countries of Eastern Europe (70 versus 10). For Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland, Canada held almost all (95%) of the higher scores. Of all the pairwise comparisons, this combination had the highest number of ONEWAY significant differences (35) as well as the largest number of differences associated with France, the Western reference country. For all the East European countries the scales of "Immigration", "Rights", "Like", "Ties", "Trustworthy" and "Investment" were found to be significant. These scales (excluding "Rights") conform to the composite summary variable Affiliation identified in the PCA analysis. Further analysis of variance testing confirmed this.

As was found for the country scales, Canadians held the majority of higher pairwise mean scores. Russian products were the exception to this, where Australians held the majority of high scores. There were few significant differences on the product scales between these respondent countries. Australian and Canadian consumers held relatively similar views about products from France and Eastern Europe. In the case of Russia and Poland there were no differences while Czechoslovakia and Hungary had two each. The difference for France was on the "Willing to Buy" and scale. It is interesting to note that, notwithstanding this lower rating on purchase intentions, the overall evaluation of French products by Australians is similar to that of Canadians.

6.4.1.3 Canada / U.S.A.

Canadians rated the countries of Eastern Europe higher than the Americans 52 times out of 80. The largest difference was in the evaluation of Czechoslovakia where higher mean scores were attributed to Canada 19 times. This pairwise combination had 8 country scale differences when analyzed via the ONEWAY, far below that of the other pairwise comparisons. No scales were found to be different across all subject countries. The highest number of differences occurred in analyzing France. Given both countries' historical association with France in trade and economic development, it is surprising that more scales are significant with a fellow G-7 member than any East European subject country. Canada's ratings were higher than those of the U.S. perhaps due to its longer traditional association and friendship or simply the potential bias of the Ottawa sample which is heavily influenced by French language and culture.

Despite U.S. respondents having fewer higher scores on the country scales, they held the majority on the product side, capturing all the higher scores on Poland and 15 for Russia. Canada continued to show more positive feelings toward Czechoslovakia. However, despite the majority of higher mean scores for the U.S. on the product side, there were no consistent differences present in the scales. France again had the largest number of differences with 3 while Russia had 2, Poland 1 and Czechoslovakia and Hungary none.

6.4.1.4 Concluding comments

The largest number of significant differences on the country scales were associated with combinations involving Australia whereas the Canada/U.S.A. combination had many fewer differences. This suggests that Canadians may be more sensitive and aligned with the foreign policy influences of their neighbour, the U.S., which is highly affected by political and ideological matters. Canadians and Americans generally exhibit a more favourable response to foreigners, have diverse immigrant populations, and have been very proactive in supporting East European countries financially and politically in the transition to a market economy.

However, the country evaluations do not transpose themselves onto product evaluations. This appears to hold true for all three pairwise comparisons. In reviewing the comparisons the scale "Willing to Buy" appears as significant most often. This summary of future purchase intentions may indeed be the most important aspect in evaluating a country's products.

As discussed in Chapter 5 (Time Line), during the Canada (1992) testing period, Czechoslovakia was undergoing political change and respondents were presented with a large amount of information regarding events there. Although the beginning of these changes was occurring when the Australians and Americans responded to the questionnaire they were not subject to the amount of information available to Canadians who were surveyed while the elections and referendums took place. It would be expected

that pairwise comparisons would exhibit a bias in evaluations of Czechoslovakia. It is interesting to note that in the pairwise comparison (see Table 6.15) of Canada/Australia, Czechoslovakia had the largest number of significant differences on both the product and country scales. In the Canada/U.S.A. comparison on the country scales, Czechoslovakia had the most differences and the third fewest on the product scales.

6.4.2 Hypothesis 4

Views of East European products will be related to attitudes toward those countries.

The hypothesis regarding views of East European products and related attitudes toward those countries was tested using stepwise multiple regression analysis. Separate analyses were conducted for each respondent country (Canada 1990, Canada 1992, Australia and the U.S.A.). This was done because the summary variables identified in the principal components analysis were not consistent throughout all the respondent countries. The individual reductions in the number of variables leads to more parsimonious results and greater clarity can be achieved by using this methodology. If it had been decided to run the regression over all the respondent countries, too many predictor variables relative to the number of observations would have undermined the stability of the regression equations thus leading to poor predictive validity.

Using the dependent variable "Good Overall Products", the decision rule chosen was to reject the null hypothesis if the observed F was greater than the F associated with an alpha of .05 for any of the multiple regressions. The variables entered the regression

equation utilizing the "Stepwise" function whereby each variable named is examined at each step for entry or removal. According to Tabachnik and Fidell (1989), "stepwise regression is considered the surest path to the best prediction equation" (p. 147). For all four respondent countries the observed F was greater than the F associated with alpha less than .05. The variables "Aligned With", "Hardworking", "Technical Advancement" and "Affiliation" are present in a number of the regression equations. A summary of the regression equations is found in Table 6.16.

The product scales "Overall Products" and "Willing to Buy" were used as the dependent variables for regression. The latter scale was used due to its importance in the analysis as it relates to future purchase intentions. The same criteria and multiple regression methods were utilized. It was concluded that "Willingness to Buy" from a country and "Overall Products" were related to attitudes toward that country (Table 6.17). The Affiliation composite variable appears to be a consistent predictor as it was regressed into all equations and primarily as the first variable. For Canada 1990, the Affiliation variable was the only variable that entered the regression for both Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

Given the two original regression equations were significant, the null hypothesis (H_4 : Views of East European products are not related to attitudes toward the country) was rejected. Attitudes toward a country's products were related to overall attitudes towards that country.

Table 6.16 - Multiple Regression on "Good Overall Products"

Canada, 1990	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square**
France	Affiliation*, Technically Advanced*, Knowledge of Country, Ideal Country	.2527
Russia	Technically Advanced*, Ideal Country	.0953
Hungary	Affiliation*, Security*, (Western Culture)	.2213
Czechoslovakia	Aligned With Canada	.0595
Poland	Technically Advanced*, Aligned With Canada	.1282

Canada, 1992	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square**
France	Ideal Country, Affiliation*, Hardworking	.2081
Russia	Security*, Hardworking, Tech Advanced*, (Knowledge of Country), Ideal Country	.2969
Hungary	Security*, Affiliation*	.1078
Czechoslovakia	Ideal Country, Hardworking, Security*	.2250
Poland	Ideal Country, Hardworking, Active People	.1510

Australia	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square**
France	Security*, Affiliation*, Ideal Country, Individualistic, Knowledge of Country	.2864
Russia	Hardworking, Ideal Country, Technically Advanced*	.1423
Hungary	Democratic, Rights	.1419
Czechoslovakia	Active People, Hardworking, Security*	.1195
Poland	Peaceful Country, Aligned With Australia, Security*	.1430

U.S.A.	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square**
France	Affiliation*, Technical Advancement / Security*	.1669
Russia	(Individualistic), Hardworking, Ideal Country	.1513
Hungary	Knowledge of Country, Affiliation*	.0640
Czechoslovakia	Affiliation*, (Individualistic), Technical Advancement / Security*, Hardworking, Knowledge of Country, (Peaceful Country), Aligned With U.S.	.1967
Poland	Technical Advancement / Security*, Affiliation*, (Individualistic)	.2007

* Composite Variable

** F significant at $\alpha .05$

() Negative Beta Coefficient

Table 6.17 - Multiple Regression on "Willing to Buy"

Canada, 1990	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square**
France	Affiliation*, Active People	.1761
Russia	Affiliation*, Ideal Country, Technically Advanced*	.1372
Hungary	Affiliation*	.1868
Czechoslovakia	Affiliation*	.1352
Poland	Affiliation*, (Active People), Western Culture	.1370

Canada, 1992	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square**
France	Affiliation*, Western Culture	.2784
Russia	Ideal Country, Affiliation*, Hardworking, Security*	.2334
Hungary	Affiliation*, (Western Culture), Aligned With Canada	.1065
Czechoslovakia	Affiliation*, Ideal Country, Individualistic	.3416
Poland	Affiliation*, Knowledge of Country, Aligned With Canada	.3435

Australia	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square**
France	Affiliation*, Knowledge of Country, (Active People), Ideal Country	.2320
Russia	Affiliation*, Ideal Country, Hardworking, Western Culture, Knowledge of Country	.1509
Hungary	Affiliation*, (Peaceful Country), Individualistic, (Active People)	.1813
Czechoslovakia	Security*, Affiliation*, (Ideal Country)	.1268
Poland	Affiliation*, Individualistic	.1537

U S A	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square**
France	Affiliation*, (Safe Country), Knowledge of Country, (Peaceful Country)	.2936
Russia	Affiliation*, Hardworking, Ideal Country	.1681
Hungary	Affiliation*, Peaceful Country, (Individualistic), Technical Advancement, Security*	.2396
Czechoslovakia	Affiliation*, Ideal Country, Active People, Western Culture, (Peaceful Country)	.2340
Poland	Affiliation*, Ideal Country, Hardworking	.2209

* Composite Variable

** F significant at $\alpha .05$

() Negative Beta Coefficient

Following the analysis above, three more regressions were run using the country scale item "Knowledge of a Country" as well as overall summary variables created by summing both the country and product scales. The "Knowledge" variable found its way into a number of the previous regression equations and, since it summarizes awareness of the subject countries, a regression of independent product variables was deemed appropriate. The country and product summary variables provided insight into the overall formulation of regression equations and allowed for side-by-side comparisons of the Adjusted R-Square variable. The same criteria were utilized in the analysis. The regression equations formed can be found in Appendix J.

On the "Knowledge of" country scale, all the regression equations were found to be significant across all the subject countries. The summary variable Market Presence, which was a common composite for all respondent countries, was found in all the regression equations, and in some cases was the lone independent variable. It appears that "Brand Knowledge", "Knowledge of Products" and "Ease of Finding" products can predict knowledge of the country itself. However, these regressions tended to be weak in their predictive ability (i.e., the overall Adjusted R-Square was relatively small) and the regression equations were found to be somewhat unstable.

Regressions on both an overall summary of the country and product scales were also found to be significant. When using the Product Summary scale as the dependent variable, the composite variable Affiliation and the individual scale "Ideal Country" found

their way into a large number of the predictive regression equations. With the Country Summary scale, the Engineering composite variable was found to be a strong independent variable predictor.

As is shown in Table 6.18, the average Adjusted R-Square within each respondent country was larger when the Product Summary variable was the dependent variable. In fact, all of the target countries had a higher Adjusted R-Square on the Product Summary with the exceptions of Czechoslovakia and Poland in Canada 1990 and France and Czechoslovakia in Canada 1992. On the Product Summary scale side, the variable "Ideal Country" and composite variables Security and Affiliation were identified as the best predictors in the regression equations.

Table 6.18 - Average Adjusted R-Squares: Summary Variables

Dependent Variable	Canada 1990		Canada 1992		Australia		U.S.A.	
	<u>Ctry</u>	<u>Prdt</u>	<u>Ctry</u>	<u>Prdt</u>	<u>Ctry</u>	<u>Prdt</u>	<u>Ctry</u>	<u>Prdt</u>
France	.3023	.3450	.3732	.3610	.3282	.3486	.3021	.3166
Russia	.1155	.1920	.2326	.3972	.1870	.2702	.1033	.2076
Hungary	.1201	.1698	.1360	.1623	.0898	.1918	.1677	.2387
Czechoslo	.1069	.0662	.3138	.2586	.1341	.1733	.1885	.2418
Poland	.1886	.1269	.3052	.3188	.2068	.2098	.2409	.3188
EE Avg.	.1328	.1387	.2469	.2842	.1544	.2113	.1751	.2517

6.4.2.1 Concluding comments

It appears that a respondent's "Willingness to Buy" products from a country is related to attitudes toward that country. As well, it appears that attitudes toward a country can be related to attitudes toward the overall quality of that country's products. Furthermore, "Knowledge" of a country is related to attitudes towards a country's products. By conducting regression on the Country and Product Summary scales it has been shown that there is a greater strength in country variables being predictive of product ratings than in the ability to predict country attitudes from product ratings.

6.4.3 Hypothesis 5

People who view East European countries as aligned with their own country will rate East European countries higher than those who do not.

A series of correlations were run on the four data sets in order to evaluate this hypothesis. The variable "Aligned With" was utilized as the dependent variable to test the relationship. Initially the correlations were tested using the variables in the composite factor Affiliation (i.e., "Immigration", "Like", "Ties", "Trust" and "Invest"). These variables were chosen as they appeared to best represent a respondent's 'connection' with the target countries. However, it was decided that correlations with country sum scores would also be a critical factor to observe in testing the hypothesis as it represents the 'totality' of attitudes toward the subject countries. Following these tests, correlations with each individual country scale variable were conducted.

As can be seen in Table 6.19, country scale sum score correlations with "Aligned With" were significant across all subject and respondent combinations. Correlations of Affiliation with "Aligned With" were found to be significant for 12 of 16 (75%) East European combinations and 16 of 20 (80%) all-country combinations. As was to be expected given the analysis presented earlier, Australian scores were lower than other respondent countries in the country sum correlations. Australia also had 3 non-significant results in correlations with Affiliation including a negative score for Hungary.

In order to gain a better understanding of how respondent's overall mean scores changed relative to the measure of alignment, the data were recoded into three categories. Scores of 1, 2 or 3 were categorized as "Not Aligned With", 4 as "Unsure of Alignment" and 5, 6 or 7 as "Aligned With", and correlated against the overall country scale mean score as well as the mean score of the Affiliation summary factor. It was expected that, especially for the Affiliation factor, as respondents rated "Alignment" higher, the mean score would increase. As can be seen in Appendix K the significant differences discussed earlier for this hypothesis showed strong tendencies toward this expectation. For the country sums, the means all increased (20 out of 20 times) as "Alignment" increased. For Affiliation, the means increased in 11 of 16 cases for East European countries and 16 out of 20 when France was included.

Table 6.19 - Correlations with "Aligned With"

with Affiliation

Country	Canada, 1990	Canada, 1992	Australia	U.S.A.
France	.3094 **	.4197 **	.3062 **	.3534 **
Russia	.1665 **	.2275 **	.1686 **	.1179
Hungary	.2787 **	.2222 **	(.1058)	.2231 **
Czechoslovakia	.3232 **	.1721 **	.0209	.1565 **
Poland	.2761 **	.1600 **	.0929	.1954 **

with Country Scale Sum

Country	Canada, 1990	Canada, 1992	Australia	U.S.A.
France	.3923 **	.4356 **	.2289 **	.3990 **
Russia	.1818 **	.2798 **	.2201 **	.1560 *
Hungary	.2903 **	.3059 **	.1326	.3489 **
Czechoslovakia	.4043 **	.2944 **	.1430	.2571 **
Poland	.3972 **	.3367 **	.1528	.3043 **

* significant at α less than .05 ** significant at α less than .01

Given the number of significant correlations between "Aligned With" and both the country scale summary scores and Affiliation composite variable, the null hypothesis (H_0 : People who view East European countries as aligned with their own country will not rate them higher than those who do not) should be rejected. It appears that those who view their own country as aligned with East European countries, and in fact as well as when all countries, including France, are considered, rate them higher than those that do not.

In correlating the individual country scales with "Aligned With", across all target countries, U.S. respondents had a negative correlation score between "Aligned With" and "Individualistic" while the Australians had the same on "Western Culture". Australia also had no significant correlations with Hungary and only one with Poland and three with Czechoslovakia. The only respondent country where all the Affiliation variables were found to be correlated with alignment was for France. The variables "Educated", "Ideal", "Safe", and "Peaceful" were also significant at the .01 level. In fact, as can be seen in Table 6.20, France had by far the highest number of variables significant at the .01 level.

Table 6.20 - Significant Correlations: Country Scales and "Aligned With"

	Canada 1990	Canada 1992	Australia	U.S.A.	Total
France	15	12	9	13	49
Russia	4	6	7	7	24
Hungary	4	10	0	15	29
Czechoslovakia	13	8	3	9	33
Poland	8	8	1	6	23
Total No. Signif. (EE Only)	29	28	11	37	109

Significance at less than .01 "Aligned With" scale not included in correlations

6.5 Demographics

As was detailed earlier, there has been little consistency in findings across the many studies which have examined correlates of the demographics of respondents to product-country images. The following testing was undertaken across all respondent and subject

countries in order to test the impact of demographics on ratings of foreign product quality perceptions.

6.5.1 Hypothesis 6

There will be a difference in the ratings of the countries (products) of East European across respondents of different gender, age, income or education levels.

In order to test the relationship of demographics to the perception of products and countries, MANOVA testing was conducted within each respondent country. MANOVA is appropriate in this case as testing is done within the individual studies on variables not affected by the split samples. This results in increased power over ANOVA for these particular tests in evaluating questions regarding demographics and the PCI effect.

The demographic characteristics tested included gender, age, education and income level. In some of the more recent PCI studies, "Good Overall Products" has been the primarily variable utilized in demographics testing [e.g., Bennett 1991; Bourk 1992]. In this study it was decided that the "Good Overall Products" scale would be tested but as well country and product scale summary variables would also be tested as the dependent variables across each subject country. Thus, conclusions could be compared against previous studies as well as expand the PCI demographic literature. At another level, a comparison could be drawn between results on an actual single summary scale and that of a cumulative scale (i.e., the scale of "Good Overall Products" versus a summary of all

product scales. The Wilk's Lambda results are summarized across all demographic categories by respondent country in Table 6.21.

Table 6.21 - Wilk's Lambda Summary of Demographic Differences (Country and Product Scales)

	Canada 1990		Canada 1992	Australia		U.S.A.
	<u>VI</u>	<u>VII</u>		<u>VI</u>	<u>VII</u>	
<u>Gender</u>						
Good Overall Prod.	.370	(.419)	.044*	.815	(.313)	.255
Product Summary	.064	(.736)	.210	.165	(.909)	.215
Country Summary	.393	(.084)	.359	.110	(.485)	.432
<u>Age</u>						
Good Overall Prod.	.549	(.487)	.000*	.731	(.819)	.150
Product Summary	.837	(.557)	.036*	.434	(.729)	.016*
Country Summary	.418	(.054)	.048*	.449	(.309)	.166
<u>Income</u>						
Good Overall Prod.	.353	(.557)	.555	.574	(.651)	.729
Product Summary	.058	(.360)	.292	.657	(.616)	.642
Country Summary	.214	(.004)*	.934	.056	(.840)	.701
<u>Education</u>						
Good Overall Prod.	.195	(.031)*	.071*	.665	(.014)*	.074*
Product Summary	.063	(.007)*	.065*	.844	(.011)*	.000*
Country Summary	.003*	(.005)*	.094*	.173	(.017)*	.006*

* Significant

VI - France, Russia, Hungary, Czechoslovakia

VII - France, Russia, Poland, Yugoslavia

Independent hypotheses were tested for each demographic characteristic. Previous literature has provided conflicting results regarding the specific testing differences related to demographics. A more lenient Alpha rate of .10 was chosen so as to increase the opportunity of identifying potential differences. As both the Canada 1990 and Australian

sampling utilized two versions of the questionnaire and thus two sets of testing procedures, the Bonferroni inequality was utilized. Alpha was therefore set at .05 for these studies and remained at .10 for Canada 1992 and the U.S.A. studies. The hypothesis would be rejected if the F approximation of Wilk's Lambda was significant at p less than .05 or .10 depending on the study.

6.5.1.1 Gender

For each study, respondents were split into male and female groups in order to detect whether ratings differed on the basis of gender. The only study to yield a significant p value was Canada (1992) on the dependent variable "Overall Product". None of the other studies approached significance on the basis of gender.

Further univariate analysis of Canada (1992) on "Good Overall Products" revealed that Poland was the only respondent country significant with an alpha level of less than .020 (alpha .10 / 5 dependent variables) with a p value of .003. With gender as the dependent variable, "Aggressive" in the country scales, and "Reliability", "Service" and "Good Overall Products" in the product scales were rated differently by males and females.

6.5.1.2 Age

Respondents were split into age groups of under 29, 30-39, 40-54 and over 54 in order to test whether age was related to ratings of the target countries. The Canada (1992)

study was found to be significant based on age category on each of the dependent variables tested. The U.S.A. study showed age significance on the summary Product scale variable only. In the Australia study, no differences were found, while in the Canada (1990) study the Country scale summary variable came extremely close to significance at .054.

Further univariate analysis was conducted by testing all age pairwise combinations (i.e., under 29 vs. 30-39, under 29 vs. 40-54 etc.). A total of 6 pairwise combinations were possible with alpha set at $p < .017$ ($.10/6$) and the results are summarized in Table 6.22.

Table 6.22 - Significant Age Categories: Wilk's Lambda

	Canada Σ Prod. (1992)	Canada Σ Coun. (1992)	Canada Overall (1992)	U.S.A. Σ Prod.
under 29 vs. 30-39	.005*	.024	.012*	.942
under 29 vs. 40-54	.017*	.854	.000*	.246
under 29 vs. over 54	.152	.019**	.000*	.006*
30-39 vs. 40-54	.244	.293	.126	.104
30-39 vs. over 54	.922	.480	.087	.003*
40-54 vs. over 54	.512	.072	.033	.027

* Significant at $p < .017$

** Considered significant

Further Analysis:

under 29 vs. 30-54	.003	n/a	n/a	n/a
under 29 vs. over 54	n/a	n/a	.005	n/a
under 39 vs. over 54	n/a	n/a	n/a	.001

For Canada (1992) on the variable "Good Overall Products" it was found that subjects under 29 rated the target countries differently (more positively) than the other two categories. Further testing was conducted that revealed that subjects under 29 rated the countries differently than those over 54 ($p=.005$). Univariate testing on the subject countries at $p<.02$ (.10/5) showed that Russia was the only significant subject country with a p of .016.

On the Canada (1992) Product Summary scale, two significant differences in age analysis were found. Further testing showed that subjects under 29 had different Product Summary scores than those from 30-54. Univariate analysis found Russia as significant at $p=.000$. Finally, on the Country Summary a difference was found between subjects under 29 and those over 54.

For the U.S.A. study on the Product Summary scale, subjects under 29 and those between 30 and 39 were found to be different than those over 54. Further analysis concluded that subjects under 39 had significantly different Product Summary scores than those over 54 with univariate analysis showing Russia to be significant at $p=.016$.

6.5.1.3 Income

Respondents were split into income categories of under \$35000, \$35000 to \$65000 and over \$65000. On the Country Summary scale category, Canada (1990) Version II was found to be significant. On the same scale, Australia Version I approached significance.

Multivariate pairwise analysis on Canada (1990) using an alpha of .333 (.10/3) revealed differences between respondents with income under \$35000 and \$35000 to \$65000 ($p=.025$) and between the under \$35000 and over \$65000 groups ($p=.001$). Further analysis confirmed that respondents with incomes under \$65000 responded differently than those with incomes over \$65000, and, of the subject countries tested, Poland was significant with a p of .000.

6.5.1.4 Education

Respondents were split into three education groups, namely High School or Less, Some College and College or More. As can be seen in Table 6.21, this demographic characteristic received, by far, the highest number of significant differences across each dependent variable. Canada (1992), Canada (1990) Version II, Australia Version II, and the U.S.A. were found to be significant over each dependent variable.

