**Product-Country Images in the Argentine Setting:
An Analysis of Animosity and Admiration**

by: Jason C.L. Baillargeon, B.I.B. (high honours)

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

Master of Business Administration

Eric Sprott School of Business

Carleton University
Ottawa, ON
January 13, 2003
© copyright
2003, Jason C.L. Baillargeon

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

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

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

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

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

0-612-79753-8

Canada

ACCEPTANCE SHEET

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

***Product-Country Images in the Argentine Setting:
An Analysis of Animosity and Admiration***

submitted by Jason C.L. Baillargeon in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree Master of Business Administration

Thesis Co-Supervisor

Thesis Co-Supervisor

Director, Eric Sprott School of Business

Carleton University

January 13, 2003

Abstract

This study examined Product-Country Images (PCI) among Argentine consumers with specific emphasis on animosity and admiration along with the development of an Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model. Data was collected in Buenos Aires, Argentina in May of 2001. PCI among Chilean consumers, based on a parallel study, was also assessed to determine whether animosity existed on the part of Chileans towards Argentina. The study's results reveal that Argentine and Chilean consumers hold animosity towards each other, however, it is greater in the case of Argentine consumers. The results show that Argentine consumers possess country admiration towards both Canada and the U.S. but it is stronger in the case of the U.S. Inferences are made that admiration towards the U.S. may outweigh patriotic sentiments in Argentina. The study finds that animosity and admiration towards a country can co-exist and affect both product evaluations and willingness to buy.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my co-supervisors, Professors Heslop and Papadopoulos, whose encouragement and wisdom were instrumental in all aspects of this endeavour. Special thanks to Professor Roberto Serra who warmly welcomed me in Buenos Aires and helped guide me in the data collection. I would also like to thank those who collected data in Chile, through the guidance of Professor José Rojas Mendes, which was also used in this research endeavour.

I am grateful to friends in Canada and Argentina, as well as Family. I would like to especially thank my mom, Tanya, and Cindy who supported me throughout. Lastly, I would like to express gratitude to horses whose nobility and beauty were the sources of inspiration and hope during my most overwhelming days.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW	2
2.1 Overview of Product-Country Images	2
2.1.1 What is PCI?	2
2.1.2 The Mechanisms of Country Image Effects	3
2.1.3 PCI in a NIC Context	8
2.2 Social Psychological Bases of the PCI Effect	13
2.2.1 In-groups Versus Out-groups	14
2.2.2 Affect and Cognition	18
2.2.3 Stereotypes	21
2.2.4 Patriotism and Nationalism	25
2.2.5 Ethnocentrism	27
2.2.6 Altercentrism and Admiration	32
2.2.7 Cultural affiliation	34
2.2.8 Interregional jealousies	36
2.2.9 Animosity	37
2.3 Regional integration	41
2.3.1 Brief Overview of Regionalism	41
2.3.2 MERCOSUR	43
2.3.3 NAFTA	45
2.3.4 Implications of Regional Integration to the Present Study	46
2.4 Argentina	47
2.4.1 Argentine Economic and Geographic Data	48
2.4.2 Argentine Historical Factors	53
2.4.3 Argentine Cultural Factors	56
3.0 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES	58
3.1 Objective 1 – Comparisons of Product-Country Images	58
3.2 Objective 2 – Patriotism	58
3.3 Objectives 3 – Animosity and Admiration	59
3.4 Objective 4 – Testing of an Animosity/Admiration Model	61
3.5 Objective 5 – Education	65
4.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	66
4.1 Research Instrument	66
4.2 The Sample	67
4.3 Data Collection	68
4.4 Sample Size	68
4.5 Data Analysis Procedure	69

5.0 FINDINGS	73
5.1 Characteristics of the Sample	73
5.2 Product-Country Images – Objective 1, Hypothesis 1	75
5.2.1 Product Images	75
5.2.2 Country and People Images	80
5.3 Construct Development	87
5.4 Consumer Patriotism – Objective 2, Hypotheses 2-3	99
5.5 Animosity and Admiration – Third Objective, Hypotheses 4-8	101
5.6 Model Testing – Objective 4, Hypotheses 9-15	109
5.7 Education and Animosity – Objective 5, Hypothesis 16	121
6.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	122
6.1 Argentine Consumers Product and Country Images	122
6.2 Patriotism	123
6.3 Animosity, Admiration and the Model	124
6.4 Influences of Education on Animosity	128
7.0 LIMITATIONS	130
8.0 BENEFITS AND IMPLICATIONS	134
8.1 PCI Researchers	134
8.2 Policy-Makers	135
8.3 Marketers	139
REFERENCES	143

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Argentine Trade by Trade Bloc	43
Table 2.2	Argentine Trade by Country	49
Table 2.3	Country Profiles for the Year of 2001	51
Table 4.1	Response Rate	69
Table 5.1	Demographic Characteristics of the Argentine Sample	74
Table 5.2	Overall Ratings of Product Items	76
Table 5.3	Doubly Multivariate Analysis of Argentine Consumer Perceptions of Product Differences	78
Table 5.4	Country Images Held by Argentine Consumers	81
Table 5.5	Doubly Multivariate Analysis of Argentine Consumer Perceptions of Country Differences	83
Table 5.6	Principal Components Analysis of Product Scales (Argentina)	88
Table 5.7	Principal Components Analysis of Country Scales (Argentina)	89
Table 5.8	PCA Dimension Groupings	90
Table 5.9	Principal Components Analysis of Product Scales including “Know Country”	93
Table 5.10	Cronbach’s Analysis of Familiarity Construct	94
Table 5.11	Proposed and Modified Models with Cronbach’s Analysis	97
Table 5.12	Product Beliefs Function Comparisons to Argentina	99
Table 5.13	Product Beliefs Appeal Comparisons to Argentina	100
Table 5.14	Proud to Own and Willingness to Buy Comparisons to Argentina	101
Table 5.15	Argentine Consumers’ People Animosity Evaluations	102
Table 5.16	Argentine Consumers’ Relations Animosity Evaluations	103
Table 5.17	Chilean Consumers’ People Animosity Evaluations	104
Table 5.18	Chilean Consumers’ Relations Animosity Evaluations	104
Table 5.19	People Animosity Held by Argentine Consumers towards Chile – Independent-Samples T Test	105
Table 5.20	People Animosity Held by Argentine Consumers towards Chile – Independent-Samples T Test	106
Table 5.21	Doubly Multivariate Analysis of Argentine Consumer Perceptions of Country Admiration Differences	108
Table 5.22	Correlation Analysis of Model Paths Summary Table	110
Table 5.23	Non-hypothesized Correlation Paths Summary Table	110
Table 5.24	Evaluation of the Familiarity Construct as a Moderating Variable Between Product Evaluations and Willingness to Buy	112
Table 5.25	People Animosity and Education	121
Table 5.26	Relations Animosity and Education	121

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1	CETSCALE	29
Figure 3.1	The Proposed Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model	62
Figure 5.1	The Revised Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model	98
Figure 5.2	The Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model – Argentina	114
Figure 5.3	The Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model – Canada	115
Figure 5.4	The Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model – Chile	116
Figure 5.5	The Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model – Mexico	117
Figure 5.6	The Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model – United States	118
Figure 5.7	The Final Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model	120

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A – Research Instrument	151
Appendix B – MANOVA Output for Product Image Differences	184
Appendix C – MANOVA Output for Country Image Differences	196
Appendix D –MANOVA Output for Product Beliefs Function and Appeal Differences	209
Appendix E – MANOVA Output for Argentine People and Relations Animosity towards Chile	214
Appendix F – MANOVA Output for Chilean People and Relations Animosity Towards Argentina	219
Appendix G – MANOVA Output for Argentine Consumers’ Country Admiration	225
Appendix H – MANOVA Output for Between Country Construct Differences	236

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The study of country images and their effects on consumer decision making has become one of the largest areas of study in international marketing. A large body of research exists but much of it is descriptive with little attention to advancing theoretical bases for the beliefs and feelings held by those of one country towards other countries, their people and their products.

The present research will continue a stream of studies by the IKON research group and associates on consumers in countries that are members and potential members of NAFTA (Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, and the United States (U.S.)). This study will focus on consumers in Argentina. From a theoretical viewpoint, it will draw on the socio-psychological literature concerning animosity and admiration to augment the basic descriptive study concerning Argentine consumers' views of the products, peoples and countries of the five countries used in the study. The theory is well suited to the topic since the historical relationship between Chile and Argentina has been one of ongoing conflict and rivalry. In addition, Argentina is a newly industrialized Latin American country with aspirations to improve its economic position through association with highly developed regions of North America. The U.S., in particular, is a country often seen as worthy of emulation by Argentines for its lifestyle. While the primary source of data for the research is a consumer survey conducted in Argentina, the previous work of the IKON group allows access to a parallel study of Chilean consumers for comparison of views of Chileans towards Argentina.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

A common theme in literature is that the study of PCI is multi-faceted and complex. The purpose of this section is to briefly provide an overview of PCI as a prelude to later sections that will probe more deeply into more specific matters and complexities that are pertinent and relatively unexplored in PCI research today.

2.1 Overview of Product-Country Images

This section will provide an overview of PCI through three subsections:

- 2.1.1 will provide a description of PCI
- 2.1.2 will discuss the mechanisms of PCI with specific emphasis on the halo effect and summary construct as well as product dimensions
- 2.1.3 will evaluate PCI in a newly industrialized country context highlighting both attitudes towards foreign versus domestic products and PCI in Latin American countries

2.1.1 What is PCI?

PCI entails more than just the cognitive perceptions that consumers derive for a product when the country-of-origin information is given. It also includes a collection of feelings and societal influences that form a mindset. This mindset is composed of an array of beliefs and feelings for both the product and the country that are in constant interaction. This interplay is forever evolving as circumstances and influences change but ultimately leads to a judgment or judgments for a particular point in time. Essentially, PCI can be considered as the images about product performance and desirability that one conjures up and associates with a product when considering its perceived country of origin (Papadopoulos, 1993).

A cue is a piece of information that can assist an individual in forming a judgment about the suitability of a product. A consumer's evaluation of a given product is based on two categories of information cues: intrinsic and extrinsic (Olson and Jacoby, 1972). Intrinsic cues include such items as taste, design and physical performance, in other words, items that are inherent within the product. In contrast, extrinsic cues consist of items such as price, brand name and warranty, items that are not part of the product itself but add value in the minds of consumers (Olson and Jacoby, 1972). PCI falls into the latter of the two categories. PCI becomes especially relevant in cases where consumers may have less familiarity and knowledge regarding the intrinsic cues of a product (Han and Terpstra, 1988). In essence, PCI is often used as a surrogate information cue (Zhang, 1997).

2.1.2 The Mechanisms of Country Image Effects

Both the product and country are in constant interaction that consequently results in the formation of an image. As such, two important concepts to understand when considering PCI are those of the halo effect and summary constructs. Han (1989) postulated that when consumers are not familiar with a brand, country-of-origin (COO) image may act as a halo from which consumers draw inferences pertaining to a brand's product attributes. In turn, this affects their attitude towards the brand indirectly through product attribute ratings. On the other hand, as consumers become familiar with a country's products, country image may become a construct that summarizes consumer's beliefs about product attributes. This directly affects their attitude towards a brand associated with the country.

Essentially, country image used as a halo operates under the premise that consumers use country image when evaluating products because they are unable to sense the true qualities of the product before purchase (Han, 1989). The halo effect suggests the following structural relationship: country image → product beliefs → brand attitude.

Country image used as a summary construct is applicable after consumers have knowledge and have encoded information regarding a country's products. They retrieve stored information concerning a country's products for which they are familiar with to make inferences and evaluations about other products from that particular country (Han, 1989). Han (1989) contends that this occurs because consumers abstract information about a country's products due to the assumptions that brands from that same country will have very similar product attributes. The summary construct has the following structural relationship: brand beliefs → country image → brand attitude.

Knight and Cantalone (2000) proposed a model that is both comprehensive and flexible that they claim improves upon the model set forth by Han (1989). The authors collected data in Tokyo by distributing 600 questionnaires through a large class at a university. The students were asked to distribute the questionnaires to randomly chosen households in their neighborhood. Of the 600, 349 usable questionnaires were returned representing a response rate of 58%. Data was also collected from students in a U.S. university resulting in 255 usable questionnaires. Knight and Cantalone (2000) suggest that their "flexible" model provides an all-encompassing explanation of attitude formation, allowing attitudes to be both directly and indirectly influenced by country-of-origin

image (COI) through beliefs. They contend that regardless of the state of the consumer's knowledge, both country image and product beliefs are used simultaneously in varying degrees. Knight and Cantalone (2000) hypothesized that under low-knowledge conditions, product beliefs would influence attitudes significantly more than COI. Conversely, under high-knowledge conditions, COI would influence attitudes significantly more than product beliefs. Knight and Cantalone (2000) encountered mixed results for these two hypotheses and were unable to provide substantial evidence to support them. They concluded that beliefs are strongly influenced by country image regardless of the degree of product knowledge.

Lee and Ganesh (1999) contend that general information of a country is greater than product specific information of that country. Categorical knowledge at the general level is more likely to be retrieved before product specific information when a country name is stimulated in one's mind. Therefore they postulated that the overall image of a country is likely to be a deterministic factor in shaping the product specific image of a country. Their study consisted of a survey mailed to a sample of 1,536 randomly selected U.S. households for which a 16% response rate, or 242 returned surveys, was obtained. Sixteen versions of the survey were created combining four brands, with two products, and two countries of manufacture (Canada versus Mexico).

Lee and Ganesh (1999) hypothesized and demonstrated that the overall image of a country has a direct effect on product specific image. The authors then further postulated and demonstrated that product specific image acts as a mediator between overall product

image and consumer evaluation. They also demonstrated that consumers with low country familiarity depended more on COO information than those with high country familiarity and that the effects were greater for both low and high country familiarity than moderate country familiarity.

Papadopoulos and Heslop (1993) noted that it was only in the five years prior to the date of their study that PCI research was legitimized as worthy of in-depth analysis and consideration. Past PCI studies were too applied and practical, largely atheoretical and descriptive. Despite the movement away from descriptive research endeavours to a more thorough understanding of PCI, Papadopoulos and Heslop (1993, p. 62) wrote, “...comparatively little is known about *why* people hold the views they do concerning products from different countries and *how* they develop them.” Through their eight-country study, which was the largest research endeavour of its kind for that time, Papadopoulos and Heslop (1993) thoroughly investigated the linkages between views of countries and their people with views of products. The authors developed relevant scales to capture these linkages, as well as constructs and their relationships. This had never been discussed in the international marketing literature before. The authors found, among others, that country images are useful predictors of product images.

Product dimensions refer to attributes and skills that are required and deemed necessary for the production of certain goods. Inferences can be made on whether or not a given product would be favourably evaluated based upon the ratings of the attributes and skills that are required to make that product. In other words, ratings of a country's strengths or

weaknesses to produce certain dimensions of products can be used as a determinant for product evaluations.

Han and Terpstra's (1988) findings suggest that a country image may be applicable strictly to product dimensions. They reason that although individual country images are different between product categories, a distinctive image of a product dimension may be transferable across product categories. This means that if a consumer deems a country as holding certain key attributes required in the production of a certain product, one can infer that the consumer would also rate that certain product favourably. Similarly, Roth and Romeo (1992) found that when a country was rated as having a positive image for certain dimensions that are believed to be important for the production of a given product category, that given category was also evaluated favourably by consumers for that country. The authors also found that strong country matches with regards to country image dimensions and product categories predict willingness to buy foreign products (Roth and Romeo, 1992). A product match then occurs when important dimensions for a product category are consistent with a country's image (Roth and Romeo, 1992).

The formation of PCIs that are held by an individual involves an extensive array of societal and personal beliefs and feelings. The formation of PCIs as well as contributing forces warrants further attention and will be elaborated upon in subsections within section 2.2, Social Psychological Bases of the PCI Effect.

2.1.3 PCI in a NIC Context

Most PCI studies have concentrated largely on developed countries' (DCs) views on other developed countries. A limited number of studies have focused on newly industrialized countries (NICs) and only a small number of these have collected and examined data in a Latin American context. Ahmed and d'Astous (1995) contend that much of the PCI research that has been conducted in DCs is applicable and relevant to NICs. However, some key differences do exist.

Schooler's (1971) study revealed that a hierarchy of bias exists based on COO from differing regions and countries. The literature suggests that this notion holds especially true when products from NICs are borne in mind (Witt and Rao, 1992). Nes and Bilkey (1993) found that products labelled as made in developing countries were perceived as being more risky and of lower quality than products labelled as made in developed countries. Similarly, Cordell (1992) found that consumers prefer products from DCs over those from NICs. It is, therefore, important for marketers to consider which countries are going to react more or less positively towards goods made in a developing country (Ahmed et al., 1995). Products with a well-known brand name should enjoy a lesser devaluation when consumers are made aware that they are produced in an NIC (Cordell, 1992). Also, perceptions towards NIC products are moderated by product categories (Ahmed and d'Astous, 1998). This means that some product types from NICs will be less discounted than others. However, generally, PCI information positively affects

product evaluations when the product is from a DC and negatively affects product evaluations when it is from an NIC (Gaedeke, 1973).

2.1.3.1 Attitudes Towards Domestic Versus Foreign Products

Domestic consumers of NICs are well aware of disparities in quality when comparing products from more DCs. For example, in their eight-country study, Papadopoulos et al. (1990) found that domestic products were rated highest for all eight countries in Market Presence and Response but did not fair as well for Product Integrity and/or Price-Value performance in LDCs¹. The authors explain this finding by noting that although domestic goods are more obtainable, better known, and more likely to be purchased in the domestic market, this does not mean that consumers have greater confidence in their performance. In fact, German respondents were the only sample to have the most positive views of domestic goods for both Overall and Product Integrity, whereas the Greek and Hungarian samples rated home products noticeably lower in most dimensions. The other five countries Papadopoulos et al. (1990) studied included Canada, the U.S., Great Britain, France, and the Netherlands.

Attitude formation is an important concept to consider and is best described by Papadopoulos et al. (1990) who, through a review of literature, identified four competing influences that may affect the formation of attitudes and the decision process of buyers.

The first influence cited is the level of industrial development of the home country.

Given the fact that consumers may be aware of the weaknesses of domestic

¹ Argentina is treated as a newly industrialized country (NIC) in the present research paper. However, the term less developed country (LDC) will be used when the study under review has elected to use this terminology to describe countries they review.

manufacturers, they may prefer foreign goods of countries with a greater degree of industrial development. The second influence is market development. When industrial development in the home country is lagging but market development is advanced, consumers would be more conscious of foreign goods through media and other sources but less aware of their own less developed goods. The third influence is affective feelings towards the home country. This exists when strong nationalistic pride is present among consumers who then rate domestic goods more favourably than foreign goods. The last influence is the overall assessment of the home country's economic strength and vulnerability. This assessment is triggered by the consumer's feelings of national pride combined with their perceptions of their country's industrial and market development. Papadopoulos et al. (1990, p. 286) contend that these influences suggest that, "...the thought processes of consumers, as they attempt to balance various influences in evaluating products from competing origins, are complex."

In the context of the competing forces identified in the works of Papadopoulos et al. (1990), NIC consumers may be torn between feelings of national pride and the knowledge that home country products may be inferior to DC products. The concepts of affect versus cognition as well as concepts such as patriotism will be elaborated upon in the next section.

2.1.3.2 PCI in a Latin American Context

PCI within a Latin American context has received little study. Jaffe and Martinez (1995) collected data in Monterrey, Mexico, to study consumer preferences between home and

foreign goods. The authors collected a total of 228 questionnaires. The sample was equally divided between males and females and represented a significantly more highly educated population when compared to the rest of Mexico. The authors found that Mexicans rated electronic products from their home country as being inferior to those made in Japan and the U.S. The authors contend that this provides evidence that there are socio-economic pressures for Mexicans to buy foreign goods. Jaffe and Martinez (1995) also found that low-income Mexicans rated Mexican electronic goods more favourably than their high-income counterparts.

Almonte et al., (1995) examined *malinchista* tendencies in Mexico. The term *malinchista* denotes someone who betrays national goals, sides with foreigners, or devalues the Mexican identity in favour of foreign benefits (Almonte et al., 1995). Mexican consumers were surveyed in Chihuahua City, Mexico, using face-to-face interviews in a convenience consumer sample in a shopping mall. The study involved taste tests of both correctly and incorrectly labeled Mexican and U.S. potato chips and salsa. The last part of the survey consisted of a questionnaire with ratings regarding the products and price, correctly labeled or not, as well as open-ended and structured questions regarding attitudes, food consumption habits, and socio-demographic characteristics. Almonte et al. (1995) predicted that *malinchista* would extend into Mexican consumer choices for products from diverging COOs. However, COO bias was found to exist in only two out of their six hypotheses. The authors conclude that the results indicated only a weak bias in favour of Mexican labeling.

Similarly, Witkowski (1998) attempted to measure ethnocentric tendencies in Mexican and Hungarian consumers. Self-administered questionnaires were distributed to both Hungarian and Mexican samples. The Mexican sample consisted of 200 respondents from both big cities and border towns in Mexico as well as Mexicans residing in Southern California. The Hungarian sample consisted of 120 respondents from both big cities and border towns in Hungary as well as Hungarians residing in the Czech Republic. His results indicated that Mexican consumers proved to be more ethnocentric than their Hungarian counterparts, but there was no evidence that this affected their purchase decisions for foreign products.

Ahmed and d'Astous (1995) collected and analyzed data from Chile and Belgium. The Chilean part of the data for the study was collected in city of Talca. Using an area sampling procedure, 529 questionnaires were distributed resulting in 200 usable questionnaires. The authors found that Chileans rated their home country the highest as both a country of design (COD) and country of assembly (COA) among the NICs. Chileans also rated themselves as high as Canada and higher than Belgium as both a COD and COA. The authors noted that Chilean respondents did not seem affected by the fact that Canada is a highly developed country with a per capita income seven times higher than that of Chile. Also, Chileans perceived Mexican products as being significantly cheaper than those of Canada, Japan and their home country (Ahmed and d'Astous, 1995). Despite being rated higher than Mexico, Canada did not share the same level of prestige as the U.S. in the eyes of Chilean consumers (Ahmed and d'Astous, 1995). Chileans shared their European and American counterparts' views that the

perceived quality disparity between DC and NIC products is a result of DC workers being more technologically sophisticated than NIC workers and thus able to produce higher quality products (Ahmed and d'Astous, 1995). Overall, Ahmed and d'Astous (1995) found that Chileans hold a relatively positive image of their home country as a country of origin.

Schooler (1965) is recognized as being the first author to examine PCI and did so within a Latin American context. He found that within the Central American Common Market (CACM), regional fears, jealousies and animosities act as invisible barriers to trade. The work of Schooler (1965) will be discussed further in subsection 2.2.8, Interregional Jealousies.

2.2 Social Psychological Bases of the PCI Effect

Several social psychological concepts are relevant when considering PCI. Specific to this study's objectives, the following concepts will be reviewed as they hold particular importance:

- 2.2.1 In-groups Versus Out-groups
- 2.2.2 Affect and Cognition
- 2.2.3 Stereotypes
- 2.2.4 Patriotism and Nationalism
- 2.2.5 Ethnocentrism
- 2.2.6 Altercentrism and Admiration
- 2.2.7 Cultural Affiliation
- 2.2.8 Interregional Jealousies
- 2.2.9 Animosity

2.2.1 In-groups Versus Out-groups

An in-group can be defined as a “group of people united by common beliefs, attitudes, or interests and usually excluding outsiders” (ITP Nelson Canadian Dictionary, 1997, p. 700). In contrast, an out-group can be defined as a “group of people excluded from or not belonging to one’s own group, especially when viewed as subordinate or contemptibly different” (ITP Nelson Canadian Dictionary, 1997, p. 973).

The study of in-groups in a PCI context is important because:

- 1) individuals evaluate in-groups more favourably than out-groups when the goal is to achieve a favourable social identity. This tendency is not limited to just evaluations of people, but can also be broadened to products, services, and brands that are associated with the in-group (Tajfel, 1981).
- 2) the division of the world into countries acts as classification of people as either being part of the in-group, or the home country, and the out-group, or foreign countries (Verlegh, 1999). Similarly, the groups that one belongs to through birth or early experience have an effect on which groups one deems to be in-groups or out-groups later on in life (Druckman, 1994).

Therefore, the association between PCI and the study of in-groups is important because a nation that one belongs to can be viewed as an in-group and products are associated to the countries from which they are derived.

This subsection will provide an overview of relevant literature pertaining to the study of in-groups. Later subsections within this section, particularly on stereotyping and ethnocentrism, will discuss the concept of in-groups and how it relates to these concepts.

Druckman (1968) found striking support for a universal bias towards the in-group. Druckman (1994) contends that this is not without reason. Through his literature review, he found that studies suggest individuals view groups as furnishing them with security and safety, as well as status and prestige in return for their loyalty and commitment. He found that nations, in particular, gain personal relevance for individuals when they become sentimentally attached to their country (affectively involved), motivated to assist their country (goal-oriented), and gain a sense of identity and self-esteem through their identification with their country (ego involved). Loyalty breeds accountability to others and increases through the socialization process and expands from smaller to larger groups. Favouring one's own group can then hold true even when one stands to lose substantially (Druckman, 1994). Similarly, Oakes and Turner (1980) found that minimal inter-group discrimination tends to increase self-esteem with the primary cause being a desire to have a positive social identity and to make group membership salient.

According to the social identity theory, one's self-esteem is boosted by making a favourable comparison between one's own and another group. Nationalism ties an individual's self-esteem to the esteem in which the home nation is held. Being able to discriminate against other groups provides a rationale for why one belongs to a particular

group, thereby making one feel good about one's self. Loyalty and identification with the nation then become tied to one's own sense of self (Druckman, 1994).

In-groups, and nations as an in-group association, not only breed loyalty but also result in the disparagement of other nations. Whether or not this can be systematically applied to all out-groups is questionable.

Druckman (1968) noted that the available literature up to the time of his simulation study was filled with evidence of the tendency to find traits and behaviours of out-groups as being curious at best but also grounds for avoidance and enmity. Druckman's (1968) simulation study consisted of 176 naval recruits, 16 in each simulation test. In each simulation test a historical background, similar to that of a bi-polar cold war, was given to participants as well as membership and a role for one of four fictitious countries. At the end of each simulation test, participants were asked to rate all participants as persons rather than decision-makers using scales with personality traits. As a result of his simulation study, Druckman (1968) discovered that individuals rated people from their own nation as being more liked, respected, and as having stronger personalities than individuals from other nations. Druckman's (1968) contends that his findings indicate that merely belonging to an out-group provides justification for negative evaluations by an in-group.