Table 6.23 summarizes the multivariate pairwise testing conducted. Alpha was set at .033 (.10/3) for each test. For Canada (1990) Version II, France was significant at .000 and .001 on the Country Summary scale and "Good Overall Products" variables respectively. In further testing done on education, whenever a significant difference was found it was between those with a High School education or less versus those with a College education or more.

Table 6.23 - Education Categories Wilk's Lambda

Canada, 1990			Σ Prd. ¹ "	Σ Cty. ¹ "	Overall ¹ "	Σ Cty. ¹ "
H.S. or Less	vs.	Some College	.230	.112	.200	.219
Some College	vs.	College +	.081	.083	.252	.063
H.S. or Less.	vs.	College +	.081	.002*	.005*	.000*
Australia			Σ Prd. ¹ "	Σ Cty. ¹ "	Overall ¹ "	
H.S. or Less	vs.	Some College	.065	.038	.037	
Some College	vs.	College +	.158	.054	.465	
H.S. or Less.	vs.	College +	.014*	.092	.010*	
Canada, 1992			Σ Prd.	Σ Cty.	Overall	
H.S. or Less	vs.	Some College	.086	.318	.052	
Some College	vs.	College +	.178	.304	.153	
H.S. or Less.	vs.	College +	.135	.032*	.198	
U.S.A.			Σ Prd.	Σ Cty.	Overall	
H.S. or Less	vs.	Some College	.086	.142	.419	
Some College	vs.	College +	.178	.036	.103	
H.S. or Less.	vs.	College +	.135	.001*	.027*	
* Significant at $p < .333$ (.10 / 3)			^ Version Number			

For Australia on the Product Summary scale and "Good Overall Products" variables, France was again significant with p values of .002 and .004 respectively. For Canada (1992) the only significant difference was on the Country Summary scale. Here, Russia, Hungary and Czechoslovakia had significant p values of .001, .011 and .007 respectively. Finally, for the U.S. on the "Good Overall Products" scale no specific subject country was

found to be significant but on the Country Summary scale France and Hungary were both significant at .000.

6.5.2 Summary

Overall, analysis of Hypothesis 6 shows that Gender, Age, and Income are not significantly related to the ratings of foreign countries or products from Eastern Europe or France. The results discussed are as scattered as the findings in the literature. As can be seen in Table 6.24, of all the demographic variables, Education is clearly the best predictor of evaluations of ratings for both countries and products, whether at the summary or individual scale levels.

Table 6.24 - Summary of Demographic Indicators

<u>Category</u>	<u>Country</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Gender	Canada, 1992	Good Overall Products	Male vs. Female
Age	Canada, 1992	Good Overall Products	under 29 vs. over 54
		Product Scale Summary	under 29 vs. 30-54
		Country Scale Summary	could not be determined
	U.S.A.	Product Scale Summary	under 39 vs. over 54
Income	Canada, 1990 ^{vi}	Country Scale Summary	under \$65,000 vs. over \$65,000
Education	Canada, 1990 ^{vi}	Country Scale Summary	H.S. or less vs. College or more
	Canada, 1990 ^{vii}	All three Scales	H.S. or less vs. College or more
	Australia ^{vii}	All three Scales	H.S. or less vs. College or more
	Canada, 1992	All three Scales	H.S. or less vs. College or more
	U.S.A.	All three Scales	H.S. or less vs. College or more

7. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This chapter discusses the main findings of the study as documented in the previous chapter through factor analysis, descriptive statistics and hypothesis testing.

7.1 Descriptive Statistics

Canadians (1990 and 1992), Australians and Americans utilized similar underlying structures when analyzing the country scales of the subject countries. Canadians did not change their structure over the two year period. However, on the product scale side the only consistent composite variable created for all studies was that of Market Presence. Americans and Canadians developed similar Engineering / Design composite factors but there were discrepancies of individual scales within each of the variables.

All the subject countries treated France as a distinctly different country on both the nation and product scales. Pairwise T-Tests revealed that there were few variables where France was rated the same as the East European countries. On the country scales, where ratings were not significantly different, the scales included "Immigration", "Ties", "Trustworthy", "Investment" and "Hardworking". On the product side there was almost complete agreement that France was distinct on all scales. The only discrepancy occurred with Australia and the U.S. considering the "Value" of French products similar to those from East European countries. However, given the higher degree of differentiation, it appears respondents are more willing to discriminate on products rather than countries or people.

France, as was expected, was rated highest on both the country and product scales. Russia was on the other extreme as it was rated lowest on both the country and product scales. Poland was perceived positively from a country and people perspective, but it was behind Hungary and Czechoslovakia in terms of the product scales. Hungary, which has followed a policy of westernization longer than any of the other subject countries, placed behind Poland and Czechoslovakia on the country scales.

Australia gave the lowest overall mean scores on both the country and product scales, while Canada (1992) had the highest rating on the country scales and the U.S.A. on the product scales. Doubly multivariate pairwise analysis revealed that each respondent country held different views from the other regarding both the countries and products of the different East European countries.

7.2 Canada 1992 versus 1990

Canadians in 1992 rated East European countries higher on 60 scales and lower on 20 than those in 1990, while for products the ratings were 37 and 27 respectively. The countries of Eastern Europe were rated significantly different over the two year period while products were not. In summary:

H_{1A} : The images of Canadians toward the countries of Eastern Europe have not changed over the two year period. **REJECT**

H_{1B} : The images of Canadians toward the products of Eastern Europe have not changed over the two year period. **DO NOT REJECT**

Canadians in 1992 appeared not to feel that they knew more about the countries or products of Eastern Europe than they did two years earlier. It was felt that Canadians may have more information, but, due to the radical and continual changes taking place, did not feel, in general, that they knew more about the countries tested. If other countries in the region (e.g., Romania, Bulgaria and Albania etc.) had been tested the results may have been different as it has only been recently that news coverage has delved more deeply into countries behind the 'iron curtain'. In summary:

H_{2A} : Canadians do not know more about the countries of Eastern Europe than they did two years ago. **DO NOT REJECT**

H_{2B} : Canadians do not know more about the products of Eastern Europe than they did two years ago. **DO NOT REJECT**

7.3 Canada (1992) versus Australia versus U.S.A.

On the country scale, there were differences in how Canada (1992), Australia and the U.S.A rate the countries of Eastern Europe. Australians were much less positive toward the subject countries tested. In pairwise respondent country testing, the U.S.A and Canada rated subject countries similarly, whereas differences were found in testing combinations of Australia and either the U.S.A. or Canada. On the product scales, the three countries rated East European countries similarly, and there were no significant pairwise differences. In summary:

H_{3A}: There will be no difference in Canadian, Australian and American images of East European countries. **REJECT**

H_{3B}: There will be no difference in Canadian, Australian and American images of East European products. **DO NOT REJECT**

7.4 Views of Products as Related to Country Attitudes

Through regression analysis it was found that on the "Willingness to Buy" and "Good Overall Products" scales, products from a country are related to attitudes toward that country as has been found in previous research (Bennett 1991; Papadopoulos and Heslop 1993). Regression testing on country and product summary scales shows that there is a better prediction of product ratings with country scales than prediction of country ratings with product ratings thereby supporting the idea that the views of products are related to attitudes toward a country. This was consistent across all respondent countries. In summary:

H₄: Views of East European products will not be related to attitudes toward those countries. **REJECT**

7.5 Alignment and Country Ratings

It was believed that respondents who viewed East European countries as "Aligned With" their own country would rate East European countries higher than those who do not. Using "Aligned With" as the dependent variable, a series of correlations were administered to the data across all respondent countries. Correlations on both the

summary of the country scales and with the composite variable "Affiliation" were significant. In summary:

H₄: People who view East European countries as aligned with their own country will not rate East European countries higher than those who do. **REJECT**

7.6 PCI and Demographics

The PCI literature has been inconsistent in determining whether demographic characteristics play a role in perceptions of products and countries. Gender, age, income and education level were tested across all respondent countries. Gender, age and income levels do not appear to be good discriminators for PCI analysis whereas education does.

In summary:

H_{5 gender} : There will be no difference in the ratings of the countries (products) of Eastern Europe between women and men. **DO NOT REJECT**

H_{6 age} : There will be no difference in the ratings of the countries (products) of Eastern Europe between young and old people. **DO NOT REJECT**

H_{7 income} : There will be no difference in the ratings of the countries (products) of Eastern Europe between people of low and high income levels. **DO NOT REJECT**

H_{8 education} : There will be no difference in the ratings of the countries (products) of Eastern Europe between people of low and high education levels. **REJECT**

8. RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

The usefulness of the results of the research is limited by a number of factors. Respondents may have overemphasized the PCI effect since other cues were not presented as part of the decision process (e.g., price, brand) as has been documented by Bilkey and Nes (1982). However, the goal of the original research was not to test purchase behaviour but attitudes and perceptions. Papadopoulos and Heslop (1993) state that in comparing images of various countries, single-cue designs are more likely to be used. Furthermore, in this case, since studies on Eastern Europe are relatively new to the body of this literature, basic information must be gathered before testing a full multiple cue situation. There would have to be an increase in product availability in order for such an investigation to occur.

Changes in the geographical and political make-up of Eastern Europe during the research period and the fact that Albania, Romania and Bulgaria (among others) were not included in the study limit the generalizability of the research. The excluded countries tend to be less familiar to respondents and lag behind the countries studied in their reform measures. Through the four questionnaire sets, attempts were made to incorporate some of the transformations that occurred during the time intervals (removal of Yugoslavia due to unrest, substitution of Russia following the breakup of the U.S.S.R., comparison of East and West Germany).

The cities where the questionnaires were distributed are metropolitan in nature and the results may not be generalizeable to the populations of the countries as a whole. However, urban consumers are more likely to know more about foreign products and countries and to act as opinion leaders. As the changes occurring in Eastern Europe became widely known, these views should more closely approximate the populations of the countries tested.

The time frame between the studies for the cross-sectional analysis also limits the findings. A six to seven month gap separates the time that the 1992 studies were carried out in. Given the nature of some of the events, the differences found may be due to the changes occurring within the region. However, the timeline discussion shows that, apart from the movement of Czechoslovakia toward independence, the events reported on Eastern Europe were more or less the same throughout the testing period.

9. IMPLICATIONS

The results of this study will be of interest to a number of groups both inside and outside Eastern Europe as well as marketers. Within Eastern Europe both industry and government need to know how their respective countries and products are viewed in the West. In the West, investors, including governments, require information regarding the appropriateness of investment locations whether they be on the basis of economic assistance or production capabilities. As well, domestic industries must be aware of potential sources of competition. Although interest on the academic side may encompass some of the above factors, it is more geared towards the underlying relationship between countries and products and the basis for changes in perceptions that have occurred.

9.1 Implications Inside Eastern Europe

Western retail operations from various industry sectors and countries have invaded Eastern Europe. Companies such as Baskin-Robbins (U.S.A.), Benetton (Italy), Siemens (Germany), Sony (Japan) and IKEA (Sweden) are poised to attract domestic consumer spending without adding export value. These ventures create low skilled employment and some economic growth. In contrast, investments such as those made by General Electric or Suzuki in Hungary meet the export needs of these countries. These investments create high skilled employment, spin-off employment in other economic sectors as well as providing convertible currency. In Suzuki's situation, fully one half of production is

intended for export to Western Europe while 70% of General Electric's Hungarian made lightbulbs are for export.

Research shows that East European product images are lower than those of Western product images. This research showed that French products were rated superior on all product scale categories across all respondent countries. This poorer image may be related to the fact that Canadian, Australian and American consumer attitudes toward an East European country may generalize to attitudes toward that country's products (i.e., images of countries are transposed to products) inferring a negative halo. Or, on the other hand, current levels of exposure to products from Eastern Europe are too low thus not allowing for independent assessment and evaluation.

It is likely that respondents from all subject countries in this study did not have much experience with products from Eastern Europe and thus country image served as a halo from which product attributes were inferred [Han 1989]. However, from the longitudinal study of Canadian respondents, there appears to be a 'lagged' effect of country images being translated to product images. Or, perhaps, the halo/summary construct model, does not hold for developing countries.

Countertrade has been a mainstay of foreign business in Eastern Europe due to the lack of convertible currency available. According to Bakos (1993), as a solution to payment problems within Hungary, companies such as Suzuki are considering exporting Hungarian

products such as wine and poultry to Japan and other countries. Such situations point out the even larger importance of PCI. Firms must concentrate not only on the image of their manufactured product but also on that of items handled in countertrade

As was reported by the United Nations (1992) from data generated by the East-West Project at Carleton University, current FDI in Eastern Europe is heavily financed by West European firms. For the year 1990, companies from Canada, Australia and the United States accounted for only 15% of listed enterprises in Eastern Europe. In contrast, Germany accounted for 22% and Japan only 1%. Michalak (1993) documents the importance for East European countries in seeking FDI as an export promotion measure. In times of economic restraint and little hard capital, East European governments interested in promoting domestic industries, production or possible joint venture and licensing opportunities need to know how their countries and products are perceived. This research can assist these countries in building upon their perceived strengths and down-playing or actively altering perceived weaknesses. Such information aids in long term industrial and strategic planning.

Many Western nations have agreed to assist in the transition away from communism. As a result, Western firms are carefully studying the effects of investing in these countries and, as such, must be prepared to be involved for the long term and to nurture business partnerships. The U.S. Department of Commerce (1993) reported that, in 1992, imports from Eastern Europe (excluding the former Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia) totalled

\$894.5 million. As these countries become more sophisticated in both their technological capabilities and general business practices they will become even more successful in competing on a global scale. Each East European country must individually evaluate its strengths and weaknesses based on scale measurements. Eastern Europe will undoubtedly be a growing economic force in the coming years.

Bennett (1991) provides several examples of activities East European countries may undertake in changing their present images (e.g., point out strengths of their products, stress positive country characteristics, distance themselves from Russia, promote tourism etc.). The importance of these recommendations is enhanced by the findings of this transnational research. Adding to Bennett's recommendations, East European countries may wish to stress their continuing economic reforms and the successful ventures already being undertaken with other developed nations (e.g., "West European multinationals believe in being here, what about your firm?"). In general, Canadian attitudes toward Eastern Europe have improved, but there has been little shift in product images. East European countries may want to demonstrate the increasing level of technological advancement within the region and, in particular, the fact that they are becoming "Just Like Us" in the process, thus aiding in positive attitude transitions from countries to products. It appears that, unlike Australians, Canadians and Americans may be more responsive to such messages. Australians may be adopting a 'wait and see' approach to Eastern European countries and products.

9.2 Implications Outside Eastern Europe

Erzan, Holmes and Safadi (1992) indicate that actual exports from Eastern Europe are approximately \$9 billion and may vary between \$2.8 and \$3.7 billion in the medium run and between \$18.9 and \$28 billion in the long run. They also indicate that total exports to the West increased by 11.6% in 1990, that overall East European exports make up 6.9% of world trade and that export trade to North America and Japan will increase dramatically from its current base. Domestic industries cannot ignore the oncoming threat of products from Eastern Europe. Firms in countries outside Eastern Europe need to analyze whether this "new" competition will be detrimental to their economic survival. For example, if Russian optical components are viewed as having an advantage over domestically made products in Western countries, local industries need to be prepared to react to or, in the case of importers, capitalize on, this strength.

In the case of Canada, longitudinal research has shown that images of East European countries have improved positively, but images of products have remained relatively constant. Given the lack of significant differences in comparisons between the U.S. and Canada in the analysis, this situation may also be true of North America as a whole (excluding Mexico). Although the constancy of product ratings may be a blessing for industry in the short run, if the halo hypothesis holds, the more positive attitudes become towards the countries of Eastern Europe, the more positive attitudes toward the products will become. Industries, if faced with competition from East European imports, should

stress the negative aspects of East European products (i.e., poor value, workmanship, overall quality etc.) while extorting their own relative strengths.

Investors outside Eastern Europe who are searching for either new production facilities (locations) or sources of material inputs (including manufacturers inside these countries) need to know whether the goods they wish to sell will be at a competitive advantage or disadvantage due to the 'made-in' effect. The use of PCI is a powerful tool within the marketing mix and is essential in the global economic make-up of tomorrow. A marketer's failure to recognize the potential advantages of where a product is manufactured, or its negative side effects, would amount to poor strategic planning. Globalization is a double edged sword and business must make knowledgeable, informed decisions based on all information available, including PCI. Ultimately, managers must be aware of country effects and plan accordingly. The consequences include opportunities lost or even marketing disaster for not addressing the area effectively. Failure to do so would be equivalent to discounting any of the other identified intrinsic or extrinsic cues consumers use in their purchasing decision process.

This research shows there are significant differences in attitudes toward the countries of Eastern Europe. A decision must be made regarding where the majority of customers will be located and choose the most appropriate investment location. Russia is consistently rated last on both country and product dimensions whereas Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland appear to be interchangeable in terms of image. In the Canadian comparisons

Czechoslovakia did not fare as well as its rival countries possibly due to its internal political problems. With its split into the Czech and Slovak Republics, careful analysis must be undertaken in order to distinguish the effect on PCI ratings. Investors evaluating and considering Russia should be extremely careful to weigh the costs and benefits of such a production location.

9.3 Implications for Marketing Researchers

This research adds knowledge to the very small number of PCI studies that provide either cross-country or longitudinal analysis and adds to the even fewer number of PCI studies that have been conducted on Eastern Europe. From the research, academics will glean further insight into the association of country and product attitudes.

This research may provide further evidence for the halo effect suggested by Han (1989). However, it also suggests that, by itself, it may be too simplistic given that, in the Canadian analysis, no measurable change in product attitudes evolved. The transnational analysis showed that, for all respondent nations, there was a stronger connection between country views affecting product attributes than vice-versa. If LISREL type analysis can substantiate the relationship between country and product images, marketing plans and strategies can be designed to accommodate and exploit this relationship. The research also goes one further step in suggesting that Market Presence (i.e., ease of finding product, knowledge of the product and recognizable brands) is a key factor in predicting

knowledge of the country itself although it is not as strong as variables such as Affiliation in predicting "Willingness to Buy" and other product attributes.

Canadians and Americans generally have a more positive response than Australians to the countries and products of Eastern Europe. This adds to the potential opportunity to treat North America (excluding Mexico) as a single market. There appears to be little resistance by North Americans towards purchasing products from Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland (on the scale "Willing to Buy"). It appears that a well devised marketing plan could satisfy consumer purchase intentions.

10. RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The analysis of the two Canadian data sets indicates a more positive outlook towards the countries of Eastern Europe. However, attitudes towards the products are somewhat static. As noted, it appears that the halo effect may be too simplistic in applying it to developing countries. The implications for other developing regions such as South Asia and Latin and South America are important for these countries and thus further research on these areas, as they evolve, should be undertaken. There is a need to track changes over a longer period of time. It is important to build on this research to understand the construct that is at work. As Eastern Europe represents a unique developing region still in transition but also still in turmoil, further research examining the changes in attitudes relative to the events occurring in Eastern Europe is required. As well, given the splitting of Czechoslovakia into the Czech and Slovak Republics on January 1, 1993, research is required to analyze its effect on PCI.

Analysis has shown that while North Americans are relatively consistent in their ratings of Eastern Europe, Australians have very different views. This was also seen in the product summary construct scales. Research is required to understand whether other countries in the Asia-Pacific region, as well as other non-European focused countries (i.e., South Asia, South America etc.) have views that approach those of Australians. It is possible that PCI ratings may be more regionally bound than was anticipated. Instead of conducting transnational analysis, it may be more appropriate to conduct inter-regional and transregional analysis. There is a need to gather more information on countries that

are further away from the regions analyzed. In this case Australia was more distant from the areas tested and were found to have rated them differently.

The Canada analysis demonstrated a common underlying structure to the two studies on the country scales. The Canadian country scale structure was similar for Australia and the U.S.A. leading to some commonalities. However, on the product side there was very little inter-country commonality. This points to the important sensitivities in arriving at views about countries and products, in particular. This may be due to the fact that respondents use different criteria in analyzing developing countries. There is the need to further test and develop the country and product attitude scales. There are most likely scales that are not adding any vital information to the knowledge of PCI or are not fully understood by respondents when evaluating developing countries because they simply do not have enough knowledge upon which to make an informed response (e.g., "After Sales Service", "Value for Money", "Reliable" etc.) or have been tainted by information on a particular product such as a Russian made automobile (Lada).

This research has shown that, from the demographic variables tested, education level is the best predictor of PCI evaluations. It is suggested that researchers more fully understand the effect education has on evaluations. Finally, analysis of industrial buyer and investor attitudes toward Eastern Europe should be sought in order to fully develop views of the region.

11. CONCLUSION

The research objectives involved analysis in three areas, namely, changes in Canadian views toward East European countries and products, evaluation of PCI from a transnational perspective and the relation of demographic characteristics to perceptions of products.

From the longitudinal analysis (Canada 1992 vs. 1990) of images toward East European countries and products, Canadians appear to have very stable underlying constructs in evaluating countries. Attitudes toward the countries of Eastern Europe have become more positive, but there has been little or no change in images of products. The dramatic changes occurring in Eastern Europe have affected attitudes toward the countries but it may take more time and capital, among other factors, to change attitudes toward products ("Technically Advanced", "Workmanship", "Reliability" etc.).

There are clear differences in transnational evaluations (Canada, Australia and U.S.A.) of East European countries, but not products. This is consistent with the findings in the Canadian analysis. It is also concluded that, although it is considered too simplistic a measure upon which to evaluate developing countries, Han's (1989) halo effect is stronger than the summary construct within the countries studied. Given subjects had limited experience with products from Eastern Europe, this analysis seems plausible. Finally, those who view their country as "Aligned With" East European countries (as well as for France) rate them higher than those who do not.

Although individual respondent country differences were found, there was little consistency in evaluations based on demographic characteristics. Gender and income provided little evidence of differences while age was better. Education appears to be the best predictor of evaluations of ratings for foreign products and countries, with a strong difference between those that have a high school education or less and those with a college education or higher.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmed, Sadrudin A. and Alain d'Astous (1993), "Cross-National Evaluation of Made-In Concept Using Multiple Cues", European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 27 (7), p. 39-52.
- Bakos, Gábor (1993), "Magyar Suzuki", The Hungarian Quarterly, Vol. 34 (130), p. 81-85.
- Bannister, J.P. and J.A. Saunders (1978), "U.K. Consumers' Attitudes Towards Imports: The Measurement of National Stereotype Image", European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 12 (8), p. 562-570.
- Baughan, Christopher C. and Attila Yaprak (1993), "Mapping Country-of-Origin Research: Recent Developments and Emerging Avenues", in N. Papadopoulos and L.A. Heslop, eds., Product-Country Images: Impact and Role in International Marketing, New York: The Haworth Press, p. 89-156.
- Bennett, David (1991), "Canadian Consumer Evaluations of East European Countries and Their Products", Unpublished Thesis, Carleton University.
- Bilkey, W.J. and E. Nes (1982). "Country-of-Origin Effects on Product Evaluations", Journal of International Business Studies, Vol. 8 (1), p. 89-99.
- Bourk, Margaret P. (1992), "A Comparison of English and French Canadian Ethnicity Effects of Country-of-Origin on Product Evaluation", Unpublished Thesis, Carleton University.
- Brewer, Thomas L. (1993), "Government Policies, Market Imperfections and Foreign Direct Investment", Journal of International Business Studies, Vol. 24 (1), p. 101-120.
- Bugajski, Janusz (1991), "Eastern Europe in the Post-Communist Era", Columbia Journal of World Business, Vol. 26 (1), p. 5-9.
- Chasin, Joseph B. and Eugene D. Jaffe (1979), "Industrial Buyer Attitudes Towards Goods Made in Eastern Europe", Columbia Journal of World Business, Vol. 14 (2), p. 74-81.
- Chao, Paul (1993), "Partitioning Country-of-Origin Effects: Consumer Evaluations of a Hybrid Product", Journal of International Business Studies, Vol. 24 (2), p. 291-306.
- Crossborder Monitor (1993, Apr. 14), "East Meets West: Trade is Key, Not Short Term Aid", Economic Intelligence Unit.

- Crossborder Monitor (1993, Oct. 6), "Company and Industry", Economic Intelligence Unit.
- Damanpour, Faramarz (1993), "Temporal Shifts of Developed Country Images: A 20-Year View", in N. Papadopoulos and L.A. Heslop, eds., Product-Country Images: Impact and Role in International Marketing, New York: The Haworth Press, p. 357-378.
- Darling, John R. (1990), "A Study of Changes in Finnish Consumer Attitudes Towards the Products and Associated Marketing Practices of Selected Countries", The Finnish Journal of Business Economics, Fall, p. 175-187.
- Darling, John R. and Van R. Wood (1990), "A Longitudinal Study Comparing Perceptions of U.S. and Japanese Consumer Products in a Third/Neutral Country: Finland 1975 to 1985", Journal of International Business Studies, Vol. 21 (3), p. 427-450.
- Dickerson, Kitty G. (1987), "Relative Importance of Country-of-Origin as an Attribute in Apparel Choices", Journal of Consumer Studies and Home Economics, Vol. 11, p. 333-343.
- Doyle, Anna-Beth, Jocelyn Beaudet and Frances Aboud (1988), "Developmental Patterns in the Flexibility of Children's Ethnic Attitudes", Journal of Cross-Sectional Psychology, Vol. 19 (1), p. 3-18.
- Emmerji, Louis (1992), "Globalization, Regionalization and Free Trade", Columbia Journal of World Business, Vol. 27 (2), p. 6-13.
- Erickson, Gary M., Johny K. Johansson and Paul Chao (1984), "Image Variables in Multi-Attribute Product Evaluations: Country-of-Origin Effects", Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 11 (2), p. 694-699.
- Erzan, Refik, Christopher Holmes and Raid Safadi (1992), "How Changes in the Former CEA Area May Affect International Trade in Manufactures", Working Paper. The World Bank, New York.
- Ettenson, Richard, Janet Wagner and Gary Gaeth (1988), "Evaluating the Effects of Country-of-Origin and the 'Made in the U.S.A.' Campaign: A Conjoint Approach", Journal of Retailing, Vol. 64 (1), p. 85-100.
- Forgas, J.P. and M. O'Driscoll (1984), "Cross-Cultural and Demographic Differences in the Perceptions of Nations", Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Vol. 15 (2), p. 199-222.

- Gaedeke, Ralph (1973), "Consumer Attitudes Toward Products 'Made In' Developing Countries", Journal of Retailing, Vol. 49 (2), p. 13-24.
- Gleitman, Henry (1986), Psychology, Second Edition, New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Han, C. Min and Vern Terpstra (1988), "Country-of-Origin Effects for Uni-National and Bi-National Products", Journal of International Business Studies, Vol. 19 (2), p. 235-255.
- Han, C. Min (1989), "Country Image: Halo or Summary Construct?" Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 26 (2), p. 222-229.
- Han, C. Min (1990), "Testing the Role of Country Image in Consumer Choice Behaviour", European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 24 (6), p. 24-40.
- Hisrich, Robert D. and Jan Jones (1992), "U.S./Hungarian Joint Ventures: An Opportunity for Entering New Markets", Journal of Global Marketing, Vol. 5 (3), p. 89-108.
- Hong, Sung-Tai and Robert S. Wyer Jr. (1990), "Determinants of Product Evaluation: Effects of Time Interval Between Knowledge of a Product's Country-of-Origin and Information About Its Specific Attributes", Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 17 (3), p. 277-288.
- Hooley, Graham J. (1993), "Raising the Iron Curtain: Marketing in a Period of Transition", European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 27 (11/12), p. 6-20.
- Hünerber, Reinhard (1990), "Risks and Opportunities in Eastern Europe", European Management Journal, Vol. 8 (4), p. 514-519.
- Johansson, Johny K. and Israel D. Nebenzahl (1986), "Multinational Production: Effect on Brand Value", Journal of International Business Studies, Vol. 17 (3), p. 101-126.
- Kaynak, Erdener (1989), "How Chinese Buyers Rate Foreign Suppliers", Industrial Marketing Management, Vol. 18 (2), p. 187-198.
- Kraljic, Peter (1990), "The Economic Gap Separating East and West", Columbia Journal of World Business, Vol. 25 (4), p. 14-19.
- Lee, Hanjoon, Chankon Kim and Joseph Miller (1992), "The Relative Effects of Price, Warranty and Country-of-Origin on Consumer Product Evaluations", Journal of Global Marketing, Vol. 6 (1/2), p. 55-80.

- Liefield, John and Marjorie Wall (1993), "The Effects of Intrinsic, Country-of-Origin and Price Cues on Product Evaluation and Choice", European Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 1, p. 191-205.
- Lillis, Charles M. and Chem L. Narayana (1974), "Analysis of 'Made-in' Product Images: An Exploratory Study", Journal of International Business Studies, Vol. 5 (1), p. 119-127.
- Lim, Jeen-Su and John Kim (1992), "Impact of Consumer's Confidence in Judgements About Missing Information on Product Evaluation", Journal of Business Research, Vol. 25 (3), p. 215-229.
- Lumpkin, James R., John C. Crawford and Gap Kim (1985), "Perceived Risk as a Factor in Buying Foreign Clothes," International Journal of Advertising, Vol. 4, p. 157-171.
- Lumpkin, James, Charles Madden, Sheb L. True and Daniel Rajaratnam (1992), "Willingness to Buy from Eastern Block Countries: U.S. Consumers Before and After Glasnost", Working Paper.
- McGee, Lynn W. and Rosann L. Spiro (1991), "Salesperson and Country-of-Origin Effects on Attitudes and Intentions to Purchase", Journal of Business Research, Vol. 22 (1), p. 25-40.
- McMillan, Carl H. (1992), "Foreign Direct Investment Flows to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe: Nature, Magnitude and International Implications", Journal of Development Planning, Vol. (23), p. 305-325.
- Michalak, W.Z. (1993), "Foreign Direct Investment and Joint Ventures in East-Central Europe: A Geographical Perspective", Environment and Planning A, Vol. 25 (11), p. 1573-1591.
- Morello, Gabriele (1993), "International Product Competitiveness and the "Made in" Concept", in N. Papadopoulos and L.A. Heslop, eds., Product-Country Images: Impact and Role in International Marketing, New York: The Haworth Press. p. 285-309.
- Nagashima, Akira (1970), "A Comparison of Japanese and U.S. Attitudes Toward Foreign Products", Journal of Marketing, Vol. 34 (1), p. 68-74.
- Nagashima, Akira (1977), "A Comparative 'Made In' Product Image Survey Among Japanese Businessmen", Journal of Marketing, Vol. 41 (3), p. 95-100.

- Nigh, Douglas and Karen D. Smith (1989), "The New U.S. Joint Ventures in the U.S.S.R.: Assessment and Management of Political Risk", Columbia Journal of World Business, Vol. 24 (2), p. 53-60.
- Papadopoulos, Nicolas and Louise A. Heslop (1986), "Travel as a Correlate of Product and Country Images", in T.E. Muller, ed., Marketing, Vol. 7 (Administrative Sciences Association of Canada - Marketing Division, May), p. 191-200.
- Papadopoulos, Nicolas (1993), "What Product and Country Images Are and Are Not", in N. Papadopoulos and L.A. Heslop, eds., Product-Country Images: Impact and Role in International Marketing, New York: The Haworth Press, p. 3-38.
- Papadopoulos, Nicolas and Louise A. Heslop (1993), "But Who Knows Where or When": Reflections on the Images of Countries and Their Products", in N. Papadopoulos and L.A. Heslop, eds., Product-Country Images: Impact and Role in International Marketing, New York: The Haworth Press, p. 39-75.
- Papadopoulos, Nicolas, Louise A. Heslop and Gary Bamossy (1990), "A Comparative Image Analysis of Domestic Versus Imported Products", International Journal of Research in Marketing, Vol. 7 (4), p. 283-294.
- Papadopoulos, Nicolas, Louise A. Heslop and David Bennett (1992), "National Image Correlates of Product Stereotypes: A Study of Attitudes Towards East European Countries", European Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 1 (1), p. 206-213.
- Papadopoulos, Nicolas, Louise A. Heslop and Jozsef Beracs (1990), "National Stereotypes and Product Evaluations in a Socialist Country", International Marketing Review, Vol. 7 (1), p. 32-47.
- Pool, Ithiel de Sola (1965), "Effects of Cross-National Contact on National and International Images", in Herbert C. Kelman, ed., International Behaviour, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, p. 106-129.
- Rogers, Paul and Paul Mathews (1991), "Western Quality at a Low Price: Cleaning Up in Poland", European Management Journal, Vol. 9 (4), p. 425-432.
- Roth, Martin S. and Jean B. Romeo (1992), "Matching Product Category and Country Image Perceptions: A Framework for Managing Country-of-Origin Effects", Journal of International Business Studies, Vol. 23 (3), p. 477-498.
- Schooler, Robert D. (1971), "Bias Phenomena Attendant to the Marketing of Foreign Goods in the U.S.", Journal of International Business Studies, Vol. 2 (1), p. 71-80.

- Sharma, Subhash, Terrence A. Shimp, Jeongshin Shin (1995), "Consumer Ethnocentrism: A Test of Antecedents and Moderators", Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Vol. 23 (1), p. 26-37.
- Stevens-Ströhmman, Rosalind (1993), "Privatization and Restructuring: the German Experience", Policy Studies Eastern Europe: The Challenge of Change, Vol. 14 (4), p. 4-14.
- Stewart, Allyson (1992), "Navigating the Seven C's of Hungary", European Management Journal, Vol. 10 (1), p. 87-89.
- Tabachnick, Barbara G. and Linda S. Fidell (1993), Using Multivariate Statistics, Second Edition, New York: HarperCollins.
- Tajfel, H. and J.P. Forgas (1981), "Social Categorization: Cognition, Values and Groups", Social Cognition: Perspectives on Everyday Understanding, New York: Academic Press.
- Taucher, George (1992), "The Making of the New Russian Chief Executive", European Management Journal, Vol. 10 (2), p. 169-172.
- Thomas, R.T. (1983), "Univariate Repeated Measures Techniques Applied to Multivariate Data", Psychometrika, Vol. 48 (3), p. 451-464.
- United Nations (1992), "The East-West Business Directory 1991/1992", Department of Economic and Social Development.
- Wall, Marjorie, Louise A. Heslop (1986), "Consumer Attitudes Toward Canadian-Made Versus Imported Products," Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Vol. 14 (2), p. 27-36.
- Wall, Marjorie, John Liefeld and Louise A. Heslop (1991), "Impact of Country-of-Origin Cues on Consumer Judgements in Multi-Cue Situations: A Covariance Analysis," Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Vol. 19 (2), p. 105-113.
- Wang, Chih-Kang and Charles W. Lamb (1980), "Foreign Environmental Factors Influencing American Consumer's Predispositions Toward European Products," Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Vol. 8 (4), p. 345-356.
- Witt, Jerome and C.P. Rao (1992), "The Impact of Global Sourcing on Consumers: Country of Origin Effects on Perceived Risk", Journal of Global Marketing, Vol. 6 (3), p. 105-128.
- Yip, George S. (1992), Total Global Strategy, First Ed., Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

APPENDIX A - Research Instrument

N.B.: The format of this questionnaire has been adjusted in order to meet thesis requirements

**INTERNATIONAL TRADE:
THE QUALITY OF PRODUCTS FROM FOREIGN NATIONS**

This survey is carried out by researchers of the International Business Study Group at the School of Business of Carleton University. It is part of a larger study whose object is to understand better the views of consumers in Canada, Australia, and the United States about products made in various countries.

We kindly ask that you please answer all the questions; incomplete questionnaires cannot be included in the 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 in the space provided on the back cover. We will read your comments carefully and take them into account.

Thanks a lot for your help!

Dr. Louise A. Heslop,
Professor of Marketing
and
Dr. Nicolas Papadopoulos,
Professor of International Business

As a small token of our appreciation, we will be glad to provide you with a summary of the study's findings once our analysis is complete. To ensure that your responses in this survey will remain anonymous, do not provide your address with this questionnaire; if you would like to receive the summary, please drop us a note with your address at:

School of Business
Carleton University
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, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Russia. 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 NOT THIS

Rich : ____ : ____ : X : ____ : X : ____ : ____ : Poor

Please be sure to answer every scale for every country. Do not omit any.

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.

RUSSIA AND THE RUSSIANS

Industrialized	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Industrialized
Educated People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Uneducated People
Non-Western Culture	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Western Culture
I Know Little About Russia & the Russians	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Know A Lot About Russia & 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	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Would Welcome More Immigration From
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	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	We Should Have Closer Ties With
Not Trustworthy People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Trustworthy People
People Are Very Hard Working	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People Are Not Very Hard Working
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 & the Hungarians	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Know A Lot About Hungary & 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	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Would Welcome More Immigration From
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	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	We Should Have Closer Ties With
Not Trustworthy People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Trustworthy People
People Are Very Hard Working	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People Are Not Very Hard Working
Individualistic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Group Oriented
I Would Not Favour Further Canadian Investment in Hungary	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Would Favour Further Canadian Investment In Hungary

CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND THE CZECHOSLOVAKS

Industrialized	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Industrialized
Educated People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Uneducated People
Non-Western Culture	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Western Culture
I Know Little About Czechoslovakia & the Czechoslovaks	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Know A Lot About Czechoslovakia & the Czechoslovaks
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	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Would Welcome More Immigration From
People Have Many Rights	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People Have Few Rights
I Dislike Czechoslovakia	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Like Czechoslovakia
Aggressive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Peaceful
Aligned With Canada	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Aligned With Canada
We Should Not Have Closer Ties With	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	We Should Have Closer Ties With
Not Trustworthy People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Trustworthy People
People Are Very Hard Working	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People Are Not Very Hard Working
Individualistic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Group Oriented
I Would Not Favour Further Canadian Investment in Czechoslovakia	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Would Favour Further Canadian Investment In Czechoslovakia

POLAND AND THE POLISH

Industrialized	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	Not Industrialized
Educated People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	Uneducated People
Non-Western Culture	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	Western Culture
I Know Little About Poland & the Polish	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	I Know A Lot About Poland & the Polish
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	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	I Would Welcome More Immigration From
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	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	We Should Have Closer Ties With
Not Trustworthy People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	Trustworthy People
People Are Very Hard Working	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	People Are Not Very Hard Working
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 of the same countries -- France, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Russia. It does not matter whether or not you have had personal experience with the products from the country in question. By "products" we mean both physical products and services (everything from soap and cars to ships and medical research).

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

Products Are Unattractive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Products Are 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?

Microwave Ovens: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality
Shoes: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality
Clock Radios: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality
Luggage: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality

PRODUCTS OF RUSSIA

Products Are Unattractive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Products Are 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?

Microwave Ovens: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality
Shoes: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality
Clock Radios: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality
Luggage: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality

PRODUCTS OF HUNGARY

Products Are Unattractive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Products Are 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?

Microwave Ovens: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality
Shoes: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality
Clock Radios: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality
Luggage: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality

PRODUCTS OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Products Are Unattractive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Products Are 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 Czechoslovakia?

Good Overall Products	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor Overall Products
-----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------

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

Microwave Ovens: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality
Shoes: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality
Clock Radios: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality
Luggage: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality

PRODUCTS OF POLAND

Products Are Unattractive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Products Are 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?

Microwave Ovens: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality
Shoes: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality
Clock Radios: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality
Luggage: Poor Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Quality

SECTION III. Recent Developments

Recently there have been several political and economic changes in Eastern Europe. Some of these changes resulted in the formation of new countries. The questions in this section ask you what you feel the quality of goods made in the new countries will be like in comparison to those before them.

Please answer the same way as before, by placing an "X" in the middle of the space that most closely represents your opinion.

1. In October 1990, East and West Germany were reunified. In your view,

a. Compared to goods previously made in West Germany, goods made in the united Germany will be:

Higher in Quality : _ _ _ _ _ : Lower in Quality

b. Compared to goods previously made in East Germany, goods made in the united Germany will be:

Higher in Quality : _ _ _ _ _ : Lower in Quality

2. In December 1991, the former Soviet Union (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics--U.S.S.R.), was dissolved and several new independent countries were created. One of these is Russia. In your view,

a. How similar are Russia and the U.S.S.R.?

Very Similar : _ _ _ _ _ : Not at all Similar

b. Compared to goods previously made in the U.S.S.R., goods made in Russia will be:

Higher in Quality : _ _ _ _ _ : Lower in Quality

3. Several of the former Yugoslavian republics have become independent countries. In your view,

Compared to goods made in the former Yugoslavia, goods made in the new independent countries that used to be parts of it will be:

Higher in Quality : _ _ _ _ _ : Lower in 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 analyze 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 \$15,000 _____	\$45,000-\$54,999 _____
\$15,000-\$24,999 _____	\$55,000-\$64,999 _____
\$25,000-\$34,999 _____	\$65,000-\$74,999 _____
\$35,000-\$44,999 _____	\$75,000 and over _____

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>Czechoslovakia</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 effort is very greatly appreciated.

THANK YOU!

APPENDIX B - Summary of Daily Newspaper Reviews

Australia: Courier-Mail November 1991 - January 1992

November 1 - 14

- France promises aid to Soviet Union; advocates aid and investment in Soviet economy
- KGB agent who eavesdropped on British Ambassador to Moscow recounts espionage
- first annual Remembrance Day for political prisoners in Moscow
- aid to Gorbachev tells of plan to blow up the Kremlin and kill coup plotters
- Bush pushes for strong U.S. role in realigned Europe
- despair of Soviet consumers grows as officials warn of riots and a lack of hard currency for foreign debt

- KGB stole 1985 Nobel Prize stolen from Sakharov claim his widow
- Ukraine decides to join a new Soviet economic union; boosts Gorbachev's hold on power
- thousands gather in Moscow to proclaim Lenin's revolution not worth celebrating
- U.S. outcry over Soviet Aid Plan due to use of defense monies for aid
- Russia rejects presidential declaration of emergency rule in Chechen

November 15 - 30

- Gorbachev warns Soviet Republics on their failure to complete accord creating a confederacy
- Walesa (Poland) searches for a Prime Minister and runs into a conflict with Koczynski
- Yeltsin announces approval of economic reforms including trade liberalization
- claims that a "stealth" submarine has been developed by USSR
- 70% of Soviet population now lives beneath the poverty line
- Gorbachev recalls old ally Shevardnadze to post of Foreign Minister; move bolsters confidence in Gorbachev
- U.S. to spend \$1.9 billion in food aid to go directly to republics
- Gorbachev fails to persuade 12 republics to sign treaty to create Union of Sovereign States
- Shevardnadze warns that some government plotters survived the coup and could strike again

December 1 - 15

- Yeltsin says Russia would back out of Soviet Union if Ukraine voted for Independence
- Soviet Union / Russia reach a compromise guaranteeing federal funding until the end of the year

- Gorbachev warns that the Soviet Union's demise will bring catastrophic war
- Ukrainians vote 90% for secession
- in Australia Gareth Evans ruled out immediate recognition of Ukraine
- NATO urges Ukraine to renounce nuclear weapons and abide by international commitments made by the Soviet Union
- Gorbachev says that the food crisis in Moscow has now become critical
- leaders of Russia, Ukraine and Byelorussia having critical talks which may spell the end of Gorbachev's revitalized Soviet Union
- three breakaway republics vote to found their own free market commonwealth; Yeltsin prepares to meet Gorbachev
- Ukraine wants a nuclear safeguard; President of Ukraine (Kravchuk) wants to have a "3-button" nuclear control system with Russia and Byelorussia
- talk of moving the capital of Russia from Moscow
- other Republics consider joining CIS
- fear that Soviet Union could experience worst upheaval since 1917
- Yeltsin hints that Gorbachev has weakened his stance or succession as support for CIS increases
- Gorbachev begins to feel strain, appears ready to resign
- Central Asian republics ready to join CIS
- concern in NATO over break-up of Soviet Union due to control of missiles
- James Baker (U.S.) warns that out of work Soviet scientists and engineers may be lured to Iraq or Libya; wants U.S. to promote programs in U.S.S.R.
- Czechoslovakian communist leader Svoboda is on a hunger strike to protest restrictions on free speech
- Pentagon (U.S.) chiefs fear whose finger may be on the nuclear button
- Gorbachev may embark on a lecturing tour or write his memoirs; no position within the CIS
- food supplies run out in Moscow

December 16 - 31

- Gorbachev's Russian allies insist he still has a role to play in new CIS
- Baker (U.S.) travels to Russia to meet with Yeltsin regarding the collapse of the Soviet Union and U.S. response and reaction
- CIA director (Gates) views Soviet Union as an arsenal without a country
- European Community agrees to recognize breakaway republics on January 15 but only if certain conditions are met
- Moscow Mayor (Popov) confirms his resignation to take place before the end of the year
- Yeltsin tells Italian newspaper that Gorbachev should quit by the middle of January
- Gorbachev and Yeltsin agree to transfer of power to CIS by January
- President of Kazakhstan not yet ready to give up nuclear weapons

- Polish PM (Olszewski) abandons attempt to form a government
- Gorbachev to decide his fate following weekend meeting of new CIS
- Yeltsin issues a decree to allow him to take control of the Kremlin
- Baker (U.S.) says he expects only Russia to retain nuclear weapons
- Mayor Popov (Moscow) says he would rather quit than force same humiliation as Gorbachev
- Yeltsin wins pledge from Pontif to help the Republic overcome its difficulties
- Soviet Union laid to rest 75 years after its 'birth'
- UN supports Russia's request to assume the seat formerly occupied by the Soviet Union
- article outlines the new structure of the CIS as contained in a draft accord
- fierce fighting in control for Georgian Republic as shots are fired on the Government House
- Germany pushes European Community to accept Soviet Republics
- Gorbachev still wants to stay in politics; believes the new CIS cannot survive, expected to relinquish power very soon
- rebels trap Georgian leader (Gamsakhurdia) in Parliament
- nuclear arsenal controlled by Yeltsin ("I've got the Button!!")
- British, German, NATO and Japanese leaders pay tribute to Gorbachev
- China blames Gorbachev for collapse of his country
- European Community recognizes rights of former Soviet states
- Georgian President seeks truce to evacuate wounded loyalists
- citizens have little regret that Gorbachev is leaving
- editorial debating pros and cons of Yeltsin's ability
- Gorbachev being courted to do everything from casino boss to university professor
- problems for CIS over arms and division
- Soviet parliament slides into history books
- rebels capture KGB headquarters and free political prisoners
- nuclear weapons still point at their cold war targets
- Chinese leaders, diplomats and analysts say Soviet style disintegration will not happen
- editorial questions Yeltsin's ability to live up to his nuclear control pledges
- Ukraine, Azerbaijan and Moldavia refuse to take part in a military bloc
- in Georgia rebel and loyalist troops unite to demand leaders resignation