Based on an assessment of a wide variety of experiments conducted by other researchers, Druckman (1994) later supported his previous works and maintained that simply being

classified in a group creates positive biases for one's own group regardless of whether an individual has ever seen or met members belonging to other groups. One's own group is perceived as being better, friendlier, more competent, and stronger than other groups.

The disparagement of the out-group can vary in degree. Druckman (1994) notes that judgments based on familiarity with another country are a result of cognitive factors. People who have high familiarity with a particular nation are less likely to describe it in a stereotyped manner. Druckman (1994) contends that people are more motivated to learn about countries they like. In learning about liked countries one becomes more knowledgeable thereby gaining greater familiarity.

In her study of East African Tribes, Brewer (1968) found that social distance between groups was strongly minimized when the out-group was perceived as being similar; when it was closer geographically; and when it had a high level of advancement. Brewer and Kramer (1985) concluded that contact with the out-group by the in-group causes greater familiarity, thereby resulting in more positive inter-group attitudes and social acceptance. From a social psychology standpoint this can be explained by the fact that the more a stimulus is presented to a subject, the more the individual begins to like the stimulus independent of recognition (Zajonc, 2000).

Bass and Dunteman (1963) concluded that evaluations of other groups are only partly based on reality and observed performance. Out-groups are undervalued in comparison to the in-group and even more so when the out-group becomes a competitor. When an

out-group becomes a collaborator with the in-group, it receives better evaluations and is held in higher esteem. Bass and Dunteman's (1963) approach concentrates more upon the competitive situation between groups as a root cause of evaluations pertaining to each other.

Druckman et al. (1974) proposed an evaluative process in the creation of a stereotype. The contention is that an individual makes an initial affective judgment towards a nation. If this judgment is negative the individual does not seek any further information, leading to vague evaluative reference. If the judgment is positive, the individual seeks further information thereby leading to a firmer evaluative reference. Antecedents of the formation of familiarity involve affect towards the nation in question that may then influence willingness to acquire cognitive information of that given country. The study of affect and cognition then tie in as an important area of study to understanding both familiarity and PCI.

2.2.2 Affect and Cognition

The debate of the effects of affect and cognition and which is predominant and results in the formation of the other is widespread throughout the social psychology literature. Zajonc (2000, 1980) has persuasively argued that both are independent but yet intertwined at the same time. Zajonc (1980, p. 154) best embodied this notion when he wrote: "Feeling is not free of thought, nor is thought free of feelings." This debate has

entered the present research as it ties in directly with its research objectives on various fronts.

Han (1988) studied the role of consumer patriotism by examining consumers' choice between foreign and domestic products. The results for his study were obtained through telephone surveys of 212 respondents from a mid-western city in the U.S. The countries used in the survey included Japan, Korea, and the home country, U.S. Two products, televisions and automobiles, were used. Han (1988) study considered two cognitive factors and one affective factor. The first cognitive factor considered was the perceived difference in quality between domestic and foreign products and the second was product serviceability, while the affective factor used was consumer patriotism. Han (1988) found that the affective factor mildly influenced the cognitive factors. That is, the patriotic consumer had only a small tendency to rate foreign products less favourably and domestic products more favourably.

Han's (1988) findings indicate that although consumers may have significantly differing cognitive attitudes towards products made in different countries, these attitudes do not necessarily have an effect on their choice of domestic versus foreign products. However, the affective factor, patriotism, does indeed influence the choice.

Zajonc (1980) noted that a number of experimental studies on preferences, attitudes, impression formation, and decision making suggest that affective judgments are fairly independent and come before cognitive operations. He further postulates that affective

judgments may result in the formation of cognitive operations as opposed to the reverse, and more widely received, notion, that cognitive operations act as a basis for affective judgments (Zajonc, 1980).

Zajonc (1980) contends that affective judgments can occur without a great deal of perceptual and cognitive encoding. Affective reactions can occur earlier and with a greater degree of confidence than their cognitive counterparts. Zajonc (1980) concludes that affect and cognition operate under separate and partially independent systems that can each affect the other. He argues that affect is always present in cognition but that cognition is not always present in affect. He contends that affect occurs without effort, however, the same cannot be said for cognition. He also argues that affect is the first element to emerge when a stimulus is presented.

Affect can also be easily encoded in the mind and retrieved with little thought once a judgment has been reached. Branscombe (1988, p. 20) best illustrated this phenomenon when she wrote: "... once an affective response has become automatized, it appears spontaneous, the presence of a goal (externally or internally set) not being necessary. Thus, as individuals gain experience with a particular emotion domain, a response rule is selected based on the current state, without an explicit search being required." Similarly Berkowitz et al. (2000) contend that many aggression-based responses emerge automatically in response to an associatively linked stimulus situation. No cognitive response is processed but rather an automatic emotionally based response emerges. From

this, Berkowitz et al. (2000) conclude that people often mould their cognitive processes to what they are feeling.

As a final note to this section, the work of Zajonc (1980, p. 159) will be drawn upon once again: “The cause of the conflict, the positions taken, the matter at issue, who said what, may have all been forgotten, and yet the affect that was present during the incident may be readily retrieved.”

In terms of how this may apply to international relations, a socio-political event can occur between two countries and an emotion can be internalized within an affected individual. As time passes, regardless of whether or not the individual can recollect the exact issues at play, the internalized feeling will remain. This feeling, whether it be hate, affection or another feeling, is then placed on the out-group, or members of the other nation, and is consequently embedded in products from the out-group.

2.2.3 Stereotypes

A stereotype can be defined as a “conventional, formulaic, and oversimplified conception or image” (ITP Nelson Canadian Dictionary, 1997, p. 1337). When products are associated to a particular COO in the mind of a consumer, they are also associated to stereotypes of that given country such as the land, the people, and its products (Verlegh, 1999). Thus, the study of stereotypes holds particular relevance to the study of PCI.

Stereotyping serves the cognitive function of simplifying and systemizing information from a social environment that would otherwise be too multifarious and complex to act upon (Tajfel, 1981). Askegaard and Ger (1997) contend that stereotypes are used as an efficient simplification tool to facilitate analysis of a complex environment. They act as more than just shortcuts and cognitive memory biases, but also combine cognitive, motivational, sensory and affective processes in a given context in order to induce a specific stereotyping effect. Tajfel (1981, p. 163) successfully depicted the role of stereotypes when he wrote: "In a sense, these [stereotypes] are the structural constants of the socio-psychological situation; it is the framework within which the input of the socially derived influence and information must be adapted, modified and recreated."

Most authors have approached the study of stereotypes by focusing on negative and derogatory out-group stereotypes. As previously noted in subsection 2.2.1, out-groups are often viewed negatively in comparison to the in-group (Druckman, 1968). This may explain why past studies have given little attention to positive and admirable out-group stereotypes. Despite its lack of study, it is possible for the in-group to hold positive beliefs and stereotypes towards the out-group. This notion will be further discussed in subsection 2.2.6, Altercentrism and Admiration.

According to Tajfel (1981, p. 161), out-group social stereotypes are likely to be formed and disseminated in conditions that require:

- (a) "a search for the understanding of complex, and usually distressful; large-scale social events;
- (b) justification of actions, committed or planned, against out-groups;

- (c) a positive differentiation of the in-group from selected out-groups at a time when such differentiation is perceived as becoming insecure and eroded; or when it is not positive, and social conditions exist which are perceived as providing a possibility for a change in the situation.” (Tajfel, 1981, p. 161)

Askegaard and Ger (1997) outlined the intergroup consequences as a result of formed stereotypes:

“Stereotype effects include distortion of perception – bias in selectivity, accentuation of both differences between, and similarity within categories (in- and out-groups), perceived homogeneity of out-groups, confirmatory bias – tendency of stereotypic expectations to confirm themselves, and evaluative bias – evaluative and behavioral discrimination favouring the in-group.” (Askegaard and Ger, 1997, p. 52)

Once a stereotype has been formed within the in-group towards the out-group and accepted it is hard to change (Druckman, 1994). Tajfel (1981) further elaborates on this notion by differentiating social categorizations that are neutral and those that are value loaded. He contends that a neutral social categorization involves a group placing a stereotype on another group with neither positive nor negative value connotations. In this instance, if a group encounters evidence that is held contrary to that of the stereotype, it will generally be accepted with not much thought. In the second instance, if the social categorization is value loaded and disconformities are found, acceptance may threaten and endanger the value system for which the differentiation between the observing group and the group in question is held. As a result, Tajfel (1981) contends that value loaded social categorizations are stronger and much more difficult to change.

Stereotypes also provide a means of justifying prior intergroup discrimination (Rutland and Brown, 2001). Social identity theory contends that stereotypes hold consensus within a social group due to the fact that the in-group wants to collectively justify their behaviour (Jost and Banaji, 1994). Social identity theory posits that when negative images of the in-group are viewed as both legitimate and stable, the group in question will internalize these stereotypes even though they may be harmful to themselves (Jost and Banaji, 1994). Jost and Banaji (1994, p. 3) define false consciousness as "... the holding of beliefs that are contrary to one's personal or group interest and which thereby contribute to the maintenance of the disadvantaged position of the self or the group." Jost and Banaji (1994) contend that stereotypes may arise out of false or true consciousness. The characteristics of the stereotypes may in fact have no bearing on the characteristics of the group but are nevertheless employed.

Jost and Banaji (1994) built upon previous notions of stereotyping, specifically ego-justification and group-justification, and proposed the notion of system-justification. They define system-justification as the psychological process in which one sacrifices the interests of the group or the self in order to preserve the existing social arrangements. The authors contend that this notion helps explain previously unexplained phenomena such as disadvantaged groups and individuals imposing negative stereotypes on themselves.

The concept of system-justification may be applicable to NICs in regards to their perceptions and stereotypes towards DCs in the context of the present research. Based on the system-justification approach, it is possible that a NIC would not only positively

evaluate a DC but also devalue their home country as an attempt to account for its comparative disadvantages to the DC. System-justification seems to be related to the concept of altercentrism that will be reviewed in a later subsection.

2.2.4 Patriotism and Nationalism

Druckman (1994) differentiates the concepts of nationalism and patriotism by citing key differences between the two. He views patriotism as a love and willingness to sacrifice for one's country. Nationalism involves the preceding coupled with exclusion and hostility towards other countries.

The need for attachment to the nation tends to stem from the affective and instrumental functions that nations serve for their citizens (Druckman, 1994). As previously discussed in subsection 2.2.1, nations can act as an in-group, thereby resulting in over-evaluation of the home nation and disparagement of other nations. As such, nationalist feelings amplify the propensity for misperception (Druckman, 1994). National identity can also be regarded as a significant attribute of the self (Verlegh, 1999). In an international spectrum, national identity is the focus of transnational relations and may even lead to increased nationalistic ideologies (Jelin, 1999).

Druckman (1994) considered nationalism as becoming a social phenomenon to the extent that individuals form attitudes about their own and other nations. Such attitudes are a reflection of the feelings that individuals have towards these objects and their sense of loyalty to them. The feelings of attachment that invoke loyalty are not whimsical but

basic to the definition of one's self. As such, loyalty to a group strengthens one's identity and sense of belonging (Druckman, 1994).

Research attempts have been made to assess and evaluate the importance and effects of both nationalism and patriotism on PCIs.

Cattin et al. (1982) found that differences existed in the perceptions and beliefs among French and American industrial buyers for products made in the U.S., France, West Germany, England, and Japan. The largest discrepancy between French and American industrial buyers' evaluations occurred between American and French products with the home country being evaluated as higher. The authors attributed these differences to national biases.

Granzin and Olsen (1998) found a network of influences that affect consumers' purchase-related support for American workers who are susceptible to competition from foreign products. This network of influences included the lower costs of helping workers, internalization of a responsibility to help, feeling a common fate with the workers, perception of similarity with the workers, social concerns for Americans who have lost their jobs, ethnocentric orientation toward trading with foreign countries, and patriotic loyalty to America.

In their study, Balabanis et al. (2001) attempted to investigate the impact of patriotism, nationalism and internationalism as antecedents of consumer ethnocentrism in Turkey

and the Czech Republic. The results of their study showed a link between patriotism and consumer ethnocentrism in the Turkish sample but not in the Czech sample. Conversely, a significant positive relationship existed between nationalism and consumer ethnocentrism in the Czech sample but not in the Turkish sample. Internationalism did not affect consumer ethnocentrism in either sample. The authors concluded that the influences of neither patriotism nor nationalism consistently affect consumer ethnocentrism and that it varies depending upon the country.

Similarly, Papadopoulos et al. (1990) reported that despite frequent media reports concerning the effects of imports and rising protectionism, consumers are aware of the weaknesses of domestic producers and hold approving attitudes towards products from foreign DCs with strong reputations for quality products and production.

2.2.5 Ethnocentrism

Consumer ethnocentricity as defined by Shimp and Sharma (1987, p. 280) is: "... the beliefs held by consumers about the appropriateness, indeed morality, of purchasing foreign-made products." Supphellen and Rittenburg (2001, p. 910) write that: "... consumer ethnocentrism denotes the tendency of consumers to evaluate domestic (in-group) brands and products unreasonably favourably compared to foreign (out-group) brands and products." Sharma et al. (1995) identified three primary characteristics of consumer ethnocentricity:

- 1) its cause is the love and concern for one's own country and the fear that imports may harm one's countrymen.

- 2) it contains the willingness and, in highly ethnocentric consumers, the morality of buying imports.
- 3) it refers to a personal level of prejudice against imports.

The effects of consumer ethnocentrism include an over evaluation of domestic goods and under evaluation of imports, a sense of moral obligation to buy domestic goods, and a preference for domestic goods (Sharma et al., 1995). Consumer ethnocentric tendencies are particularly strong among consumers who consider their economic well-being or livelihood to be jeopardized by foreign competition (Shimp and Sharma, 1987). As a result, highly ethnocentric consumers are most likely to hold biased judgments by highlighting the positive aspects of domestic goods and downplaying the virtues of foreign goods (Shimp and Sharma, 1987).

Shimp and Sharma (1987) and Sharma et al. (1995) have investigated the effects of consumer ethnocentricity in depth and both developed and found support for a corresponding measure that they refer to as the CETSCALE. Sharma et al. (1995) developed a conceptual model that is illustrated on the next page.

Since Shimp and Sharma's (1987) original CETSCALE development, Sharma et al. (1995) tested their conceptual model among Korean consumers through questionnaires that were both mailed-out (125 questionnaires) and taken home by school children to their parents (542 questionnaires). The authors found support for all associations among model elements except for age. The authors contended that age and ethnocentrism would be positively related but found no proof to back this hypothesis. Other researchers have

attempted to validate and refute the model as well as question the effects, if any, of consumer ethnocentricity on consumer purchasing of domestic over foreign goods.

Figure 2.1
CETSCALE

Contrary to Sharma et al. (1995), Witkowski (1998) found age to be the only demographic variable in both Hungarian and Mexican samples that was significantly related to the CETSCALE. Older respondents were much more ethnocentric than younger respondents. Witkowski (1998) only found some support in his Hungarian sample and none in the Mexican sample that consumer ethnocentrism would be negatively associated to the purchase of foreign products.

In their study of foreign versus domestic gas station brands in Poland, Supphelen and Rittenburg (2001) found that when the foreign brand is superior to the domestic brand,

consumer ethnocentrism is shown through a more positive perception of the domestic brand with little or no effect to the perceptions of the foreign brand. Supphelen and Rittenburg (2001) proposed that in some cases social identity concerns and ethnocentrism motivations may work in opposition. Such cases are likely to occur when the in-group norm dictates that foreign is better but at the same time the consumer is compelled to adhere to their ethnocentric tendencies. Supphelen and Rittenburg (2001) suggested that ethnocentric consumers would probably seek some kind of compromise and try to reduce the discrepancy between superior foreign brands and inferior domestic brands. In this situation, the authors found that consumer ethnocentrism has a positive effect on the domestic brand but no effect on the superior foreign brand.

Supphelen and Rittenburg (2001) used the terms *search* and *experience* attributes in their study. The authors consider search attributes as qualities of products that are directly observable and unambiguous whereas experience attributes are those qualities that one encounters only after purchasing and using the product. In the case of experience attributes, the authors provided the example of driving a car. One can only experience the pleasure of driving a car after using it. Thus the authors contend that experience attributes are much more subjective than search attributes.

The authors demonstrated that ethnocentric evaluations of inferior domestic goods are more pronounced on experience attributes of products over search attributes. They supported this notion by theories of top-down vs. bottom-up processing. Top-down processing involves attaching a previous evaluation of the category to the stimulus

whereas bottom-up processing involves the evaluation of specific aspects of the stimulus (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993 in Supphelen and Rittenburg, 2001). Top-down processing allows the ethnocentric consumer to rationally defend their preference for inferior domestic goods by resorting to ambiguous evaluations that are largely dependent upon personal taste in contrast to search attributes involved in bottom-up processing that are observable and unambiguous (Supphelen and Rittenburg, 2001).

Hult et al. (1999) found that the CETSCALE is a useful tool for measuring consumer ethnocentrism across cultural and national boundaries. Hult et al. (1999) also proposed that ethnocentric consumers would not openly express their views if they thought that their views are not consistent with those held by the rest of society. However, the ethnocentric consumer may explicitly express their biases for home goods through their consumption behaviours. Conversely, a non-ethnocentric consumer may report ethnocentric tendencies if such behaviour is viewed as being socially acceptable, but at the same time explicitly express their non-bias to home goods through purchasing foreign goods.

The work of Hult et al. (1999) can be put into perspective by the work of Osterhus (1997) who contends that social norms consist of the perceptions one has regarding societal sentiments. Personal norms, however, deal with how one acts upon societal norms and whether or not one decides to incorporate societal sentiments and beliefs as their own (Osterhus, 1997). Consistent with the preceding, Osterhus (1997) found that normative influences do not automatically translate into personal behaviour.

Batra et al. (2000) studied the effects of ethnocentrism and admiration. Data was collected in India in two major cities, Bombay and Delhi, through personal at-home interviews among 508 urban, mainly middle-class women. The authors hypothesized that consumer ethnocentrism would moderate the effect of perceived brand non-localness for LDC consumers who admire DC lifestyles on brand attitudes. In this way, consumer ethnocentrism will have a negative impact on non-local brand attitudes. However, no support was found to validate this hypothesis. The authors also proposed that consumers who are both ethnocentric, or possess the desire to buy local brands, and admire DC lifestyles, would be torn between the two opposing factors. These two factors would then offset each other. For the consumer who is both ethnocentric and does not admire DC lifestyles, negative attitudes towards non-local brands would be greater. Despite their logical reasoning, the authors found no significant support for these hypotheses.

Although Batra et al. (2000) could not support their claims, their rationale does provide an interesting point of view: consumers are torn between a variety of intergroup forces as well as their own beliefs. Furthermore, Batra et al. (2000) found evidence that not only can ethnocentrism exist within a nation but also its opposite, altercentrism, as will be explored in the next section.

2.2.6 Altercentrism and Admiration

Normative influences not only include ethnocentrism but also can include admiration and altercentrism. When NIC consumers view products from a DC as having high social

signaling value and DC lifestyles are held in esteem, Batra et al. (2000) argue that admiration towards that DC exists as a normative influence. Admiration can be defined as “wonder mingled with reverence, esteem, approbation; gratified contemplation” (The Oxford International Dictionary of the English Language, 1957, p. 24). Admiration thrives when perceived non-local origin leads to increased positive brand attitudes for consumers in developing countries that are high in susceptibility to normative influences. Thus, admiration towards a DC will positively affect attitudes towards brands of that country (Batra et al., 2000). In their study of the effects of local/non-local brands on consumers in developing countries, Batra et al. (2000) concluded that the effect of DC admiration on brand attitudes does not simply occur because of a higher quality inference but rather because of the symbols for cosmopolitanism and prestige that non-local brands possess.

Similarly, but caused by different factors, Druckman (1994) considered studies from Montero (1986) and Salazar (1983) that examined the existence of xenocentrism, also referred as altercentrism, in Latin American countries towards the U.S. This particular phenomenon tends to exist when a nation has a dependent relationship upon a more powerful nation. Montero (1986) found that when comparisons are made, Venezuelans devalue themselves and overvalue Americans giving them the highest evaluation. This self-depreciation was followed by a U.S. dependent ideology. Altercentrism breeds a negative national identity because the reference group is outside of one's own nation (Druckman, 1994). The concept of altercentrism can also be explained by Jost and

Banaji's (1994) notion of system-justification where one sacrifices the interests of the group or the self in order to preserve the existing social arrangements.

One can postulate that the difference between altercentrism and admiration seems to lie in the fact that admiration results in positive evaluations of the DC, or out-group, while altercentrism results in a devaluation of the NIC, or in-group.

2.2.7 Cultural affiliation

“A *state* is a group of people occupying a defined geographic region and recognizing the authority of an organized government. A *nation* consists of people sharing a common ethnic heritage and a cognate language or languages. In many ECMs [emerging consumer markets], political boundaries were drawn primarily to satisfy colonial exigencies.”

- Burgess and Harris (1999, p. 170)

The distinction between nation and state made by Burgess and Harris (1999) addresses one of two issues pertinent to cultural affiliation and the study of PCI. The first as noted by Burgess and Harris (1999) is that state boundaries are not necessarily indicative of a nation. That is, a given state may contain several nations. Conversely, a nation may exist in several states. As such, loyalty from the individual may not necessarily lie with the state but rather to the perceived nation. Under this premise, one can consider a nation crossing over state boundaries. This leads to the second issue of cultural affiliation. One may view colonial ties or some other form of communion as being indicative of one's own nation, as opposed to artificial borders set up by the state. It would then be possible for one to not only view the nation as a region within the state, as highlighted as the first

pertinent issue to the study of cultural affiliation, but also as geographically dispersed areas all over the world where the perceived tying bond comes into play.

Burgess and Harris (1999) noted that cultural affiliation can occur in the form of perceptions of social identity that correspond more with a perceived future or past ancestral homeland rather than current political realities (Burgess and Harris, 1999). Specifically, the authors found that national identity influences brand preference among South African consumers as they were more likely to hold general brand preferences for home-nation rather than home-state.

Similarly, in their studies of cultural affiliation, Heslop et al. (1998) focused on subcultural affiliations to ethnically linked regions. To the author's knowledge, studies conducted by Burgess and Harris (1999) and Heslop et al. (1996, 1998) are the only studies of their kind to research the topic of cultural affiliation in a PCI context with the same end. Others such as Hulland (1998) have made reference to cultural affiliation but not focused their research endeavors on the topic. In the case of Hulland (1998), he found that regional patriotism and/or a closer cultural, political, and social affinity seemed to exist among respondents' own country and the country of brand.

Heslop et al. (1998) found that more positive images existed for respondents with subcultural affiliations to ethnically linked regions. However, the findings of Heslop et al. (1998) did not support an ethnic affiliation influence on developed nation respondents in regards to product-country images of developing nations. The authors reason that the

high risk associated with products from developing nations may override bias due to ethnic affiliations. In a DC to DC context, Heslop et al. (1998) found support for ethnic affiliation in English Canadians towards products made in Britain but none for French Canadians towards France. The authors explained their findings by noting the possibility that perhaps stronger ties exist between English Canadians towards Britain than French Canadians towards France. From an intra-state national context, Heslop et al. (1998) found higher evaluation of Canadian products by English Canadians than French Canadians. They credited nationalistic tendencies as a key factor for this finding. Heslop et al. (1998) suggest that subnational differences among consumers within the same country may justify implementing different marketing strategies targeted at these differing subnationalities within that same country.

2.2.8 Interregional jealousies

A limited amount of PCI research has investigated the notion of interregional jealousies. Schooler (1965) was the first ever to conduct an empirical test examining the effects of COO and explained his findings by citing the notion of interregional jealousies. In his study, Schooler (1965) found that Guatemalans evaluated identical products from Mexico, a country not belonging to the Central American Common Market (CACM), as equal to their own and higher than products from Costa Rica and El Salvador, two countries that are members of CACM. Schooler (1965) concluded that regional fears, jealousies, and animosities represented hidden barriers to increased trade within the CACM, and that existing preconceptions regarding the products of a country are affected by the attitude held toward the people in that given country. All of the countries in

Schooler's (1965) study shared Spanish colonial ties and a common language. However, these affiliations were overridden by what was perceived by consumers as a potential threat. Similar findings have been reported from the subnational studies of Heslop et al. (1998), discussed in subsection 2.2.7, and research focusing on animosity (Klein et al. 1998), which is presented in the following section.

A final study of interest to the discussion of interregional jealousies is that of González et al. (2002) who researched negative biases at subcultural and international levels among Spanish respondents. Data for the study was collected through a self-administered questionnaire, with 803 collected in total, in three separate regions: the Basque region of Spain, the Navarra region of Spain and France. The authors were unable to support their hypothesis of negative bias at the subcultural level, consumers from Basque towards Navarra, but did find support for negative biases in an unexpected direction at the international level, Spanish consumers towards France.

2.2.9 Animosity

Animosity can be defined as “bitter hostility or open enmity; active hatred” (ITP Nelson Canadian Dictionary, 1997, p. 53).

At times imported brands have become linked with cultural clashes (Roemer, 1995). An example of this is cited by Roemer (1995) who contends that “Japan bashing” in the U.S. stems from the belief that Japanese imports threaten American values. Despite the fact that most American consumers do recognize that Japanese automobiles are of higher quality than their domestic offerings, feelings of xenophobia, rooting back to the Pearl

Harbor attacks, influence American consumers to do the patriotically correct act of buying local and at the same time specifically avoiding automobiles made in Japan (Roemer, 1995). Through her proposed theory of acculturation, Roemer (1995) suggests that a divergence of affect and cognition exists whereby a consumer's prejudice against another culture may prevail over higher evaluations of product quality thus leading to "boycotting." Essentially, Roemer (1995) appears to be saying that affective factors, influenced by acculturation and the feelings that one possesses for another nation, may be of greater importance than cognitive factors in a consumer's image and loyalty towards a given brand.

Along the same lines as the work of Roemer (1995), Klein et al. (1998) set forth an animosity model that predicts that animosity toward a foreign nation will negatively impact the purchase of products made in that nation regardless of product quality evaluations. Animosity in a PCI context differs from ethnocentrism in that it is country specific and, as such, the consumer may purchase imports from other foreign countries but not from the specific country for which the animosity is held (Klein et al., 1998). Klein et al. (1998, p. 90) contend that under the animosity model "Consumers might avoid products from the offending nation not because of concern about the quality of goods, but because the exporting nation has engaged in military, political, or economic acts that a consumer finds both grievous and difficult to forgive."

Klein et al. (1998) studied the attitudes of consumers' from Nanjing, China towards Japan and Japanese products. The reason that the authors selected the city of Nanjing

was because it underwent a terrible occupation and massacre by the Japanese during World War II. The authors found that although Chinese consumers evaluated Japanese products favourably, their willingness to buy them was significantly affected by animosity held towards the Japanese for past conflicts. The authors concluded that the effects of animosity on the buying decisions of Chinese consumers were above and beyond consumer ethnocentrism. Klein et al. (1998) are among a very limited number of researchers to analyze animosity in a PCI context.