January 1 - 14

- CIS split over whether they should have a unified conventional armed force
- Italian magistrate claims Soviet uranium and plutonium for sale in Europe
- Russian consumers go on buying spree for before shops close for new year holiday and reopen with higher prices
- Yeltsin reforms to end subsidies that kept cost of living low; into a supply and demand relationship; shops have been empty for weeks
- group of Russian deputies demand the government resign price increases

- rival military council to Georgian President pledge to organize new elections within three months
- Gorbachev now has time to catch up with friends like the Reagans
- rival forces in Georgia at a stalemate following a failed assault by loyal soldiers on a rebel held broadcast tower
- Danish military intelligence believe there are still tactical nuclear weapons in Georgia
- TASS has lost its traditional role with the disappearance of the Soviet Union
- Russians struggle to come to terms with three day old price liberalization
- Georgia's President arrested in Azerbaijan and taken back to Georgia
- Georgian President arrested in temporary refuge in Armenia
- growing unrest spurs Yeltsin to preach patience and hope
- clash over control of Black Sea Fleet; Ukraine steps back from confrontation with Yeltsin and postpones takeover of armada
- Georgian provisional PM (Sigva) promises to dissolve the military council
- France want European Community to open supermarkets in Moscow to stop Russian mafia from hijacking food
- Russia and Ukraine agree to divide Black Sea Fleet
- Armenia claims it only granted temporary asylum to ousted Georgia leader
- Libyan agents reportedly attempted to recruit two Russian scientists
- Bulgarians take to second poll to elect President as Zhelev fails to win a clear majority

U.S.A.: Washington Post: April - May 1992

(Throughout this time period the war in the Balkans continued with daily information of troop movements, battles and international resolve to end the conflict. To a smaller extent the same types of information are provided on the war in Azerbaijan)

April 1 - 14

- German defense minister resigns over arms sale to Turkey
- Russia signs federation treaties with 18 of 20 semi-autonomous regions; help preserve unity
- Russia, Ukraine and Belarus agree to transfer all tactical nuclear weapons to Russia
- Russia receives deferral of principal payments to foreign governments

- U.S. & Allies set aside \$24 billion in aid for ex-Soviet states with U.S. also providing credits to businesses and lifts legal restrictions (also editorial on same topic)
- Russia to make steep cuts in troops, adopt defensive stance
- Poland to tighten controls on weapons trade but seeks more arms sales

- shuffle of Russian top political leaders
- Russian's tighten controls on troops
- Russian firm charged with 'dumping' low cost uranium in U.S.
- Yeltsin to soften economic reforms to appease parliamentary revolt

- Yeltsin wins key reform vote in parliament
- U.S. contributes \$10 million to science centre in Ukraine
- Russia and Ukraine squabble over Black Sea fleet, both claim authority
- Bosnia recognized by world community

- Russian congress resents west for dictating Russia's economic reforms and planning
- Chevron deal in Kazakhstan snagged. The fear of being swindled results in bureaucratic foot dragging in Eastern Europe for joint venture and licensing agreements
- Russia and Ukraine agree to divide Black Sea fleet
- open editorial condemnation of U.S. for money spent on foreign problems such as Eastern Europe when there are problems at home
- Yeltsin threatens to resign if his special powers are taken away regarding economic reforms; plans to visit U.S. in June

- Russia ratifies internal federal treaty (worried about itself breaking up similar to that of the ex-Soviet Union)
- Russian cabinet resigns protesting legislative efforts to dampen reforms
- East European governments upset European Community refuses to drop trade barriers on imports

- Russian cabinet resignations on hold as compromises on reform measures are made
- dilemma in Poland: reforms going well but pressures not to shut down state owned factories continues; resentment of reforms as most reconstruction money comes from Germany

April 15 - 30

- pro-Yeltsin forces rally in support of reforms
- large article on "New World Order" and the transformation of the East Bloc; U.S. agencies coping to staff missions
- deal possible between Russia and Japan for disputed islands
- open editorial on Russia and how much aid should be provided (general support for more aid)
- Hungary chastised for lax financial laws and secret bank accounts

- James Baker asks Congress for quick approval on Soviet aid package; senior house leaders want to take care of domestic needs first
- large article on helping U.S. businesses move into former Soviet bloc
- editorial "New World Disorder"
- accident at Russian nuclear power plant revives safety fears
- ailing Polish economy shows signs of recovery
- U.S. trying to find 'peaceful' work for ex-Soviet nuclear scientists so that they will not take their expertise to 'trouble' countries

- Yeltsin refines image: calmer, most subtle attitudes putting Russia first
- Washington lawyer setting up Moscow conference for Russian lawyers and legal scholars on law and business
- former chief engineer at Chernobyl denounces official history of events as lies
- G-7 nations back Russia reform measures
- Russia and 12 ex-Soviet republics join I.M.F. and World Bank

- Ukraine seeks western protection from Russia in exchange for destroying nuclear weapons
- Yeltsin refuses to let west dictate reforms just because they are loaning them money
- editorial on Yeltsin joining I.M.F. / World Bank

May 1 - 14 1992

- Yeltsin suggests abolishing Congress
- senior bureaucrat consider linking Soviet aid to unemployment benefits and jobs for laid-off Americans
- Czechoslovakian journalists may have collaborated with communists in the old regime in Czechoslovakia

- there was a clash of old and new in May Day celebrations: in Moscow old communists marched while young Muscovites went on holidays
- Attila Varhegyi (28 years old) elected mayor in Szolnak, Hungary; represents "new wave" in Hungarian politics and a new political party called Fidesz (yuppies)
- reactor leak in Bulgaria discovered
- Gorbachev arrives in U.S. for 2 week tour
- communist 'playground' in Osteebad visited
- Hungary welcomes ties with Germany with open arms; they are excited about the investment as a way to western style and prosperity
- U.S. companies fact hard sell in Hungary; new ventures are getting mixed reviews after initial enthusiasm; GE shuts down factory for two weeks to decrease inventories and investments by 25%
- U.S. and Russia disagree over a missile sales by the Russians to India worth \$200 million
- Russian ruble to be fully convertible by July 1
- Ukraine President Leonid Kravchuk in U.S. for official visit
- Kohl of Germany pledges more aid to Eastern Europe and Soviet Republics
- Ukraine agrees to eliminate nuclear arms and abide by the START Pact
- editorial questions what Russia is actually doing in the Baltics; information released that Russia is doing repairs to a Libyan submarine on a Russian occupied zone in Latvia
- Yeltsin creates a separate Russian military under his control
- Ukraine shifts nuclear arms to Russia
- in Poland, Walesa asks for expanded Presidential powers
- Russian and U.S. war veterans meet in Red Square and march together
- editorial suggests that the former U.S.S.R. may be dangerous to one's health due to nuclear weapons, manufacturing plants etc. and very poor controls
- strife and unrest in former Soviet states threaten stability of C.I.S.
- story about how 9 botanists in Leningrad guarded tons of grains and seed from 1941-42 and hence today we have the cross-breeding of seeds
- Bush bars trade with both the Russian and Indian space organizations of the missile sale
- Ukraine leaders refuse to attend summit with other Soviet republics
- Gorbachev's business side comes to the forefront in U.S. visit; asks for aid for Russia as well as respect
- Crimea seeks independence from the Ukraine
- six Soviet Republics sign security pact, 5 do not (including Ukraine)
- Japan tells Quayle it will make loans to Eastern Europe
- some Russians are privatizing by looting state goods; old communist elite goods are being sold in the new market economy

- Nazarbayev, leader of Kazakh visits U.S.
- Kazakhstan gives up arms and signs \$20 billion with Chevron
- Hungarian press keeps quiet over health of Prime Minister
- Russia moves to reclaim Crimea provoking confrontation with Ukraine
- Hungary demands a halt in the Slovakian diversion of the Danube River
- defense is stressed in the new leaner Russian army
- collective farming nears end in Russia
- Poland and Russia sign amity pact
- editorial on the lack of stability in post-Soviet East Europe

Canada: Ottawa Citizen June - July 1992

(Throughout this time period the war in the Balkans continued with near daily information of troop movements, battles and international resolve to end the conflict. Information was also present on the war in Azerbaijan conflict. From June 1 until June 14 the "Earth Summit in Rio De Janeiro, Brazil received almost daily updates; although Eastern Europe was not discussed directly, there was much mention of developing countries. From July 25 onward full Olympic Games coverage was provided.)

June 1 - June 15

- corruption alive and well in Yeltsin bureaucracy
- Yeltsin backs South African return to United Nations
- Crimea to remain part of Ukraine but gets special economic power
- Gorbachev chastised for remarks he made regarding Russian reform measures
- West takes dim view on reform reversals (e.g., quadrupling of money supply, delays in increasing energy prices)
- accident in nuclear submarine in northern Russian port
- U.S. defector in Russian prison hospital
- Pawlak becomes Poland's new Prime Minister after President Walesa demanded Onyszkiewicz resign

- Czechs and Slovaks vote on fate of union; fears of breakup, President Havel appeals for unity
- milk and bread prices triple in Moscow
- Czech and Slovak leaders to discuss coalition; vows to call Slovak independence referendum if demand not met in negotiations
- editorial: Czech separation looms ominously; close to break-up as talks fail
- Russia and U.S. fall short of nuclear arms deal
- coal mine blast in Ukraine kills 38
- allegations of 'arms-for-art' deals approved by Gorbachev during his regime
- Czechoslovakian President Havel snubbed by separatist leader Merciar (Slovak)

- Russian gang nets \$100 million in bank fraud
- miners blamed for putsch in Romania and toppling of Prime Minister Petre Roan
- China to buy aircraft carrier from Ukraine (likened to a military paradise)
- Yeltsin against witch hunt for former communists
- NATO worried about hard-line communists growing influence in Russia
- 6000 ex-Soviet troops ordered out of Ukraine
- meeting in Prague to end separatists threats in Czechoslovakia

- Russian troops sent to North Ossetia where hundreds have died in battles with Georgian militia
- Yeltsin admits U.S. PoW's may be lost in remnants of gulag prison system (ex-Soviet leaders lied about their existence)
- theatre critic describes tour of Moscow (dreamed of world he left behind in Ottawa; Moscow's lawless streets)
- Earth Summit ends
- four killed by car bomb attempt at Georgian leader
- Red Cross says drug shortage in ex-Soviet Union threatens thousands
- U.S. - Russia space mission in works
- Romanian orphans have to learn to love; unable to form emotional attachment or bond to foster parents in Canada
- Yeltsin - Bush Summit begins
- Yeltsin storms out of TV interviews when questioned about babies dieing in St. Petersburg Hospital due to lack of antibodies
- fears of deadly Nazi gases dumped in Baltic - unstable
- Yeltsin to visit Ottawa and 'deserves' warm welcome

June 16 - June 30

- Canadian and Russian first to reach North Pole unaided
- Czechs and Slovaks edge toward peaceful separation
- Yeltsin presses appeal for U.S. aid, addresses U.S. Congress
- rivals in Czechoslovakia agree on forming new government, deadlocked on how to prevent split
- Yeltsin in Ottawa; critics say he bowed to U.S.
- Yeltsin invites investment from Canadian partners; says Canadians are sincere and reliable
- Russians in Israel tell visiting Gorbachev they are worried about getting jobs
- Mrs. Yeltsin visits Childrens Hospital of Eastern Ontario
- Yeltsin gets grain agreement (1 million tons to Russia), most favoured trade nation status, \$200 million in insurance guarantees for Canadian companies investing in Russia
- Slovaks near to split; discussions on how to set-up independent states
- large article on travel in Russia, dining out in Moscow, tourism etc.
- Ottawa Senators Hockey Club chooses Alexei Yashin of Moscow Dynamo in entry draft
- Czechoslovakia moving toward bloodless, but painful, divorce
- unemployment in Poland is bad, especially for women
- no final solution to Chernobyl
- ethnic tensions rise as clashes kill dozens in ex-Soviet states

- Estonia first republic to get rid of ruble and have own currency
- Russian threat heightens tensions in embattled republics
- many Slovaks wary of separation; Havel urges referendum
- Russian scientists in Antarctica protest low pay
- Russia and Moldavia close to war
- Quebec writer invited to Moscow to meet Yeltsin (wrote book on a recovering alcoholic, got Yeltsin to sign book, sold book for \$1000 and wants to donate money to Russian detoxification centre) at leaders expense
- thousands flee Moldavia
- Yeltsin's world tour has not resolved education, economic, and health systems back home
- Russian wheat deal helps grain handlers
- West to create emergency fund for C.I.S. reactors

- Canadian Hockey League deals with European invasion of players (including East Bloc) by allowing each team to draft one player in special entry draft
- Russian military hardware goes on auction block
- chaos in Russia amid imminent political, social destruction in member states
- travel section on Vladivostok
- McDonalds to open in Warsaw by end of June
- Polish villagers stone AIDs hostel for children
- letters to editor praising and criticizing rebuilding of Russian economy
- debate in Poland grows on whether seek revenge on former communists
- Russian football players defect after game in Ottawa; 2 change their mind
- Ukrainian Canadians pay for new Embassy in Ottawa

July 1 - July 15

- Canadian troops sent to Sarajevo
- currency auctions to be used to determine value to ruble
- Havel names new, smaller government in Czechoslovakia
- Yeltsin takes pay raise as economy in Russia tumbles
- Polish coalition fails, PM Pawlak offers resignation; Walesa appeals for parliament to resolve
- Canada pushes for big role in overhaul of East Bloc nuclear reactors energy plants
- G-7 meeting coming up in Munich, another Russia aid deal in works
- MP's vote Havel out as Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia
- big article detailing the nuclear 'bazaar' emerging in the ashes of the ex-Soviet Union
- Hungarian officials seize shipments of nuclear materials from Romania and Russia
- travel section on Prague and its expensive hotels

- Yeltsin says Russia will not beg for aid
- glory days gone for Russian military (no blank cheque)
- G-7: did West lose cold war (editorial)

- C.I.S. tops Germany in European basketball tournament
 - Yeltsin warns aid plan key to reform measures
 - editorial by Havel: democratic ideals do not preclude nationalist feelings
 - unexpected rise in popularity of communists in former East Germany
 - Romanians not looking for quick reunion with Romanians residing in Moldavia
 - possibility of coup in Russia and other CIS nations
 - ban on communist party in Russia; goes to trial
 - Premier Lukanov in Bulgaria seeks immunity from prosecution over corruption charges: loses
 - two Poles hope they can return to Canada after being deported
-
- Yeltsin proposes swapping debt for state owned farms and businesses at G-7
 - Russian officials deny threat of coup
 - Walesa endorses Prime Minister Suchocka (first woman) to end parliamentary division
 - in Ukraine, \$20,000 prize offered to any engineer that makes Chernobyl safe
 - resistance to leadership in Georgia
 - economic reforms create civil unrest in Russia with 4 million unemployed
 - former Soviet states eager to do business with Canada; Trade Minister Wilson on trade mission to area, signs deals
 - open editorial on communist trials
 - cease-fire in former Soviet republics broken
 - peacekeepers head for Ossetia, Georgia
 - Czechs make plans for independence; Havel would consider job for himself
 - Olympic athletes unsure of what is going on after break-up of Soviet Union; competing for C.I.S. on paper only

July 16 - July 31

- Yeltsin thwarts move for government takeovers of newspapers
- Slovaks seem oblivious to perils of break-up; some have second thoughts about separation
- Ukraine economist forced to quit government for categorically opposing Western aid
- Yeltsin rules out summer coup, goes on holidays
- Russia and U.S. plan astronaut swap
- Havel quits as Slovaks vote to separate
- factions in Moldavia agree to stop fighting
- Bulgaria International Olympic Committee members barred from travelling to Barcelona
- Canadians under fire in Balkans
- mistrust divides Czechoslovakia as country looks at split
- Russian oil boon attracts Alberta investors
- Russian performers in Toronto homeward bound after money problems, set-up fund to help sick colleague

- early Russian entrepreneurs still in jail while entrepreneurs today flourish
- Ukraine-Russia clash over fleet; Ukraine accused of stealing ship
- Czechs and Slovaks agree on path to separation
- Russian pilot sacrifices himself to avoid crashing in city
- Russian parachute form Canadian planes near Petawawa
- new trial for Ceausescu in Romania
- Canada to take thousands of Bosnian refugees
- high crime rate in Russia

APPENDIX C - Principal Components Analysis (PCA) by Individual Country

France (Country Scales)

Factor	Canada 1	Canada 2	Australia	U.S.A.
1	Like .763 Trustworthy .705 Immigration .675 Ties .734 Investment .682 Ideal .565 Dangerous .411 (5.5 ^a / 27.7% ^b)	Like .656 Trustworthy .626 Immigration .809 Ties .803 Investment .750 (5.8 / 29.2%)	Like .744 Trustworthy .770 Immigration .632 Ties .691 Investment .672 Ideal .405 Aggressive .667 Alignment .438 (6.0 / 30.1%)	Like .636 Trustworthy .593 Rich .410 Alignment .498 Ideal .547 Dangerous .566 Aggressive .781 (5.5 / 27.9%)
2	Stable .609 Rich .699 Educated .766 Industrialized .766 (2.0 / 9.8%)	Stable .613 Rich .683 Educated .763 Industrialized .796 (2.0 / 10.2%)	Stable .755 Rich .778 Educated .578 Many Rights .680 (1.9 / 9.4%)	Stable .627 Rich .575 Educated .749 Industrialized .806 Alignment .413 (1.6 / 8.1%)
3	Dangerous .413 Autocratic .626 Many Rights .471 Aggressive .592 Alignment .569 (1.5 / 7.7%)	Dangerous .696 Ideal .658 Like .445 Aggressive .632 Trustworthy .432 (1.4 / 7.0%)	Dangerous .604 Autocratic .588 Ideal .579 West .707 Passive .536 (1.1 / 5.6%)	Immigration .720 Investment .764 (1.4 / 6.8%)
4	West .646 Know .735 Passive .494 (1.2 / 5.8%)	Many Rights .664 Alignment .491 Hardworking .674 Individual .655 (1.2 / 5.8%)	Industrialized .651 Educated .494 Hardworking .739 (1.1 / 5.0%)	West .407 Know .764 Autocratic .694 (1.1 / 5.4%)
5	Hardworking .521 Individual .849 (1.0 / 5.2%)	West .579 Know .696 Autocratic .670 (1.1 / 5.5%)	Know .686 Individual .436 (1.0 / 5.0%)	West .599 Dangerous .434 Many Rights .774 (1.1 / 5.4%)
6		Passive .747 (1.1 / 5.3%)		Passive .563 Hardworking .731 (Individual) .664 - (1.0 / 5.2%)
cum (%) ^c	56.2%	62.8%	56.8%	59.2%

^a Eigenvalue^b Percentage of Variance Explained^c Cumulative Variance Explained

Factor Analysis, Russia / U.S.S.R. (Country Scales)

Factor	Canada 1	Canada 2	Australia	U.S.A.
1	Dangerous .554 Immigration .677 Like .717 Aggressive .614 Ties .727 Trustworthy .739 Investment .731 (4.0 / 19.8%)	Dangerous .536 Immigration .695 Like .674 Aggressive .490 Ties .667 Trustworthy .766 Investment .739 (4.4 / 22.1%)	Dangerous .445 Immigration .592 Like .766 Aggressive .643 Ties .832 Trustworthy .807 Investment .647 (4.0 / 20.1%)	Dangerous .407 Immigration .690 Like .764 Aggressive .497 Ties .730 Trustworthy .714 Investment .739 (3.9 / 19.3%)
2	Autocratic .591 Stable .698 Ideal .520 Rich .707 Many Rights .629 (2.5 / 12.3%)	Autocratic .768 Stable .513 Ideal .532 Many Rights .673 West .520 Alignment .406 Individual .376 (2.6 / 13.2%)	Autocratic .655 Alignment .630 Individual .621 (2.3 / 11.4%)	Industrialized .712 Stable .803 Ideal .458 Educated .591 Rich .785 (2.7 / 13.7%)
3	Educated .727 Industrialized .845 (1.4 / 6.8%)	Educated .714 Stable .514 Rich .653 Industrialized .803 (1.6 / 7.8%)	Educated .628 Stable .750 Rich .626 (1.4 / 7.1%)	Many Rights .480 Aggressive .496 Alignment .748 (1.5 / 7.5%)
4	Alignment .739 Individual .479 (1.3 / 6.4%)	(Know) .515 - Hardworking .696 (1.3 / 6.5%)	West .650 Many Rights .605 (Hardworking) .435 - (1.4 / 6.9%)	West .531 Passive .759 (1.4 / 6.9%)
5	Passive .772 Hardworking .728 (1.1 / 5.5%)	Passive .791 Alignment .582 (1.2 / 6.2%)	Passive .747 Hardworking .510 Industrialized .586 (1.2 / 6.1%)	(Know) .574 - Hardworking .778 (Individual) .493 - (1.2 / 5.8%)
6	(West) .577 Know .747 (1.0 / 5.2%)		Ideal .725 (1.0 / 5.1%)	Autocratic .863 Many Rights .434 (1.1 / 5.6%)
cum (%)	56.2%	55.7%	56.8%	58.9%

Factor Analysis, Hungary (Country Scales)

Factor	Canada 1	Canada 2	Australia	U.S.A.
1	Dangerous .497 Immigration .706 Like .753 Aggressive .576 Ties .798 Trustworthy .711 Investment .778 (4.5 / 22.3%)	Dangerous .546 Immigration .818 Like .594 Aggressive .584 Ties .815 Trustworthy .768 Investment .681 (5.7 / 28.6%)	Dangerous .544 Immigration .525 Like .812 Aggressive .716 Ties .750 Trustworthy .832 Investment .715 (4.2 / 21.2%)	Industrialized .641 Educated .708 Stable .707 Rich .817 Ideal .573 Many Rights .567 (5.7 / 28.4%)
2	Stable .789 Rich .770 Educated .532 Ideal .501 (2.4 / 12.0%)	Stable .643 Rich .644 Educated .829 Ideal .470 Dangerous .436 Industrialized .797 (2.0 / 9.8%)	Stable .715 Rich .533 Autocratic .658 Many Rights .545 Dangerous .488 (2.4 / 11.8%)	Immigration .771 Like .604 Ties .627 Trustworthy .419 Investment .819 (2.5 / 12.5%)
3	Individual .694 Autocratic .520 Many Rights .465 Alignment .613 Ideal .543 (1.7 / 8.5%)	Individual .643 Autocratic .696 Many Rights .476 Alignment .673 (1.5 / 7.6%)	Individual .804 Rich .406 (1.6 / 7.8%)	West .407 Dangerous .690 Like .421 Aggressive .777 Trustworthy .599 (1.2 / 6.2%)
4	Passive .643 Industrialized .683 Educated .594 West .495 (1.4 / 6.8%)	Passive .853 Know .537 Like .591 (1.4 / 6.9%)	Educated .744 Industrialized .878 (1.3 / 6.7%)	Passive .644 West .649 Know .681 Autocratic .468 (Individual) .415 - (1.2 / 5.9%)
5	Know .800 Aggressive .444 (1.2 / 5.8%)	Know .412 Many Rights .436 (Hard working) .699 - (1.2 / 6.1%)	Know .781 Immigration .417 (Hard working) .550 - (1.2 / 6.2%)	Autocratic .430 Many Rights .437 Hardworking .695 Alignment .617 (1.1 / 5.5%)
6	(West) .580 - Hardworking .770 (1.1 / 5.4%)		Passive .775 Alignment .507 (1.1 / 5.7%)	
7			West .802 (1.0 / 5.1%)	
cum (%)	60.8%	59.0%	64.5%	58.4%

Factor Analysis, Czechoslovakia (Country Scales)

Factor	Canada 1	Canada 2	Australia	U.S.A.
1	Like .822 Ties .803 Trustworthy .718 Investment .818 Immigration .735 Aggressive .654 (4.9 / 24.3%)	Like .503 Ties .757 Trustworthy .484 Investment .793 Immigration .863 (6.4 / 32.1%)	Like .686 Ties .575 Trustworthy .626 Investment .495 Ideal .429 Aggressive .786 Dangerous .768 (4.8 / 24.1%)	Like .652 Ties .713 Trustworthy .547 Investment .830 Immigration .730 Aggressive .443 (5.8 / 28.8%)
2	Ideal .479 West .637 Autocratic .668 Dangerous .569 Many Rights .723 (2.7 / 13.6%)	Ideal .718 Stable .741 Rich .884 Dangerous .498 (2.1 / 10.6%)	Ideal .527 Stable .805 Rich .853 Individual .453 Many Rights .625 (2.4 / 11.8%)	Ideal .736 Stable .808 Rich .750 Dangerous .660 Many Rights .453 Aggressive .411 (2.2 / 10.8%)
3	Stable .693 Rich .675 Industrialized .739 Educated .740 (1.7 / 8.4%)	Know .626 West .605 Industrialized .638 Educated .616 Autocratic .527 Many Rights .444 (1.4 / 6.9%)	Know .496 Immigration .823 Ties .601 Investment .667 (1.7 / 8.5%)	Know .506 West .725 Autocratic .595 Many Rights .567 Aggressive .505 Trustworthy .479 (Individual) .564 (1.4 / 7.0%)
4	Alignment .674 Individual .758 (1.3 / 6.7%)	Dangerous .779 Like .528 Aggressive .639 Trustworthy .601 (1.3 / 6.3%)	Industrialized .862 Educated .592 (1.4 / 6.9%)	Industrialized .806 Educated .804 (1.3 / 6.5%)
5	Passive .485 Hardworking .879 (1.1 / 5.6%)	Passive .482 Hardworking .805 Individual .572 (1.0 / 5.3%)	Passive .833 (Alignment) .672 (1.2 / 5.9%)	Passive .620 Hardworking .773 (1.2 / 6.0%)
6	Know .899 (1.0 / 5.3%)	Autocratic .430 Many Rights .475 Alignment .785 Individual .458 (1.0 / 5.1%)	Autocratic .664 West .788 (1.1 / 5.5%)	Alignment .831 (1.0 / 5.2%)
7			(Know) .436 Hardworking .832 (1.0 / 5.2%)	
cum (%)	63.7%	66.3%	67.9%	64.2%

Factor Analysis, Poland (Country Scales)

Factor	Canada 1	Canada 2	Australia	U.S.A.
1	Immigration .801 Like .747 Ties .665 Trustworthy .435 Investment .617 Passive .504 (4.6 / 22.9%)	Immigration .766 Like .788 Ties .828 Trustworthy .817 Investment .651 Aggressive .738 Dangerous .828 (5.8 / 28.8%)	Immigration .789 Like .709 Ties .807 Trustworthy .690 Investment .741 Aggressive .474 Dangerous .490 (5.0 / 25.0%)	Immigration .820 Like .644 Ties .797 Trustworthy .575 Investment .792 (5.3 / 26.7%)
2	Rich .462 Industrialized .804 Educated .783 (2.2 / 11.0%)	Rich .804 Stable .753 Many Rights .530 Ideal .617 (2.0 / 10.1%)	Rich .784 Stable .794 Many Rights .579 Ideal .631 Educated .421 (2.1 / 10.7%)	Dangerous .698 Stable .436 Many Rights .588 Autocratic .535 Like .490 Aggressive .724 Trustworthy .576 (2.1 / 10.7%)
3	Stable .655 Rich .636 Individual .719 (1.5 / 7.7%)	Industrialized .858 Educated .731 (1.5 / 7.7%)	West .646 Know .488 Autocratic .686 Aggressive .521 (1.4 / 7.0%)	Industrialized .671 Educated .736 (Individual) .600 - Passive .493 (1.4 / 6.9%)
4	Dangerous .636 Aggressive .871 Trustworthy .518 (1.3 / 6.5%)	West .533 Know .766 (1.2 / 5.9%)	Educated .471 Alignment .647 Individual .725 (1.3 / 6.7%)	Stable .493 Rich .837 Ideal .512 (1.3 / 6.5%)
5	Autocratic .695 Know .445 Many Rights .763 (1.2 / 6.2%)	Autocratic .581 Alignment .412 Individual .712 (1.0 / 5.3%)	Industrialized .899 Educated .554 (1.2 / 6.2%)	West .594 Alignment .869 (1.1 / 5.6%)
6	Ideal .813 (1.1 / 5.5%)	Passive .676 Alignment .462 Hardworking .690 (1.0 / 5.0%)	Passive .759 Hardworking .666 (1.2 / 5.9%)	Know .619 (Hardworking) .612 - (1.0 / 5.0%)
7	(West) .484 - Hardworking .794 Alignment .441 (1.0 / 5.1%)			
cum (%)	64.9%	62.7%	62.5%	61.4%

Factor Analysis, France (Product Scales)

Factor	Canada 1	Canada 2	Australia	U.S.A
1	Will Buy .513 Overall .641 Workmanship .662 Satisfied .747 Reliability .537 Tech Advan .653 Easy to Find .632 Imitative .486 Attractive .528 Brand .477 (.63 39.1%)	Will Buy .628 Overall .476 Workmanship .515 Satisfied .485 Reliability .599 Tech Advan .514 Proud .564 Imitative .651 (6.8 42.5%)	Will Buy .432 Overall .756 Workmanship .696 Satisfied .724 Reliability .615 Tech Advan .636 Proud .580 Service .630 Value .521 Quality .622 Attractive .424 (6.0 37.8%)	Will Buy .623 Overall .619 Workmanship .557 Satisfied .608 Reliability .605 Quality .485 Proud .609 Service .540 Value .731 (6.1 38.4%)
2	Brand .438 Know .468 Quality .433 Attractive .550 Imitative .563 Expensive .778 Proud .577 (1.3 7.9%)	Value .617 Service .731 Quality .416 Reliability .496 Tech Advan .561 Workmanship .601 Satisfied .587 Overall .542 (1.2 7.2%)	Brand .635 Easy to Find .646 Know .690 Will Buy .587 (1.4 8.5%)	Brand .777 Easy to Find .642 Attractive .588 Reliability .410 Tech Advan .547 Workmanship .467 Satisfied .450 Overall .404 Will Buy .407 Imitative .619 Proud .441 (1.3 7.8%)
3	Quality .517 Value .759 Will Buy .436 Reliability .460 Proud .506 Service .665 (1.1 7.1%)	Brand .618 Know .659 Easy to Find .819 (1.0 6.4%)	Attractive .467 (Expensive) .767 Imitative .547 (1.1 6.7%)	Quality .453 Expensive .866 (1.1 6.9%)
4		Quality .537 Expensive .889 (1.0 6.3%)		
cum (%)	54.2%	62.5%	52.9%	53.1%

Factor Analysis, Russia / U.S.S.R. (Product Scales)

Factor	Canada 1	Canada 2	Australia	U.S.A.
1	Attractive .675 Workmanship .816 Satisfied .812 Overall .765 Will Buy .664 Quality .784 Reliability .747 Proud .602 Imitative .649 Value .504 Tech Advan .563 (6.0 / 37.7%)	Attractive .617 Workmanship .687 Satisfied .774 Overall .807 Will Buy .779 Quality .810 Reliability .783 Proud .688 Imitative .543 Value .660 Service .448 (6.4 / 39.8%)	Attractive .625 Workmanship .484 Satisfied .643 Overall .532 Will Buy .792 Quality .618 Reliability .537 Proud .650 Service .487 Value .719 (6.0 / 37.8%)	Attractive .803 Workmanship .730 Satisfied .713 Overall .623 Will Buy .669 Quality .686 Reliability .646 Proud .520 Imitative .645 (5.9 / 36.8%)
2	Brand .777 Know .728 Easy to Find .708 (1.6 / 10.0%)	Brand .652 Tech Advan .428 Easy to Find .708 (1.5 / 9.2%)	Quality .516 Imitative .605 (Expensive) .606 Reliability .519 Tech Advan .603 Workmanship .644 Satisfied .512 Overall .596 (1.6 / 10.3%)	Quality .410 Value .808 Proud .408 Service .719 (1.4 / 8.6%)
3	Proud .527 Service .716 (Tech Advan) .450 (1.1 / 7.1%)	Expensive .877 (1.2 / 7.2%)	Brand .704 Know .734 Easy to Find .728 (1.3 / 7.9%)	Brand .677 Know .607 Easy to Find .735 Tech Advan .408 (1.2 / 7.8%)
4	(Value) .542 Expensive .798 (1.1 / 6.7%)	Value .446 Know .711 Service .569 (1.1 / 6.7%)		(Will Buy) .497 Expensive .850 (1.1 / 6.7%)
cum (%)	61.6%	62.9%	54.6%	59.9%

Factor Analysis, Hungary (Product Scales)

Factor	Canada 1	Canada 2	Australia	U.S.A.
1	Attractive .453 Satisfied .623 Overall .623 Value .518 Will Buy .553 (Expensive) .604 Reliability .743 Workmanship .814 (5.9 / 37.0%)	Attractive .613 Satisfied .825 Overall .720 Value .738 Will Buy .653 Quality .725 Reliability .696 Proud .701 Workmanship .782 (6.1 / 38.1%)	Attractive .676 Satisfied .401 Overall .528 Value .723 Imitative .454 Quality .821 (4.8 / 30.3%)	Attractive .766 Satisfied .729 Overall .680 Value .550 Will Buy .668 Quality .756 Reliability .704 Proud .664 Workmanship .790 Imitative .441 (6.0 / 37.3%)
2	Brand .639 Attractive .493 Imitative .816 Tech Advan .647 (1.6 / 10.2%)	Brand .621 Know .792 Easy to Find .680 (1.4 / 8.7%)	Reliability .793 Workmanship .801 Easy to Find .434 Tech Advan .529 Imitative .443 Satisfied .522 (1.7 / 10.5%)	Brand .781 Know .566 Easy to Find .744 Tech Advan .566 Imitative .474 Service .425 (1.6 / 9.7%)
3	Service .454 Will Buy .437 Proud .848 Quality .650 Value .516 (1.5 / 9.2%)	Service .542 Expensive .664 Imitative .697 (1.3 / 8.1%)	Service .770 Will Buy .744 Proud .656 Tech Advan .419 Satisfied .436 (1.6 / 10.1%)	Expensive .912 (1.1 / 7.0%)
4	Brand .402 Know .872 Easy to Find .580 (Expensive) .409 (1.1 / 6.6%)		Brand .705 Know .792 Easy to Find .655 (1.2 / 7.4%)	
5			Expensive .898 (1.0 / 6.4%)	
cum (%)	63.0%	55.0%	64.7%	54.0%

Factor Analysis, Czechoslovakia (Product Scales)

Factor	Canada 1	Canada 2	Australia	U.S.A.
1	Attractive .763 Workmanship .705 Satisfied .712 Overall .573 Will Buy .679 Quality .429 Reliability .669 Imitative .726 Proud .450 Brand .488 Tech Advan .704 (6.1 / 38.3%)	Attractive .617 Workmanship .501 Satisfied .586 Overall .631 Will Buy .602 Quality .764 Reliability .543 Value .798 Proud .760 Service .692 (7.3 / 45.4%)	Attractive .569 Workmanship .578 Satisfied .533 Overall .482 Will Buy .437 Quality .636 Reliability .759 Value .598 Brand .752 Imitative .732 Tech Advan .616 Easy to Find .405 (6.5 / 40.6%)	Attractive .717 Workmanship .689 Satisfied .750 Overall .573 Will Buy .708 Quality .752 Reliability .596 Value .717 Proud .658 (5.9 / 36.9%)
2	Value .820 Quality .605 Proud .578 Service .548 (1.5 / 9.6%)	Will Buy .464 Workmanship .442 Overall .480 Imitative .684 (Expensive) .690 Reliability .426 Tech Advan .570 Attractive .490 (1.4 / 8.5%)	Will Buy .572 Workmanship .599 Overall .594 Proud .673 Service .732 Easy to Find .407 Satisfied .643 (1.4 / 8.7%)	Imitative .731 Tech Advan .775 Easy to Find .642 (1.5 / 9.5%)
3	Brand .529 Know .859 Easy to Find .626 (1.3 / 8.3%)	Brand .690 Know .693 Easy to Find .844 Workmanship .433 Satisfied .414 (1.2 / 7.8%)	Know .870 Easy to Find .541 (1.2 / 7.4%)	Brand .643 Know .758 Service .591 (1.1 / 6.9%)
4	Expensive .874 (1.0 / 6.3%)		(Expensive) .864 Attractive .503 (1.1 / 7.0%)	Expensive .939 (1.0 / 6.5%)
cum (%)	62.5%	61.7%	63.6%	59.8%

Factor Analysis, Poland (Product Scales)

Factor	Canada 1	Canada 2	Australia	U.S.A.
1	Attractive .620 Value .723 Quality .759 Overall .752 Satisfied .676 Will Buy .785 Reliability .689 Proud .762 Workmanship .611 Imitative .425 (6.8 / 42.2%)	Attractive .597 Value .748 Quality .858 Overall .760 Satisfied .700 Will Buy .682 Reliability .785 Proud .695 Workmanship .770 Service .610 (7.1 / 44.6%)	Attractive .798 Value .735 Quality .663 Overall .474 Tech Advan .596 (5.2 / 32.5%)	Attractive .762 Value .734 Quality .729 Overall .614 Satisfied .755 Will Buy .781 Reliability .577 Proud .552 Workmanship .737 Imitative .472 (6.3 / 39.4%)
2	Imitative .579 Attractive .482 Expensive .823 Tech Advan .698 Workmanship .436 (1.9 / 11.6%)	Imitative .667 Attractive .538 Brand .705 Tech Advan .746 Satisfied .408 Easy to Find .638 (1.5 / 9.1%)	Quality .442 Reliability .599 Workmanship .861 Overall .594 Satisfied .709 (1.7 / 10.3%)	Imitative .512 Know .594 Brand .826 Easy to Find .747 (1.5 / 9.2%)
3	Brand .796 Know .653 Easy to Find .820 Service .419 (1.4 / 8.8%)	(Expensive) .517 Know .755 Easy to Find .518 (1.3 / 7.9%)	Brand .728 Know .557 Easy to Find .733 Imitative .609 (1.0 / 7.5%)	Reliability .426 Tech Advan .604 Service .823 (1.2 / 7.3%)
4			Will Buy .729 Reliability .455 Proud .808 (1.0 / 6.5%)	Expensive .887 (1.0 / 6.3%)
5			(Expensive) .791 Service .607 (1.0 / 6.3%)	
cum (%)	62.6%	61.6%	63.2%	62.2%

APPENDIX D PCA Across All Respondent Countries

(Country Scales)

Factor	France	Russia	Hungary	Czechoslovakia	Poland
1	Immigration .689 Like .628 Ties .680 Trustworthy .615 Investment .750 Knowc .411 (5.8 / 28.8%)	Immigration .686 Like .751 Ties .745 Trustworthy .776 Investment .729 Agges .587 Dangerous .533 (4.0 / 20.1%)	Immigration .747 Like .737 Ties .805 Trustworthy .725 Investment .795 Agges .536 Dangerous .432 (5.1 / 25.7%)	Immigration .749 Like .737 Ties .811 Trustworthy .686 Investment .815 Agges .575 Dangerous .409 (5.6 / 28.2%)	Immigration .836 Like .620 Ties .764 Trustworthy .506 Investment .801 (5.3 / 26.4%)
2	Stab .730 Rich .717 Right .438 Industrialized .655 Educated .739 Hardworking .425 Alignment .353 (1.7 / 8.7%)	Stab .778 Rich .744 Ideal .499 Educated .456 (2.4 / 11.8%)	Stab .500 Rich .489 Ideal .469 Autocratic .662 Right .629 Alignment .607 Dangerous .428 (2.2 / 11.1%)	Stab .788 Rich .781 Ideal .679 Dangerous .631 Right .500 Agges .413 (2.1 / 10.7%)	Stab .693 Rich .811 Ideal .504 Educated .586 Right .427 Industrialized .449 (2.0 / 9.9%)
3	Autocratic .570 Knowc .557 Passive .469 West .715 Dangerous .417 Ideal .434 (1.3 / 6.6%)	Autocratic .721 Right .576 Alignment .527 Individual .474 (1.4 / 7.0%)	Educated .791 Industrialized .764 Rich .577 Stab .527 (1.3 / 6.6%)	Autocratic .639 Right .442 West .705 Knowc .639 (1.4 / 6.8%)	Like .416 Agges .766 Dangerous .667 Trustworthy .604 (1.3 / 6.4%)
4	Agges .711 Dangerous .600 Ideal .496 (1.0 / 5.3%)	Industrialized .593 Educated .474 Passive .654 West .412 (1.3 / 6.4%)	Knowc .606 Passive .706 West .575 (1.2 / 5.8%)	Industrialized .850 Educated .725 (1.2 / 5.9%)	Ideal .426 Passive .494 West .508 Right .412 Knowc .687 Autocratic .596 (1.2 / 5.9%)
5	Individual .906 (1.0 / 5.0%)	Hardworking .729 Knowc .625 (1.1 / 5.4%)	Agges .496 Individual .696 Dangerous .463 (1.1 / 5.5%)	Hardworking .760 Passive .705 (1.1 / 5.4%)	Hardworking .718 Passive .402 Educated .462 Industrialized .567 (1.1 / 5.5%)
6			Hardworking .865 (1.0 / 5.0%)	Individual .766 Alignment .549 (1.0 / 5.0%)	Individual .779 Alignment .597 (1.0 / 5.2%)
Cum (%)	54.4%	50.7%	59.9%	62.0%	59.3%

Factor Analysis All Respondent Countries (Product Scales)

Factor	France	Russia	Hungary	Czechoslovakia	Poland
1	Workmanship .507 Will Buy .417 Overall .451 Reliability .467 Attractive .510 Easy to Find .682 Knowp .534 Satisfied .549 Imitative .586 Tech Advan .480 (6.2 / 38.9%)	Workmanship .710 Will Buy .729 Overall .745 Reliability .726 Attractive .672 Proud .715 Value .614 Satisfied .762 Imitative .527 Service .495 (6.0 / 37.4%)	Workmanship .757 Will Buy .654 Overall .690 Reliability .661 Attractive .709 Proud .646 Value .646 Quality .743 (5.7 / 35.7%)	Workmanship .667 Will Buy .717 Overall .677 Reliability .647 Attractive .701 Proud .683 Value .683 Satisfied .717 Imitative .498 Service .444 Tech Advan .451 (6.4 / 40.0%)	Workmanship .697 Will Buy .733 Overall .719 Reliability .731 Attractive .570 Proud .671 Value .730 Satisfied .735 Imitative .442 (6.4 / 40.2%)
2	Workmanship .499 Will Buy .571 Over .561 Reliability .530 Proud .577 Satisfied .557 Value .774 Service .628 Quality .527 (1.2 / 7.3%)	Easy to Find .722 Brand .730 Knowp .674 (1.5 / 9.2%)	Easy to Find .708 Brand .741 Knowp .663 Imitative .407 Tech Advan .443 (1.4 / 9.0%)	Easy to Find .756 Brand .733 Knowp .593 Imitative .474 Tech Advan .509 (1.2 / 7.8%)	Easy to Find .811 Brand .765 Knowp .582 Imitative .416 (1.5 / 9.3%)
3	Expensive .836 Quality .464 (1.1 / 6.6%)	Expensive .784 Tech Advan .453 (1.1 / 7.1%)	Expensive .859 (1.2 / 7.2%)	Expensive .781 Service .462 (1.1 / 7.1%)	Expensive .814 Service .406 Tech Advan .503 (1.1 / 7.2%)
Cum (%)	52.8%	53.8%	51.9%	54.9%	56.7%

APPENDIX E - PCA Canada (1992), Australia, USA

(Country Scales)

Factor	France		Russia		Hungary		Czechoslovakia		Poland	
1	Like	.602	Like	.771	Like	.494	Like	.494	Like	.445
	Trustworthy	.620	Trustworthy	.779	Trustworthy	.502	Trustworthy	.545	Trustworthy	.492
	Immigration	.677	Immigration	.696	Rich	.834	Rich	.843	Rich	.829
	Ties	.643	Ties	.748	Hardworking	.564	Hardworking	.588	Hardworking	.636
	Investment	.746	Investment	.725	Stab	.767	Stab	.809	Stab	.781
	Knowc	.471	Agges	.574	Right	.782	Right	.798	Right	.769
			Dangerous	.520	Dangerous	.684	Dangerous	.715	Dangerous	.666
					Autocratic	.790	Autocratic	.796	Autocratic	.719
					Ideal	.761	Ideal	.781	Ideal	.765
					Educated	.786	Educated	.741	Educated	.753
					Individual	.629	Individual	.657	Individual	.708
					Agges	.555	Agges	.624	Agges	.570
					Alignment	.750	Alignment	.734	Alignment	.732
					Industrialized	.796	Industrialized	.740	Industrialized	.729
					Knowc	.750	Knowc	.714	Knowc	.692
					Passive	.730	Passive	.661	Passive	.670
					West	.708	West	.733	West	.674
	(5.8 / 29.0%)		(4.1 / 20.3%)		(13.9 / 69.7%)		(13.8 / 69.0%)		(13.3 / 66.5%)	
2	Stab	.725	Stab	.799	Stab	.415	Ideal	.474	Autocratic	.429
	Rich	.721	Rich	.770	Rich	.405	Educated	.411	Knowc	.472
	Educated	.737	Educated	.483	Like	.764	Like	.755	Like	.777
	Industrialized	.662	Ideal	.481	Trustworthy	.751	Trustworthy	.713	Trustworthy	.745
	Right	.436	Industrialized	.404	Agges	.655	Agges	.606	Agges	.637
	Workmanship	.423			Investment	.816	Investment	.832	Investment	.818
					Immigration	.795	Immigration	.797	Immigration	.823
					Ties	.844	Ties	.849	Ties	.848
					Hardworking	.465	Hardworking	.460	Passive	.423
					Dangerous	.570	Dangerous	.525	Dangerous	.578
					Right	.429	Knowc	.460	Right	.434
					Ideal	.498	Passive	.445	Ideal	.474
					West	.415			West	.443
					Individual	.424				
	(1.7 / 8.7%)		(2.4 / 12.1%)		(1.0 / 74.9%)		(1.0 / 74.1%)		(1.1 / 75.6%)	
3	Trustworthy	.445	Autocratic	.731						
	Like	.467	Right	.581						
	Agges	.703	West	.543						
	Dangerous	.632	Alignment	.395						
	Ideal	.556								
	(1.3 / 6.3%)		(1.4 / 7.2%)							
4	West	.733	Industrialized	.610						
	Autocratic	.588	Passive	.588						
	Knowc	.498	Individual	.434						
	Passive	.462								
	(1.1 / 5.4%)		(1.3 / 6.4%)							
5	Individual	.892	Hardworking	.697						
	Alignment	.413	Knowc	.672						
	(1.0 / 5.2%)		(1.1 / 5.4%)							
cum (%)	54.7%		51.5%		74.9%		74.1%		75.6%	