Others have also contributed indirectly and to a lesser extent to the animosity model. The work of Papadopoulos et al. (1990) showed that French and British respondents rated Japanese products last on the “proud to own” variable out of five countries but first on Product Integrity. Due to historical factors, specifically World War II, it is possible that animosity exists between the French and British towards the Japanese. It may also indicate the possibility of a consumer accepting the fact that a product from a particular nation is of high quality but at the same time expressing dissatisfaction in owning from a pride standpoint. Similarly, Lee and Ganesh (1999) contend that consumers can have an overall negative image of a country but still have a positive image of that country’s products.

Erickson et al. (1984) proposed that an image variable could have a direct influence not only on beliefs but also on attitudes. The authors argued that a brand name could provoke an emotional reaction or that a consumer could have a bias against a foreign country that has affective implications for producers from that country. Despite these

persuasive arguments, the authors found that COO affects beliefs but no other component of attitudes.

The animosity model set forth by Klein et al. (1998) is of great interest and has deep implications for marketers. For example, it would be futile for Japanese manufacturers to market the quality attributes of their products to consumers in Nanjing, China, as they would not buy the products regardless of quality. Efforts may be better directed at attempting to reconcile past grievances with the Chinese. Whether or not Klein et al.'s (1998) model can be applied to other nations who have animosity toward other nations remains in debate. It seems questionable that the cognitive and affective factors would not interplay and affect each other. Or, in other words, that past grievances would cultivate not only unwillingness to own a product from a given country, but also result in the disparagement of product evaluations from that same country. As previously noted in subsection 2.2.2, affect can mould cognition. It is then entirely possible for consumers to hold animosity to a given nation and, as a result of this animosity, begrudge products from that country as well.

The study of animosity and its effects on product evaluations is essential to the study of PCIs and has been little studied by researchers. The present research, among other objectives, will explore this concept through the Argentine/Chilean example. Conversely, admiration may also exist and play a significant role in consumer evaluations. Another objective of the present research is to determine whether admiration exists and its effects on Argentine consumer evaluations of products using the

U.S. and Canada as examples. Before considering this research, it is important to understand the past and present relations between these countries, as well as understanding many social elements that are commonplace in Argentina.

2.3 Regional Integration

Within past sections an overview of PCI was given with emphasis of PCI in an NIC context as well as social-psychological factors that serve as antecedents to PCI. A shift will now be made from PCI and social psychology research to regional integration and Argentina. Both of these topics contain practical issues concerning the present research setting.

The present section will address regional integration and its direct implications to Argentina. It will be divided into the following subsections:

- 2.3.1 a brief overview of regionalism
- 2.3.2 MERCOSUR in the context of the present research
- 2.3.3 NAFTA in the context of the present research
- 2.3.4 implications for the present study

2.3.1 Brief Overview of Regionalism

Regional integration can be defined as “the process of providing common rules, regulations, and policies for a region.” (Mattli, 1999, p. 44) Mattli (1999) cites two types of conditions that must be present in order for integration to succeed. Firstly, demand conditions must be met. Mattli (1999) considers demand conditions as the potential for significant economic gains from market exchange within the region. Secondly, supply

conditions must be met. Mattli (1999) views supply conditions as the willingness of political leaders to undergo integration. In order for this to occur, regional integration must offer political leaders improved possibilities of retaining power. To summarize, regions with strong market pressure for integration and benefits to political leadership are most likely to experience successful integration.

Regional integration can bring about economic growth through specialization, exchange, and division of labour (Mattli, 1999). However, when considering a global perspective beyond the integrated region, Winters (1999) contends that there is insufficient evidence and diverging views as to whether or not regionalism results in increased multilateralism. He cites the possibility of producers obtaining most of what they want from regional arrangements and not looking beyond the integrated region. Winters (1999) criticizes the research to date as he claims it is unable to ascertain whether or not regionalism results in freer trade on a global scale. He notes that new frameworks and models must be constructed to assess the implications of regionalism.

A brief statistical synopsis of trade between Argentina and various trade blocs in millions of USD for the year 2000 is provided below (Argentine Ministry of Economy, 2002). The exports and imports columns respectively indicate Argentine exports to and imports from the given trade bloc.

Table 2.1
Argentine Trade by Trade Bloc (in millions of USD)

Area	Exports (FOB) (% of Total)	Imports (CIF) (% of Total)	Balance
MERCOSUR	8,401.8 (31.8%)	7,199.3 (28.5%)	1,202.5
NAFTA	3,764.5 (14.3%)	5,675.2 (22.5%)	- 1,910.7
EU	4,691.3 (17.8%)	5,783.9 (22.9%)	- 1,092.6
ASEAN	574.4 (2.2%)	574.8 (2.3%)	- 0.4
Rest of World	8,977.5 (34%)	6,009.6 (23.8%)	2,967.8
Total	26,409.5	25,242.9	1,166.6

2.3.2 MERCOSUR

The Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR) is an initiative for regional integration between the full members (Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay) and free trade agreements with associate members (Chile and Bolivia). The full members signed an agreement in 1991 and free trade agreements were finalized with Chile in 1995 and Bolivia in 1996 respectively (Jelin, 1999). Although the route to regional integration through MERCOSUR is recent in the Southern Cone (countries parallel to and south of Brazil), relations between the countries in question are not. Interactions between these countries stem from the colonial period through independence and have not been without conflict. In fact, some frontier disputes still remain unresolved to this day (Jelin, 1999). Predecessors to MERCOSUR include such efforts as the Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA), the Andean Pact, The Central American Common market, and the Latin American Integration Area (LAIA). Most argue that these past trade agreements

failed, although some still formally exist, for one or the other or a combination of both economic and political obstacles to integration (Richards, 1997).

Within MERCOSUR fears and rivalries exist within the labour market along with feelings of mutual trust and distrust between nations along with xenophobia (Jelin, 1999). Key figures in the negotiation process of MERCOSUR publicly expressed the common historical roots of their nations and a brotherhood between nations coupled with a common destiny between the countries of the Southern Cone (Jelin, 1999). Jelin (1999) contends that the 'MERCOSUR effect' is paradoxical. She elaborates this notion by claiming that it pushes for regional integration and the dissolution of borders but at the same time nationality and national identity is reinforced in regional dialogues and negotiations. Through her analysis of the experiences of border areas and social movements within MERCOSUR, Jelin (2001) contends that the ongoing societal processes do not necessarily entail increased cooperation and integration. In fact, new conflicts often emerge leading to a strengthening, not weakening, of nationalism.

Richards (1997) proposes a hierarchical approach to viewing MERCOSUR. He contends that developed countries, such as the U.S., act as centre countries in the global economy and less developed countries play a subordinate role. Through regional integration attempts such as MERCOSUR, less developed countries that are particularly strong within the confines of the region boost their status to semi-peripheral members of the global system whereas weaker countries within the region fall subordinate to them. Such would be the case in MERCOSUR with Argentina and Brazil who would act as the

stronger countries within the region (Richards, 1997). Richards (1997) criticizes this approach as it weakens the possibilities toward any authentic commitment to an integrative arrangement that would promote balanced regional development.

2.3.3 NAFTA

The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) is an improved and expanded version of the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement that includes Mexico. The terms of NAFTA were finalized and signed in 1994. The agreement includes a ten-year phased elimination of tariff and non-tariff barriers on regional trade. However, some import-sensitive goods received a fifteen-year transition period (Mattli, 1999).

On a visit to Argentina in 1994, U.S. Treasury Secretary Ron Brown publicly endorsed the economic program set forth by the Argentine government and positively speculated on future affiliation between Argentina and NAFTA (Richards, 1997). The U.S. has demonstrated strong interests in not being isolated from the Southern Cone by MERCOSUR (Richards, 1997). The U.S. and former President Bush Sr. envisioned the prospect of an America working together as a whole as demonstrated in the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative (Richards, 1997). However, under the MERCOSUR agreement, Argentina cannot become a member of NAFTA unless all MERCOSUR member countries follow suit or Argentina leaves MERCOSUR. On the other hand, the same cannot be said for Chile, which is an affiliate member to MERCOSUR.

Richards (1997) noted that the promise of an independent agreement with NAFTA has significantly influenced Chile's position in regards to MERCOSUR. Chile has opted to become an affiliate member and not a full member of MERCOSUR as full membership would prohibit an independent trade agreement with NAFTA unless all other MERCOSUR countries join the agreement as well. This act of solidarity thereby places considerable pressure on MERCOSUR full member countries to conform to an agenda of liberalization in the Americas envisioned by the U.S. Chile's desired association with NAFTA and unwillingness to become a full member to MERCOSUR may have greater symbolic/political than economic ramifications for MERCOSUR (Richards, 1997). Despite the fact that Chile is neither a lucrative market nor a significant exporter for MERCOSUR, Richards (1997) argues that Chile may carry considerable influence in the thinking of regional policy makers.

2.3.4 Implications of Regional Integration to the Present Study

Raúl Prebisch, a famous Argentine economist, proposed that regional strategy of import substitution could promote industrialization within the South American region and lessen the declining terms of trade relative to the capitalist centre. Regional integration was thought to be essential in allowing for economies of scale (Richards, 1997). In the case of MERCOSUR Prebisch's line of thought may hold merit. The possible inclusion of Argentina in NAFTA would be contrary to his argument, as it would draw Argentina closer to the capitalist centre, the U.S.

In terms of the present research setting, Nabi and Nasim (2001) note that geographic proximity can result in territorial disputes and the nurturing of old hatreds. However, the authors contend that a new paradigm has been created with the advent of globalization and, more specifically, regionalism. This involves a change from previously held conflict oriented attitudes to a refocusing on mutually advantageous economic growth opportunities. The authors cite examples of Japan and Korea, China and India, as well as France and Germany where such transformations have taken place. Under the present research setting, long lasting conflicts exist between Chile and Argentina. Whether or not regional animosities still exist and whether this affects product evaluations are key objectives to the proposed research.

PCIs are an important component in the development and maintenance of regional integration efforts. The images that are held by the people of one nation toward another can have profound and long-lasting effects on their willingness to support or oppose integration.

2.4 Argentina

This section will provide an overview of Argentina with practical information pertinent to the present research setting. It is divided into the following subsections:

- 2.4.1 will provide an overview of Argentine economic and geographic data
- 2.4.2 will discuss key Argentine historical factors that are relevant to the research objectives
- 2.4.3 will evaluate relevant cultural factors regarding Argentina

2.4.1 Argentine Economic and Geographic Data

Argentina has a population of 37.5 million with annual population growth rate of 1.2 percent (Worldbank, 2002). Citizens are predominantly Roman Catholic and the official language is Spanish. Gross National Income (GNI) per capita for the year 2001 was estimated \$6,960 USD (Worldbank, 2002), the highest in South America, with a 15 percent unemployment rate for the year 2000 (U.S. Department of State, 2001).

According to studies conducted by the United Nations (UN), the city of Buenos Aires has a Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita similar to France and Austria while provinces such as Formosa and Corrientes maintains standards similar to countries like Belize and Panama (Diez, 2000). The Argentine Ministry of Economy acknowledges that 45% of homes in Argentina are in a situation in which basic necessities are unsatisfactory (Diez, 2000).

Argentina's largest border is shared with Chile and is 5,308 kilometers in length. According to the Worldbank (2002) Argentina's surface area is 2.8 million square kilometers. However, according to the Statistical Yearbook of the Argentine Republic (Indec, 2001), citing the Military Geographic Institute as their source, Argentina's territories cover 3,761, 274 square kilometers. Greater Buenos Aires covers 3,680 square kilometers, or approximately 0.1 percent of the nations territory, but over 33 percent of the population resides in this area (Diez, 2000).

In 1999, Argentina's GDP stood at \$283 billion USD making it the second largest economy in South America (U.S. Department of State, 2001). From 1993 onwards,

Argentina witnessed economic restructuring and macroeconomic stability that in turn led to major new investments in services and industry. Consequently, Argentina's exports almost doubled from \$12 billion USD in 1992 to 23.2 billion USD in 1999. Imports also increased substantially from \$15 billion USD to \$25.5 billion USD for the same time period (U.S. Department of State, 2001).

Argentina's three largest trading partners in 2000 were Brazil, accounting for 26 percent of both exports and imports; the U.S., accounting for 12 percent of exports and 19 percent of imports; and Chile, accounting for 10 percent of exports but only 2 percent of imports (Indec, 2001).

The table below illustrates trade between Argentina and the countries used in the present research setting as well as an overall total for the Americas in millions of USD for the year 2000 (Argentine Ministry of Economy, 2002). The exports and imports columns respectively indicate Argentine exports to and imports from the given country.

Table 2.2
Argentine Trade by Country
(in millions of US\$)

Country	Exports (FOB)	Imports (CIF)	Balance
United States	3,110.8	4,731.7	- 1,621.0
Chile	2,670.4	608.1	2,062.3
Mexico	325.7	583.3	- 257.6
Canada	283.1	307.1	-24.0
Americas	16,125.8	13,840.3	2,285.4

In 1998, primary products accounted for 25 percent of Argentine exports, agricultural manufactures for 33 percent, higher earning industrial products for 33 percent, and fuels for nine percent (Indec, 2001). In 1998, imports based on economic application were

divided in the following manner: capital goods, 27 percent; intermediate assets, 32 percent; fuels, three percent; parts and accessories for capital goods, 18 percent; consumer goods, 15 percent; and automobiles, five percent (Indec, 2001).

Spain has the largest amount of foreign investment in Argentina with the U.S. coming a close second. U.S. investments amounted to \$16 billion USD at the end of 1999. U.S. direct investment is centred around telecommunications, petroleum and gas, electric energy, financial services, chemicals, food processing and vehicle manufacturing (U.S. Department of State, 2001).

Foreign trade's role in the Argentine economy has assumed increased importance and growth since 1990. In 1999 it equaled 17 percent of GDP compared to 11 percent in 1990. Despite this growth, Argentina's trading sector continues to play a relatively minor role in its economy. This can be attributed to Argentina's heritage of decades of import-substitution policies (U.S. Department of State, 2001, p. 8).

In terms of Argentina's economic and technological development in comparison to the other countries in the study, a summary table, Table 2.3, provides information concerning some key social, economic, and technological indicators as a point of reference (The World Bank Group, 2002).

Table 2.3
Country Profiles for the Year of 2001

INDICATOR	Argentina	Canada	Chile	Mexico	U.S.
People					
Population (millions)	37.5	31	15.4	99.4	284
Population growth (annual %)	1.2	0.9	1.3	1.5	0.9
Life expectancy	73.9 ¹	78.9 ¹	75.6 ¹	73.0 ¹	-
Urban population (% of total)	88.3	78.9	86	74.6	77.4
Illiteracy rate (% of males 15+)	3.1	-	3.9	6.4	-
Illiteracy rate (% of females 15+)	3.1	-	4.2	10.2	-
Environment					
Surface area (millions of sq. km)	2.8	10.0	0.757	2.0	9.6
Energy use per capita (kg of oil equivalent)	1,682.6 ²	7,992.3 ²	1,510.8 ²	1,507.3 ²	8,015.4 ²
Electricity use per capita (kwh)	1,775.5 ²	15,302.4	2,011.4 ²	1,466.5 ²	11,689.5 ²
Economy					
GNI, Atlas method (current US\$)	261 billion	662 billion	66.9 billion	550.5 billion	9.9 trillion
GNI per capita, Atlas method (current US\$)	6,960	21,340	4,350	5,540	34,870
GDP growth (annual %)	-3.7	1.5	2.9	-0.3	1.2
Inflation, GDP deflator (annual %)	-1.8	1.2	3.8	5.5	2.2
Agriculture, value added (% of GDP)	4.8 ¹	2.5 ²	10.5 ¹	4.4	-
Industry, value added (% of GDP)	27.6 ¹	32.8 ²	33.5 ¹	26.8	-
Services, etc., value added (% of GDP)	67.6 ¹	64.7 ²	56.0 ¹	68.9	-
Exports of goods and services (% of GDP)	10.8 ¹	39.9 ²	31.8 ¹	27.6	11.7 ²
Imports of goods and services (% of GDP)	11.5 ¹	38.3 ²	30.8 ¹	30.0	12.8 ²
Technology and Infrastructure					
Fixed lines and mobile telephones (per 1,000 people)	376.5 ¹	961.1 ¹	443.5 ¹	267.1 ¹	1,0976 ¹
Personal computers (per 1,000 people)	51.3 ¹	390.2 ¹	82.3 ¹	50.6 ¹	585.2 ¹
Internet users (in millions)	2.5 ¹	12.7 ¹	2.5	2.7 ¹	95.4 ¹
Paved roads (% of total)	29.5 ²	-	19.4 ¹	29.7 ²	58.8 ²
Trade and finance					
Trade in goods as a share of GDP (%)	18.1 ¹	75.8 ¹	51.4 ¹	60.8 ¹	20.7 ¹
High-technology exports (% of manufactured exports)	9.0 ¹	18.6 ¹	3.4 ¹	22.4 ¹	34 ¹
Foreign direct investment, net inflows in reporting country (in billions of current US\$)	11.7 ¹	62.8	3.7 ¹	13.3 ¹	287.7 ¹
Present value of debt (current US\$)	155.0 billion ¹	-	34.9 billion ¹	157 billion ¹	-

¹ Indicates data from the year 2000, ² Indicates data from the year 1997

Based on people indicators of Table 2.3, population totals vary substantially for each country. The U.S. represents the largest population followed by Mexico as a distant second, Argentina as third, Canada as a close fourth, and Chile as fifth. Illiteracy rates in Mexico are the highest and Argentina the lowest with the exclusion of the U.S. and Canada where data was not available.

In terms of environment, Canada and the U.S. are similar in geographic size as the largest, Argentina and Mexico are also similar in size with Chile being the smallest. Energy and electricity use in Canada and the U.S. is quite high with Argentina, Chile, and Mexico being comparably similar but substantially lower than their northern counterparts.

The U.S. definitely has the largest economy and Chile the smallest. In terms of gross national income (GNI) per capita, the U.S. ranks highest, followed by Canada, Argentina, Mexico, and then Chile.

In terms of technology and infrastructure, Chile has the most fixed lines and mobile phones as well as personal computers per 1,000 people out of the NIC countries. The U.S. and Canada rank much further ahead than their NIC counterparts in this regard, but with the U.S. ranking superior to Canada.

2.4.2 Argentine Historical Factors

This subsection will focus on historical factors that may still hold substantial influence over PCIs held by the Argentine people today. Focus will be placed only on historical periods that are deemed as most prevalent and enduring.

2.4.2.1 Perón's Era

Juan D. Perón is recognized as the most controversial and important figure in Argentine history of recent times. In fact, his influence still remains strong in Argentina (Spektorowski, 1994).

Ideas implemented by Perón were originally developed by nationalists but also largely influenced by Italian fascism (Spektorowski, 1994). His rise to power in 1946 involved a great deal of national sentiment manipulation (Rock, 1987, p. 267). Propaganda feeding upon Argentine pride and patriotism was also used throughout his reign of power. In 1946 he declared October 17 a national holiday: "Loyalty Day". This same day also marked his return from imprisonment a year earlier (Rock, 1987, p. 285).

As did his predecessor, Edelmiro Farrell, Perón refused to cave in to the demands of the U.S. publicly to ally on various fronts but pleaded for the U.S.'s support privately. Perón depicted his confrontation with the U.S., specifically ambassador Spruille Braden, in 1946 to the Argentine people quite simply: 'Braden or Perón' (Spektorowski, 1994). Spektorowski (1994, p. 176) interpreted this challenge in the following manner: "That

slogan transformed the conflict between two different political and ideological conceptions into a conflict between the nation and 'American' imperialism."

Perón and his combination of both fascism and social justice remain deeply rooted in Argentine political culture and the Argentines as a people today (Spektorowski, 1994) consequently resulting in an Argentine resistance to foreign interests on their national capital for quite some time (Richards, 1997). This phenomenon also resulted in a view by foreign multinationals that Argentina was an "unfriendly" location for investment (Richards, 1997). As such, Argentina's suspicion of foreign capital, a direct result of Perón's populist nationalist movement, has retarded its industrial development (Richards, 1997).

2.4.2.2 Argentine/Chilean Conflict

In order to understand the possibility of animosity between Argentina and Chile, it is important to understand some basic historical factors and conflicts between these two nations.

In 1915, 1938, 1948, 1954 and 1960 Argentina formally disputed the occupation of Chileans on certain territories as illegitimate. Finally, in 1967, Chile acknowledged Argentina and made a decision to bring the dispute forward to the Queen of England for resolution. Argentina agreed to the request in 1971 (Jordán, 1993). In 1977, the Queen of England informed both sides of her final ruling. The ruling greatly favoured Chile as it was given rights to all three islands in question (Jordán, 1993, Rock, 1987). On January 25, 1978, Argentine officials announced to their country, as well as the rest of the

world, that they did not feel obligated to abide by the ruling set forth by the Queen. At this time, the possibility of war was in the minds of many (Jordán, 1993).

Shortly after Argentina's response to the Queen's ruling, Chile brought forth the idea of bringing the dispute to the International Court of Justice convinced that a similar ruling would result. However, Argentina did not believe that resolving this dispute in a peaceful manner would be fruitful. The country was ready to take up arms (Jordán, 1993).

Argentines were convinced that they would be victorious in a war primarily due to a larger military and economic resource base. Soldiers began to position at the South of the country in preparation for conflict (Jordán, 1993). It is interesting to note that these events were at their climax during the World Cup, a time in which Argentines filled the streets in demonstrations of patriotic pride (Jordán, 1993).

On November 12, 1978, Argentine and Chilean officials met in Buenos Aires in response to a request from the Vatican to have Pope John Paul II act as a mediator to the conflict. Both sides found it difficult to negate this request and agreed (Jordán, 1993). The Pope's suggestions were put forward on December 12, 1980. They were accepted by Chile a few days thereafter but after three months of consideration, Argentina rejected the terms (Jordán, 1993).

With the Falkland/Malvinas dispute also at the political forefront, Argentina elected to abandon its land dispute with Chile in hopes of receiving its support in the war against Great Britain (Jordán, 1993). Support throughout Latin America in favour of Argentina

was strong and almost unanimous: Nicaragua offered troops, Venezuela offered oil, and Peru offered warplanes among others. Only Chile and the Pinochet regime stood against Argentina by allowing Britain to use its southern territories to house commando units (Rock, 1987).

The aborted 1978 territorial conflict over the tiny Beagle Channel Islands was embraced with bellicose indoctrination that was a mere escalation of the traditional anti-Chilean contents of the Argentine educational curriculum. Massive amounts of anti-Chilean literature were produced both during and after the civilian supported conflict (Escudé, 2000).

2.4.3 Argentine Cultural Factors

Escudé (2000) argues that the existence of distinction between peoples of diverging nations within Hispanic America is largely a fabrication of the state. Citizens of Buenos Aires definitely have more in common with Uruguayans than they do with Argentines from the north of their country who in turn probably have more in common with Paraguayans. However, great political mind-set differences exist between these nations and other neighboring nations to Argentina. The commonalities that exist within Latin America (language, religion, historical origin, etc.) acted as barriers to the development of a national identity within the artificial boundaries of countries. In order to make up for a lack of a natural national identity, the Argentine government stepped up its efforts to promote patriotism within their own country, but more importantly to create negative images of its neighbors (Escudé, 2000).

Escudé's (2000) contentions tie into previous discussions of both animosity and interregional jealousies. Under the present research setting, the works of Escudé (2000) hold direct relevance to the study of animosity between Argentina and Chile.

3.0 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES

Five research objectives have been developed for this study and are outlined below with corresponding hypotheses. Data analysis techniques for each objective, and its related hypothesis(es), will be elaborated on in section 4.4, Data Analysis

3.1 Objective 1 – Comparisons of Product-Country Images

The first objective of the research is to present and compare views of Argentine consumers towards the products, country image and people of Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S. and the home country, Argentina. This comparison will provide a baseline for testing of specific country-based hypotheses.

H1: Argentine consumers will rate the products, country and people of Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S. and the home country, Argentina significantly differently.

3.2 Objective 2 – Patriotism

The second objective is to assess issues relevant to the patriotism of Argentine consumers in a PCI context. Patriotism is very strong in Argentina (Escudé, 2000). However, since Argentina is a NIC, it is unlikely that respondents will be able to rate Argentine products as being superior to those from Canada and the U.S.:

H2: Argentine respondents will give lower product belief ratings to the home country than to Canada and the U.S. but higher product belief ratings to the home country than to Mexico and Chile.

However, regardless of product ratings, consumers may demonstrate patriotism through pride of ownership and willingness to buy home country products:

H3: Argentine respondents will be most proud and willing to buy home country products compared to products of the four other countries.

3.3 Objectives 3 – Animosity and Admiration

The third objective relates to the constructs of animosity and admiration. As discussed in the literature review in general and specific terms, the beliefs of Argentines towards the other countries in the study can be expected to be affected by strong feelings of animosity and admiration. Using product and country scales in this research, a model involving animosity and admiration and their relationship to product-related constructs is posited and the proposed paths in the model are tested (see Objective 4). Hypotheses related to this third objective propose which countries Argentine consumers will admire and for which they will hold animosity. The outcomes of the testing of these hypotheses will be assessed and interpreted using historical and regional factors.

In addition, a determination related to this objective is whether or not Chilean consumers hold animosity towards Argentina. Data from a Chilean consumer sample that has been collected by the IKON Group will be used. The research methodology used to collect the Chilean data was similar to the one used to collect the Argentine data (see next section for research methodology). The Chilean data, however, will only be used to determine whether animosity exists towards Argentina.

The set of hypotheses within this objective involves expected levels of ratings for certain countries compared to the other countries for animosity and admiration.

Given the historical relationship between Argentina and Chile as well as cultural factors discussed in past sections, it is expected that Argentine consumers will hold animosity towards Chile and its people:

H4: Argentine consumers will give Chile the least favourable scores within the animosity construct of the model compared to the four other countries.

It is also expected that Chilean consumers will hold animosity towards Argentina and its people:

H5: Chilean consumers will give Argentina the least favourable scores within the animosity construct of the model compared to the four other countries.

As a result of not being on the losing end of the territorial dispute, it is expected that Chilean consumers will hold some animosity towards Argentina and its people but that this animosity will not be as strong as that held by Argentines towards Chileans:

H6: Chilean consumers will rate Argentina more favourably than Argentine consumers will rate Chile on scores within the animosity construct of the model.