Factor Analysis, Canada (1992), Australia and U.S.A. (Product Scales)

Factor	France	Russia	Hungary	Czechoslovakia	Poland
1	Satisfied .620 Will Buy .605 Reliability .532 Over .604 Proud .603 Workmanship .533 Service .595 Quality .506 (6.2 / 38.7%)	Satisfied .739 Will Buy .753 Reliability .719 Over .712 Proud .716 Workmanship .675 Service .513 Imitative .509 Attractive .672 Value .645 (6.1 / 37.9%)	Only 1 Factor Extracted: No Rotation Possible. (12.8 / 80.1%)	Only 1 Factor Extracted: No Rotation Possible. (12.8 / 79.8%)	Only 1 Factor Extracted: No Rotation Possible. (12.8 / 80.3%)
2	Over .466 Workmanship .528 Reliability .430 Expensive .770 Quality .555 Imitative .510 Attractive .486 Tech Advan .415 (1.2 / 7.5%)	Easy to Find .721 Brand .702 Knowp .682 (1.4 / 8.9%)			
3	Imitative .436 Easy to Find .748 Brand .690 Knowp .548 (1.1 / 6.6%)	Expensive .759 Tech Advan .489 (1.2 / 7.3%)			
Cum (%)	52.9%	54.0%	80.1%	79.8%	80.3%

APPENDIX F - Summary of Country and Product Mean Scores

This legend applies to all for the following Appendix F:

F = France, R = U.S.S.R/Russia, H = Hungary, C = Czechoslovakia,
P = Poland

* Variable name given is the positive end of the scale

^ Range of Scores: 1 (low) to 7 (high)

+ No Significant Difference from France at $<.01$

Underline = highest of all the countries

Bold = lowest score of all the countries

Means for Country Items: Canada, 1990

<u>VARIABLE*</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>P</u>
Industrialized	<u>5.74</u> [^]	4.30	3.84	4.68	4.14
Educated	<u>5.90</u>	4.21	4.12	4.81	4.23
Western Culture	<u>4.87</u>	2.69	3.28	3.54	3.53
Know A Lot About	<u>4.08</u>	3.26	2.42	2.70	2.84
Stable	<u>5.31</u>	2.58	3.54	3.96	3.18
Rich	<u>5.16</u>	2.61	2.96	3.36	2.40
Democratic	<u>5.30</u>	2.17	3.39	3.62	3.63
An Ideal Country	<u>4.80</u>	2.23	3.02	3.46	3.01
Safe	<u>5.36</u>	3.32	4.28	4.30	4.08
Active	<u>5.29</u>	3.97	4.12	4.57	4.66
Welcome Immigration From	4.57	4.42+	4.75+	<u>5.06</u>	4.66+
Many Rights	<u>5.51</u>	2.14	3.12	3.13	3.12
I Like	<u>5.61</u>	4.25	4.75	5.03	4.64
Peaceful	<u>4.80</u>	3.37	4.67+	4.74+	4.68+
Aligned With "Canada"	<u>4.84</u>	3.29	3.47	3.79	3.72
Should Have Closer Ties With	<u>5.09</u>	4.91+	4.79+	5.04+	4.92+
Trustworthy	<u>5.24</u>	4.31	4.86	5.01+	5.00+
Hardworking	<u>4.71</u>	4.83+	4.84+	<u>5.09+</u>	4.94+
Individualistic	<u>4.60</u>	2.98	3.49	3.78	3.59
Favour Investment In	4.65	4.43+	4.53+	<u>4.88+</u>	4.70+
Mean	<u>5.07</u>	3.51	3.91	4.23	3.98
Rank	1	5	4	2	3

Means for Product Items: Canada, 1990

<u>VARIABLE*</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>P</u>
Attractive Products	<u>5.63</u> [^]	2.70	3.95	4.13	3.59
Good Value	<u>4.58</u>	3.62	4.15+	4.11	4.18
Willing to Buy	<u>5.14</u>	3.10	4.13	4.47	3.97
Innovative	<u>5.30</u>	2.80	3.60	3.88	3.30
Good Quality	<u>5.26</u>	2.98	3.96	4.08	3.66
Recognizable Brands	<u>4.98</u>	2.70	2.80	3.35	2.80
Expensive	<u>5.43</u>	3.44	3.77	3.85	3.46
Know A Lot About	<u>3.53</u>	2.40	2.32	2.50	2.39
Reliable	<u>5.03</u>	3.30	4.03	4.30	3.73
Proud to Own	<u>4.72</u>	3.04	3.67	3.93	3.52
Technically Advanced	<u>5.21</u>	3.28	3.46	3.80	3.13
Good Service	<u>4.05</u>	3.20	3.60	3.73	3.38
Easy to Find	<u>4.09</u>	2.55	2.90	3.32	2.93
Good Workmanship	<u>5.14</u>	3.29	4.01	4.36	3.77
Satisfied With	<u>5.04</u>	3.39	4.03	4.27	3.91
Good Overall Products	<u>5.20</u>	3.01	3.97	4.22	3.70
Mean	<u>4.90</u>	3.05	3.65	3.89	3.47
Rank	1	5	3	2	4

Means for Country Items: Canada, 1992

<u>VARIABLE*</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>P</u>
Industrialized	<u>5.99[^]</u>	<u>3.92</u>	4.03	4.60	4.55
Educated	<u>5.98</u>	<u>4.34</u>	4.37	4.81	4.49
Western Culture	<u>5.30</u>	<u>2.79</u>	3.60	3.76	3.88
Know A Lot About	<u>4.41</u>	3.36	2.40	<u>2.81</u>	3.18
Stable	<u>5.52</u>	<u>2.13</u>	3.75	3.86	3.58
Rich	<u>5.33</u>	<u>2.32</u>	3.01	3.25	2.85
Democratic	<u>5.36</u>	<u>2.99</u>	3.75	3.76	4.02
An Ideal Country	<u>4.78</u>	<u>2.39</u>	3.19	3.39	3.30
Safe	<u>5.20</u>	<u>3.35</u>	3.95	4.16	4.20
Active	<u>5.11</u>	<u>3.89</u>	4.33	4.48	4.59
Welcome Immigration From	<u>5.19</u>	<u>4.93+</u>	5.00+	5.17+	5.10+
Many Rights	<u>5.45</u>	<u>2.75</u>	3.55	3.57	3.51
I Like	<u>5.57</u>	<u>4.76</u>	4.82	5.13	5.07
Peaceful	<u>4.79</u>	<u>3.59</u>	4.48+	4.55+	4.56+
Aligned With "Canada"	<u>4.98</u>	<u>3.40</u>	3.52	3.78	3.81
Should Have Closer Ties With	<u>5.20</u>	5.14+	5.12+	5.16+	5.11+
Trustworthy	<u>5.27</u>	<u>4.67</u>	4.89	5.02	5.07
Hardworking	<u>4.66</u>	<u>4.74+</u>	4.82+	<u>4.88+</u>	4.85+
Individualistic	<u>4.95</u>	<u>3.17</u>	3.78	3.84	3.68
Favour Investment In	4.99	5.00+	<u>4.83+</u>	4.95+	<u>5.03+</u>
Mean	<u>5.20</u>	<u>3.68</u>	4.06	4.25	4.22
Rank	1	5	4	2	3

Means for Product Items: Canada, 1992

<u>VARIABLE*</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>P</u>
Attractive Products	<u>5.76[^]</u>	<u>2.80</u>	4.06	4.05	3.57
Good Value	<u>4.52</u>	<u>3.43</u>	4.14	4.11	4.02
Willing to Buy	<u>5.16</u>	<u>3.31</u>	4.30	4.37	3.83
Innovative	<u>5.10</u>	<u>2.90</u>	3.79	3.68	3.39
Good Quality	<u>5.19</u>	<u>3.09</u>	4.00	4.14	3.85
Recognizable Brands	<u>4.86</u>	<u>2.58</u>	2.86	3.00	2.83
Expensive	<u>5.46</u>	<u>3.46</u>	3.76	<u>2.90</u>	3.69
Know A Lot About	<u>3.58</u>	2.51	<u>2.33</u>	2.56	2.47
Reliable	<u>4.90</u>	<u>3.22</u>	3.92	4.05	3.90
Proud to Own	<u>4.69</u>	<u>3.35</u>	3.94	4.05	3.81
Technically Advanced	<u>5.05</u>	<u>3.48</u>	3.52	3.70	3.46
Good Service	<u>4.12</u>	<u>3.11</u>	3.63	3.56	3.50
Easy to Find	<u>4.20</u>	<u>2.54</u>	2.87	3.07	3.00
Good Workmanship	<u>5.03</u>	<u>3.30</u>	3.92	4.19	3.90
Satisfied With	<u>4.99</u>	<u>3.43</u>	3.99	4.17	3.93
Good Overall Products	<u>5.25</u>	<u>3.08</u>	3.89	4.11	3.80
Mean	<u>4.87</u>	<u>3.10</u>	3.68	3.73	3.56
Rank	1	5	3	2	4

Means for Country Items: Australia

<u>VARIABLE*</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>P</u>
Industrialized	<u>5.48</u> [^]	4.71	4.06	4.60	4.80
Educated	<u>5.35</u>	3.99	3.92	4.33	4.13
Western Culture	<u>5.15</u>	3.06	3.45	3.67	3.51
Know A Lot About	<u>3.32</u>	2.89	2.17	2.42	2.29
Stable	<u>5.22</u>	2.12	3.35	3.26	3.37
Rich	<u>5.37</u>	2.17	2.71	2.97	2.68
Democratic	<u>4.83</u>	2.99	3.51	3.49	3.63
An Ideal Country	<u>4.54</u>	2.12	2.80	2.88	2.88
Safe	<u>5.01</u>	2.83	3.60	3.60	4.10
Active	<u>5.13</u>	4.20	4.20	4.33	4.51
Welcome Immigration From	<u>4.06</u>	3.67	3.36	3.48+	3.91+
Many Rights	<u>5.36</u>	2.28	2.87	3.10	3.08
I Like	<u>5.07</u>	3.92	4.07	4.05	4.35
Peaceful	<u>4.23</u>	3.27	3.92+	3.84+	4.18+
Aligned With "Australia"	<u>3.97</u>	2.81	3.49	3.28	3.17
Should Have Closer Ties With	<u>4.63</u>	4.43+	4.00+	3.89	4.53+
Trustworthy	4.37	4.07+	4.05+	4.19+	<u>4.63</u> +
Hardworking	4.47	<u>4.92</u>	4.74+	4.85+	4.58+
Individualistic	<u>4.93</u>	2.79	3.42	3.51	3.37
Favour Investment In	<u>4.20</u>	3.71	3.76+	3.70	3.67
Mean	<u>4.76</u>	3.35	3.57	3.67	3.77
Rank	1	5	4	3	2

Means for Product Items: Australia

<u>VARIABLE*</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>P</u>
Attractive Products	<u>5.54</u> [^]	2.86	3.56	3.91	3.79
Good Value	<u>4.12</u>	3.62	3.93+	4.02+	3.99+
Willing to Buy	<u>4.21</u>	2.91	3.42	3.72+	3.57
Innovative	<u>5.16</u>	3.20	3.47	3.78	3.45
Good Quality	<u>5.29</u>	3.20	3.78	3.83	3.82
Recognizable Brands	<u>4.93</u>	2.57	2.83	3.15	2.93
Expensive	<u>5.71</u>	3.83	4.00	4.01	3.75
Know A Lot About	<u>3.69</u>	2.48	2.30	2.54	2.38
Reliable	<u>4.86</u>	3.48	3.85	3.98	3.88
Proud to Own	<u>4.62</u>	3.23	3.61	3.77	3.62
Technically Advanced	<u>5.27</u>	3.45	3.38	3.57	3.37
Good Service	<u>4.08</u>	3.31	3.53	3.65	3.71+
Easy to Find	<u>4.30</u>	2.58	2.74	3.06	2.85
Good Workmanship	<u>5.25</u>	3.41	3.81	3.94	3.77
Satisfied With	<u>4.96</u>	3.44	3.83	3.97	3.82
Good Overall Products	<u>5.31</u>	3.30	3.70	3.84	3.64
Mean	<u>4.83</u>	3.18	3.48	3.67	3.52
Rank	1	5	4	2	3

Means for Country Items: U.S.A.

<u>VARIABLE*</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>P</u>
Industrialized	<u>5.71</u> [^]	<u>3.82</u>	3.90	4.19	4.37
Educated	<u>5.78</u>	4.19	<u>4.07</u>	4.22	4.26
Western Culture	<u>5.11</u>	<u>3.08</u>	3.62	3.74	3.80
Know A Lot About	<u>3.91</u>	3.42	<u>2.49</u>	2.81	3.17
Stable	<u>5.47</u>	<u>2.41</u>	3.79	3.60	3.89
Rich	<u>5.11</u>	<u>2.42</u>	3.17	3.20	3.07
Democratic	<u>4.70</u>	<u>3.19</u>	3.66	3.57	4.02
An Ideal Country	<u>4.62</u>	<u>2.30</u>	3.25	3.38	3.37
Safe	<u>5.18</u>	<u>3.24</u>	4.06	3.85	4.29
Active	<u>5.02</u>	<u>3.89</u>	4.22	4.45	4.49
Welcome Immigration From	<u>4.61</u>	4.23	<u>4.20</u>	4.22	4.46+
Many Rights	<u>5.24</u>	<u>2.79</u>	3.63	3.50	3.75
I Like	<u>5.13</u>	<u>4.39</u>	4.59	4.66	4.74
Peaceful	<u>4.89</u>	<u>3.55</u>	4.35	4.24	4.54
Aligned With "U.S.A."	<u>5.17</u>	<u>3.63</u>	3.82	3.77	4.18
Should Have Closer Ties With	5.01	<u>5.12</u> +	4.87+	<u>4.84</u> +	4.95+
Trustworthy	<u>4.88</u>	<u>4.19</u>	4.64+	4.54	4.82+
Hardworking	<u>4.74</u>	4.62+	<u>4.58</u> +	4.64+	<u>4.74</u> +
Individualistic	<u>3.20</u>	<u>4.79</u>	4.16	4.24	4.14
Favour Investment In	<u>4.34</u>	<u>4.70</u>	4.58+	4.46+	4.62+
Mean	<u>4.89</u>	<u>3.70</u>	3.98	4.00	4.18
Rank	1	5	4	3	2

Means for Product Items: U.S.A.

<u>VARIABLE*</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>P</u>
Attractive Products	<u>5.38</u> +	<u>3.16</u>	3.99	3.89	3.96
Good Value	<u>4.19</u>	<u>3.62</u>	3.95+	4.09+	4.16+
Willing to Buy	<u>4.78</u>	<u>3.58</u>	3.98	4.02	4.17
Innovative	<u>4.86</u>	<u>3.31</u>	3.69	3.69	3.76
Good Quality	<u>4.98</u>	<u>3.36</u>	4.08	4.00	4.04
Recognizable Brands	<u>4.61</u>	<u>2.74</u>	3.18	3.02	3.17
Expensive	<u>5.49</u>	<u>3.91</u>	3.93	3.95	3.94
Know A Lot About	<u>3.68</u>	2.67	2.54	<u>2.53</u>	2.75
Reliable	<u>4.71</u>	<u>3.53</u>	3.86	3.99	3.99
Proud to Own	<u>4.57</u>	<u>3.54</u>	3.89	3.87	3.91
Technically Advanced	<u>4.85</u>	<u>3.38</u>	3.53	3.72	3.53
Good Service	<u>4.08</u>	<u>3.42</u>	3.79	3.78	3.93+
Easy to Find	<u>4.16</u>	<u>2.77</u>	3.21	3.14	3.22
Good Workmanship	<u>4.82</u>	<u>3.61</u>	4.01	3.99	4.07
Satisfied With	<u>4.66</u>	<u>3.63</u>	3.97	3.96	4.07
Good Overall Products	<u>4.93</u>	<u>3.35</u>	3.96	4.06	4.06
Mean	<u>4.67</u>	<u>3.35</u>	3.72	3.73	3.80
Rank	1	5	4	3	2

Means for Country Items: France

<u>VARIABLE*</u>	<u>Cn 1</u>	<u>Cn 2</u>	<u>Aus</u>	<u>USA</u>
Industrialized	5.74 [^]	<u>5.99</u>	5.48	5.71
Educated	5.90	<u>5.98</u>	5.85	5.78
Western Culture	4.87	<u>5.30</u>	5.15	5.11
Know A Lot About	4.08	<u>4.41</u>	3.32	3.91
Stable	5.31	<u>5.52</u>	5.22	5.47
Rich	5.16	5.33	<u>5.37</u>	5.11
Democratic	5.30	<u>5.36</u>	4.83	4.70
An Ideal Country	4.80	4.78	<u>4.54</u>	4.62
Safe	<u>5.36</u>	5.20	5.00	5.18
Active	<u>5.29</u>	5.11	5.13	5.02
Welcome Immigration From	4.57	<u>5.19</u>	4.06	4.61
Many Rights	<u>5.51</u>	5.45	5.36	5.24
I Like	<u>5.61</u>	5.57	5.07	5.13
Peaceful	4.80	4.79	4.23	<u>4.89</u>
Aligned With "Country X"	4.84	4.98	3.97	<u>5.17</u>
Should Have Closer Ties With	5.09	<u>5.20</u>	4.63	5.01
Trustworthy	5.24	<u>5.27</u>	4.37	4.88
Hardworking	4.71	4.66	4.47	<u>4.74</u>
Individualistic	4.60	<u>4.95</u>	4.93	3.20
Favour Investment In	4.65	<u>4.99</u>	4.20	4.34
Mean	5.07	<u>5.20</u>	4.76	4.89
Rank	2	1	4	3

Means for Product Items: France

<u>VARIABLE*</u>	<u>Cn 1</u>	<u>Cn 2</u>	<u>Aus</u>	<u>USA</u>
Attractive Products	<u>5.63[^]</u>	5.76	5.54	5.38
Good Value	<u>4.58</u>	4.52	4.12	4.19
Willing to Buy	5.14	<u>5.16</u>	4.21	4.78
Innovative	<u>5.30</u>	5.10	5.16	4.86
Good Quality	5.26	5.19	<u>5.29</u>	4.98
Recognizable Brands	<u>4.98</u>	4.86	4.93	4.61
Expensive	5.43	5.46	5.71	<u>5.49</u>
Know A Lot About	3.53	3.58	<u>3.69</u>	3.68
Reliable	<u>5.03</u>	4.90	4.86	4.71
Proud to Own	<u>4.72</u>	4.69	4.62	4.57
Technically Advanced	5.21	5.05	<u>5.27</u>	4.85
Good Service	4.05	<u>4.12</u>	4.08	4.09
Easy to Find	4.09	4.20	<u>4.30</u>	4.16
Good Workmanship	5.14	5.03	<u>5.25</u>	4.82
Satisfied With	<u>5.04</u>	4.99	4.96	4.66
Good Overall Products	5.20	5.25	<u>5.31</u>	4.93
Mean	<u>4.90</u>	4.87	4.83	4.67
Rank	1	2	3	4

3 of/de 3

PM-1 3½" x 4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

Means for Country Items: U.S.S.R. / Russia

<u>VARIABLE*</u>	<u>Cn 1</u>	<u>Cn 2</u>	<u>Aus</u>	<u>USA</u>
Industrialized	4.30 [^]	3.92	4.71	3.82
Educated	4.21	4.34	3.99	4.19
Western Culture	2.69	2.79	3.06	3.08
Know A Lot About	3.26	3.36	2.89	3.42
Stable	2.58	2.13	2.12	2.41
Rich	2.61	2.32	2.17	2.42
Democratic	2.17	2.99	2.99	3.19
An Ideal Country	2.23	2.39	2.12	2.30
Safe	3.32	3.35	2.83	3.24
Active	3.97	3.89	4.20	3.99
Welcome Immigration From	4.42+	4.93+	3.67	4.23
Many Rights	2.14	2.75	2.28	2.79
I Like	4.25	4.76	3.92	4.39
Peaceful	3.37	3.59	3.27	3.55
Aligned With "Country X"	3.29	3.40	2.81	3.63
Should Have Closer Ties With	4.91+	5.14+	4.43+	5.12+
Trustworthy	4.31	4.67	4.07+	4.19
Hardworking	4.83+	4.74+	4.92+	4.62+
Individualistic	2.98	3.17	2.79	4.79
Favour Investment In	4.43+	5.00+	3.71	4.70
Mean	3.51	3.68	3.35	3.70
Rank	3	2	4	1

Means for Product Items: U.S.S.R. / Russia

<u>VARIABLE*</u>	<u>Cn 1</u>	<u>Cn 2</u>	<u>Aus</u>	<u>USA</u>
Attractive Products	2.70 [^]	2.80	2.86	3.16
Good Value	3.62	3.43	3.62	3.62
Willing to Buy	3.10	3.31	2.91	3.58
Innovative	2.80	2.90 [^]	3.20	3.31
Good Quality	2.98	3.09	3.20	3.36
Recognizable Brands	2.70	2.58	2.57	2.74
Expensive	3.44	3.46	3.83	3.91
Know A Lot About	2.40	2.51	2.48	2.67
Reliable	3.30	3.22	3.48	3.53
Proud to Own	3.04	3.35	3.23	3.54
Technically Advanced	3.28	3.48	3.45	3.38
Good Service	3.20	3.11	3.31	3.42
Easy to Find	2.55	2.54	2.58	2.77
Good Workmanship	3.29	3.30	3.41	3.61
Satisfied With	3.39	3.43	3.44	3.63
Good Overall Products	3.01	3.08	3.30	3.35
Mean	3.05	3.10	3.18	3.35
Rank	4	3	2	1

Means for Country Items: Hungary

<u>VARIABLE *</u>	<u>Cn 1</u>	<u>Cn 2</u>	<u>Aus</u>	<u>USA</u>
Industrialized	3.84 [^]	4.03	4.06	3.90
Educated	4.12	4.37	3.92	4.07
Western Culture	3.28	3.60	3.45	3.62
Know A Lot About	2.42	2.40	2.17	2.49
Stable	3.54	3.75	3.35	3.79
Rich	2.96	3.01	2.71	3.17
Democratic	3.39	3.75	3.51	3.66
An Ideal Country	3.02	3.19	2.80	3.25
Safe	4.28	3.95	3.60	4.06
Active	4.12	4.33	4.20	4.22
Welcome Immigration From	4.75+	5.00+	3.36	4.20
Many Rights	3.12	3.55	2.87	3.63
I Like	4.75	4.82	4.07	4.59
Peaceful	4.67+	4.48+	3.92+	4.35
Aligned With "Country X"	3.47	3.52	3.49	3.82
Should Have Closer Ties With	4.79+	5.12+	4.00+	4.87+
Trustworthy	4.86	4.89	4.05+	4.64+
Hardworking	4.84+	4.82+	4.74+	4.58+
Individualistic	3.49	3.78	3.42	4.16
Favour Investment In	4.53+	4.83+	3.76+	4.58+
Mean	3.91	4.06	3.57	3.98
Rank	3	1	4	2