From an admiration standpoint, it is expected that Argentina will possess a degree of admiration towards the U.S. and possibly Canada. Both are developed nations that are economically thriving compared to Argentina. Conversely, it is also possible that a certain degree of animosity may exist due to historical factors, such as the U.S. exclusion of Argentina in the Marshall Plan as well as conflicting viewpoints between Juan Perón

and the U.S. government during and after the WWII (Rock, 1987). More recently, it has been found that Argentines and Americans have similar values with regards to economic and political ideologies (Elordi, 2000). Furthermore, the desirability of U.S. products to Argentine consumers and the adoption of U.S. lifestyles have been on the rise in recent years (Diez, 2000). Given the foregoing, it is expected that Argentines will admire U.S. lifestyles as well as economic and political factors inherent within the country:

H7: Argentine consumers will give the U.S. the most favourable scores within the admiration construct of the model compared to the other countries.

Since Canada is also a developed nation but generally not viewed as being as economically and politically powerful as the U.S.:

H8: Argentine consumers will give Canada the second most favourable scores within the admiration construct of the model compared to the other countries.

3.4 Objective 4 – Testing of an Animosity/Admiration Model

The foregoing hypotheses use constructs measured by certain beliefs of the target countries. The proposed measures for these constructs, as well as the patterns of associations among these constructs and behaviour-related outcomes, are posited in the model indicated in Figure 3.1. The following hypotheses will be used to test the relationship paths in the model.

Figure 3.1
The Proposed Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model

Past PCI studies that have used a similar research instrument have found that an association pattern exists between Product Beliefs and Product Evaluations (Dowdles, 1997; Nadeau, 1998; Gooding, 2002). This study is expected to be no different:

H9: Product Beliefs will be positively related to Product Evaluations.

Klein et al. (1998) found that animosity resulted only in a decreased willingness to buy goods from the country for which the animosity is held but that product judgments remained unaffected. However, it seems likely that animosity will affect not only Willingness to Buy but also Product Evaluations. The reason is that, as previously noted in subsection 2.2.2, affect and cognition are intrinsically intertwined. It seems likely that Animosity will influence Product Evaluations as well as Willingness to Buy:

H10: Animosity will be negatively related to both Product Evaluations and Willingness to Buy.

In regards to the above hypothesis, it must be noted that higher degrees of animosity will exist when the measures within the animosity construct are low.

Along the same reasoning as above, Admiration is also expected to influence Product Evaluations as well as willingness to buy:

H11: Admiration will be positively related to both Product Evaluations and Willingness to Buy.

Past PCI studies that have used a similar research instrument have found that an association pattern exists between Product Evaluations and Willingness to Buy (Dowdles, 1997; Nadeau, 1998; Gooding, 2002). This study is expected to be no different:

H12: Product Evaluations will be positively related to Willingness to Buy.

As discussed, the greater the degree of familiarity, the less a given stimulus is likely to be described in a stereotyped manner. Furthermore, the greater exposure to a given stimulus, the more a subject is likely to be partial to that stimulus (Zajonc, 2000). It is then expected that Familiarity will directly affect Product Evaluations:

H13: Familiarity will be positively related Product Evaluations.

Familiarity is expected to not only affect Product Evaluations, but also to moderate the effects of Product Evaluations on Willingness to Buy. Consumers evaluate products from a given country based on perceptions. Their perceptions may be based on a wide degree of information or very little information. If consumers perceive a country as having strong product evaluations but base their decision on the small amount of information they know, they probably have made this evaluation with a lower degree of confidence. This lack of confidence will result in a decreased willingness to buy due to increase perceived risk:

H14: Familiarity will moderate the effects of Product Evaluations on Willingness to Buy.

3.5 Objective 5 – Education

The fifth and final objective is to determine whether or not educational levels influence Animosity towards Chile. The use of demographics as a determining factor for various concepts such as ethnocentrism has resulted in a large degree of mixed results among studies. Most conclude that demographics have little to no relationship to determining PCIs. Argentina should be no different. As such, no demographics were included in the model. However, in Argentina, the educational curriculum has devoted efforts in promoting anti-Chilean sentiments as a result of past conflicts through various mandatory texts. The higher the level of education an Argentine receives, the more anti-Chilean content he/she would be exposed to (Escudé, 2000). Therefore:

H15: Higher education levels will be related to a greater existence of animosity in Argentine respondents towards Chile.

4.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The main data base for the present study is of Argentine consumers attitudes towards the products and people of Canada, the U.S., Chile, Mexico and that of their home country, Argentina. The study will also use an existing data base of Chilean consumers for a limited number of comparisons. The research instrument and collection procedure was similar to the method outlined below. The Chilean sample size was 303 respondents. The remainder of this section will refer only to the new Argentine sample.

4.1 Research Instrument

The research instrument used in this study is one developed by Heslop and Papadopoulos and has been used for other similar research endeavours in Canada, Chile and Mexico (See Appendix A for English and Spanish versions).

The questionnaire was translated and back translated to Spanish. To further ensure that the translation accurately reflects variations in dialect and a somewhat different Spanish used by porteños (a term used to describe Argentines living in Buenos Aires), the translation was further checked by a Counselor of the Embassy of the Argentine Republic in Ottawa who is originally a porteño. Minor changes to the questionnaire were made as a result.

The questionnaire consisted of an introduction that included an overview of its purpose, why the respondent was chosen, an assurance of the anonymity of respondent, how the respondents could obtain feedback and, lastly, the work address and signature of a

reputable Argentine professor who had agreed to assist with the study. After the introduction, instructions followed on how respondents should complete the questionnaire. Respondents were required to fill three main sections concerning product images, people and country images, and basic demographic information. Product images as well as the country and people images sections consisted of several bi-polar scales in order to rate each of the five countries. The product images section consisted of nineteen ratings that include product attributes, familiarity, pride, willingness to buy and overall comparison to all other countries. The country and people section consists of sixteen ratings for the home country and twenty-three ratings for all other countries. Scales in this section were aimed at representing feelings of affect towards the countries and their people, as well as cognitive factors such as beliefs held concerning the level of industrial development, knowledge of the source country, alignment of the source country with the home country and the respondents' desired level of interaction with the source country. The demographic section asked for the respondents' sex, age, education and family monthly income within given ranges. Lastly, the respondent was invited to add comments on the back of the final page.

4.2 The Sample

The sampled population consisted of adults who reside in the Capital Federal region of Buenos Aires, Argentina. Respondents were selected using a multi-stage sampling procedure based on area maps. A total of 19 tracts were selected using this procedure and a maximum of 20 useable questionnaires were collected in each tract. City blocks were randomly selected, and from these blocks, individual households were chosen using

a random walk-pattern. Every third residence was approached on each street in the pattern. However, if there was no response or the target respondent refused to complete the questionnaire, the next residence was selected. In the case of apartment buildings, one apartment was selected on odd numbered floors. No more than five questionnaires were collected per apartment building. Interviewers rotated between asking for female or male respondents to ensure a gender-balanced sample.

4.3 Data Collection

Data was collected in May of 2001. The drop-off/pick up technique was employed. Questionnaires were dropped off at residences and picked up one hour later.

4.4 Sample Size

As in previous studies conducted by the IKON Group, a sample size of approximately 300 respondents was determined as being suitable. A large sample size reduces the possibility of falsely rejecting or accepting a hypothesis (Stevens, 1996).

As table 4.1 indicates, fieldworkers approached 1,318 residences in total. There was no response (i.e. nobody was home) in 581 households, reducing the number of actual communications with potential respondents to 733. Of this number, 411 refused to participate and 322 agreed. Of the 322 that agreed, 277 completed all scales of the questionnaire and 45 partially completed the questionnaire. Incomplete questionnaires were deemed as useable when at least 80% of the scales were complete. Using this criterion, 26 of the 45 partially complete questionnaires were deemed as useable and 17

were not. This resulted in a final figure of 303 useable questionnaires and a response rate of 41.3%.

Table 4.1
Response Rate

Tract	No response	Refused	Complete	Incomplete	Total
1	49	25	11	0	85
2	6	7	17	0	30
3	10	4	20	3	37
4	29	18	8	0	55
5	69	46	18	5	138
6	19	17	14	6	56
7	6	1	19	2	28
8	51	34	17	6	108
9	45	33	17	5	100
10	42	33	12	4	91
11	4	9	16	0	29
12	0	12	9	3	24
13	18	12	14	1	45
14	10	12	11	2	35
15	75	40	17	3	135
16	36	30	17	2	85
17	34	6	4	0	44
18	52	42	19	3	116
19	30	30	17	0	77
TOTAL	585	411	277	45	1,318

4.5 Data Analysis Procedure

Descriptive statistics were used to present the demographic characteristics of the sample in comparison to the actual Argentine population. The above analyses and all other analyses used SPSS.

In order to achieve the first research objective, that is, to present and compare Argentine consumers' PCI perceptions of the five countries, a series of descriptive statistics was

calculated. Descriptive statistics included measures of frequencies, means, and standard deviations, as appropriate. Statistically significant differences in products and country images between countries were also assessed. Doubly multivariate within-subjects comparisons were performed to determine whether differences existed in the ratings of the products, as well as the countries and their people. This involved a comparison of all five countries and, if the overall test of difference was found to be significant, a series of ten-paired comparisons of the five countries was performed. Doubly multivariate analysis of variance was run using SPSS Repeated Measures MANOVA. Differences for the overall five country analysis were considered as being significant if $p < .05$ for the observed F value. In the case of the ten pairwise multivariate tests, an alpha level of $.05/10 = .005$ was used to ensure the overall probability of type 2 error was not compromised. To ascertain which specific variables respondents rated significantly differently, Tukey confidence intervals were used. These analyses involve twenty-three potential differentiating scales for country/people section and nineteen product scales for the product section. Each variable was assessed using univariate F-tests. Variables were considered significantly different at $p < .005$.

The second, third, and fourth objectives involve constructs and model path testing within the proposed Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model as previously illustrated in Figure 3.1. Before meeting these research objectives, principal components analysis (PCA) was performed to determine the underlying dimensions of the scales in the product measures and in the people and country measures. The purpose was to test for support of the configuration of the proposed operational measures of the constructs used in the

Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model. PCA determined the pattern of association of the individual scales and the robustness of the proposed constructs in the model. In addition, Cronbach's alpha was performed as a reliability analysis to determine how closely the items of the scales were related to each other. Based on these findings, some construct reconfiguration was needed before testing the hypotheses within objectives two to four.

The second research objective, hypotheses two and three that address Argentine patriotism, was also met by using the doubly multivariate analysis. Significance levels and procedure were the same as above.

The third research objective, hypotheses four to eight, concerning Argentine admiration and both Argentine and Chilean animosity, also used a doubly multivariate analysis using SPSS Repeated Measures MANOVA for both the admiration and animosity constructs. Significance levels and procedures were the same as stated for the first research objective. Comparisons between the different levels of animosity between the Argentine and Chilean samples were tested using Independent Samples T Test with a level of significance of $p < .05$.

Objective four concerned the Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model. Hypotheses were formulated for each path of the model as it emerged from preliminary construct validation testing with PCA. To test the paths, correlation analyses were run on the averaged scores of the construct component scales. The role of Familiarity as a

moderating variable between Product Evaluations and Willingness to Buy was tested using analysis of covariance (ANCOVA).

The final research objective contained one hypothesis concerning whether or not the education level of respondents was related to animosity. Significant differences for this hypothesis were tested using ANOVA and curve estimation regression.

5.0 FINDINGS

5.1 Characteristics of the Sample

Table 5.1 describes the sample's demographic characteristics. As the table indicates, percentage of male respondents was 51.2 and that of female respondents, 48.8. The median age of respondents was between 35-39 years, approximately 87% of those surveyed had attained high school graduation or higher, and the median monthly household income in USD was between \$900.01 and \$1,500.

The population statistics for both Argentina and Capital Federal (City of Buenos Aires) are also shown. Unfortunately, the 1991 Argentine census did not include all of the necessary data to complete city totals. The only available data was for the percentage of males and females. Education totals were available for Greater Buenos Aires (the city and surrounding area) but not solely for the city itself (Indec, 2001). As previously discussed in subsection 2.4.1, the city of Buenos Aires has a GDP per capita similar to France and Austria, while provinces such as Formosa and Corrientes are comparable to LDCs (Diez, 2000). The city of Buenos Aires also has the lowest percentage of households where basic urban necessities are not met (Indec, 2001). These factors must be taken into consideration when comparing the sample's and the population's demographics.

Overall, the sample is younger, more educated, and of a higher monthly family income than the Argentine population. It is, nevertheless, useful for the purposes of this study.

Table 5.1
Demographic Characteristics of the Argentine Sample

Variable		Sample	Argentina	City of Buenos Aires
Gender:	Male	51.2%	48.9%	45.3%
	Female	48.8%	51.1%	54.7%
Age¹:	Less than 20	8.3%	-	-
	20-24 years	17.5%	12.4%	-
	25-29 years	11.6%	11.7%	-
	30-34 years	10.3%	11.2%	-
	35-39 years	6.0%	10.7%	-
	40-44 years	9.6%	9.9%	-
	45-49 years	8.9%	8.6%	-
	50-54 years	9.6%	7.6%	-
	55-59 years	8.6%	6.9%	-
	60-64 years	5.3%	6.6%	-
	65 or more	4.3%	14.7%	-
Education²:	Incomplete grade school	1.0%	17.0%	15.5%
	Complete grade school	1.3%	37.4%	39.5%
	Incomplete high school	10.9%	16.4%	15.9%
	High school graduate	23.8%	16.1%	15.9%
	Incomplete college	5.3%	1.3%	1.4%
	College graduate	9.6%	3.8%	3.9%
	Incomplete university	29.4%	2.8%	2.6%
	University graduate	11.9%	4.8%	4.8%
Monthly Household Income (in USD)³:	Post-graduate	6.9%	-	-
	Under \$500	5.8%	38.4%	-
	\$500.01-\$900	19.2%	27.2%	-
	\$900.01-\$1,500	25.7%	17.6%	-
	\$1,500.01-\$2,100	19.9%	6.8%	-
	\$2,100.01-\$2,700	13.7%	3.5%	-
	\$2,700.01-\$3,300	5.8%	2%	-
	More than \$3,300	9.9%	4.4%	-

Population data was obtained from the 1991 Argentine Census with the exception of income (Indec, 2001)

¹ The main reason only 8.3% of the sample was under twenty years of age is that the survey required respondents to be a minimum of eighteen years. For comparative purposes, the Argentine population under 20 years of age was not included. Normally it would account for 39.3% of the population. Population percentage totals were calculated excluding this segment of the population.

² Population totals for education include population aged 5 years or older in Argentina and Greater Buenos Aires (city totals not available) not attending school but having previously attended some educational establishment.

³ Indicates monthly wages for workers in June of 1999.

A sample that includes a considerable number of individuals with higher levels of income and education can be advantageous because it assesses the views of those consumers who are expected to have a considerable influence on the attitudes and behavioural orientations over the rest of the population. These consumers are also more likely to have been exposed to foreign countries, markets, and products thereby making them more suitable respondents given the nature of the study.

5.2 Product-Country Images – Objective 1, Hypothesis 1

The first objective was to present and compare views of Argentine consumers towards the products, country image and people of the five countries in the study. This comparison will provide a baseline for testing of specific country-based hypotheses.

H1: Argentine consumers will rate the products, country image and people of Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S. and the home country, Argentina significantly differently.

5.2.1 Product Images

Two tables were created to summarize Argentine consumers' perceptions of the products of the five countries under study. Table 5.2 provides means and standard deviations of the product items for each country. Overall, the U.S. received the highest product ratings, followed by Canada, Argentina, Mexico, and Chile. Argentina received a higher overall mean than Canada. However, this can be attributed to large differences on market presence scales where Canada was rated lowest and Argentina second highest. Overall, Canada fared better than Argentina on product attribute ratings. To summarize Table 5.2, Argentine products received the highest mean on Value, Price, and Proud to

Table 5.2
Overall Ratings of Product Items

Variable	Argentina	Canada	Chile	Mexico	United States
Quality	4.43 (1.36)	5.32 (1.05)	<u>3.47</u> (1.44)	3.62 (1.31)	5.36 (1.35)
Value	5.28 (1.44)	4.69 (1.31)	3.64 (1.45)	<u>3.61</u> (1.26)	4.80 (1.49)
Workmanship	4.35 (1.52)	5.02 (1.22)	<u>3.41</u> (1.38)	3.52 (1.23)	5.11 (1.34)
Defects in Merchandise	4.36 (1.53)	4.59 (1.63)	<u>4.33</u> (1.38)	4.48 (1.24)	4.51 (1.71)
Attractiveness	4.35 (1.46)	4.77 (1.26)	<u>3.21</u> (1.43)	3.72 (1.45)	5.49 (1.38)
Innovativeness	3.29 (1.49)	4.88 (1.30)	<u>3.16</u> (1.33)	3.41 (1.29)	5.92 (1.17)
Variety	3.99 (1.67)	4.63 (1.49)	<u>3.31</u> (1.34)	3.67 (1.38)	6.09 (1.12)
Brand Names	4.65 (1.75)	<u>3.24</u> (1.93)	3.63 (1.99)	3.61 (1.95)	5.11 (2.14)
Price Level	5.40 (1.40)	4.56 (1.36)	3.64 (1.37)	<u>3.62</u> (1.31)	4.35 (1.56)
Durability	4.23 (1.47)	5.16 (1.20)	<u>3.56</u> (1.32)	3.65 (1.26)	5.11 (1.41)
Technology Level	3.55 (1.48)	5.66 (1.11)	<u>3.36</u> (1.36)	3.51 (1.34)	6.20 (1.05)
Reliability	4.02 (1.48)	5.34 (1.25)	<u>3.36</u> (1.41)	3.53 (1.28)	5.56 (1.29)
Your knowledge of the country's products	5.24 (1.50)	<u>2.58</u> (1.50)	3.34 (1.65)	2.95 (1.57)	5.42 (1.47)
Overall Satisfaction	4.02 (1.38)	4.45 (1.25)	<u>3.31</u> (1.29)	3.41 (1.24)	5.35 (1.24)
Ease of Finding	4.86 (1.64)	2.64 (1.61)	3.50 (1.70)	2.91 (1.49)	5.71 (1.33)
Willing to Buy	4.64 (1.41)	3.43 (1.56)	<u>2.93</u> (1.55)	3.13 (1.55)	4.83 (1.63)
Proud to Own	4.64 (1.75)	3.47 (1.74)	<u>2.41</u> (1.41)	2.81 (1.51)	4.17 (1.93)
After Sales Service	3.41 (1.64)	4.27 (1.42)	<u>3.13</u> (1.31)	3.24 (1.32)	5.14 (1.45)
Ratings compared to product from other countries	4.54 (1.45)	5.21 (1.13)	<u>3.50</u> (1.36)	3.69 (1.27)	5.79 (1.10)
Number of Highest	3	2	0	0	14
Number of Lowest	0	3	14	2	0
Mean	4.38	4.37	<u>3.38</u>	3.47	5.26

Bold = highest score of all the countries

Underline = lowest score of all the countries

Own. Canada received the highest mean for Defect in Merchandise and Durability. Product from the U.S. received the highest mean on all other product scales. Products from Canada received the lowest mean for Brand Names, Knowledge of Products, and Ease of Finding; Mexico for value and Price Level; and Chilean products received the lowest mean for all other scales.

Table 5.3 contains a doubly multivariate analysis of Argentine consumers' perceptions of product differences. An approximate F-value of 41.04 was found for this analysis. A series of ten pairwise comparisons were also conducted to assess significant differences between countries (a more detailed analysis of these comparisons is available in Appendix B). The paragraphs below will highlight pairwise differences in Argentine consumer product ratings for each of the countries. The home country will be assessed first, followed by, Canada, Chile, Mexico, and the U.S. To avoid repetition, once a pairwise comparison has been addressed between one country and another, it will not be reassessed when discussing the other country.

Argentines rated home products significantly higher than those of Mexico, F-value of 38.95, and Chile, F-value of 42.82, on all scales except Defects, Innovativeness, Technology Level, and After Sales Service that showed no significant differences between these countries' products. Also, no significant difference existed for Variety between home and Mexican products. Compared to Canada, F-value of 47.41, Argentine consumers rated home products as being of greater Value, knowledge of Brand Names, a

Table 5.3
Doubly Multivariate Analysis of Argentine Consumer Perceptions of Product Differences

	Pairwise Comparisons									
Variable	A/C	A/Ch	A/M	A/US	C/Ch	C/M	C/US	Ch/M	Ch/US	M/US
Exact F-value	47.41	42.82	38.95	53.84	35.68	32.85	47.33	7.81	57.13	57.34
Quality	C	A	A	US	C	C	ns	ns	US	US
Value	A	A	A	A	C	C	ns	ns	US	US
Workmanship	C	A	A	US	C	C	ns	ns	US	US
Defects in Merchandise	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Attractiveness	C	A	A	US	C	C	US	M	US	US
Innovativeness	C	ns	ns	US	C	C	US	M	US	US
Variety	C	A	ns	US	C	C	US	M	US	US
Brand Names	A	A	A	US	ns	ns	US	ns	US	US
Price Level	A	A	A	A	C	C	ns	ns	US	US
Durability	C	A	A	US	C	C	ns	ns	US	US
Technology Level	C	ns	ns	US	C	C	US	ns	US	US
Reliability	C	A	A	US	C	C	ns	ns	US	US
Knowledge of Products	A	A	A	ns	Ch	M	US	Ch	US	US
Overall Satisfaction	C	A	A	US	C	C	US	ns	US	US
Ease of Finding	A	A	A	US	Ch	C	US	Ch	US	US
Willingness to Buy	A	A	A	ns	C	ns	US	ns	US	US
Proud to Own	A	A	A	ns	C	C	US	M	US	US
After Sales Service	C	ns	ns	US	C	C	US	ns	US	US
Overall Rating	C	A	A	US	C	C	US	ns	US	US
Number of Sig Differences	18	15	14	15	16	15	12	6	18	18
Sig Difs > for Country 1	A = 7	A = 15	A = 14	A = 2	C = 14	C = 14	C = 0	Ch = 2	Ch = 0	M = 0
Sig Difs > for Country 2	C = 11	Ch = 0	M = 0	US = 13	Ch = 2	M = 1	US = 12	M = 4	US = 18	US = 18

A = Argentina, C = Canada, Ch = Chile, M = Mexico, US = United States; Country letter(s) indicate Significantly higher Difference at p<.005 for that country compared to the other; ns = No Significant Difference with country

better Price Level, greater Knowledge and Ease of Finding Products, and were more Proud and Willing to Buy domestic goods. Argentine products received lower ratings than Canadian on all other scales except for Defects where no significant difference existed. Compared to the U.S., F-value 53.84, Argentine products were rated as being of better Value and Price. No significant differences existed for Defects, as was the case between all pairwise comparisons of each country's products, Knowledge of Products, Willingness to Buy, and Proud to Own. U.S. Products were rated higher on all other scales.

No significant differences existed between Canadian and Chilean products on Defects and knowledge of Brand Names. Canadian products were rated lower on Ease of Finding and Knowledge of Products than Chilean products. However, Canadian products were rated higher on all other scales, F-value of 35.68. In comparison to Mexican products, F-value of 32.85, Canadian products rated lower on Knowledge of Products. No significant differences existed on Defects, knowledge of Brand Names, Ease of Finding and Willingness to Buy. Canadian products were rated higher on all other scales. Canadian products were not rated higher than U.S. products on any of the scales; however, no significant differences existed on Quality, Value, Workmanship, Defects, Price, Durability and Reliability. An F-value of 47.33 was obtained for this pair.

Chilean products were rated higher on Knowledge of Products and Ease of Finding compared to Canadian, F-value of 35.68, and Mexican products, F-value of 7.81.

Chilean products were rated lower on Attractiveness, Innovativeness, Variety and Proud

to Own compared to Mexican products. No significant differences existed on all other scales between the products from Chile and Mexico. No significant difference existed between Chilean and U.S. products on Defects. However, this was the only scale that Chilean products were not rated lower than U.S. products, F-value of 57.13.

When Mexican and U.S. products were compared, F-value 57.34, the exact same result occurred as the comparison between Chilean and U.S. products. That is, there was no difference for defects, but otherwise Mexican products were rated lower than U.S. products.

The U.S. received the most favourable ratings compared to all other countries. U.S. products were rated highest on almost all scales compared to all other countries with few exceptions. Domestic products were rated higher on Value and Price Level. In some instances, as noted in the four preceding paragraphs, no significant differences existed between the products from the U.S. and the other countries.

5.2.2 Country and People Images

Country and people images will be assessed in the same manner as subsection 5.2.1, Product Images. Table 5.4 provides means and standard deviations of the country and people items. Overall, Canada was rated highest followed by the U.S., Mexico, Argentina, and Chile. Argentina received the lowest mean on Wealth, Work Ethic, Political Stability, Technology Level, Stability of Economy, Quality of Life, Role in World Politics, and Environmental Controls; Canada on Knowledge of Country; Mexico

Table 5.4
Country Images Held by Argentine Consumers

Variable	Argentina	Canada	Chile	Mexico	U.S.
Likeability of People	5.07 (1.52)	3.92 (1.44)	3.33 (1.74)	5.22 (1.42)	<u>3.18</u> (1.53)
Industriousness	4.18 (1.65)	5.39 (1.14)	<u>3.70</u> (1.53)	4.09 (1.34)	5.26 (1.38)
Education Level	3.78 (1.48)	5.81 (1.05)	3.45 (1.30)	<u>3.36</u> (1.21)	5.22 (1.44)
Wealth	<u>3.12</u> (1.61)	5.58 (1.05)	3.26 (1.29)	3.33 (1.29)	5.80 (1.18)
Friendliness	4.35 (1.55)	4.31 (1.32)	<u>3.46</u> (1.59)	4.93 (1.36)	3.64 (1.49)
Trustworthiness	3.42 (1.50)	5.01 (1.23)	<u>2.93</u> (1.32)	4.05 (1.31)	4.51 (1.62)
Work Ethic	<u>3.52</u> (1.57)	5.34 (1.13)	3.64 (1.37)	4.04 (1.19)	5.10 (1.45)
Individualism	5.28 (1.56)	4.59 (1.41)	4.16 (1.54)	<u>3.95</u> (1.31)	5.27 (1.85)
Political Stability of Country	<u>2.10</u> (1.37)	5.89 (1.09)	3.67 (1.42)	3.68 (1.34)	6.24 (1.11)
Technology Level of Country	<u>2.94</u> (1.50)	6.02 0.99	3.44 (1.32)	3.57 (1.27)	6.54 (0.83)
Stability of the Economy	<u>1.92</u> (1.17)	6.00 (1.05)	3.97 (1.42)	3.35 (1.22)	6.23 (1.08)
Quality of Life	<u>2.53</u> (1.32)	6.00 (1.05)	3.23 (1.26)	3.09 (1.22)	5.85 (1.16)
Role in World Politics	<u>2.31</u> (1.38)	5.15 (1.25)	3.02 (1.33)	3.42 (1.24)	5.60 (1.91)
Environmental/Pollution Controls	<u>1.96</u> (1.24)	5.40 (1.36)	3.05 (1.45)	2.73 (1.38)	5.04 (1.72)
Individual Rights and Freedoms	3.72 (1.81)	5.54 1.22	<u>2.95</u> (1.38)	3.56 (1.27)	5.48 (1.43)
Alignment with Argentina	-	3.33 (1.55)	2.84 (1.50)	3.27 (1.22)	4.29 (1.79)
Your Knowledge of the Country	6.15 (1.13)	<u>3.52</u> (1.45)	4.13 (1.59)	3.61 (1.46)	4.93 (1.57)
Political and Economic Ties	-	5.71 (1.34)	<u>4.35</u> (2.00)	5.01 (1.56)	4.84 (2.10)
Immigration from the Country	-	4.74 (1.86)	<u>2.31</u> (1.65)	3.28 (1.73)	4.24 (2.02)
Desire for Investment in the Country	-	4.88 (1.81)	<u>3.64</u> (2.01)	4.35 (1.85)	4.69 (2.08)
Desire for Investment from the Country	-	5.87 (1.42)	<u>3.93</u> (2.09)	5.00 (1.71)	5.45 (1.91)
Desire for Exports to the Country	-	6.24 (1.11)	<u>5.47</u> (1.82)	5.81 (1.37)	6.22 (1.31)
Desire for Imports from the Country	-	4.39 (1.91)	<u>3.01</u> (1.90)	3.63 (1.79)	4.00 (2.12)
Number of Highest	2	12	0	2	7
Number of Lowest	8	1	11	2	1
Mean	<u>3.52</u>	5.16	<u>3.52</u>	3.93	5.11

Bold = highest score of all the countries; Underline = lowest score of all the countries; - = not applicable

on Education Level and Individualism; the U.S. on Likeability; and Chile on all other scales. Argentina received the highest mean on Individualism and Knowledge of Country; Mexico on Likeability and Friendliness; the U.S. on Industriousness, Wealth, Individualism, Political Stability, Technology Level, Stability of Economy, Role in World Politics, and Alignment with Argentina; Canada received the highest mean on all other scales.

Table 5.5 contains a doubly multivariate analysis of Argentine consumers' perceptions of country and people differences. An approximate F-value of 79.456 was observed for comparisons between Argentina and the other four countries (linkages scales not applicable) and 47.42 for the overall four-country comparison excluding home where all scales are applicable (See Appendix C for detailed analysis).

Argentine consumers' evaluations of the country and people items were both interesting and surprising. Argentines rated their own country as significantly lower than all other countries on Political Stability, Stability of Economy, Quality of Life, Role in World Politics, and Environmental Controls. The results of Political Stability and Stability of Economy can be explained by actual conditions that existed at the time the data was collected, May 2001. Although the looming economic crisis that resulted in a social upheaval was a few months away from its worst point when the data was collected, these results may highlight the general environment beforehand. The economic and social crisis which followed the data collection period, resulted in the resignation of the Minister of Finance, Domingo Cavallo, and, shortly thereafter, the Argentine President,

Table 5.5
Doubly Multivariate Analysis of Argentine Consumer Perceptions of Country Differences

Pairwise Comparisons											
Variable	A/C	A/Ch	A/M	A/US	C/Ch	C/M	C/US	Ch/M	Ch/US	M/US	
Exact F-value	163.16	90.85	82.48	164.51	64.06	52.32	24.41	19.89	75.89	64.08	
Likeability of People	A	A	ns	A	C	M	C	M	ns	M	M
Industriousness	C	A	ns	US	C	C	ns	M	US	US	US
Education Level	C	A	A	US	C	C	C	ns	US	US	US
Wealth	C	ns	ns	US	C	C	ns	ns	US	US	US
Friendliness	ns	A	M	A	C	M	C	M	ns	M	M
Trustworthiness	C	A	M	US	C	C	C	M	US	US	US
Work Ethic	C	ns	M	US	C	C	C	M	US	US	US
Individualism	A	A	A	ns	C	C	US	ns	US	US	US
Political Stability	C	Ch	M	US	C	C	US	ns	US	US	US
Technology Level	C	A	M	US	C	C	US	ns	US	US	US
Stability of Economy	C	Ch	M	US	C	C	US	Ch	US	US	US
Quality of Life	C	Ch	M	US	C	C	ns	ns	US	US	US
Role In World Politics	C	Ch	M	US	C	C	US	M	US	US	US
Environmental Controls	C	Ch	M	US	C	C	ns	Ch	US	US	US
Individual Rights	C	A	ns	US	C	C	ns	M	US	US	US
Alignment with Argentina	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	C	ns	US	M	US	US	US
Knowledge of Country	A	A	A	A	Ch	ns	US	Ch	US	US	US
Political and economic ties	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	C	C	C	M	US	ns	US
Immigration from	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	C	C	C	M	US	US	US
Investments in	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	C	C	ns	M	US	ns	US
Investments from	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	C	C	C	M	US	US	US
Exports	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	C	C	ns	M	US	US	US
Imports	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	C	C	C	M	US	US	US
Number of Sig Differences	15	14	12	16	23	21	16	17	21	21	21
Sig Difs > for Country 1	A = 2	A = 9	A = 3	A = 3	C = 22	C = 19	C = 9	Ch = 3	Ch = 0	M = 2	M = 2
Sig Difs > for Country 2	C = 13	Ch = 5	M = 9	US = 13	Ch = 1	M = 2	US = 7	M = 14	US = 21	US = 19	US = 19

A = Argentina, C = Canada, Ch = Chile, M = Mexico, US = United States; Country letter(s) indicate Significantly higher Difference at p<.005 for that country compared to the other; ns = No Significant Difference with country

Fernando de la Rúa. Therefore the low scores on Political Stability suggest Argentines were anticipating the political and economic disruptions that ensued several months later. It is surprising, however, that Argentines rated home as lowest on quality of life. Argentina has a significantly higher GNI per capita than both Chile and Mexico (Worldbank, 2002). Perhaps the general economic and social uncertainty explains this result. Another possible explanation could be the existence of altercentrism whereby Argentines devalue themselves relative to other nations as a means of self-justification for their situation. Argentina rated their own country highest compared to all other countries on Knowledge of Country.

This paragraph will address the pairwise comparisons between Argentina and the four other countries. References will not be made to the six scales discussed above where Argentina was either rated lower or higher than the four other countries. In comparing Argentina to Canada, F-value of 163.16, Argentina was rated lower on Industriousness, Education Level, Wealth, Trustworthiness, Work Ethic, and Individual Rights. Argentina received more favourable ratings than Canada on Likeability and Individualism. No significant difference existed on Friendliness. Argentina received higher ratings than Chile on Likeability, Industriousness, Education Level, Friendliness, Trustworthiness, Individualism, Technology Level, and Individual Rights. No significant differences existed between Wealth and Work Ethic. An F-value of 90.85 was obtained for this pair. Argentina was rated higher than Mexico on Education Level and Individualism. Argentina was rated lower on Friendliness, Trustworthiness, Work Ethic, and Technology Level. No significant differences existed for Likeability, Industriousness,

and Individual Rights. An F-value of 82.48 was obtained for this pair. Argentina was rated more favourably than the U.S. on Likeability and Friendliness. No significant difference existed for Individualism. Argentina received less favourable ratings than the U.S. on all other scales. An F-value of 164.51 was obtained for this pair.

Canada was rated higher on all scales compared to Chile, F-value of 64.06, except for Knowledge of Country. Canada was rated lower than Mexico on the Likeability and Friendliness people scales. No significant differences existed for Alignment with Argentina and Knowledge of Country. Canada was rated higher on all other scales. An F-value of 52.32 was obtained for this pair. Canada received less favourable ratings than the U.S. on Individualism, Technology Level, Stability of Economy, Role in World Politics, Alignment with Argentina, and Knowledge of Country. Canada received more favourable ratings on Likeability of People, Education Level, Friendliness, Trustworthiness, Work Ethic, Political and Economic Ties, Immigration From, Investments From, and Imports. No significant differences existed on the other scales when comparing these two countries. An F-value of 24.41 was obtained for this pair.

Chile's ratings were very poor relative to the other countries. Compared to Mexico, F-value of 19.89, Chile was rated higher on Stability of Economy, Environmental Controls, and Knowledge of Country. No significant differences existed for Education Level, Wealth, Individualism, Political Stability, Technology Level, and Quality of Life. Chile was rated less favourably than Mexico on all other scales. No significant differences existed between Chile and the U.S. on Likeability of People and Friendliness. Chile was

rated lower than the U.S. on all other scales with a F-value of 75.89. It is surprising that, given the geographic proximity and MERCOSUR, Argentines consider themselves more aligned with all other countries over Chile. Also, overall, fewer linkages were desired with Chile compared to all other countries. This finding will be further addressed later in this section within the animosity hypotheses.

Mexico received a higher rating than the U.S. on Likeability and Friendliness. No significant differences existed between these two countries Political/Economic Ties and Investments In. Mexico received lower ratings than the U.S. on all other scales. An F-value of 64.08 was observed for this pair. Overall, Mexicans were rated as the most Friendly compared to the other four countries.

The U.S. outperformed the NICs on most scales. However, The U.S.'s DC counterpart, Canada, fared slightly better overall.

Significant differences existed for most pairwise comparisons on all scales. The only one exception was defects on the product scales where no significant difference existed between any of the countries. Despite this one omission, hypothesis H1, that posited that Argentine consumers would not rate the products, country and people of Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S., and the home country, Argentina significantly differently, is accepted for both product images and country and people images.

5.3 Construct Development

Hypotheses within objectives two to five involve the constructs and model testing of the Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model. Before testing the hypotheses involving the constructs within the model, it is important to ascertain what scales group together to measure a smaller set of underlying dimensions including the Animosity and Admiration constructs. Principal components analysis (PCA) was the analytical approach undertaken for this purpose. Stevens (1996) suggests that the most widely accepted method of PCA assessment is the Kaiser criterion where components whose eigenvalues are greater than one are retained. In addition, PCI researchers (eg. Heslop and Papadopoulos, 1993; Szamosi, 1995; Mehrkens, 2000) have used factor loadings of .40 or higher to determine the individual cut-off point of scales on factors with varimax rotation to increase the interpretability of the factors. The same approach was used in the present study.

The results of PCA for the product scales are shown in Table 5.6 and for the country and people scales in Table 5.7. Table 5.8 groups the scales within common dimensions and shows which scales grouped together for which countries. In tables 5.6 to 5.9, in the case of a scale that loaded at .4 or above in two different dimensions, the lower loading is indicated in parentheses.

Based on the groupings in Table 5.8, modifications were made to the proposed Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model. This was done since the scales within each construct of the proposed Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model, see Figure 3.1, do not group together at an acceptable level to confirm that they are part of the same

Table 5.6
Principal Components Analysis of Product Scales (Argentina)

#	Argentina	Canada	Chile	Mexico	United States
1	Quality .737	Quality .710	Quality .820	Quality .784	Quality .722
	Workman .562	Workman .691	Workman .815	(Value .426)	Workman .648
	(Defects .434)	Durability .717	Attract .758	Workman .698	Durability .785
	Durability .770	Tech level .711	Innovate .724	Attract .741	Reliability .815
	Tech level .652	Reliability .729	Variety .660	Innovate .672	Satisfied .642
	Reliability .800	Satisfied .434	Durability .810	(Variety .464)	(Buy .531)
	Satisfied .760	(Service .490)	Tech level .805	Durability .770	Proud .594
	Proud .573	Overall .743	Reliable .822	Tech level .715	Service .495
	Service .493		Satisfied .727	Reliability .760	Overall .735
	Overall .782		(Buy .440)	Satisfied .607	
			(Proud .499)	(Service .404)	
			Service .617	Overall .722	
			Overall .790		
	(4.8 ^a / 25.4% ^b)	(4.1 / 21.8%)	(7 / 36.7%)	(5.6 / 29.5%)	(4.5 / 23.5%)
2	Attract .620	Know .680	Know .671	Know .557	Attract .604
	Innovate .751	Find .740	Find .766	(Satisfied .475)	Innovate .823
	Variety .779	Buy .782	Buy .731	Find .618	Variety .782
		Proud .687	Proud .566	Buy .802	Tech level .658
		Service .495	(Service .448)	Proud .722	
				Service .639	
	(2.2 / 11.4%)	(2.7 / 14.1%)	(2.6 / 13.6%)	(3 / 15.8%)	(2.9 / 15.2%)
3	Know .739	Attractive .684	Value .711	Value .680	Know .690
	Find .711	Innovative .787	Defects -.602	Defects -.754	Find .715
	Buy .575	Variety .727	Price .769	Price .704	Buy .584
					(Proud .432)
	(1.8 / 9.6%)	(2.2 / 11.4%)	(1.7 / 9.2%)	(1.7 / 9%)	(2.1 / 11.1%)
4	Value .817	Value .797	(Defects .414)	Variety .512	Value .773
	Price .796	Price .824	Brands .838	Brands .829	Brands -.441
				(Know .419)	Defects -.438
	(1.7 / 9.2%)	(1.5 / 8%)	(1.1 / 6%)	(Find .477)	Price .795
				(1.6 / 8.2%)	(1.8 / 9.5%)
5	Defects .627	Defects .775			
	Brands .650	Brands .636			
	(1.3 / 6.7%)	(1.2 / 6.4%)			
	61.6%^c	62.2%	65.4%	62.5%	59.3%

^aEigenvalue

^bPercentage of Variance Explained

^cTotal Percentage of Variance Explained

Table 5.7
Principal Components Analysis of Country Scales (Argentina)

#	Argentina	Canada	Chile	Mexico	United States
1	Pol stabil .726	Industrious .484	Likeable .781	Education .604	Wealth .625
	Tech level .631	Education .683	Industrious .754	Wealth .615	Pol stabil .780
	Econ stabil .754	Wealth .613	Education .566	(Work ethi .438)	Tech Level .772
	Q of life .692	(Trust .423)	(Wealth .409)	Individual .444	Econ stabil .844
	Role polit .694	Work ethi .507	Friendly .785	Pol stabil .690	Q of Life .749
	Enviro .649	Pol stabil .755	Trust .673	Tech Level .813	(Enviro .404)
	Rights .643	Tech Level .798	Work ethi .635	Econ stabil .840	Rights .520
		Econ stabil .843		Q of life .759	
		Q of Life .810		Role polit .606	
		Role polit .586		Enviro .682	
		Enviro .623		Rights .578	
	(3.7 ^a / 23% ^b)	(5.7 / 24.8%)	(3.7 / 16.2%)	(5.1 / 22.2%)	(4 / 17.4%)
2	Likeable .668	Ties .686	(Education .467)	Likeable .780	Enviro .540
	Industrious .738	Immigrate .709	Wealth .628	Industrious .686	(Rights .425)
	Education .592	Invest In .675	(Work ethi .416)	Friendly .800	Ties .781
	Friendly .783	Invest Fr .717	Pol stabil .649	Trust .712	Immigrate .568
	Trust .748	Exports .620	Tech Level .757	Work ethi .627	(Invest In .485)
	Work ethi .685	Imports .646	Econ stabil .750		Invest Fr .677
			Q of life .638		Exports .567
					Imports .640
					(3.4 / 14.7%)
	(3.3 / 20.5)	(3.1 / 13.4%)	(3.3 / 14.5%)	(3 / 13%)	
3	Individual .763	Likeable .755	(Ties .512)	Ties .717	Like .829
	Know .723	Friendly .836	Immigrate .692	(Invest In .424)	Friend .870
		Trust .623	Invest In .696	Invest Fr .750	
		(Work ethi .494)	Invest Fr .674	Exports .820	
			mports .782		
	(1.2 / 7.8%)	(2.3 / 10.2%)	(2.7 / 11.8%)	(2.4 / 10.4%)	(2 / 8.7%)
4		Align .768	(Q of life .456)	Immigrate .799	Industrious .637
			Role polit .526	Invest In .531	Trust .553
			Enviro .723	Imports .767	Work ethi .612
			Rights .653		Individual .465
			Align .667		
		(2.3 / 10.2%)	(2.3 / 10.1%)	(2 / 8.8%)	(1.9 / 8.5%)
5		Individual .669	Individual .424	Align .595	Education .738
		Know .659	Know .585	Know .814	Role polit .531
			Ties .517		
			Exports .773		
		(1.3 / 5.8%)	(1.8 / 8%)	(1.4 / 6.1%)	(1.5 / 6.4)
6					Align .620
					Know .484
					Invest In .578
					(1.4 / 6.2)
	51.3%^c	60%	60.7%	60.5%	61.9%

^aEigenvalue

^bPercentage of Variance Explained

^cTotal Percentage of Variance Explained

Table 5.8
PCA Dimension Groupings

Dimension/Naming		Scales	Countries
Product1	Product Beliefs Function	Quality Workmanship Durability Tech level Reliability After Sales Service	Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S
	Product Evaluations	Satisfied (Proud) Overall Rate	Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S Argentina, Chile, U.S. Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S
Product2	Familiarity	Know Find	Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S
	Used above	Proud (After Sales Service)	Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S Canada, Chile, Mexico
	Buy	Willingness to Buy	Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S
Product3	Product Beliefs Appeal	Attract Innovate Variety	Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S
Product4	Product Cost	Value Price	Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S
		(Defects)	Chile, Mexico, U.S.
Product5	Not used	Defects Brands	Argentina, Canada, Chile, U.S Argentina, Canada, Chile, U.S
Country1	Country Admiration	Wealth Political Stability Tech Level Econ stability Quality of Life Role polit Environment Rights	Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S Argentina, Canada, Mexico Argentina, Canada, Mexico, U.S Argentina, Canada, Mexico, U.S
Country2	People Animosity	Likeable Friendliness Trustworthiness Work Ethic	Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico
Country3	Relations Animosity	Ties Immigration Invest In Invest From Exports Imports	Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S Canada, Chile, U.S Canada, Chile, Mexico, U.S Canada, Chile, U.S Canada, Chile, U.S Canada, Chile, U.S

Parentheses () around a scale indicates that the scale grouped stronger for another construct

underlying dimension.

In the case of the Product Beliefs dimension, it was expected that Attractive, Innovative, Good Quality, Technology level, Good Workmanship, Reliability, Variety, and Durability would load together. This grouping is, for the most part, consistent with past studies (Nadeau, 1998; Gooding, 2002; Dowdles, 1997). However, in the present study, PCA indicated that Product Beliefs consists of two dimensions: Function and Appeal. Scales from the Product1 dimension (Quality, Workmanship, Durability, Tech level, Reliability, and After Sales Service) of Table 5.8 were taken to account for Product Beliefs Function. Although Satisfied, Proud, and Good Overall also group with this dimension, they were not included as they are considered to be theoretically distinct, though a strong relationship is hypothesized. All scales within the Product3 dimension (Attractive, Innovative, and Variety) of Table 5.8 indicate Product Beliefs Appeal. As such, Product Beliefs from the proposed model is divided into two smaller dimensions. Furthermore, After Sales Service has been added as a scale to the Product Beliefs Function construct.

In the proposed model, Product Evaluations consisted of Good Value, Good Overall, Proud to Own, and Satisfaction, which is consistent with past studies (Gooding, 2002; Dowdles, 1997). The Product Evaluations construct of the revised model will use the three remaining scales not used in the Product1 dimension (Good Overall, Proud to Own, Satisfaction) of Table 5.8. Thus, the revised model is identical to the proposed model except that Good Value was dropped.

An additional dimension, Product Cost, was created that was not present in the proposed model. Product Cost consists of Value and Price. Both of these scales loaded together for all five countries. It is hypothesized that Product Cost will have a direct positive effect on Willingness to Buy.

In the proposed model, the Familiarity dimension consisted of Brands, Find, Know Products, and Know Country. In PCA, Know Products and Find group together but Brands did not and was dropped from the construct.

Originally, PCAs were conducted for both the product and country sections of the variables contained in the questionnaire. This was suitable given that there was no overlapping between these two sections in the proposed animosity/admiration theoretical model except for the Familiarity construct. In this instance, three product scales (Awareness of Brand Names, Ease of Finding, and Know Products) were included with one country scale (Know Country).

In order to determine whether or not Know Country belonged with the other three scales in the Familiarity construct, a new PCA was administered. The new PCA included all product scales as well as the Know Country scale.

Know Country loaded with Know Products for all five countries. However, adding this country scale also resulted in some other minor changes with other scales that had previously loaded with Know Products.

Table 5.9 on the previous page highlights the changes from the original product PCA to a product PCA including Know Country.

Under the PCA of product scales that includes Know Country, Know Products and Know Country load together for all five countries. However, Find, which originally loaded with Know Products for all five countries, now only loads with Canada. Despite this, given the strong loadings between Find and Know Products in the PCA product scales test not including Know Country, and the strong loadings between Know Country and Know Products in the PCA product scales test including Know Country, these three scales have been grouped together as one dimension named Familiarity. This construct is the same as the one in the proposed model, except that it excludes Brands.

As a final analysis to ascertain that Know Country belongs in the Familiarity construct, Cronbach's Alpha was conducted for both a Familiarity construct with and without Know Country.

Table 5.10
Cronbach's Alpha of Familiarity Construct

Cronbach's α		
Country	Find, Know Products and Know Country	Find and Know Products
Argentina	.54	.55
Canada	.57	.58
Chile	.60	.59
Mexico	.60	.73
U.S.	.63	.58

There is very little difference in the Cronbach's α between the two sets. However, for theoretical reasons, a PCI familiarity construct should contain both product and country

scales. Logically, Know Country, Know Products, and knowledge of Brands all require a certain degree of familiarity with either the country or the products from a given country. Therefore, Know Country was accepted as appropriate for inclusion in the Familiarity construct as it adds value from a theoretical standpoint and little statistical difference exists between a model with or without it.

The Admiration dimension of the proposed construct in the model consisted of Education Level, Wealth, Work Ethic, Political Stability, Technology Level, Stability of Economy, Quality of Life, Individual Rights, Aligned, and Political and Economic Ties. The dimension Country2 of Table 5.8 best captures these scales and includes Wealth, Political Stability, Technology Level, Stability of Economy, Individual Rights, Quality of Life and two items that were not included in the proposed model but fits the construct both empirically and logically, as they are admirable traits for a country to possess, Environmental Controls and Role in World Politics.

The animosity dimension of the proposed model consisted of both people scales to represent affect (Likeability, Friendliness, and Trustworthiness) and linkages scales (Role in World Politics, Immigration, Imports, and Investment From) to represent desired relations, or meek relations that would infer animosity. The Country2 dimension (Likeability, Friendliness, Trustworthiness and one item that was not included in the proposed model but fits the construct empirically, Work Ethic) of Table 5.8 best captures the People Animosity component of the proposed construct and has been separated into its own construct for the revised model. The Country3 dimension (Ties, Immigration,

Invest In, Invest From, Exports, Imports) captures the Relations Animosity components of the Animosity construct of the proposed model and has been separated into its own construct for the revised model. To summarize, the proposed Animosity construct has been divided into two separate constructs for the revised model: People Animosity and Relations Animosity.

Table 5.11 on the next page compares the dimensions from the proposed model to the revised model as a result of PCA. Cronbach's α was conducted as an additional check for construct internal consistency. The results indicate that the configuration of the operational constructs and their underlying dimensions of the scales in the revised constructs of the model hold together considerably stronger than the original constructs of the model. As such, a revised version of the Animosity/Admiration Theoretical model was constructed and is illustrated in Figure 5.1.

Table 5.11
Proposed and Modified Models with Cronbach's α

Proposed Model			Model After PCA Analysis		
Dimension	Cronbach's Alpha		Dimension	Cronbach's Alpha	
<u>Product Beliefs</u>	Arg	.82	<u>Product Beliefs Function</u>	Arg	.82
Attractiveness	Can	.86	Quality	Can	.81
Innovativeness	Chile	.92	Workmanship	Chile	.90
Quality	Mex	.89	Durability	Mex	.87
Technology Level	U.S.	.86	Technology Level	U.S.	.82
Workmanship			Reliability		
Reliability			After Sales Service		
Variety			<u>Product Beliefs Appeal</u>	Arg	.70
Durability			Attractiveness	Can	.75
			Innovativeness	Chile	.84
			Variety	Mex	.76
				U.S.	.80
<u>Product Evaluations</u>	Arg	.63	<u>Product Evaluations</u>	Arg	.74
Value	Can	.56	Satisfaction	Can	.61
Satisfaction	Chile	.71	Proud to Own	Chile	.78
Proud to Own	Mex	.72	Good Overall	Mex	.77
Good Overall	U.S.	.60		U.S.	.69
<u>Familiarity</u>	Arg	.48	<u>Familiarity</u>	Arg	.54
Brands	Can	.52	Know Products	Can	.57
Know Products	Chile	.52	Ease of Finding	Chile	.60
Ease of Finding	Mex	.57	Know Country	Mex	.60
Know Country	U.S.	.53		U.S.	.63
<u>Admiration</u>	Arg	-	<u>Country Admiration</u>	Arg	.82
Education Level	Can	.83	Wealth	Can	.88
Wealth	Chile	.84	Political Stability	Chile	.86
Work Ethic	Mex	.84	Tech Level (country)	Mex	.88
Political Stability	U.S.	.79	Stability of Economy	U.S.	.80
Tech Level (country)			Individual Rights		
Stability of Economy			Quality of Life		
Quality of Life			Environmental Controls		
Individual Rights			Role in World Politics		
Aligned					
Political Ties					
<u>Animosity</u>	Arg	-	<u>People Animosity</u>	Arg	.76
Likeability	Can	.72	Likeability	Can	.75
Friendliness	Chile	.79	Friendliness	Chile	.84
Trustworthiness	Mex	.74	Trustworthiness	Mex	.82
Role in World Politics	U.S.	.72	Work Ethic	U.S.	.75
Immigration			<u>Relations Animosity</u>		
Imports			Ties	Arg	-
Investment From			Immigration	Can	.80
			Invest In	Chile	.80
			Invest From	Mex	.78
			Exports	U.S.	.80
			Imports		
<u>Willingness to Buy</u>			<u>Willingness to Buy</u>		
Buy	N/A	-	Buy	N/A	-

Figure 5.1
The Revised Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model

5.4 Consumer Patriotism – Objective 2, Hypotheses 2-3

The second hypothesis is concerned with Argentine consumers' evaluations on the product belief ratings. It was hypothesized that Argentine consumers would rate their home country highest out of the two NICs but lower than the two DCs. Specifically:

H2: Argentine respondents will give lower product belief ratings to the home country than to Canada and the U.S. but higher product belief ratings to the home country than to Mexico and Chile.

As previously noted, after PCA, Product Beliefs was divided into two constructs: Product Beliefs Function and Product Beliefs Appeal. As such, H2 has also been divided into H2a, reflecting Product Beliefs Functions, and H2b, reflecting Product Beliefs Appeal.