Means for Product Items: Hungary

<u>VARIABLE *</u>	<u>Cn 1</u>	<u>Cn 2</u>	<u>Aus</u>	<u>USA</u>
Attractive Products	3.95 [^]	4.06	3.56	3.99
Good Value	4.15+	4.14	3.93+	3.95+
Willing to Buy	4.13	4.30	3.42	3.98
Innovative	3.60	3.79	3.47	3.69
Good Quality	3.96	4.00	3.78	4.08
Recognizable Brands	2.80	2.86	2.83	3.18
Expensive	3.77	3.76	4.00	3.93
Know A Lot About	2.32	2.33	2.30	2.54
Reliable	4.03	3.92	3.85	3.86
Proud to Own	3.67	3.94	3.61	3.89
Technically Advanced	3.46	3.52	3.38	3.53
Good Service	3.60	3.63	3.83	3.79
Easy to Find	2.90	2.87	2.74	3.21
Good Workmanship	4.01	3.92	3.81	4.01
Satisfied With	4.03	3.99	3.83	3.97
Good Overall Products	3.97	3.89	3.70	3.96
Mean	3.65	3.68	3.48	3.72
Rank	3	2	4	1

Means for Country Items, Czechoslovakia

<u>VARIABLE*</u>	<u>Cn 1</u>	<u>Cn 2</u>	<u>Aus</u>	<u>USA</u>
Industrialized	<u>4.68[^]</u>	4.60	4.60	4.19
Educated	<u>4.81</u>	4.81	4.33	4.22
Western Culture	<u>3.54</u>	<u>3.76</u>	3.67	3.74
Know A Lot About	2.70	<u>2.81</u>	<u>2.42</u>	<u>2.81</u>
Stable	<u>3.96</u>	3.86	<u>3.26</u>	3.60
Rich	<u>3.36</u>	3.25	<u>2.97</u>	3.20
Democratic	3.62	<u>3.76</u>	<u>3.49</u>	3.57
An Ideal Country	<u>3.46</u>	3.39	<u>2.88</u>	3.38
Safe	<u>4.30</u>	4.16	<u>3.60</u>	3.85
Active	<u>4.57</u>	4.48	<u>4.33</u>	4.45
Welcome Immigration From	5.06	<u>5.17+</u>	<u>3.48+</u>	4.22
Many Rights	3.13	<u>3.57</u>	3.10	3.50
I Like	5.03	<u>5.13</u>	<u>4.05</u>	4.66
Peaceful	4.74+	<u>4.55+</u>	<u>3.84+</u>	4.24
Aligned With "Country X"	<u>3.79</u>	3.78	<u>3.28</u>	3.77
Should Have Closer Ties With	5.04+	<u>5.16+</u>	<u>3.89</u>	4.84+
Trustworthy	5.01+	<u>5.02</u>	<u>4.19+</u>	4.54
Hardworking	<u>5.09+</u>	4.88+	4.85+	4.64+
Individualistic	3.78	3.84	3.51	<u>4.24</u>
Favour Investment In	4.88+	<u>4.95+</u>	<u>3.70</u>	4.46+
Mean	4.23	<u>4.25</u>	3.67	4.00
Rank	2	1	4	3

Means for Product Items Czechoslovakia

<u>VARIABLE*</u>	<u>Cn 1</u>	<u>Cn 2</u>	<u>Aus</u>	<u>USA</u>
Attractive Products	<u>4.13[^]</u>	4.05	3.91	<u>3.89</u>
Good Value	<u>4.11</u>	<u>4.11</u>	<u>4.02+</u>	4.09+
Willing to Buy	<u>4.47</u>	4.37	<u>3.72+</u>	4.02
Innovative	<u>3.88</u>	<u>3.68</u>	3.78	3.69
Good Quality	4.08	<u>4.14</u>	<u>3.83</u>	4.00
Recognizable Brands	<u>3.35</u>	<u>3.00</u>	3.15	3.02
Expensive	3.85	<u>2.90</u>	<u>4.01</u>	3.95
Know A Lot About	<u>2.50</u>	<u>2.56</u>	2.54	2.53
Reliable	<u>4.30</u>	4.05	<u>3.98</u>	3.99
Proud to Own	3.93	<u>4.05</u>	3.77	3.87
Technically Advanced	<u>3.80</u>	3.70	3.57	3.72
Good Service	3.73+	<u>3.56</u>	3.65	<u>3.78</u>
Easy to Find	<u>3.32</u>	3.07	<u>3.06</u>	3.14
Good Workmanship	<u>4.36</u>	4.19	<u>3.94</u>	3.99
Satisfied With	<u>4.27</u>	4.17	3.97	<u>3.96</u>
Good Overall Products	<u>4.22</u>	4.11	<u>3.84</u>	4.06
Mean	<u>3.89</u>	3.73	3.67	3.73
Rank	1	2	4	2

Means for Country Items: Poland

<u>VARIABLE*</u>	<u>Cn 1</u>	<u>Cn 2</u>	<u>Aus</u>	<u>USA</u>
Industrialized	4.14 [^]	4.55	4.80	4.37
Educated	4.23	4.49	4.13	4.26
Western Culture	3.53	3.88	3.51	3.80
Know A Lot About	2.84	3.18	2.29	3.17
Stable	3.18	3.58	3.37	3.89
Rich	2.40	2.85	2.68	3.07
Democratic	3.63	4.02	3.63	4.02
An Ideal Country	3.01	3.30	2.48	3.37
Safe	4.08	4.20	4.10	4.29
Active	4.66	4.59	4.51	4.49
Welcome Immigration From	4.66+	5.10+	3.91+	4.46+
Many Rights	3.12	3.51	3.08	3.75
I Like	4.64	5.07	4.35	4.74
Peaceful	4.68+	4.56+	4.18	4.54+
Aligned With "Country X"	3.72	3.81	3.17	4.18
Should Have Closer Ties With	4.92+	5.11+	4.53+	4.95+
Trustworthy	5.00+	5.07	4.63+	4.82+
Hardworking	4.94+	4.85+	4.58+	4.74+
Individualistic	3.59	3.68	3.37	4.14
Favour Investment In	4.70+	5.03+	3.67	4.62+
Mean	3.98	4.22	3.77	4.18
Rank	3	1	4	2

Means for Product Items: Poland

<u>VARIABLE*</u>	<u>Cn 1</u>	<u>Cn 2</u>	<u>Aus</u>	<u>USA</u>
Attractive Products	3.59 [^]	3.57	3.79	3.96
Good Value	4.18	4.02	3.99+	4.16+
Willing to Buy	3.97	3.83	3.57	4.17
Innovative	3.30	3.39	3.45	3.76
Good Quality	3.66	3.85	3.82	4.04
Recognizable Brands	2.80	2.83	2.93	3.17
Expensive	3.46	3.69	3.75	3.94
Know A Lot About	2.39	2.47	2.38	2.75
Reliable	3.73	3.90	3.88	3.99
Proud to Own	3.52	3.81	3.62	3.91
Technically Advanced	3.13	3.46	3.37	3.53
Good Service	3.38	3.50	3.71+	3.93+
Easy to Find	2.93	3.00	2.85	3.22
Good Workmanship	3.77	3.90	3.77	4.07
Satisfied With	3.91	3.93	3.82	4.07
Good Overall Products	3.70	3.80	3.64	4.06
Mean	3.47	3.56	3.52	3.80
Rank	4	2	3	1

APPENDIX G - ANOVA/T-Test Table of Canada 1992 vs 1990

France

Variable (Country Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .008$
Industrialized	.044	.012	.030	
Educated	.565	.306	.547	
Western Culture	.012	.003	.014	✓
Know a Lot About	.105	.018	.053	
Stable	.114	.043	.088	
Rich	.330	.113	.146	
Democratic	.567	.778	.853	
An Ideal Country	.420	.837	.717	
Safe	.026	.071	.053	
Active	.064	.241	.115	
Welcome Immigration From	.000	.000	.000	✓✓✓
Many Rights	.732	.746	.385	
I Like	.386	.763	.747	
Peaceful	.918	.999	.833	
Aligned with	.300	.151	.495	
Should Have Closer Ties With	.779	.361	.575	
Trustworthy	.685	.822	.960	
Hardworking	.916	.714	.765	
Individualistic	.013	.002	.009	✓
Favour Investment In	.053	.039	.042	

ANOVA Table for Russia: Canada 1992 vs. 1990

Variable (Country Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .008$
Industrialized	.004	.013	.012	✓
Educated	.645	.287	.300	
Western Culture	.518	.403	.347	
Know a Lot About	.973	.344	.594	
Stable	.000	.000	.000	✓✓✓
Rich	.008	.008	.030	✓✓
Democratic	.000	.000	.000	✓✓✓
An Ideal Country	.079	.087	.049	
Safe	.788	.448	.769	
Active	.326	.340	.435	
Welcome Immigration From	.003	.001	.000	✓✓✓
Many Rights	.000	.000	.000	✓✓✓
I Like	.001	.000	.000	✓✓✓
Peaceful	.284	.061	.042	
Aligned with	.207	.425	.189	
Should Have Closer Ties With	.286	.038	.208	
Trustworthy	.022	.002	.013	✓
Hardworking	.728	.303	.572	
Individualistic	.122	.276	.108	
Favour Investment In	.001	.000	.000	✓✓✓

ANOVA Table for Hungary: Canada 1992 vs. 1990

Variable (Country Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .008$
Industrialized	.051	.222	.228	
Educated	.036	.131	.187	
Western Culture	.027	.051	.207	
Know a Lot About	.668	.937	.874	
Stable	.389	.311	.106	
Rich	.913	.652	.691	
Democratic	.015	.005	.021	✓
An Ideal Country	.149	.187	.359	
Safe	.100	.024	.015	
Active	.049	.169	.544	
Welcome Immigration From	.122	.158	.333	
Many Rights	.001	.001	.053	✓✓
I Like	.264	.477	.911	
Peaceful	.516	.043	.284	
Aligned with	.912	.902	.769	
Should Have Closer Ties With	.033	.051	.044	
Trustworthy	.450	.997	.749	
Hardworking	.795	.887	.859	
Individualistic	.032	.016	.138	
Favour Investment In	.277	.433	.082	

ANOVA Table for Czechoslovakia: Canada 1992 vs. 1990

Variable (Country Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .008$
Industrialized	.892	.780	.781	
Educated	.777	.953	.679	
Western Culture	.062	.071	.143	
Know a Lot About	.267	.507	.706	
Stable	.999	.398	.632	
Rich	.225	.336	.345	
Democratic	.108	.216	.662	
An Ideal Country	.711	.851	.501	
Safe	.834	.470	.147	
Active	.622	.959	.323	
Welcome Immigration From	.716	.666	.696	
Many Rights	.002	.004	.061	✓✓
I Like	.426	.647	.780	
Peaceful	.608	.169	.263	
Aligned with	.678	.504	.361	
Should Have Closer Ties With	.270	.742	.883	
Trustworthy	.316	.909	.524	
Hardworking	.535	.310	.220	
Individualistic	.760	.598	.908	
Favour Investment In	.636	.917	.834	

ANOVA Table for Poland: Canada 1992 vs. 1990

Variable (Country Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .008$
Industrialized	.002	.044	.083	✓
Educated	.035	.044	.231	
Western Culture	.018	.012	.037	
Know a Lot About	.098	.015	.162	
Stable	.005	.016	.016	✓
Rich	.000	.000	.000	✓✓✓
Democratic	.005	.005	.013	✓✓
An Ideal Country	.016	.023	.110	
Safe	.248	.289	.903	
Active	.927	.238	.100	
Welcome Immigration From	.021	.014	.079	
Many Rights	.006	.000	.020	✓✓
I Like	.000	.002	.001	✓✓✓
Peaceful	.569	.390	.362	
Aligned with	.627	.268	.909	
Should Have Closer Ties With	.246	.176	.546	
Trustworthy	.229	.393	.766	
Hardworking	.787	.876	.763	
Individualistic	.496	.094	.574	
Favour Investment In	.073	.094	.092	

ANOVA Table for France: Canada 1992 vs. 1990

Variable (Product Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .010$
Attractive Products	.646	.171	.363	
Good Value	.638	.691	.533	
Willing To Buy	.913	.622	.874	
Innovative	.038	.077	.039	
Good Quality	.453	.770	.290	
Recognizable Brands	.612	.449	.365	
Expensive	.939	.745	.662	
Know a Lot About	.908	.471	.896	
Reliable	.107	.285	.108	
Proud to Own	.873	.691	.649	
Technically Advanced	.078	.232	.156	
Good Service	.380	.390	.416	
Easy to Find	.378	.344	.382	
Good Workmanship	.139	.248	.263	
Satisfied With	.425	.645	.632	
Good Overall Products	.888	.339	.726	
MARKET PRESENCE	.649	.592	.897	

ANOVA Table for Russia: Canada 1992 vs. 1990

Variable (Product Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .010$
Attractive Products	.193	.731	.335	
Good Value	.093	.165	.155	
Willing To Buy	.234	.211	.109	
Innovative	.529	.538	.353	
Good Quality	.579	.486	.471	
Recognizable Brands	.417	.425	.434	
Expensive	.634	.950	.867	
Know a Lot About	.428	.184	.297	
Reliable	.381	.286	.601	
Proud to Own	.009	.049	.033	✓
Technically Advanced	.171	.228	.149	
Good Service	.668	.340	.328	
Easy to Find	.890	.837	.798	
Good Workmanship	.960	.854	.862	
Satisfied With	.997	.976	.992	
Good Overall Products	.648	.709	.493	
MARKET PRESENCE	.923	.956	.845	

ANOVA Table for Hungary: Canada 1992 vs. 1990

Variable (Product Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .010$
Attractive Products	.184	.301	.262	
Good Value	.793	.776	.728	
Willing To Buy	.309	.172	.503	
Innovative	.208	.034	.079	
Good Quality	.788	.994	.696	
Recognizable Brands	.457	.616	.781	
Expensive	.871	.589	.821	
Know a Lot About	.900	.840	.822	
Reliable	.396	.150	.619	
Proud to Own	.064	.093	.018	
Technically Advanced	.399	.781	.972	
Good Service	.968	.851	.612	
Easy to Find	.687	1.00	.690	
Good Workmanship	.212	.290	.294	
Satisfied With	.369	.502	.582	
Good Overall Products	.711	.883	.897	
MARKET PRESENCE	.464	.573	.946	

ANOVA Table for Czechoslovakia: Canada 1992 vs. 1990

Variable (Product Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .010$
Attractive Products	.797	.748	.930	
Good Value	.865	.938	.999	
Willing To Buy	.468	.686	.480	
Innovative	.143	.183	.266	
Good Quality	.790	.733	.634	
Recognizable Brands	.072	.022	.036	
Expensive	.000	.000	.000	✓✓✓
Know a Lot About	.734	.913	.851	
Reliable	.039	.119	.069	
Proud to Own	.452	.260	.136	
Technically Advanced	.270	.665	.540	
Good Service	.116	.390	.201	
Easy to Find	.212	.135	.095	
Good Workmanship	.423	.313	.145	
Satisfied With	.524	.598	.305	
Good Overall Products	.389	.856	.543	
MARKET PRESENCE	.188	.066	.060	

ANOVA Table for Poland: Canada 1992 vs. 1990

Variable (Product Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .010$
Attractive Products	.839	.667	.561	
Good Value	.281	.325	.188	
Willing To Buy	.636	.604	.437	
Innovative	.427	.313	.159	
Good Quality	.191	.136	.329	
Recognizable Brands	.750	.795	.759	
Expensive	.090	.109	.225	
Know a Lot About	.539	.584	.728	
Reliable	.184	.069	.123	
Proud to Own	.026	.031	.007	
Technically Advanced	.044	.016	.024	
Good Service	.199	.298	.255	
Easy to Find	.370	.484	.590	
Good Workmanship	.461	.186	.178	
Satisfied With	.779	.486	.558	
Good Overall Products	.124	.154	.501	
MARKET PRESENCE	.307	.413	.538	

T-Test Table for: Canada 1992 vs. 1990

Variable (Country Scales)	France	Russia	Hungary	Czechosl.	Poland
Industrialized	.010	.009	.237	.595	.011
Educated	.327	.318	.088	.996	.059
Western Culture	.007	.439	.061	.193	.034
Know a Lot About	.011	.437	.901	.445	.024
Stable	.052	.000	.182	.511	.003
Rich	.066	.006	.693	.383	.000
Democratic	.666	.000	.013	.355	.008
An Ideal Country	.844	.135	.217	.540	.029
Safe	.090	.828	.015	.278	.357
Active	.126	.586	.131	.477	.550
Welcome Immigration From	.000	.011	.145	.483	.007
Many Rights	.653	.000	.002	.001	.003
I Like	.767	.000	.579	.401	.001
Peaceful	.937	.065	.155	.162	.417
Aligned with	.311	.379	.712	.982	.556
Should Have Closer Ties With	.393	.098	.031	.428	.172
Trustworthy	.742	.003	.795	.957	.547
Hardworking	.652	.504	.882	.192	.545
Individualistic	.012	.136	.037	.642	.517
Favour Investment In	.013	.000	.061	.667	.030

T-Test Table for: Canada 1992 vs. 1990

Variable (Product Scales)	France	Russia	Hungary	Czechosl.	Poland
Attractive Products	.209	.381	.376	.587	.924
Good Value	.619	.198	.905	.965	.240
Willing To Buy	.866	.151	.262	.565	.411
Innovative	.079	.391	.150	.141	.494
Good Quality	.521	.379	.761	.648	.159
Recognizable Brands	.360	.373	.702	.048	.829
Expensive	.789	.825	.955	.000	.075
Know a Lot About	.717	.341	.928	.691	.595
Reliable	.203	.482	.287	.033	.151
Proud to Own	.760	.012	.035	.383	.037
Technically Advanced	.177	.164	.616	.493	.016
Good Service	.472	.489	.806	.154	.319
Easy to Find	.401	.885	.879	.107	.635
Good Workmanship	.293	.967	.446	.186	.304
Satisfied With	.610	.733	.732	.402	.856
Good Overall Products	.606	.518	.501	.396	.450

APPENDIX H - ANOVA ("Know a Lot About", "Aligned With")

Canada 1992 vs. Canada 1990

Variable (Country Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. .010
Know a Lot About:				
France	.105	.018	.053	
Russia	.973	.344	.594	
Hungary	.668	.937	.874	
Czechoslovakia	.267	.507	.706	
Poland	.098	.015	.162	
Aligned With:				
France	.300	.151	.495	
Russia	.207	.425	.189	
Hungary	.912	.902	.769	
Czechoslovakia	.678	.504	.361	
Poland	.627	.268	.909	

Variable (Product Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. .010
Know a Lot About:				
France	.908	.471	.896	
Russia	.428	.184	.297	
Hungary	.900	.840	.822	
Czechoslovakia	.734	.913	.851	
Poland	.539	.584	.728	
Easy to Find:				
France	.378	.344	.382	
Russia	.890	.837	.798	
Hungary	.687	.998	.690	
Czechoslovakia	.212	.135	.095	
Poland	.370	.484	.590	

T-Test for: Canada 1992 vs. Canada 1990

Variable (Country Scales)	France	Russia	Hungary	Czechosl.	Poland
Know a Lot About	.011	.437	.901	.445	.024
Aligned With	.311	.379	.712	.982	.556

Variable (Product Scales)	France	Russia	Hungary	Czechosl.	Poland
Know a Lot About	.717	.341	.928	.691	.595
Easy to Find	.401	.885	.879	.107	.635

APPENDIX I - ONEWAY ANOVA Canada, 1992 vs. Australia vs. U.S.A.

for France:

DUNCAN test at .01 (Value are F Probabilities): Perfect Sample Sizes

A: Canada & Australia

B: Canada & U.S.A.

C: Australia & U.S.A.

Variable (Country Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .008$	Pairwise Signif.
Industrialized	.000 (A)	.000 (A)	.000 (A)	///	A
Educated	.104	.117	.110		
Western Culture	.495	.383	.519		
Know a Lot About	.000 (ABC)	.000 (ABC)	.000 (ABC)	///	ABC
Stable	.056	.049	.060		
Rich	.022	.006 (C)	.004 (C)	//	
Democratic	.000 (AB)	.000 (AB)	.000 (AB)	///	AB
An Ideal Country	.349	.364	.123		
Safe	.228	.267	.151		
Active	.428	.409	.779		
Welcome Immigration From	.000 (ABC)	.000 (ABC)	.000 (ABC)	///	ABC
Many Rights	.211	.325	.261		
I Like	.000 (AB)	.000 (AB)	.000 (AB)	///	AB
Peaceful	.001 (AC)	.001 (AC)	.001 (AC)	///	AC
Aligned with	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	///	AC
Should Have Closer Ties With	.001 (A)	.001 (A)	.001 (AC)	///	A
Trustworthy	.000 (ABC)	.000 (ABC)	.000 (ABC)	///	ABC
Hardworking	.216	.119	.143		
Individualistic	.000 (BC)	.000 (BC)	.000 (BC)	///	BC
Favour Investment In	.000 (AB)	.000 (AB)	.000 (AB)	///	AB

ONEWAY ANOVA Table for Russia: Canada, 1992 vs. Australia vs. U.S.A.

Variable (Country Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .008$	Pairwise Signif.
Industrialized	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	///	AC
Educated	.103	.068	.035		
Western Culture	.066	.127	.081		
Know a Lot About	.001 (AC)	.001 (AC)	.001 (AC)	///	AC
Stable	.116	.021	.025		
Rich	.168	.035	.148		
Democratic	.245	.318	.200		
An Ideal Country	.065	.048	.070		
Safe	.001 (AC)	.001 (AC)	.001 (AC)	///	AC
Active	.100	.077	.154		
Welcome Immigration From	.000 (ABC)	.000 (ABC)	.000 (ABC)	///	ABC
Many Rights	.000 (AC)	.003 (AC)	.000 (AC)	///	AC
I Like	.000 (ABC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (ABC)	///	AC
Peaceful	.050	.031	.015 (A)		
Aligned with	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	///	AC
Should Have Closer Ties With	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	///	AC
Trustworthy	.000 (AB)	.000 (AB)	.000 (AB)	///	AB
Hardworking	.033	.118	.163		
Individualistic	.000 (BC)	.000 (ABC)	.000 (BC)	///	BC
Favour Investment In	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	///	AC

ONEWAY ANOVA Table for Hungary: Canada, 1992 vs. Australia vs. U.S.A.