In terms of H2a, Table 5.12 summarizes significant differences between all Argentina and the other countries for Product Beliefs Function and Table 5.13 for Product Beliefs Appeal. Within these tables, a bolded mean reflects a significantly higher difference and an underlined mean a significantly lower difference from Argentina ($p < .005$).

MANOVA paired comparisons were used as the statistical analysis method for this objective (a more detailed analysis, with F-values, can be found in Appendix D).

Table 5.12
Product Beliefs Function Comparisons to Argentina

Scale	Argentina	Canada	Chile	Mexico	U.S.
Quality	4.43	5.32	<u>3.47</u>	<u>3.62</u>	5.36
Workmanship	4.35	5.02	<u>3.41</u>	<u>3.52</u>	5.11
Durability	4.23	5.16	<u>3.56</u>	<u>3.65</u>	5.11
Technology level	3.55	5.66	3.36	3.51	6.20
Reliability	4.02	5.34	<u>3.36</u>	<u>3.53</u>	5.56
After sales service	3.41	4.27	3.13	3.24	5.14
Mean	4.00	5.13	<u>3.38</u>	<u>3.51</u>	5.41

Given the results seen in Table 5.12, H2a is accepted. Argentine respondents gave both Canada and the U.S. significantly higher ratings than Argentina on all scales within the Product Beliefs Function Construct. In the case of Chile and Mexico, Argentine respondents rated home higher on all scales but no significant differences existed on both Technology Level and After Sales Service. In short, the two DCs' products rated significantly higher on all Product Beliefs Function scales as hypothesized. For the NICs, home country products were rated higher on all scales but no significant differences existed on two scales.

Table 5.13
Product Beliefs Appeal Comparisons to Argentina

Scale	Argentina	Canada	Chile	Mexico	U.S.
Attractiveness	4.35	4.77	<u>3.21</u>	<u>3.72</u>	5.49
Innovativeness	3.29	4.88	3.16	3.41	5.92
Variety	3.99	4.63	<u>3.31</u>	3.67	6.09
Overall Mean	3.88	4.76	<u>3.23</u>	3.60	5.83

The results in Table 5.13 provide support for partially accepting H2b. The two DCs' products rated significantly higher on all scales as hypothesized. However, in the case of the NICs, home country products were rated significantly higher on all scales compared to Chile except for Innovativeness where no significant difference existed. In comparison to Mexico, home country products were rated higher on Attractiveness, but no significant differences existed for Innovativeness and Appeal. In terms of the overall mean, home country products were significantly higher than Chile and higher than Mexico but at a level approaching significance with $p = .005$.

H3: Argentine respondents will be most proud and willing to buy home country products compared to the four other countries.

Given the results in Table 5.14, H3 is partially accepted. Argentine products were rated significantly higher on both Proud to Own and Willingness to Buy for all countries except for the U.S. where no significant differences existed. In the case of Willingness to Buy, Argentine products were rated higher than the U.S. at a level approaching significance with $p = .008$.

Table 5.14
Proud to Own and Willingness to Buy Comparisons to Argentina

Scale	Argentina	Canada	Chile	Mexico	U.S.
Proud to Own	4.64	<u>3.43</u>	<u>2.93</u>	<u>3.13</u>	4.83
Willing to Buy	4.64	<u>3.47</u>	<u>2.41</u>	<u>2.81</u>	4.17

These results indicate that perhaps patriotism in Argentina is not as strong as expected. It also indicates that higher quality U.S. goods also possess a certain degree of perceived pride in ownership for Argentine consumers. This may be a result of the cosmopolitanism and prestige associated with U.S. goods in Argentina. Inferences can also be made from these results that ethnocentrism is not prevalent in Argentina or that, at least, admiration outweighs its effects when considering the U.S.

5.5 Animosity and Admiration – Third Objective, Hypotheses 4-8

Hypotheses within this objective focused on both animosity, Argentines to Chile and vice versa, and admiration Argentines to the U.S. and Canada. MANOVA pairwise comparisons were the statistical approach undertaken for all of the hypotheses with the exception of H6 where Independent Sample T tests were employed.

H4: Argentine consumers will give Chile the least favourable scores within the animosity construct of the model compared to the four other countries.

H4 was divided into two separate hypotheses, H4a to reflect People Animosity and H4b to reflect Relations Animosity. Table 5.15 summarizes People Animosity results and Table 5.16 summarizes Relations Animosity results (more detailed analyses are available in Appendix E).

Given the results in Table 5.15, H4a is partially accepted. In terms of People Animosity, Chile received significantly lower scores, indicating Argentines have higher animosity to Chile than to Canada and Mexico on all scales. Argentine respondents rated home people as being more Likeable, Friendly, and Trustworthy than Chileans but there was no significant difference on the Work Ethic scale. The U.S. was rated higher on Work Ethic and Trustworthiness than Chile but there were no significant differences for Likeability and Friendliness.

Table 5.15
Argentine Consumers' People Animosity Evaluations

Scale	Chile	Argentina	Canada	Mexico	U.S.
Likeability of People	3.33	5.07	3.92	5.22	3.18
Friendliness	3.46	4.35	4.31	4.93	3.64
Trustworthiness	2.93	3.42	5.01	4.95	4.51
Work Ethic	3.64	3.52	5.34	4.04	5.10
Mean	3.34	4.09	4.65	4.56	4.11

the results in Table 5.16 provide support for accepting H4b. Argentine consumers evaluated Chile as significantly lower than all other countries on the Relations Animosity scale indicating a relatively high degree of animosity towards Chile. On a side note, Canada received the highest ratings compared to all other countries indicating that the

Table 5.16
Argentine Consumers' Relations Animosity Evaluations

Scale	Chile	Canada	Mexico	U.S.
Political and economic ties	4.35	5.71	5.01	4.84
Immigration	2.31	4.74	3.28	4.24
Investment in	3.64	4.88	4.35	4.69
Investment from	3.93	5.87	5.00	5.45
Exports	5.47	6.24	5.81	6.22
Imports	3.01	4.39	3.63	4.00
Overall Mean	3.78	5.30	4.52	4.90

lowest degree of Relations Animosity and the highest degree of desired linkages.

Hypothesis five is similar to H4 but concerns Chilean views of Argentines and Argentina.

H5 contends that Chilean consumers will hold animosity towards Argentina. Specifically,

H5: Chilean consumers will give Argentina the least favourable scores within the animosity construct of the model compared to the four other countries.

Similarly to H4, H5 was divided into two separate hypotheses, H5a to reflect People Animosity and H5b to reflect Relations Animosity. Table 5.17 summarizes People Animosity results and Table 5.18 summarizes Relations Animosity results (more detailed analyses are available in Appendix F).

Given the results of Table 5.17, H5a is accepted. Argentina was rated lowest by Chilean respondents on all scales within the People Animosity construct compared to Canada, Chile and Mexico. In comparison to the U.S., Argentina was rated lower in all but one instance (Likeability which approached significance).

Table 5.17
Chilean Consumers' People Animosity Evaluations

Scale	Argentina	Canada	Chile	Mexico	U.S.
Likeability of People	3.65	4.42	5.70	5.68	3.97
Friendliness	3.56	4.70	5.55	5.42	4.06
Trustworthiness	3.45	5.10	4.59	4.35	4.90
Work Ethic	3.80	5.39	4.43	4.13	5.26
Overall Mean	3.62	4.90	5.07	4.90	4.55

Given the results of table 5.18, H5b is not accepted. Although Chilean consumers desire more linkages with Canada and the U.S. compared with Argentina, no significant differences existed between Argentina and Mexico with the exception of one scale (Investment From). A probable explanation of these results is that Chilean consumers desire greater linkages with DCs over NICs rather than the existence of animosity.

Table 5.18
Chilean Consumers' Relations Animosity Evaluations

Scale	Argentina	Canada	Mexico	U.S.
Political and economic ties	5.41	5.89	5.33	5.80
Immigration	3.47	4.62	3.56	4.37
Investment in	4.89	5.49	5.05	5.57
Investment from	4.69	5.80	5.07	5.87
Exports	5.75	6.13	5.82	6.30
Imports	4.13	5.10	4.41	5.18
Overall Mean	4.73	5.50	4.87	5.52

Given that the existence of animosity has been demonstrated for Argentina towards Chile on both the People and Relations Animosity constructs and Chile towards Argentina for the People Animosity construct, independent samples T tests were performed to determine which country holds the greater degree of animosity towards the other. It was hypothesized that Argentines would hold a greater degree of animosity towards Chile than Chileans towards Argentina as a result of being on the losing end of the territorial

dispute and due to Chile's assistance to Great Britain during the Falklands/Malvinas war.

Specifically,

H6: Chilean consumers will rate Argentina more favourably than Argentine consumers will rate Chile on scores within the animosity construct of the model.

H6 was also divided into two separate hypotheses to reflect the division of the Animosity construct. H6a reflects People Animosity and H6b Relations Animosity respectively.

In terms of H6a, Argentines rated Chile lower than Chileans rated Argentina on all scales in the People Animosity construct but none were significant except for the Trustworthiness scale. As such, H6a is only partially accepted.

Table 5.19
People Animosity Held by Argentine Consumers towards Chile
Independent-Samples T Test

Variable		Group Statistics			Independent Samples Test*		
		N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.
Likeability	A to Ch	302	3.33	1.74	-2.199	600	.028
	Ch to A	300	3.65	1.74			
Friendliness	A to Ch	301	3.46	1.59	-.716	598	.474
	Ch to A	299	3.56	1.61			
Trustworthiness	A to Ch	301	2.93	1.32	-4.623	597	.000
	Ch to A	298	3.45	1.41			
Work ethic	A to Ch	300	3.64	1.37	-1.463	595	.144
	Ch to A	297	3.80	1.38			

*equal variance assumed

A to Ch = Argentine consumers' evaluations of the people from Chile

Ch to A = Chilean consumers' evaluations of the people from Argentina

H6b, Relations Animosity, is accepted. Argentine respondents desired fewer linkages with Chile on all scales but one (Exports) in the Relations Animosity construct compared to Chilean respondents to Argentina.

Table 5.20
People Animosity Held by Argentine Consumers towards Chile
Independent-Samples T Test

Variable		Group Statistics			Independent Samples Test*		
		N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	2-tail Sig.
Ties	A to Ch	302	4.35	2.00	-7.209	599	.000
	Ch to A	299	5.41	1.58			
Immigration	A to Ch	302	2.31	1.65	-8.221	598	.000
	Ch to A	298	3.47	1.80			
Invest In	A to Ch	302	3.64	2.01	-8.222	599	.000
	Ch to A	299	4.89	1.70			
Invest From	A to Ch	301	3.93	2.09	-4.730	597	.000
	Ch to A	298	4.69	1.81			
Exports	A to Ch	301	5.47	1.82	-2.071	599	.039
	Ch to A	300	5.75	1.45			
Imports	A to Ch	302	3.01	1.90	-7.156	599	.000
	Ch to A	299	4.13	1.96			

*equal variance assumed

A to Ch = Argentine consumers' evaluations of the people from Chile

Ch to A = Chilean consumers' evaluations of the people from Argentina

Hypotheses seven and eight consider the Admiration construct. As discussed in subsection 2.2.6 of the literature review, admiration thrives when non-local products are viewed as possessing qualities of cosmopolitanism and prestige. The Admiration construct contains scales that are viewed as the underlying dimensions for the existence of possible admiration thereby leading to stronger product evaluations and willingness to buy, as will be addressed in the next objective. However, for the time being, it is expected that the DCs will receive higher evaluations than the NICs for all scales within the Admiration construct.

Specifically,

H7: Argentine consumers will give the U.S. the most favourable scores within the admiration construct of the model compared to the other countries.

Since Canada is a DC but not as economically and political powerful as the U.S. and also does not possess the same degree of exposure as the U.S. in Argentina:

H8: Argentine consumers will give Canada the second most favourable scores within the admiration construct of the model compared to the other countries.

Both H7 and H8 are supported. Argentine respondents evaluated both Canada and the U.S. significantly higher than home, Chile, and Mexico on all scales within the Country Admiration construct. In comparing Canada and the U.S., the U.S. was either rated higher or there was no significant difference on the scales in question. Table 5.20 summarizes the significant difference between each country (More detailed analyses are available in Appendix G).

Table 5.21
Doubly Multivariate Analysis of Argentine Consumer Perceptions
of Country Admiration Differences

	Pairwise Comparisons									
Variable	A/C	A/Ch	A/M	A/US	C/Ch	C/M	C/US	Ch/M	Ch/US	M/US
Exact F-value	286.20	83.85	57.81	289.05	157.33	120.72	21.00	22.92	190.22	155.38
Wealth	C	ns	ns	US	C	C	ns	ns	US	US
Political Stability	C	Ch	M	US	C	C	US	ns	US	US
Technology Level	C	A	M	US	C	C	US	ns	US	US
Stability of Economy	C	Ch	M	US	C	C	US	Ch	US	US
Quality of Life	C	Ch	M	US	C	C	ns	ns	US	US
Role In World Politics	C	Ch	M	US	C	C	US	M	US	US
Environmental Controls	C	Ch	M	US	C	C	ns	Ch	US	US
Individual Rights	C	A	ns	US	C	C	ns	M	US	US
Number of Sig Differences	8	7	6	8	8	8	4	4	8	8
Sig Difs > for Country 1	A = 0	A = 2	A = 0	A = 0	C = 8	C = 8	C = 0	Ch = 2	Ch = 0	M = 0
Sig Difs > for Country 2	C = 8	Ch = 5	M = 6	US = 8	Ch = 0	M = 0	US = 4	M = 2	US = 8	US = 8

A = Argentina, C = Canada, Ch = Chile, M = Mexico, US = United States; Country letter(s) indicate Significantly higher Difference at $p < .005$ for that country compared to the other; ns = No Significant Difference with country

5.6 Model Testing – Objective 4, Hypotheses 9-15

The fourth objective was to determine the patterns of association of constructs and related construct measures as outlined in the revised Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model. All scales were averaged within each construct before doing correlation analyses of the individual hypotheses. Table 5.22 summarizes significant path coefficients between the constructs. Some minor adjustments were made to the revised model to the final and accepted Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model (see Figure 5.7 for final model), which will be justified and discussed in this section. Figures 5.2 through 5.6 illustrate the correlations between each pair of constructs for each country of the final Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model. Hypotheses nine through fifteen contain all of the hypothesized correlations.

H9: Product Beliefs will be positively related to Product Evaluations.

H9 was divided into two separate hypotheses to reflect the division of the Product Beliefs Constructs. H9a represents Product Beliefs Function and H9b represents Product Beliefs Appeal to Product Evaluations. Both were accepted since significant positive correlations were found for all five countries.

H10: Animosity will be negatively related to both Product Evaluations and Willingness to Buy.

H10 was also divided, but into four separate hypotheses. H10a represents People Animosity and H10b represents Relations Animosity to Product Evaluations and H10c represents People Animosity and H10d represents Relations Animosity to Willingness to

Table 5.22
Correlation Analysis of Model Paths Summary Table

Path accepted in model when $p < .01$ (**)		Path Coefficients					Total $p < .01$
Hyp	Path	Argentina	Canada	Chile	Mexico	U.S.	
H9a	Product Beliefs Function $\rightarrow$ Product Evaluations	.77***	.61***	.81***	.76***	.70***	5/5
H9b	Product Beliefs Appeal $\rightarrow$ Product Evaluations	.41***	.52***	.67***	.63***	.47***	5/5
H10a	People Animosity $\rightarrow$ Product Evaluations	.45***	.43***	.50***	.20***	.42***	5/5
H10b	Relations Animosity $\rightarrow$ Product Evaluations	n/a	.31***	.37***	.20***	.49***	4/4
H10c	People Animosity $\rightarrow$ Willingness to Buy	.16**	.25***	.27***	.04 ^{ns}	.31***	4/5
H10d	Relations Animosity $\rightarrow$ Willingness to Buy	n/a	.18**	.16**	.09 ^{ns}	.40***	3/4
H11a	Admiration $\rightarrow$ Product Evaluations	.35***	.31***	.53***	.38***	.43***	5/5
H11b	Admiration $\rightarrow$ Willingness to Buy	.11*	.08	.32***	.24***	.26***	3/5
H12	Product Evaluations $\rightarrow$ Willingness to Buy	.44***	.56***	.68***	.63***	.69***	5/5
H13	Familiarity $\rightarrow$ Product Evaluations	.20***	.39***	.34***	.52***	.36***	5/5
H14	Familiarity moderates Product Evaluations $\rightarrow$ W Buy	.41***	.46***	.63***	.50***	.64***	5/5
H15	Product Cost $\rightarrow$ Willingness to Buy	.17***	-.06 ^{ns}	.12*	.16**	-.05 ^{ns}	2/5
Positive Significant Relationships at $p < .01$		9/10	10/12	11/12	10/12	11/12	51/58

Table 5.23
Non-hypothesized Correlation Paths Summary Table

Path accepted when $p < .01$ (**)		Path Coefficients					Total $p < .01$
Additional Tests	Path	Argentina	Canada	Chile	Mexico	U.S.	
	Product Beliefs Function $\rightarrow$ Willingness to Buy	.33***	.28***	.55***	.50***	.45***	5/5
	Product Beliefs Appeal $\rightarrow$ Willingness to Buy	.16**	.29***	.47***	.40***	.37***	5/5
	Familiarity $\rightarrow$ Willingness to Buy	.33***	.50***	.50***	.51***	.38***	5/5
	Product Cost $\rightarrow$ Product Evaluations	-.0 ^{ns}	.14*	.18**	.28**	.04 ^{ns}	2/5

* = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$, ns = not significant, n/a = not applicable

Buy. Both H10a and H10b are accepted since significant correlations exist between them to Product Evaluations for all countries. H10c and H10d are accepted since significant correlations exist between both People and Relations Animosity to Willingness to Buy for all countries except for one instance where both People and Relations Animosity were not significantly correlated to Willingness to Buy in the case of Mexico. Nonetheless, all other countries were deemed as a strong enough fit and H10c and H10d were accepted.

H11: Admiration will be positively related to both Product Evaluations and Willingness to Buy.

H11 was also divided into two separate hypotheses to reflect the two different correlations. H11a represents the correlation between Country Admiration and Product Evaluations and H11b represents the correlation between Country Admiration and Willingness to Buy. H11a is accepted, as significant correlations exist for all countries. H11b is partially accepted, as significant correlations exist for three of the five countries. There was no significant correlation for Argentina and Canada at the $p < .01$. In the case of Argentina, however, it was significant at the $p < .05$ with $p = .028$.

H12: Product Evaluations will be positively related to Willingness to Buy.

H12 is accepted, as significant correlations existed for all five countries.

H13: Familiarity will be positively related Product Evaluations.

H13 is accepted, as significant correlations existed for all five countries.

H14: Familiarity will moderate the effects of Product Evaluations on Willingness to Buy.

H14 is accepted. ANCOVA revealed that Familiarity moderates the effects of Product Evaluations on Willingness to Buy for all five countries. In order to fully determine whether or not Familiarity truly adds value to the model, a comparison between Product Evaluations with and without Familiarity was assessed. Table 5.24 below illustrates this comparison.

Table 5.24
Evaluation of the Familiarity Construct as a Moderating Variable
Between Product Evaluations and Willingness to Buy

	Arg	Can	Chi	Mex	U.S.
H12: Product Evaluations → Willingness to Buy	.44***	.56***	.68***	.63***	.69***
H14: Familiarity moderates Product Eval → Buy	.41***	.46***	.63***	.50***	.64***

In no instances is the path stronger with the addition of Familiarity as a moderating variable. As such, despite the acceptance of H14, this link has been removed from the final model for parsimony.

H15: Product Cost will be positively related to
Willingness to Buy.

H15 is not accepted, a significant correlation existed in only two out of the five countries.

As depicted in Table 5.23, some additional correlations for paths not hypothesized were also tested. Significant correlations existed for both Product Beliefs Function and Appeal to Willingness to Buy. However, the paths were not as strong as for these two constructs to Product Evaluations. Furthermore, the path from Product Evaluations to Willingness to Buy was stronger than for both Product Beliefs Appeal and Function to Willingness to Buy. Therefore, these two new paths were not added to the model. A path Product Cost

to Product Evaluations was also tested, however, as with the test of H15, significant correlations existed for only two out of the five countries. Therefore, it was not accepted.

Another path that was tested was that of Familiarity to Willingness to Buy. The correlations were strong and this path was added to the final model.

Figures 5.2 to 5.6 illustrate the final model for each country with all the correlations among the constructs. The overall means of construct are shown below each construct heading (Appendix H contains MANOVA pairwise comparisons of the overall means).

In the case of Argentina, the Relations Animosity construct does not exist as it is not possible for a country to evaluate the desired linkages that it would like to have with itself. In summary, there is strong support for the set of proposed paths in all the model with the exception of Country Admiration that does not have a significant correlation with Willingness to Buy at the $p < .01$ level. A possible explanation for this lack of correlation could be the low self-evaluations that Argentines gave to their country as a result of the looming economic and social crisis but yet the still relatively high rating on their willingness to buy home goods.

Figure 5.2
The Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model – Argentina

Construct mean in box
 Correlation coefficient on arrow
 Dotted arrow indicates no significant correlation
 Solid arrow indicates significant correlation
 Bolded arrow indicates strongest correlation coming from construct

Similar to Argentina, Country Admiration did not correlate with Willingness to Buy for Canada. A possible explanation could be that Canadian products do not possess the same level of cosmopolitanism and prestige that their U.S. counterparts possess, as previously discussed, and as such, despite the high ratings in the Admiration construct, Admiration did not translate into a Greater Willingness to buy. Interestingly, Canada scored

relatively high on all constructs except for Familiarity and the most important scale, Willingness to Buy. Despite strong ratings on other constructs, a lack of familiarity on the part of Argentines towards Canada and Canadian goods leads to a lower willingness to buy highlighted by a correlation of $r = .50$ between these two constructs.

Figure 5.3
The Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model – Canada

Construct mean in box

Correlation coefficient on arrow

Dotted arrow indicates no significant correlation

Solid arrow indicates significant correlation

Bolded arrow indicates strongest correlation coming from construct

Overall, Chile did relatively poorly compared to the other countries. In the case of Country Admiration, Chile was evaluated more favourably than the home country.

Compared to Mexico, no significance differences existed between the overall means of Chile and Mexico despite an overall higher Mexican mean. Similarly, Mexico scored higher than Chile on Willingness to Buy and Product Beliefs Function but not at a significant level. Chile received significantly higher scores for Familiarity over Canada and Mexico. Given the geographic proximity between Argentina and Mexico, this should be expected. As previously discussed, Argentines held the greatest degree of both People

Figure 5.4
The Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model – Chile

Construct mean in box

Correlation coefficient on arrow

Dotted arrow indicates no significant correlation

Solid arrow indicates significant correlation

Bolded arrow indicates strongest correlation coming from construct

and Relations Animosity towards Chile and the lowest Country Admiration. As the correlation analysis below indicates, these three constructs are significantly related to both Product Evaluations and Willingness to Buy.

Two correlations in the Mexican model were not significant, both People and Relations Animosity were not significantly related to Willingness to Buy. It appears that despite low degrees of animosity on the part of Argentine consumers to Mexico, they are not

Figure 5.5
The Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model – Mexico

Construct mean in box

Correlation coefficient on arrow

Dotted arrow indicates no significant correlation

Solid arrow indicates significant correlation

Bolded arrow indicates strongest correlation coming from construct

more inclined to purchase Mexican goods. Product Evaluations and Familiarity are the two key constructs that control Willingness to Buy.

Overall, the U.S. received the highest scores for the individual constructs of the Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model. Canada was the only country that Argentine consumers rated as significantly higher on any of the constructs by displaying less People

Figure 5.6
The Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model –
United States

Construct mean in box

Correlation coefficient on arrow

Dotted arrow indicates no significant correlation

Solid arrow indicates significant correlation

Bolded arrow indicates strongest correlation coming from construct

and Relations animosity towards Canada. The home country also rivalled the U.S. on People Animosity, Familiarity, and Willingness to Buy where no significant differences existed. All of the expected correlation paths held significant for the Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model in the case of the U.S.

Figure 5.7, the Final Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model, on the next page provides measures of the constructs and the number of significant correlations between each pair of constructs. As in the individual country models, the strongest path from one construct is bolded in order to differentiate it from the weaker. The country constructs appear to be acting through Product Evaluations to Willingness to Buy. A stronger correlation exists between both People and Relations Animosity to Product Evaluations than to Willingness to Buy. This differs from Klein et al. (1998) who found that Animosity affects Willingness to Buy, but not Product Judgments. Further elaborations and possible explanations for this difference will be given in section 6.3. Similarly, Country Admiration has a much stronger correlation to Product Evaluations than Willingness to Buy. Apart from Product Evaluations, another path that has a strong direct correlation to Willingness to Buy is Familiarity. Both Product Beliefs Function and Appeal have strong correlations to Product Evaluations. However, Product Beliefs Function has a stronger correlation than Product Beliefs Appeal to Product Evaluations. Thus, this construct appears to hold greater clout in the minds of Argentines when evaluating products.

Figure 5.7
The Final Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model

Bolded arrow indicates strongest correlation coming from construct

Number of countries in which correlation coefficient was significant indicated on arrow

5.7 Education and Animosity – Objective 5, Hypothesis 16

H16: Higher education levels will be related to a greater existence of animosity in Argentine respondents towards Chile.

Research on the Argentine education curriculum indicates that Argentine students are exposed to a high degree of anti-Chilean content throughout their education. Thus, the premise for this hypothesis was that more highly educated Argentines would encounter more anti-Chilean literature thus resulting in stronger animosity. In addition to ANOVA, curve estimation regression was run using both linear and quadratic models.

Table 5.25
People Animosity and Education

Test	F	Significance
ANOVA	.86	.549
Linear	1.34	.247
Quadratic	3.55	.030

Table 5.26
Relations Animosity and Education

Test	F	Significance
ANOVA	.86	.555
Linear	.55	.460
Quadratic	2.43	.090

None of these models showed any acceptable degree of significance. Therefore, H16 was not accepted. It was concluded that there is no significant relationship between levels of education and animosity.

6.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This study examined PCI among Argentine consumers with specific emphasis on animosity and admiration along with the development of an Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model. PCI among Chilean consumers was also assessed to determine whether animosity existed on the part of Chileans towards Argentina. The following section provides a summary of these results and discussion.

6.1 Argentine Consumers Product and Country Images

The findings indicated a diverse range of evaluations by Argentines of the different countries with significant differences existing on most scales between countries. This may be attributed to the different relationships that the countries have with Argentina as well as their economic development. Three NICs were used in the study, Argentina which is the home country; Chile which is a neighbouring country with similar levels of development and colonial heritage but a past filled with conflict with Argentina; Mexico which is a neutral Latin American country with little presence in Argentina; and two DCs, the U.S. which is a country with a strong presence in Argentina; and Canada which has little presence and not very well known in Argentina. Given that many aspects of Argentine product and country images are addressed within other hypotheses, this section will only discuss findings that are not repetitious.

The most noteworthy and surprising finding of this section lay in Argentine evaluations of their own country. Home was rated as significantly lower than all other countries on Political Stability, Stability of Economy, Quality of Life, Role in World Politics, and

Environmental Controls. As previously discussed in subsection 5.2.2, this may be attributed to various looming economic, social, and political difficulties. Despite these difficulties, it is surprising that Argentines would evaluate their country with such low esteem. Individuals gain a sense of identity and self-esteem through identification with their country (Druckman, 1994) and have a desire to make group membership salient (Oakes and Turner, 1980). However, it is possible that a situation of altercentrism exists whereby a self-depreciation of the in-group occurs in order to justify their economic woes. As such, evaluations, based on individual perceptions, would fall even further below the actual economic conditions of the country.

6.2 Patriotism

Hypotheses regarding patriotism were oriented towards beliefs, pride in ownership, and willingness to buy products from the home country. In terms of Product Beliefs, as hypothesized, Argentines evaluated the home country higher than the other two NICs but lower than the two DCs. Finding that NIC consumers evaluate home products lower than those of DCs is not uncommon, as was also the case with Greece and Hungary in Papadopoulos et al. (1990). However, Ahmed and d'Astous (1995) found that Chilean consumers rated home products as high as Canada and higher than Belgium. Arguments can be made that this result was largely caused by the existence of patriotism, given the economic disparities between these nations. The Argentine results, however, seem to be more realistically based. Product scales within the Product Beliefs constructs were fairly unambiguous and, thus, it may not have been realistic for Argentines to evaluate their products as being superior to their DC counterparts without overstatement.

Willingness to Buy and Proud to Own are subjective measures in which patriotism can be displayed without distorting reality. It was hypothesized that Argentines would rate home highest on these measures compared to the other countries. This held true for all countries except for the U.S. where no significant difference existed on both scales. This finding may be explained due to the U.S. particularly high ratings on other product scales that may transcend into greater pride and willingness to buy U.S. goods for reasons of quality. This finding may also be explained by the existence of admiration on the part of Argentines towards the U.S. As previously discussed in subsection 2.2.6, Batra et al. (2000) found that DC admiration on brand attitudes does not simply occur because of a higher-quality inference. The emulation of U.S. lifestyles and the cosmopolitanism associated with U.S. goods may have an as strong effect as patriotism. In all, inferences can be made that Argentine consumers' behaviour is neither nationalistic nor ethnocentric, but that a small degree of patriotism is present.

6.3 Animosity, Admiration and the Model

The study's results indicate that Argentine consumers hold both People and Relations Animosity towards Chile. Chilean consumers also hold People Animosity towards Argentina but not Relations Animosity. The study also revealed that Argentine animosity towards Chile was stronger than Chilean animosity towards Argentina. Inferences can be made that the animosity between these two countries is caused by past conflicts and territorial disputes. Similar to Schooler's (1965) study that examined Guatemalans' perceptions of products from member and non-member CACM countries, regional fears,

jealousies and animosities act as barriers between these two countries. The low ratings on the people scales between these two countries support the works of Druckman (1968) and his contention that the ratings of people and personal traits of an opposing nation are held in contempt. In referring to the works of Rutland and Brown (2001), the negative stereotypes that Argentines and Chileans have placed on one and another can conceivably be justified by the need to substantiate past intergroup discrimination. As previously noted, the possibility of reclaiming lost territories from Chile through the prospect of war was endorsed with bellicose indoctrination and embraced by the Argentine public. Therefore, it is plausible that Argentines need to collectively justify their actions and feelings that they held at that time today. Furthermore, to draw upon the works of Tajfel (1981), value loaded stereotypes are enduring and difficult to change. This further explains why, 20 years after the climax of the conflict, these feelings appear to still remain. It would seem that although Argentina may share a *nation*, which is defined by a common ethnic heritage and cognate language (Burgess and Harris, 1999), with Chile in many regards and have several subcultural affiliations, these two groups act as very distinct *states* where artificial borders define each other in their relations.

Results from the study indicate that Argentine consumers possess country admiration towards both the U.S. and Canada. This admiration is stronger in the case of the U.S. than Canada. This result is not surprising given the higher standards of living in both of these countries compared to the NICs. Since American Influence and way of life is much more prevalent and Canada receives little exposure to Argentines, it is also not surprising that admiration is stronger to the U.S. than to Canada.

Within the People Animosity construct, Americans fared relatively well on Trustworthiness and Work Ethic, but no significance existed between Americans and Chileans on Likeability and Friendliness. Despite possessing admirable country traits and standards of living, a certain degree of People Animosity exists on the part of Argentines towards Americans. Various postulations can be made to account for this finding. It is possible that conflicts between Juan D. Perón and the U.S. have left an enduring mark. It is also possible that the privatization of many previously state-owned enterprises in Argentina by U.S. firms has led to ill feeling. Lastly, the depiction of Americans in media, despite many enviable qualities, may lead to conclusions that they are not kind people. Animosity is country specific. It can exist in varying degrees and in conjunction with other concepts such as patriotism, ethnocentrism and even admiration. The data indicates that Argentines admire most aspects of the U.S. but begrudge others.

Some minor revisions were made to the constructs of the proposed model to the final model. However, most of the changes involved removing or adding some scales in the various constructs of the model. It was found that the proposed Animosity construct was not one-dimensional – Relations are not same as People. Therefore, the Animosity construct was divided into two separate constructs: People and Relations Animosity. Product Beliefs was also divided into two separate constructs: Product Beliefs Function and Appeal. The patterns of association of the constructs remained intact with one minor change: Familiarity was not found to work as a moderating variable between Product Evaluations and Willingness to Buy, but was directly related to Willingness to Buy.

Overall, the paths were a good fit for all countries with very few instances where significant correlations did not exist.

Both Animosity and Admiration constructs had higher correlations with Product Evaluations than Willingness to Buy. This finding stands in stark contrast with the findings of Klein et al. (1998) who found that animosity affects willingness to buy but not product judgments. A possible explanation for this finding is that great disparities exist between Chile and Japan. Japan is recognized worldwide for its products and manufacturing capabilities. As such, despite the existence of animosity and negative affect, Chinese consumers in the city of Nanjing could not cognitively justify giving Japan products low ratings. Instead, animosity was demonstrated through an unwillingness to buy Japanese goods. That is, despite being cognitively aware that Japanese products are of high quality, affective components would not allow their purchase. Chile, on the other hand, is not known for producing globally competitive products, with some exceptions. Evaluating Chilean products is much more ambiguous than in the case of Japan. As such, affective reactions can play a prevalent role in cognition without a strong need for rationalization. In other words, Argentines can mould their cognitive processes to what they are feeling.

A final finding of interest was the correlations of Familiarity in the model and the evaluations of this construct. Familiarity was found to have a positive correlation with both Product Evaluations and Willingness to Buy. However, the correlation between Familiarity and Willingness to Buy was stronger than for Product Evaluations. This

presents a definite problem for foreign manufacturers whose products, brands, and country are not well known in Argentina.

The most surprising finding of the Familiarity construct was the low ratings that Chile received. Despite receiving higher ratings than Canada and Mexico, a large discrepancy existed between the U.S. and Chile. Given the geographic proximity and various similarities between Argentina and Chile, one would expect that Argentines would have greater familiarity with Chile than the U.S. Instead, the U.S. was much higher and Chile rated closer to Canada and Mexico than it did the U.S. As previously discussed, Druckman (1974) found that once a negative affective judgment has been made; the individual does not seek any further information. It is possible that the majority of information regarding Chile that is presented to most Argentines is negative in nature. As such, no further information is sought or contemplated as a value-loaded stereotype has been formed unless it confirms the stereotype.

6.4 Influences of Education on Animosity

Given the large degree of anti-Chilean content in the Argentine educational curriculum (Escudé, 2000), it was hypothesized that higher levels of education would result in higher levels of animosity towards Chile. No support was found to support this hypothesis. The data indicates that education neither decreases nor increases animosity towards Chile. Roemer (1995) argued that higher levels of education increase acculturation thereby decreasing animosity and poorly substantiated stereotypes that lead to the boycotting of goods from a given country. However, the Argentine case with Chile is unique. It is

possible that education leads to both higher levels of exposure to anti-Chilean content but also to a worldlier mindset. Both of these influences may offset each other. Another and less intricate possibility, is quite simply that levels of animosity are fairly uniform throughout Argentina regardless of education.

7.0 LIMITATIONS

This section discusses limitations of the research. The purpose is to identify areas of concern with the objectives and methodology used that may threaten the value of the results. Rationalizations are given as to why certain objectives and methods were chosen over others. Constraints of the study are also evaluated.

The questionnaire used in the study was standardized to measure general PCI in NAFTA and potential NAFTA member countries and not specifically created to measure animosity and admiration. However, it does appear to capture required measures in order to develop a strong model as shown in the Animosity/Admiration Theoretical Model developed in the present study. People Animosity involves affective measures towards the people of the target country. Strong feelings of distrust and dislikeability are indicative of enmity and animosity. Similarly, the desire to have relatively low relations, whether it be through the immigration of people, imports or political and economic ties, with a country where much is held in common also implies a degree of enmity. Conversely, holding in esteem and the approving of a country's quality of life, wealth, and overall stability indicates a degree of admiration. Despite the apparently successful theoretical attempt to embody both animosity and admiration, future research in this field of study could endeavour to further improve upon the research instrument and model by adding scales that are indicative of animosity and admiration and removing scales not used in the model without compromising the study's soundness as in previous studies depicted in the next paragraph.

One negative aspect of a questionnaire that is designed to measure animosity and its effects specifically and directly is that such a questionnaire may lead respondents to overrate animosity and other evaluations within the questionnaire. For example, the questionnaire used by Klein et al. (1998, p. 99) asked respondents to rate if they will “never forgive Japan for the Nanjing massacre” and also if “Japan should pay for what it did to Nanjing during the occupation.” Such questions are leading and may create negative bias in the minds of respondents and consequently overestimate the effects of animosity as well as other measures used in the questionnaire. In contrast, the questionnaire used in the present study does not elicit negative biases by reminding respondents, through questions or otherwise, of past conflicts between Argentina and Chile. The consumer is given no indication that animosity will be assessed or is a focus of the study and so the possibility of socially desired responding within the animosity construct is greatly diminished. Both research instruments, a questionnaire designed specifically for the analysis of the effects of animosity and a standardized PCI questionnaire, have benefits and limitations.

The major advantage of the broader PCI approach undertaken in the present study’s questionnaire is that it allows for comparisons to be made between the obtained results in Argentina and other countries.

Most PCI studies tend to use either global product evaluations or product specific evaluations. Global product evaluations, as were used in the present study, require respondents to consider a general view of all products produced in a given country. In

contrast, product specific studies require respondents to consider only one or a combination of products selected by the researcher. Proponents of product specific studies argue that images vary across product categories and that global product evaluations do not capture these variations. However, global product evaluations do capture an overall view of a country's capabilities. Additionally, as previously discussed in subsection 2.1.2, The Mechanisms of Country Image Effects, a country image may be applicable strictly to product dimensions (Han and Terpstra, 1988). Using product dimensions, inferences can be made regarding potential evaluations of specific products (Roth and Romeo, 1992). Despite differences in levels of evaluation, both product specific and global evaluations offer insight in understanding a consumer's product images.

The research instrument used in the present study involves a single-cue approach. That is, respondents were presented with a country name and asked to evaluate its products, people and land based on that given country name. Single-cue studies have been criticized for overstating the PCI effect compared to multi-cue studies (Bilkey and Nes, 1982). However, given the objectives of the research and that country images were compared between the five countries, the single-cue approach is appropriate. There was also no specific attempt to assess the size effects of the country cue over other cues in the study.

The sample only includes residents of Capital Federal, Buenos Aires, Argentina. It does not go beyond the confines of that city. Thus, it is not representative of the entire

country. The sample characteristics were also not broadly representative of the population of Argentina. However, national sampling techniques are both time consuming and costly and have been used rarely in consumer research. Buenos Aires is an appropriate city to conduct the research as it contains a significant portion of Argentina's population. Also, consumers residing in Buenos Aires have greater familiarity with foreign products, thereby making them more suitable respondents for a study requiring comments on international products.

8.0 BENEFITS AND IMPLICATIONS

PCI researchers as well as policy-makers and marketers in Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico and the U.S. can benefit from the present research. Both benefits and implications for each of the foregoing will be assessed below.

8.1 PCI Researchers

Researchers can gain insight into the effects of PCI in an Argentine setting. This has been the only study to examine PCI in Argentina. Furthermore, little attention has been given to PCI in a Latin American context. Results from the present research may also be compared to a data collected in Mexico, Chile and Canada by the IKON Group. This can offer researchers a broader understanding of PCI in regards to NAFTA and potential NAFTA member countries. On a broader spectrum, the present research can be compared to many past PCI research endeavours to increase the overall knowledge of a complex and important topic in international marketing today.

The present research offers academics a greater understanding of the concepts of animosity and admiration in a PCI setting. Both have received little study thus far. Key differences exist between the model set forth by Klein et al. (1998) and the final model of the present research. The present research offers new understandings of how animosity is viewed in a PCI context. Unlike Klein et al. (1998), animosity is directly related to product evaluations, or judgments as used in the Klein et al. (1998) study. Furthermore, the constructs of animosity used in the present study differ substantially from those developed by Klein et al. (1998) which can also be viewed as innovative as it takes a

well-developed questionnaire and uses it to develop a new model that includes both animosity and admiration.

The existence of both animosity and admiration adds to the knowledge base of diverging concepts that can be intertwined when a consumer contemplates PCIs for a given country. Past studies have examined ethnocentrism and admiration, but none have looked at both animosity and admiration simultaneously for the same country as was done with Argentine perceptions to the U.S. in the present study.

Researchers also gain insight into PCI evaluations shortly before a major economic crisis in the home country. If data is collected during and after the crisis, comparisons can be made at each stage and the recovery process of that country can be tracked.

8.2 Policy-Makers

The results from the present research are of strong interest to government policy-makers of all the countries evaluated in the questionnaire (Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico and the U.S.). The data indicates that the Argentine public would positively view a NAFTA including Argentina. Canada received particularly high scores on the desired linkages components followed by the U.S., Mexico and, lastly, Chile. In short, all NAFTA member countries received a greater desirability for linkages over Chile, a current associate member of the MERCOSUR of which Argentina is a full member. However, it is important to consider that the devaluation of Chile as a result of animosity may overstate the relatively high scores of the other countries.

On a broader spectrum, the results of the present research may be important due to recent global events and specifically American involvement in the Middle East and its war on terrorism. Such actions taken by the U.S. may increase global uncertainties and decrease global trade. Feelings of xenophobia may thrive within the U.S. and other countries in fear of possible attacks. This may cause a movement to greater regional trade in NAFTA and further pursuance of the prospects for a single America as demonstrated by the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative that was envisioned by the U.S. and former President Bush Sr. (Richards, 1997).

Policy-makers and marketers from the home country, Argentina, can emphasize the value and price of Argentine goods that received the highest ratings compared to all other countries. Argentine policy-makers can also address possible areas of concern such as innovativeness, technology level, and after sales service where no significant differences existed between Argentine and the other two NICs' products. Based on this information, they may be able to improve local production and marketing efforts. Another area of concern for Argentine policy-makers is that no significance existed between proud to own and willingness to buy Argentine over U.S. goods. Given the Argentine tradition of patriotism (Escudé, 2000), it was expected that Argentine goods would rate highest on proud to own. Higher product beliefs and country admiration of the U.S. may have been the cause of this finding. Perhaps the pride of supporting one's own country's industry equals the pride of owning goods that represent cosmopolitanism and prestige. Argentine policy-makers may be able to use the economic stability of their country in order to

encourage the purchase of home goods as a measure to improve the Argentine industry. Efforts could also be made to directly target U.S. goods as a culprit for Argentina's economic difficulties as an attempt to reduce Argentine pride in owning U.S. goods.

In terms of Chilean consumers' evaluations of Argentina, Argentine policy-makers must consider the existence of people Animosity that Chileans hold towards Argentina. Assuming that the Animosity/Admiration Theoretical model holds for Chile, this is a definite area of concern as it would then affect both product evaluations and willingness to buy.

Policy-makers in Chile, a neighbouring country that has had past conflicts with Argentina, must consider appropriate actions given the existence of animosity on the part of Argentines towards Chile. Attempts could be made to develop campaigns to increase Argentine knowledge of Chile away from the traditional anti-Chilean beliefs. This becomes especially important given that animosity affects both product evaluations and willingness to buy. As demonstrated, Argentine animosity towards Chile is greater than Chilean animosity towards Argentina. This may be a possible explanation as to why Argentine exports to Chile are well over four times the amount that it imports from Chile. This information may be reason for Chilean policy-makers to create campaigns to manage its image in Argentina.

Policy-makers from Mexico, a neutral Latin American country in the study with a similar degree of economic development as Argentina and Chile, received moderate ratings on

most product scales and significantly higher than Argentina on most country scales. However, all in all, Mexico did not fare well against its NAFTA counterparts, Canada and the U.S. This information may be of interest to as the evaluations were by a non- but potential NAFTA member country's consumers. It indicates that Mexican policy-makers must improve their image in Argentina if they wish to compete with Canadian, American, and home goods in Argentina. Mexican policy-makers should consider how they can take advantage of their high friendliness and likeability ratings which were highest among all countries surveyed. Personality could be integrated in campaigns to promote Mexican goods or possible tourism efforts.

Policy-makers from the U.S. can use the results of this study to improve and protect their position within Argentina. The U.S. is widely recognized by Argentines as being a highly developed nation and who was Argentina's second largest trading partner and source of foreign direct investment for the year 2000. Argentine consumers have an apparent admiration for U.S. lifestyles and the country as a whole which is positively related to product evaluations and willingness to buy. U.S. policy-makers can leverage this verity for promotional purposes in Argentina. The U.S., however, did not rank as well on people components of the study. Efforts should be made to improve this image in Argentina as it does affect both product evaluations and willingness to buy. Furthermore, negative people images may harm the U.S.'s ability to market services in Argentina where people images take on particular importance. Lastly, a negative people image may lessen diplomatic relations between these two countries.

Policy-makers in Canada, also a highly developed nation in North America but with much a lesser influence in Argentina than the U.S., did very well showing the lowest degree of animosity and the second highest degree of admiration after the U.S.

Troubling, however, is that there is a relatively low willingness to buy Canadian goods. This seems to be caused by a low degree of familiarity. As such Canadian policy-makers should make greater efforts to promote the existence and attributes of Canadian products in Argentina. Another strategy could be to promote Canadian products as comparable to American products that did the best relative to the other countries on product scales. On a diplomatic and relations level, Canadian policy-makers should make every effort to differentiate themselves from their American counterparts as Canada is viewed more favourably in this regard.

8.3 Marketers

Knowledge of PCI evaluations assists marketers in determining whether or not to emphasize or de-emphasize COO information (Papadopoulos, 1993). Images of a country are not constant in consumers across all countries. For example, animosity is country specific (Klein et al., 1998). This means that animosity may be present towards the Japanese in China but not necessarily in Belgium. As such, it is important for marketers of the producing country to be aware of PCIs held by consumers of their target markets and possible animosity or admiration effects.

Although no specific products are used in this research undertaking, inferences can be made regarding what products would be favourably evaluated based on Argentine

consumers' evaluations of product dimensions that are important to the production of a given product. Marketers of the countries used in the study can then look at these dimensions and infer whether or not their product would be favourably received in Argentina.

Argentine marketers should reinforce the price and value of their goods that received the highest ratings compared to the other countries used in the study. U.S. goods pose the greatest threat to Argentine marketers. Efforts should be made to attempt to override the symbols of cosmopolitanism and prestige that U.S. goods possess by the "Industria Argentina" (Argentine Industry) message on their products and promotional efforts.

Chilean marketers can use the information of the existence of animosity in order to properly direct their marketing efforts. Chilean marketers should highlight product attributes and de-emphasize the origin of the product or market it as Argentine friendly. De-emphasizing the origin would be an easier short-term solution given the possible impenetrability of successfully marketing a single or group of products as distinct from the rest of Chile in the minds of Argentine consumers. Attempts can also be made to penetrate the Argentine market through associating Chilean products with products from other countries. Chile could act as a COA and countries such as the U.S. a COD whereby the origin of the design of the product is stressed in Argentina rather than the origin of assembly. Chilean products can adopt or be associated with a brand name that originates from another country so that the given product may be perceived by Argentines as from that country and not Chile.

Given the lack of trade and relations between Mexico and Argentina, Mexican marketers are faced with a much more difficult task of receiving recognition for the origin of their products. The results indicate that Mexico cannot rely on a pre-existing and solid image of Mexican products and must operate within these constraints. Furthermore, they do not have the luxury of being a highly developed country and having their products fall into this category. Mexican marketers may wish to accentuate, or possibly group their products as part of NAFTA to Argentine consumers in order to be considered similar to the U.S.

U.S. marketers can gain valuable insight into the perceptions held by Argentine consumers towards their goods compared to the other countries used in the study. As in the case of the U.S. policy-makers, marketers should mould their efforts around the admiration that exists for their country and highlight U.S. lifestyles as well as cosmopolitanism and prestige. U.S. marketers should avoid personal components in their marketing efforts, as Americans, similar to Chileans, are not viewed as being likeable or friendly.

Canadian marketers face a difficult task, as, despite scoring relatively well on most scales, with the exception of familiarity scales, Argentines are not very willing to buy Canadian goods. Canadian marketers should then market their products as being similar to American products in order to elicit the high willingness to buy and pride in owning American goods. However, the same should not be done for services where Canadian

marketers should differentiate their services from the U.S. This should be done since Argentines rated Canada as having the lowest People and Relations Animosity and significantly different from the U.S. Canadian service marketers can present their services as possessing the same quality attributes as American services but differentiate it as Canadian to elicit the affective feelings present towards Canadians on the part of Argentines.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, Sadrudin A., and d'Astous, Alain (1995), "Country-of-Origin Effects in the Context of NAFTA: The Case of Chile." Working Paper 95-01.
- Ahmed, Sadrudin A., d'Astous, Alain, and Méndez, José I. Rojas (1995), "Country of Origin Effects in the Export Markets: Implications for Mexican Exporters." Working Paper 95-18.
- Ahmed, Sadrudin A., and d'Astous, Alain (1998), "Canadian Consumer Perceptions of Products Made in Current, New and Potential NAFTA Member Countries." Working Paper 98-24.
- Almonte, J., Falk, C., Skaggs, R., and Cardenas, R. (1995), "Country-of-Origin Bias Among High-Income Consumers in Mexico: An Empirical Study." *Journal of International Consumer Marketing* 8 (2): 27-44.
- (2002), "Argentine Foreign Trade." *The Argentine Ministry of Economy* www.indec.mecon.ar: Buenos Aires.
- Askegaard, Søren and G. Ger (1997), "Product-country images: Toward a contextualized approach." *European Advances in Consumer Research* 3: 50-58.
- Balabanis, George, Diamantopoulos, Adamantios, Mueller, Rene Dentiste, and Melewar, T.C. (2001), "The Impact of Nationalism, Patriotism and Internationalism on Consumer Ethnocentric Tendencies." *Journal of International Business Studies* 32 (1):157-175.
- Bass, Bernard M., and Duntzman, George (1963), "Biases in the evaluation of one's own group, its allies and opponents." *Conflict Resolution* 7 (1): 16-20.
- Batra, Rajeev, Ramaswam, Venkatra, Alden, Dana L., Steenkamp, Jan-Benedict E.M., and Ramachander, S. (2000), "Effects of Brand Local/Non-Local Origin on Consumer Attitudes in Developing Countries." *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 9 (2): 83-95.
- Berkowitz, Leonard, Jaffee, S., Eunkyung, J., and Troccoli, B.T. (2000), "On the Correction of Feeling-Induced Judgmental Biases." in J.P. Forgas, eds., *Feeling and Thinking: The Role of Affect in Social Cognition* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press): 131-152.
- Bilkey, Warren J., and Nes, Erik (1982), "Country-of-Origin Effects on Product Evaluations." *Journal of International Business Studies* 8 (Spring/Summer): 89 – 99.
- Bilkey, Warren J., and Nes, Erik (1993), "What Country Images Are and Are Not." in *Product-Country Images*. Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise A. Heslop, eds. Binghamton, N.Y.: The Haworth Press, 3-38.

- Branscombe, Nyla R. (1988), "Conscious and Unconscious Processing of Affective and Cognitive Information." in K. Fiedler and J. Forgas, eds., *Affect, Cognition and Social Behavior* (Toronto, ON.: C.J. Hogrefe, Inc.): 3-24.
- Brewer, Marilynn B. (1968), "Determinants of Social Distance Among East African Tribal Groups." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 10 (3): 279-289.
- Brewer, Marilynn B., and Kramer, Roderick M. (1985), "The Psychology of Intergroup Attitudes and Behavior." *Annual Review of Psychology* 36: 219-243.
- Burgess, Steven M. and Harris, Mari (1999), "Social Identity in an Emerging Market: How You Do the Wash May Say a Lot About Who You Think You Are." *Advances in Consumer Research* 26: 170-175.
- Cattin, Philippe, Jolibert, Alain, and Lohnes, Colleen (1982), "A Cross-Cultural Study of 'Made In' Concepts." *Journal of International Business Studies* (Winter): 131-141.
- Cordell, Victor V. (1992), "Effects of Consumer Preferences for Foreign Sourced Products." *Journal of International Business Studies* 1992 (Second Quarter): 251-269.
- Diez, Miguel Angel (2000), "Radiografía del consumo en la Argentina." *Mercado, Fuera de Serie* (<http://www.mercado.com.ar>) 7 (November): p. 47.
- Dowdles, Melissa (1997), "NAFTA: A comparison of Canadian Consumer and Retail Buyer Product Country Images." Unpublished MMS Thesis, School of Business, Carleton University.
- Druckman, Daniel (1994), "Nationalism, Patriotism, and Group Loyalty: A Social Psychological Perspective." *Mershon International Studies Review (Supplement to the International Studies Quarterly)* 38 (Supplement 1): 43-68.
- Druckman, Daniel (1968), "Ethnocentrism in the Inter-Nation Simulation." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 12: 45-68.
- Druckman, Daniel, Faizunisa Ali, and J. Susana Bagur (1974), "Determinants of Stereotypy in Three Cultures." *International Journal of Psychology* 9 (4): 293-302.
- Elordi, Carlos (2000), "Economic values and party preference in Mexico, Argentina, and the United States." *International Social Science Journal* 52 (1): 15-30.
- Erickson, Gary M., Johansson, Johny K., and Chao, Paul (1984), "Image Variables in Multi-Attribute Product Evaluations: Country-of-Origin Effects." *Journal of Consumer Research* 11 (2): 694-699.