Variable (Country Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .008$	Pairwise Signif.
Industrialized	.556	.363	.992		
Educated	.002 (A)	.030	.023 (A)	✓	
Western Culture	.260	.353	.296		
Know a Lot About	.006 (C)	.217	.104	✓	
Stable	.007 (C)	.103	.015	✓	
Rich	.004 (C)	.007 (C)	.000 (AC)	✓✓✓	C
Democratic	.088	.199	.303		
An Ideal Country	.002 (AC)	.011	.005 (C)	✓✓	
Safe	.003 (AC)	.004 (C)	.023	✓✓	
Active	.308	.612	.353		
Welcome Immigration From	.000 (ABC)	.000 (ABC)	.000 (ABC)	✓✓✓	ABC
Many Rights	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	✓✓✓	AC
I Like	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	✓✓✓	AC
Peaceful	.000 (AC)	.005 (C)	.000 (A)	✓✓✓	
Aligned with	.027	.022	.046		
Should Have Closer Ties With	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	✓✓✓	AC
Trustworthy	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	✓✓✓	AC
Hardworking	.270	.434	.218		
Individualistic	.000 (C)	.000 (AC)	.000 (BC)	✓✓✓	AC
Favour Investment In	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	✓✓✓	AC

ONEWAY ANOVA Table for Czechoslovakia: Canada, 1992 vs. Australia vs. U.S.A.

Variable (Country Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .008$	Pairwise Signif.
Industrialized	.048	.035	.025		
Educated	.000 (AB)	.002 (AB)	.000 (AB)	///	AB
Western Culture	.597	.588	.734		
Know a Lot About	.015 (A)	.071	.035		
Stable	.001 (A)	.011 (A)	.005 (A)	//	A
Rich	.143	.094	.029		
Democratic	.049	.153	.526		
An Ideal Country	.000 (AC)	.001 (AC)	.000 (AC)	///	AC
Safe	.001 (A)	.003 (A)	.016 (A)	//	A
Active	.214	.316	.443		
Welcome Immigration From	.000 (ABC)	.000 (ABC)	.000 (ABC)	///	ABC
Many Rights	.002 (AC)	.011	.036	/	
I Like	.000 (ABC)	.000 (ABC)	.000 (ABC)	///	ABC
Peaceful	.000 (AC)	.001 (A)	.000 (A)	///	A
Aligned with	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (C)	///	AC
Should Have Closer Ties With	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	///	AC
Trustworthy	.000 (AB)	.000 (AB)	.000 (A)	///	A
Hardworking	.045	.214	.383		
Individualistic	.000 (C)	.000 (BC)	.000 (BC)	///	C
Favour Investment In	.000 (ABC)	.000 (AB)	.000 (AB)	///	AB

ONEWAY ANOVA Table for Poland: Canada, 1992 vs. Australia vs. U.S.A.

Variable (Country Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .008$	Pairwise Signif.
Industrialized	.025	.021 (C)	.027		
Educated	.030	.024	.173		
Western Culture	.060	.046	.020		
Know a Lot About	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	✓✓✓	AC
Stable	.008 (C)	.001 (BC)	.000 (BC)	✓✓✓	C
Rich	.072	.042	.001 (C)	✓	
Democratic	.006 (AC)	.010 (C)	.029	✓	
An ideal Country	.000 (AC)	.001 (AC)	.000 (C)	✓✓✓	C
Safe	.326	.402	.736		
Active	.327	.985	.872		
Welcome Immigration From	.000 (ABC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	✓✓✓	AC
Many Rights	.000 (C)	.000 (AC)	.000 (C)	✓✓✓	C
I Like	.000 (A)	.000 (AC)	.000 (A)	✓✓✓	A
Peaceful	.008 (C)	.019 (C)	.029	✓	
Aligned with	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (ABC)	✓✓✓	AC
Should Have Closer Ties With	.003 (AC)	.004 (AC)	.013 (A)	✓✓	A
Trustworthy	.004 (A)	.010 (A)	.015 (A)	✓	A
Hardworking	.255	.226	.225		
Individualistic	.000 (C)	.000 (AC)	.000 (BC)	✓✓✓	C
Favour Investment In	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	✓✓✓	AC

ONEWAY Table for France: Canada, 1992 vs. Australia vs. U.S.A.

Variable (Product Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .010$	Pairwise Signif.
Attractive Products	.009 (B)	.012 (B)	.009 (B)	✓✓	B
Good Value	.010 (A)	.020	.014		
Willing To Buy	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	✓✓✓	AC
Innovative	.065	.056	.101		
Good Quality	.022 (C)	.024 (C)	.049		
Recognizable Brands	.106	.095	.110		
Expensive	.076	.011	.060		
Know a Lot About	.685	.645	.719		
Reliable	.170	.170	.227		
Proud to Own	.775	.558	.692		
Technically Advanced	.001 (C)	.015 (C)	.022 (C)	✓	C
Good Service	.965	.934	.595		
Easy to Find	.823	.347	.446		
Good Workmanship	.001 (C)	.000 (C)	.001 (C)	✓✓✓	C
Satisfied With	.003 (BC)	.005 (BC)	.007 (BC)	✓✓✓	BC
Good Overall Products	.001 (BC)	.001 (BC)	.002 (BC)	✓✓✓	BC
MARKET PRESENCE	.441	.205	.477		

ONEWAY Table for Russia: Canada, 1992 vs. Australia vs. U.S.A.

Variable (Product Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .010$	Pairwise Signif.
Attractive Products	.008 (B)	.004 (BC)	.018	✓✓	
Good Value	.164	.236	.321		
Willing To Buy	.000 (C)	.000 (AB)	.000 (AB)	✓✓✓	
Innovative	.003 (AB)	.005 (AB)	.006 (B)	✓✓✓	B
Good Quality	.143	.089	.149		
Recognizable Brands	.590	.410	.626		
Expensive	.003 (AB)	.002 (AB)	.004 (B)	✓✓✓	B
Know a Lot About	.411	.509	.261		
Reliable	.029	.022 (B)	.038		
Proud to Own	.051	.075	.026 (B)		
Technically Advanced	.653	.884	.749		
Good Service	.063	.043	.043		
Easy to Find	.178	.112	.212		
Good Workmanship	.070	.033	.046		
Satisfied With	.172	.078	.210		
Good Overall Products	.081	.054	.079		
MARKET PRESENCE	.154	.109	.136		

ONEWAY Table for Hungary: Canada, 1992 vs. Australia vs. U.S.A.

Variable (Product Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .010$	Pairwise Signif.
Attractive Products	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	///	AC
Good Value	.155	.430	.273		
Willing To Buy	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	.000 (AC)	///	AC
Innovative	.053	.012 (A)	.047		
Good Quality	.153	.360	.060		
Recognizable Brands	.155	.504	.035		
Expensive	.101	.114	.134		
Know a Lot About	.112	.668	.663		
Reliable	.827	.822	.318		
Proud to Own	.043	.083	.020 (A)		
Technically Advanced	.255	.448	.158		
Good Service	.294	.137	.228		
Easy to Find	.081	.021 (C)	.022 (C)		
Good Workmanship	.309	.254	.263		
Satisfied With	.440	.417	.325		
Good Overall Products	.052	.051	.063		
MARKET PRESENCE	.024 (C)	.104	.022		

ONEWAY Table for Czechoslovakia: Canada, 1992 vs. Australia vs. U.S.A.

Variable (Product Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .010$	Pairwise Signif.
Attractive Products	.317	.263	.348		
Good Value	.446	.835	.525		
Willing To Buy	.001 (A)	.001 (A)	.001 (A)	✓✓✓	A
Innovative	.591	.499	.906		
Good Quality	.055	.126	.059		
Recognizable Brands	.812	.482	.594		
Expensive	.000 (AB)	.000 (AB)	.000 (AB)	✓✓✓	AB
Know a Lot About	.481	.993	.931		
Reliable	.935	.641	.464		
Proud to Own	.145	.134	.051		
Technically Advanced	.790	.351	.251		
Good Service	.301	.154	.284		
Easy to Find	.896	.724	.982		
Good Workmanship	.095	.043	.144		
Satisfied With	.170	.078	.282		
Good Overall Products	.114	.031	.056		
MARKET PRESENCE	.782	.894	.780		

ONEWAY Table for Poland: Canada, 1992 vs. Australia vs. U.S.A.

Variable (Product Scales)	Random Start Point: 40	Random Start Point: 2400	Random Start Point: 1000701	Signif. $\alpha < .010$	Pairwise Signif.
Attractive Products	.183	.006 (B)	.162		
Good Value	.403	.699	.338		
Willing To Buy	.013 (C)	.006 (C)	.003 (C)	✓✓	C
Innovative	.085	.049	.014		
Good Quality	.371	.296	.092		
Recognizable Brands	.270	.310	.054		
Expensive	.174	.364	.064		
Know a Lot About	.018	.134	.021		
Reliable	.953	.429	.382		
Proud to Own	.254	.081	.102		
Technically Advanced	.777	.499	.216		
Good Service	.034	.003 (B)	.003 (B)	✓✓	
Easy to Find	.061	.017 (C)	.015 (C)		
Good Workmanship	.332	.115	.103		
Satisfied With	.320	.133	.264		
Good Overall Products	.019 (C)	.003 (C)	.001 (C)	✓✓	C
MARKET PRESENCE	.013 (C)	.028	.001 (AC)	✓	

APPENDIX J - Multiple Regression Equations
R-Square and Independent Variables for Regressions on "Knowledge of Country"

Canada, 1990	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square
France	Market Presence*, Engineering / Experience*, (Prestige*), Cost of Products, Value for Money	.1936
Russia	Cost of Products, Market Presence*, Engineering / Experience*, Value for Money	.0645
Hungary	Market Presence*, (Prestige*)	.0821
Czechoslovakia	Market Presence*	.0205
Poland	Market Presence*, (Prestige*), Value for Money	.0869

Canada, 1992	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square
France	Advanced	.0611
Russia	Market Presence*, (Engineering / Experience / Design*)	.0686
Hungary	Market Presence*	.0283
Czechoslovakia	Market Presence*	.0473
Poland	Market Presence*, (Service)	.1398

Australia	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square
France	Market Presence*	.1252
Russia	Market Presence*, (Cost of Products)	.0968
Hungary	Market Presence*	.0486
Czechoslovakia	No Feasible Regression	n/a
Poland	Market Presence*, (Cost of Products), Workmanship	.2045

U.S.A	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square
France	Market Presence*, Technically Advanced Products	.0840
Russia	Market Presence*, (Availability*), (Service), Engineering / Design / Experience*, (Cost of Products)	.1629
Hungary	Market Presence*, (Cost of Products)	.1044
Czechoslovakia	Market Presence*, (Availability*), Attractiveness of Products	.1095
Poland	Market Presence*, (Availability*), (Service), Engineering / Design / Experience*	.1658

* Composite Variable ** F significant at $\alpha .05$ () Negative Beta Coefficient

R-Square and Independent Variables for Regressions on Product Scale Summary

Canada, 1990	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square
France	Affiliation*, Knowledge of Country, Active People, Political Ideology*, Western Culture, Security*	.3450
Russia	Ideal Country, Aligned with Canada, Technical Advancement*, Hardworking, Security*	.1920
Hungary	Affiliation*, Ideal Country	.1698
Czechoslovakia	Affiliation*	.0662
Poland	Security*, Aligned with Canada	.1269

Canada, 1992	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square
France	Affiliation*, Ideal Country, Western Culture, Active People, Security*	.3610
Russia	Security*, Hardworking, Ideal Country, Affiliation*, (Knowledge of Country)	.3972
Hungary	Affiliation*, Ideal Country, (Knowledge of Country)	.1623
Czechoslovakia	Ideal Country, Hardworking	.2586
Poland	Ideal Country, Active People, Hardworking, Affiliation*	.3188

Australia	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square
France	Affiliation*, Security*, Knowledge of Country, Ideal Country, Technical Advancement*	.3486
Russia	Hardworking, Ideal Country, Security*, Peaceful Country, Rights	.2702
Hungary	Rights, Democratic, Security*	.1918
Czechoslovakia	Security*, Active People, Aligned with Australia	.1733
Poland	Affiliation*, Aligned with Australia, Peaceful Country	.2098

U S A	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square
France	Affiliation*, Technical Advancement / Security*, Knowledge of Country	.3166
Russia	Hardworking, (Individualistic), Ideal Country, Aligned with U.S.	.2076
Hungary	Ideal Country, (Individualistic), Affiliation*, Hardworking	.2387
Czechoslovakia	Ideal Country, Affiliation*, Active People, Technical Advancement / Security*, (Peaceful Country), (Individualistic)	.2418
Poland	Technical Advancement / Security*, Ideal Country, Affiliation*, (Peaceful Country), (Individualistic)	.3188

R-Square and Independent Variables for Regressions on Country Scale Summary

Canada, 1990	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square
France	Engineering / Experience [*]	.3023
Russia	Engineering / Experience [*]	.1155
Hungary	Engineering / Experience [*]	.1201
Czechoslovakia	Engineering / Experience [*]	.1069
Poland	Engineering / Experience [*] , Value for Money	.1886

Canada, 1992	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square
France	Engineering / Experience / Design [*] , Technically Advanced	.3732
Russia	Engineering / Experience / Design [*] , (Cost of Products), Market Presence [*]	.2326
Hungary	Engineering / Experience / Design [*] , Technically Advanced	.1360
Czechoslovakia	Engineering / Experience / Design [*] , Technically Advanced, (Cost of Products)	.3138
Poland	Engineering / Experience / Design [*] , Technically Advanced, (Cost of Products), (Service), Market Presence [*]	.3052

Australia	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square
France	Purchase Outcome [*] , Workmanship, Evaluation [*]	.3282
Russia	Evaluation [*] , Purchase Outcome [*]	.1870
Hungary	Purchase Outcome [*]	.0898
Czechoslovakia	Workmanship, (Cost of Products)	.1341
Poland	Evaluation [*] , Workmanship, Market Presence [*]	.2068

U.S.A.	Independent Variables	Adjusted R-Square
France	Engineering / Design / Experience [*] , Technically Advanced, (Service)	.3021
Russia	Engineering / Design / Experience [*]	.1033
Hungary	Engineering / Design / Experience [*] , (Cost of Products)	.1677
Czechoslovakia	Engineering / Design / Experience [*]	.1885
Poland	Engineering / Design / Experience [*] , (Availability), Market Presence [*]	.2409

APPENDIX K - Selected Correlations (by "Aligned with")

Country Scale Summary of Means Correlated with "Aligned With"

Country	Aligned With	Can, 1990	Can, 1992	Australia	U.S.A.
France	No	4.61	4.72	4.50	4.37
France	Unsure	4.80	4.32	4.69	4.45
France	Yes	5.50	5.43	5.05	5.13
Russia	No	3.34	3.43	3.18	3.47
Russia	Unsure	3.71	3.82	3.56	3.85
Russia	Yes	3.69	4.01	3.69	3.85
Hungary	No	3.64	3.85	3.41	3.67
Hungary	Unsure	4.02	4.11	3.66	3.95
Hungary	Yes	4.22	4.50	3.75	4.45
Czechosl.	No	3.92	4.03	3.57	3.77
Czechosl.	Unsure	4.22	4.19	3.72	3.92
Czechosl.	Yes	4.68	4.70	3.89	4.41
Poland	No	3.74	3.99	3.57	3.89
Poland	Unsure	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.06
Poland	Yes	4.71	4.71	3.83	4.48

No = Scores 1, 2, 3

Unsure = Score 4

Yes = Score 5, 6, 7

Affiliation Summary of Means Correlated with "Aligned With"

Country	Aligned With	Can, 1990	Can, 1992	Australia	U.S.A.
France	No	4.69	4.57	4.10	4.26
France	Unsure	4.71	4.86	4.46	4.33
France	Yes	5.27	5.53	4.79	5.05
Russia	No	4.35	4.67	3.79	4.35
Russia	Unsure	4.57	4.93	4.23	4.72
Russia	Yes	4.66	5.36	4.22	4.56
Hungary	No	4.46	4.84	3.83	4.46
Hungary	Unsure	4.83	4.85	3.96	4.43
Hungary	Yes	5.13	5.45	3.60	5.01
Czechosl.	No	4.70	5.05	3.85	4.47
Czechosl.	Unsure	4.99	4.92	3.93	4.24
Czechosl.	Yes	5.47	5.45	3.61	5.01
Poland	No	4.63	4.98	4.05	4.56
Poland	Unsure	4.64	4.83	4.62	4.42
Poland	Yes	5.20	5.56	4.02	5.06

No = Scores 1, 2, 3

Unsure = Score 4

Yes = Score 5, 6, 7

Correlation of Variables with "Aligned With": France

Variable (Country Scales)	Canada 1990	Canada 1992	Australia	U.S.A.
Industrialized	.1691 **	.1055	.0923	.2842 **
Educated	.2525 **	.2120 **	.1666 **	.2743 **
Western Culture	.0648	.1431 *	-.0243	.0918
Know a Lot About	.0444	.0984	.0413	.1341 *
Stable	.3431 **	.3286 **	.1243 *	.3107 **
Rich	.2748 **	.1990 *	.1633 *	.3659 **
Democratic	.3238 **	.1554 *	.1161 *	.1857 **
An Ideal Country	.2686 **	.2451 **	.2298 **	.2398 **
Safe	.1623 **	.2030 **	.2105 **	.2536 **
Active	.0603	.0613	.0820	.1541 *
Welcome Immigration From	.1856 **	.2864 **	.2502 **	.1516 *
Many Rights	.2820 **	.2914 **	.1034	.1038
I Like	.2529 **	.2898 **	.2277 **	.3660 **
Peaceful	.2512 **	.2717 **	.2162 **	.2917 **
Aligned With				
Should Have Closer Ties With	.2604 **	.3690 **	.1893 **	.1889 **
Trustworthy	.2330 **	.4000 **	.3282 **	.3630 **
Hardworking	.3266 **	.3961 **	.0289	.2101 **
Individualistic	.0319	.1484 *	-.0241	-.0845
Favour Investment In	.2425 **	.3227 **	.1766 **	.1707 **

* = Significant at Less than .05

** = Significant at Less than .01

Correlation of Variables with "Aligned With": Russia

Variable (Country Scales)	Canada 1990	Canada 1992	Australia	U.S.A.
Industrialized	.0915	-.0220	-.0615	-.0207
Educated	.0226	.0444	.1010	-.0342
Western Culture	.0815	.1557 *	-.0734	.1323 *
Know a Lot About	-.0113	.1253	-.0597	-.1691 **
Stable	-.0429	.1477 *	.0723	.1397 *
Rich	.0075	.1240	.0934	.1768 **
Democratic	.2356 **	.1902 **	.1937 **	.1211
An Ideal Country	.1794 **	.1587 *	.1608 **	.1398 *
Safe	.0983	.1554 *	.2286 **	.1962 **
Active	.0234	.2726 **	.0544	-.0775
Welcome Immigration From	.1833 **	.1281	.1210 *	-.0017
Many Rights	.1105	.2449 **	.1259 *	.3020 **
I Like	.1760 **	.2489 **	.1614 **	.1276 *
Peaceful	.1319 *	.1607 *	.1919 **	.3200 **
Aligned With				
Should Have Closer Ties With	.0396	.0929	.0713	.1279 *
Trustworthy	.1159 *	.1793 **	.1498 *	.1612 **
Hardworking	.1435 *	.1099	.0832	.0738
Individualistic	.0625	.1561 *	.2165 **	-.1775 **
Favour Investment In	.0789	.2217 **	.1519 **	.0601

* = Significant at Less than .05

** = Significant at Less than .01

Correlation of Variables with "Aligned With": Hungary

Variable (Country Scales)	Canada 1990	Canada 1992	Australia	U.S.A.
Industrialized	.0338	.0826	.0307	.1729 **
Educated	-.0091	.1689 **	.2056 *	.1221
Western Culture	-.0178	.0803	-.0010	.2079 **
Know a Lot About	-.0118	.0028	-.0332	.2158 **
Stable	.0783	.2342 **	.1739 *	.2086 **
Rich	.1209	.1534 *	.2073 *	.2855 **
Democratic	.1572	.3696 **	.0477	.2815 **
An Ideal Country	.4277 **	.1338 *	.1994 *	.1781 **
Safe	.1232	.2228 **	-.0367	.2420 **
Active	.0785	.0545	.1164	.1152
Welcome Immigration From	.2373 **	.1915 **	-.0523	.1381 *
Many Rights	.1541	.2818 **	.1590	.2665 **
I Like	.2802 **	.0630	-.1277	.2943 **
Peaceful	.1998 *	.2744 **	-.0538	.2061 **
Aligned With				
Should Have Closer Ties With	.1870 *	.2398 **	-.1046	.1308 *
Trustworthy	.1223	.2417 **	-.1439	.1797 **
Hardworking	.1168	.1201	.0827	.1994 **
Individualistic	.2589 **	.1946 **	.1895	-.1225 **
Favour Investment In	.2531	.1283 *	-.0082	.1345 **

* = Significant at .05

** = Significant at .01

Correlation of Variables with "Aligned With": Czechoslovakia

Variable (Country Scales)	Canada 1990	Canada 1992	Australia	U.S.A.
Industrialized	.1202	.1729 **	.0527	.1962 **
Educated	.1014	.0551	.1775	.1763 **
Western Culture	.1032	.1547 *	-.0257	.2453 **
Know a Lot About	-.0312	.1949 **	-.1444	.1231 *
Stable	.2466 **	.1339 *	.2083 *	.1474 *
Rich	.2806 **	.1586 *	.3048 **	.1492 *
Democratic	.0681 **	.2661 **	.0310	.1756 **
An Ideal Country	.3870 **	.2794 **	.1575	.1094
Safe	.1845 **	.1617 *	.0578	.1780 **
Active	.0483 **	.1967 **	-.3047 **	.0447
Welcome Immigration From	.1359 **	.1090	.0622	.1985 **
Many Rights	.3286 **	.2921 **	.2351 **	.2241 **
I Like	.3163 **	.0512	.0477	.0771
Peaceful	.1125 **	.1675 **	.0708	.2509 **
Aligned With			.	
Should Have Closer Ties With	.2546 **	.2334 **	-.0928	.0540
Trustworthy	.2948 **	.1597 *	-.0143	.0690
Hardworking	.1125	.0382	.1462	.1241 *
Individualistic	.2435	.1659 *	.1025	-.1681 **
Favour Investment In	.3127 **	.1359 *	.0633	.1540 *

* = Significant at .05

** = Significant at .01

Correlation of Variables with "Aligned With": Poland

Variable (Country Scales)	Canada 1990	Canada 1992	Australia	U.S.A.
Industrialized	.2181 **	.1224	-.0942	.0438
Educated	.2388	.1589 *	.2322 **	.0720
Western Culture	.0799	.1462 *	-.0480	.3036 **
Know a Lot About	.1312	.2416 **	.0418	.1050
Stable	.2253 **	.1145	-.0125	.1906 **
Rich	.2861 **	.1972 **	.1456	-.0079
Democratic	.2228 **	.2981 **	-.0154	.2751 **
An Ideal Country	.1988 *	.1485 *	.1855 *	.1428 *
Safe	.0808	.1558 *	.1862 *	.1778 **
Active	.0613	.2402 **	.1022	.1338 *
Welcome Immigration From	.1258	.1683 **	.0978	.1238 *
Many Rights	.1261	.3443 **	.1413	.1581 *
I Like	.1665 *	.0653	.0552	.1327 *
Peaceful	.2132 **	.1155	.1046	.1211
Aligned With				
Should Have Closer Ties With	.2818 **	.0971	.0788	.1293 *
Trustworthy	.2872 **	.1464 *	.0840	.1730 **
Hardworking	.0947 **	.1989 **	.0628	.1597 *
Individualistic	.2060 *	.1409 *	.1601	-.0212
Favour Investment In	.1690 *	.1679 **	.0484	.2262 **

* = Significant at .05

** = Significant at .01

END

0|5-06-9|6

FIN