Escudé, Carlos (2000), "Education, Political Culture and Foreign Policy: The Case of Argentina." *Iberoamérica y el Mundo* (www.argentina-rree.com/documentos/apertura4.htm): p. 1-29.

FY 2001 Country Commercial Guide: Argentina, U.S. Department of State, FY 2001 prepared by the U.S. Embassy Buenos Aires and released by the Bureau of Economic and Business in July 2000 for the Fiscal Year 2001.

Gaedeke, Ralph (1973), "Consumer Attitudes Toward Products 'Made In' Developing Countries." *Journal of Retailing* 49 (2): 13-24.

Gooding, Elizabeth (2002), "Eastern Europe and Product-Country Images: A Longitudinal Analysis of the Competitiveness of Eastern European Products." Unpublished MBA Thesis, School of Business, Carleton University.

González, Maria José Hernández, Papadopoulos, Nicolas, and Múgica, José Miguel (2002), "Intra- and International Consumer Perceptions of Countries and Their Products: The Case of Spain." In S. Hassan, E. Bigne and J.S. Johar, eds., *The Academy of Marketing Science Multicultural Marketing Conference* (Valencia Spain), IV-B: 421-425.

Granzin, Kent L., and Olsen, Janeen E. (1998), "America's Choice of Domestic over Foreign Products: A Matter of Helping Behavior?" *Journal of Business Research* 43: 39-54.

Han, C. Min (1988), "The Role of Consumer Patriotism in the Choice of Domestic Versus Foreign Products." *Journal of Advertising Research* 28 (3): 25-32.

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

Han, C. Min, and Terpstra, Vern (1988), "Country-of-Origin effects for Uni-National and Bi-National Products." *Journal of International Business Studies* 19 (2): 235-255.

Heslop, Louise A., Papadopoulos, Nicolas, and Bourk, Margie (1998), "An Interregional and Intercultural Perspective on Subcultural Differences in Product Evaluations." *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences* 15 (2): 113-127.

Heslop, Louise A., Papadopoulos, Nicolas, and Bourk, Margie (1996), "Exploring Subcultural Influences on Product Images." *Multilevel Marketing Conference* (Va Beach): 190-205.

Hulland, John S. (1998), "The Effects of Country-of-Brand and Brand Name on Product Evaluation and Consideration: A Cross-Country Comparison." *Journal of International Consumer Marketing* 11 (1): 23-40.

Hult, G. Thomas M., Keillor, Bruce D., and Lafferty, Barbara A. (1999), "A Cross-National Assessment of Social Desirability Bias and Consumer Ethnocentrism." *Journal of Global Marketing* 12 (4): 29-43.

-- (1997), "ITP Nelson Canadian Dictionary", *International Thomson Publishing*, Toronto.

Jaffe, Eugene D., and Martinez, Carlos R. (1995), "Mexican Consumer Attitudes Towards Domestic and Foreign Made Products." *Journal of International Consumer Marketing* 7 (3): 7-27.

Jelin, Elizabeth (1999), "Dialogues, understandings and misunderstandings: social movements in MERCOSUR." *International Social Science Journal* 51 (1): 37-48.

Jelin, Elizabeth (2001), "Cultural Movements and Social Actors in the New Regional Scenarios: The case of MERCOSUR." *International Political Science Review* 22 (1): 85-98.

Jordán, Alberto R. (1993), *El Proceso: 1976/1983*, Emecé Editores: Buenos Aires.

Jost, John T., and Banaji, Mahzarin R. (1994), "The Role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 33: 1-27.

Klein, Jill Gabrielle, Ettenson, Richard, and Morris, Marlene D. (1998), "The Animosity Model of Foreign Product Purchase: An Empirical Test in the People's Republic of China." *Journal of Marketing* 62 (1): 89-101.

Knight, Gary A. and Calantone, Roger J. (2000), "A flexible model of consumer country-of-origin perceptions." *International Marketing Review* 17 (2): 127-145.

Lee, Dongdae, and Ganesh, Gopala (1999), "Effects of portioned country image in the context of brand image and familiarity." *International Marketing Review* 16 (1): 18-39.

Mattli, Walter (1999), *The Logic of Regional Integration: Europe and Beyond*. New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.

Mehrkens, Miriam B. (2000), "A Longitudinal Examination of Product-Country Images of Canada." Unpublished MMS Thesis, School of Business, Carleton University.

Nabi, Ijaz, and Nasim, Anjum (2001), "Trading with the enemy: A case for liberalizing Pakistan-India trade." in *Regionalism and Globalization: Theory and practice*. Sajal Lahiri, eds. New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 170-198.

Nadeau, John (1998), "The Product and Country Images of NAFTA from a Canadian Retail Buyer Perspective." Unpublished MMS Thesis, School of Business, Carleton University.

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

Oakes, P.J., and Turner, J.C. (1980), "Social Categorization and intergroup behaviour: does minimal intergroup discrimination make social identity more positive?" *European Journal of Social Psychology* 10: 295-301.

Olson, Jerry, and Jacoby, Jacob (1972), "Cue utilization in the quality perception process." In M. Venkatesan, ed., *Proceedings of the third annual conference of the association for consumer research*, 167-179.

Osterhus, Thomas L. (1997), "Pro-Social Consumer Influence Strategies: When And How. Do They Work?" *Journal of Marketing* 61 (October): 16-29.

--- (1957), "The Oxford International Dictionary of the English Language", *Leland Publishing Company, Ltd.*, Toronto.

Papadopoulos, Nicolas, Heslop, Louise A., and Bamossy, G. (1990), "A comparative image analysis of domestic versus imported products." *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 7 (4): 283-294.

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

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

Papadopoulos, Nicolas and Heslop, Louise (eds.) (1993), "Product-Country Images: Impact and Role in International Marketing", *International Business Press*, Binghamton, NY.

Richards, Donald G. (1997), "Dependent Development and Regional Integration: A Critical Examination of the Southern Cone Common Market." *Latin American Perspectives* 24 (6): 133-155.

Rock, David (1987), *Argentina 1516-1987: From Spanish Colonization to Alfonsín*, University of California Press: Los Angeles.

- Roemer, Christina A. (1995), "Intercultural Prejudice and Brand Equity: U.S. Reaction to Japanese Automobiles." *American Marketing Association* (Winter):387-393.
- Roth, Martin S., and Romeo, Jean B. (1992), "Matching Product Category and Country Image Perceptions: A Framework for Managing Country-of-Origin Effects." *Journal of International Business Studies* 23 (3): 477-497.
- Rutland, Adam, and Brown, Rachel (2001), "Stereotypes as justifications for prior intergroup discrimination of Scottish national stereotyping." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 31: 127-141.
- Schooler, Robert D. (1965), "Product Bias in the Central American Common Market." *Journal of Marketing Research* II (November): 394-397.
- Schooler, Robert D. (1971), "Bias Phenomena Attendant to the Marketing of Foreign Goods in the U.S." *Journal of International Business Studies* 2 (1): 71-80.
- Sharma, Subhash, Shimp, Terrence A., and Shin, Jeongshin (1995), *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 23 (1): 26-37.
- Shimp, Terrence A., and Sharma, Subhash (1987), "Consumer Ethnocentrism: Construction and Validation of the CETSCALE." *Journal of Marketing Research* 24 (August): 280-289.
- Spektorowski, Alberto (1994), "The Ideological Origins of Right and Left Nationalism in Argentina, 1930-43." *Journal of Contemporary History* 29: 155-184.
- Statistical Yearbook of the Argentine Republic: 2000* (2001), The INDEC Publications: Buenos Aires.
- Stevens, James (1996), *Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences – Third Edition*, Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Supphelen, Magne, and Rittenburg, Terri L. (2001), "Consumer Ethnocentrism: When Foreign Products Are Better." *Psychology and Marketing* 18 (9): 907-927.
- Szamosi, L.T. (1995), "Eastern Europe and Product Country Images: Analysis of Canadian, American and Australian Consumer Preferences." Unpublished MMS Thesis, School of Business, Carleton University.
- Tajfel, Henri (1981), "Social Stereotypes and Social Groups." In J.C. Turner & H. Giles (eds.), *Intergroup Behaviour*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell p. 144-167.
- Verlegh, Peter W.J. (1999), "Ingroups, Outgroups and Stereotyping: Consumer Behavior and Social Identity Theory." *Advances in Consumer Research* 26: 162-164.

Winters, Alan L. (1999), "Regionalism vs. multilateralism." in *Market Integration, Regionalism and the Global Economy*. Richard E. Baldwin, Daniel Cohen, André Sapir and Anthony Venables, eds. New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 7-49.

Witkowski, Terrence H. (1998), "Consumer Ethnocentrism in Two Emerging Markets: Determinants and Predictive Validity." *Advances in Consumer Research* 25: 258-263.

Witt, Jerome, and Rao, C.P. (1992), "The Impact of Global Sourcing on Consumers: Country-of-Origin Effects on Perceived Risk." *Journal of Global Marketing* 6 (3): 105-128.

The World Bank Group (2002), "Country Data Profiles."
www.worldbank.org/data/countrydata/countrydata.html

Zajonc, Robert B. (1980), "Feeling and Thinking: Preferences Need No Inferences." *American Psychologist* 35 (2): 151-175.

Zajonc, Robert B. (2000), "Feeling and Thinking: Closing the Debate Over the Independence of Affect." in J.P. Forgas, eds., *Feeling and Thinking: The Role of Affect in Social Cognition* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press): 31-58.

Zhang, Yong (1997), "Country-of-origin effect: The moderating function of individual difference in information processing." *International Marketing Review* 14 (4): 266-287.

APPENDICES

A list of appendices in this section is shown below. All appendices with the exception of Appendix A, which contains the English and Spanish versions of the questionnaire, contain detailed statistical analyses of the research.

Appendix A	The Research Instrument (English and Spanish Questionnaire)
Appendix B	Product Image Differences
Appendix C	Country Image Differences
Appendix D	Product Beliefs Function and Appeal Differences
Appendix E	Argentine People and Relations Animosity towards Chile
Appendix F	Chilean People and Relations Animosity towards Argentina
Appendix G	Argentine Consumers' Country Admiration
Appendix H	Between Country Construct Differences

***Appendix A –
Research Instrument***

This appendix contains English and Spanish versions of the questionnaire. The signature and address of Professor Roberto Serra of the University of Belgrano appeared on all distributed copies.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

A Market Study:
The Quality
of Foreign Products

INTERNATIONAL TRADE: THE QUALITY OF PRODUCTS FROM FOREIGN NATIONS

Dear Respondent,

In today's complex marketplace, products from all regions of the world are available for you to purchase. This increases the need for producers to understand how people evaluate products so consumers may be better served.

The purpose of this study is to understand the views of consumers about products made in various countries. This study is part of a large project which includes research in Chile, México, the United States, and Canada. The Argentine part of the study is carried out by researchers at the University of Belgrano. Specifically, we are interested in how you view products from countries which are current or possible future members of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). The five countries are Argentina, Canada, Chile, México, and the United States. This information is important to many groups including businesses, marketers, and consumers throughout North America. Results of the study will be distributed to government and industry policy makers.

You are one of a few selected respondents who are being asked to give their opinion based on a random sample of our city. To ensure proper representation of the area, it is important that each questionnaire be completed and returned. We also kindly ask that you please answer all questions because incomplete questionnaires cannot be included in the analysis.

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

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

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Roberto Serra
University of Belgrano
Buenos Aires, Argentina

INTERNATIONAL TRADE: THE QUALITY OF PRODUCTS FROM FOREIGN NATIONS

Section 1. The Countries' Products

This section examines how you feel about the products (goods and services) from five countries: Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, and the United States. It is your opinions and feelings on what you would expect to find from these countries that is important. **You are not required to have extensive knowledge of these countries or their products to fill in this questionnaire.**

Each page has a list of scales that refers to a different country. To answer each scale, simply put an "X" in the space closest to your opinion.

EXAMPLES:

If the country is best described by the item on the left,

Innovativeness Low : X : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : High

If the country is only slightly related to the item on the left,

Innovativeness Low : ____ : ____ : X : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : High

IMPORTANT NOTES

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

Innovativeness Low : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : X : ____ : High

THIS

Innovativeness Low : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : X : ____ : High

NOT

REMEMBER,

- There are no "right" or "wrong" answers for these scales
- It is your first impression or immediate reaction to the scales that should be marked
- You should look at each scale as separate from the rest, and judge each country independently from one another
- Please remember to answer every scale for every country and do not omit any
- It does not matter whether or not you have had personal experience with the country in question or its products

How would you describe products made in Argentina?

Quality	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Value	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Workmanship	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good
Defects in merchandise	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Attractiveness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Innovativeness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Variety	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Brand names	Well known	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Unknown
Price level	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Durability	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Technology level	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Reliability	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Your knowledge of Argentine products	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Overall satisfaction	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Ease of finding	Difficult	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Easy
Willing to buy	Never	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Always
Proud to own	Never	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Always
After sales service	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good

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

Poor : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : Good

How would you describe products made in Canada?

Quality	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Value	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Workmanship	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good
Defects in merchandise	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Attractiveness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Innovativeness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Variety	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Brand names	Well known	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Unknown
Price level	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Durability	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Technology level	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Reliability	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Your knowledge of Canadian products	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Overall satisfaction	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Ease of finding	Difficult	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Easy
Willing to buy	Never	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Always
Proud to own	Never	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Always
After sales service	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good

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

Poor : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : Good

How would you describe products made in Chile?

Quality	Low	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	High
Value	Low	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	High
Workmanship	Poor	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Good
Defects in merchandise	Low	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	High
Attractiveness	Low	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	High
Innovativeness	Low	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	High
Variety	Low	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	High
Brand names	Well known	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Unknown
Price level	Low	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	High
Durability	Low	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	High
Technology level	Low	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	High
Reliability	Low	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	High
Your knowledge of Chilean products	Low	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	High
Overall satisfaction	Low	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	High
Ease of finding	Difficult	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Easy
Willing to buy	Never	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Always
Proud to own	Never	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Always
After sales service	Poor	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Good

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

Poor :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Good

How would you describe products made in Mexico?

Quality	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Value	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Workmanship	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good
Defects in merchandise	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Attractiveness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Innovativeness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Variety	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Brand names	Well known	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Unknown
Price level	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Durability	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Technology level	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Reliability	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Your knowledge of Mexican products	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Overall satisfaction	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Ease of finding	Difficult	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Easy
Willing to buy	Never	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Always
Proud to own	Never	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Always
After sales service	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good

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

Poor : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : Good

How would you describe products made in the U.S.A.?

Quality	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Value	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Workmanship	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good
Defects in merchandise	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Attractiveness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Innovativeness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Variety	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Brand names	Well known	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Unknown
Price level	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Durability	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Technology level	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Reliability	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Your knowledge of American products	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Overall satisfaction	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Ease of finding	Difficult	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Easy
Willing to buy	Never	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Always
Proud to own	Never	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Always
After sales service	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good

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

Poor : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : Good

Section II. Countries and Their People

This section records how you feel about the countries and their people – Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, and the United States.

- It does not matter whether or not you have had personal experience with the country in question.
- On each of the following pages you will find different countries 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.

How would you describe the country and people of Argentina?

Likeability of people	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Industriousness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Education level	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Wealth	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Rich
Friendliness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Trustworthiness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Work ethic	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Individualism	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Political stability of country	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Technology level of country	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Stability of economy	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Quality of life	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Role in world politics	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good
Environmental/pollution controls	Few	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Many
Individual rights and freedoms	Few	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Many
Your knowledge of Argentina	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High

How would you describe the country and people of Canada?

Likeability of people	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Industriousness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Education level	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Wealth	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Rich
Friendliness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Trustworthiness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Work ethic	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Individualism	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Political stability of country	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Technology level of country	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Stability of economy	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Quality of life	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Role in world politics	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good
Environmental/pollution controls	Few	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Many
Individual rights and freedoms	Few	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Many
Alignment with Argentina	Weak	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Strong
Your knowledge of Canada	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High

What would you like to see in future relationships between Argentina and Canada?

Political and economic ties	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Immigration from Canada	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Investments in Canada	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Investments from Canada	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Exports to Canada	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Imports from Canada	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More

How would you describe the country and people of Chile?

Likeability of people	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Industriousness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Education level	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Wealth	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Rich
Friendliness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Trustworthiness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Work ethic	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Individualism	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Political stability of country	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Technology level of country	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Stability of economy	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Quality of life	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Role in world politics	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good
Environmental/pollution controls	Few	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Many
Individual rights and freedoms	Few	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Many
Alignment with Argentina	Weak	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Strong
Your knowledge of Chile	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High

What would you like to see in future relationships between Argentina and Chile?

Political and economic ties	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Immigration from Chile	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Investments in Chile	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Investments from Chile	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Exports to Chile	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Imports from Chile	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More

How would you describe the country and people of Mexico?

Likeability of people	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Industriousness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Education level	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Wealth	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Rich
Friendliness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Trustworthiness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Work ethic	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Individualism	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Political stability of country	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Technology level of country	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Stability of economy	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Quality of life	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Role in world politics	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good
Environmental/pollution controls	Few	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Many
Individual rights and freedoms	Few	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Many
Alignment with Argentina	Weak	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Strong
Your knowledge of Mexico	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High

What would you like to see in future relationships between Argentina and Mexico?

Political and economic ties	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Immigration from Mexico	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Investments in Mexico	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Investments from Mexico	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Exports to Mexico	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Imports from Mexico	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More

How would you describe the country and people of the U.S.A.?

Likeability of people	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Industriousness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Education level	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Wealth	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Rich
Friendliness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Trustworthiness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Work ethic	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Individualism	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Political stability of country	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Technology level of country	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Stability of economy	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Quality of life	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Role in world politics	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good
Environmental/pollution controls	Few	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Many
Individual rights and freedoms	Few	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Many
Alignment with Argentina	Weak	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Strong
Your knowledge of the U.S.A.	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High

What would you like to see in future relationships between Argentina and the U.S.A.?

Political and economic ties	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Immigration from the U.S.A.	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Investments in U.S.A.	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Investments from U.S.A.	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Exports to U.S.A.	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Imports from U.S.A.	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More

Background Information:

This last section asks for some background information which will help us classify your answers. Please be assured that your responses are anonymous 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 male _____ or 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 the highest educational level you attained?

Some grade school	_____	College graduate	_____
Complete Grade School	_____	Some university	_____
Some high school	_____	University graduate	_____
Complete high school	_____	Post-Graduate	_____
Some college	_____	Other (please specify)	_____

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

Under \$500	_____	\$2,100.01-\$2,700	_____
\$500.01-\$900	_____	\$2,700.01-\$3,300	_____
\$900.01-\$1,500	_____	More than \$3,300	_____
\$1,500.01-\$2,100	_____		

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

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

THANK YOU!

COMERCIO INTERNACIONAL

Estudio de Mercados:
La Calidad
de los Productos Extranjeros

COMERCIO INTERNACIONAL LA CALIDAD DE PRODUCTOS EXTRANJEROS

Nafta 003

Equipo ____

Estimado encuestado,

En el complejo mercado de hoy, Los consumidores pueden adquirir productos provenientes de todas las regiones del mundo. Esto incrementa la necesidad por parte de los productores de entender como la gente evalúa los productos de manera que estos pueden ser mejor servidos.

El objetivo de este estudio es comprender mejor la visión que tienen los consumidores sobre ciertos países y sus productos. Este estudio es parte de un extenso proyecto que incluye investigación en Chile, México, Estados Unidos y Canadá. La parte chilena de este estudio es llevada a cabo por investigadores de la Universidad de Talca. Específicamente, estamos interesados en su opinión acerca de productos de los países que son miembros actuales o potenciales del Tratado de Libre Comercio de América del Norte (TLC). Los cinco países a los que nos referimos son Argentina, Canadá, Chile, México y Estados Unidos. Esta información es de gran relevancia para muchos grupos, incluyendo empresas, investigadores de mercado y consumidores en toda América. Los resultados del estudio serán distribuidos al gobierno y a las instituciones encargadas de elaborar políticas industriales.

Usted es uno de los pocos seleccionados a quienes pedimos su opinión basándonos en una muestra aleatoria en esta ciudad. Para obtener una representación estadística correcta, es importante que cada cuestionario sea completado y devuelto. Amablemente también le pedimos que conteste todas las preguntas, ya que cuestionarios incompletos no pueden ser incluidos en el análisis.

Usted puede tener la seguridad de que sus respuestas se mantendrán completamente confidenciales. Su nombre o alguna otra información identificatoria NO aparece en el cuestionario. En nuestro análisis estadístico, usaremos solo una combinación de datos de todos los encuestados. Si desea comentar alguna pregunta o el asunto general de la investigación, por favor, no dude en hacerlo en los márgenes o en el espacio proporcionado al final del cuestionario. Leeremos sus comentarios cuidadosamente y los tomaremos en cuenta.

Si desea alguna información sobre el estudio una vez que haya concluido nuestro análisis, estaremos gustosos de proporcionarle un resumen de los resultados de esta investigación. Por favor, envíenos una nota separada a la dirección indicada más abajo con su nombre y dirección (para que sus respuestas se mantengan confidenciales no se identifique en el cuestionario).

Muchas gracias por su cooperación,

Atentamente,

Prof. Roberto Serra, Director Programa MBA
Escuela de Economía y Negocios Internacionales
Universidad de Belgrano
Marcelo T. De Alvear 1560
Buenos Aires, Argentina

COMERCIO INTERNACIONAL LA CALIDAD DE PRODUCTOS EXTRANJEROS

Sección 1. Los productos de los países.

Esta sección examina su opinión con relación a los productos (bienes y servicios) de cinco países: Argentina, Canadá, Chile, México, y los Estados Unidos. Lo que es muy importante para nosotros es conocer su opinión y sentimientos sobre lo que le gustaría encontrar de estos países. No importa si Ud. tiene o no conocimiento extenso sobre estos países o sus productos. Lo que importa son sus opiniones, no como estas se hayan formado.

Cada página contiene una lista con escalas que corresponde a cada uno de los diferentes países. Para responder cada escala, simplemente marque una "X" en el espacio más cercano a su opinión.

EJEMPLOS:

Si el país es mejor descrito con la opción de la izquierda,

Innovación Baja : X : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : Alta

Si el país solo está relacionado ligeramente con la opción de la izquierda,

Innovación Baja : _ : _ : X : _ : _ : _ : _ : Alta

NOTAS IMPORTANTES

Por favor ponga las marcas de las "X" en medio de los espacios, no sobre los puntos. Por Ejemplo:

CORRECTA

Innovación Baja : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : X : _ : Alta

INCORRECTA

Innovación Baja : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : X : _ : Alta

RECUERDE,

No existen respuestas "correctas" o "incorrectas" para estas escalas.

Su primera impresión o reacción inmediata debe ser marcada en las escalas.

Usted deberá ver cada escala de manera aislada de las demás, y juzgar a cada país independiente de los otros.

Por favor recuerde responder cada una de las escalas de los diferentes países, no omitiendo ninguna.

No importa si usted no tiene experiencias personales con los países en cuestión o sus productos, sólo nos importa su opinión personal acerca de los mismos.

¿Cómo describiría usted los productos hechos en Argentina?

Calidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Valor	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Hechura	Pobre	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Buena
Defectos en la mercadería	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Atractivo	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Innovación	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Variedad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Nombres de marcas	Conocidos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Desconocidos
Nivel de precio	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Durabilidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Nivel tecnológico	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Confiabilidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Su conocimiento de productos argentinos	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Satisfacción global	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Facilidad para ser encontrados	Difícil	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Fácil
Disposición para comprar	Nunca	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Siempre
Orgullo de poseer el producto	Nunca	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Siempre
Servicio Posventa	Malo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Bueno

Comparado con productos hechos en cualquier otro país (no solamente los que se incluyen en este cuestionario) ¿cómo clasificaría a los productos argentinos?

Malos : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : Buenos

¿Cómo describiría usted los productos hechos en Canadá?

Calidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Valor	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Hechura	Pobre	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Buena
Defectos en la mercadería	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Atractivo	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Innovación	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Variedad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Nombres de marcas	Conocidos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Desconocidos
Nivel de precio	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Durabilidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Nivel tecnológico	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Confiabilidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Su conocimiento de productos canadienses	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Satisfacción global	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Facilidad para ser encontrados	Difícil	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Fácil
Disposición para comprar	Nunca	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Siempre
Orgullo de poseer el producto	Nunca	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Siempre
Servicio posventa	Malo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Bueno

Comparado con productos hechos en cualquier otro país (no solamente los que se incluyen en este cuestionario) ¿cómo clasificaría a los productos canadienses?

Malos : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : Buenos

¿Cómo describiría usted los productos hechos en Chile?

Calidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Valor	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Hechura	Pobre	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Buena
Defectos en la mercadería	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Atractivo	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Innovación	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Variedad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Nombres de marcas	Conocidos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Desconocidos
Nivel de precio	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Durabilidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Nivel tecnológico	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Confiabilidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Su conocimiento de productos Chilenos	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Satisfacción global	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Facilidad para ser encontrados	Difícil	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Fácil
Disposición para comprar	Nunca	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Siempre
Orgullo de poseer el producto	Nunca	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Siempre
Servicio posventa	Malo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Bueno

Comparado con productos hechos en cualquier otro país (no solamente los que se incluyen en este cuestionario) ¿cómo clasificaría a los productos chilenos?

Malos : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : Buenos

¿Cómo describiría usted los productos hechos en Estados Unidos?

Calidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Valor	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Hechura	Pobre	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Buena
Defectos en la mercadería	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Atractivo	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Innovación	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Variedad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Nombres de marcas	Conocidos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Desconocidos
Nivel de precio	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Durabilidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Nivel tecnológico	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Confiabilidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Su Conocimiento de productos estadounidenses	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Satisfacción global	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Facilidad para ser encontrados	Difícil	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Fácil
Disposición para comprar	Nunca	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Siempre
Orgullo de poseer el producto	Nunca	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Siempre
Servicio posventa	Malo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Bueno

Comparado con productos hechos en cualquier otro país (no solamente los que se incluyen en este cuestionario) ¿cómo clasificaría a los productos estadounidenses?

Malos : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : Buenos

Sección II. Los Países y Su Gente

Esta sección registra como se siente Ud. acerca de los países y su gente -- Argentina, Canadá, Chile, México, y los Estados Unidos.

No importa si usted tiene experiencia personal con el país en cuestión.

En cada una de las páginas usted encontrará diferentes países para juzgar por medio de las escalas dadas, como ya anteriormente lo ha realizado. Una vez más, simplemente marque con una "X" en el espacio que más se acerca a su opinión.

Por favor recuerde contestar cada una de las escalas para los diferentes países, sin omitir ninguna.

¿Cómo describiría al país y a la gente de Argentina?

Simpatía de la gente	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Laborioso	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Nivel de educación	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Riqueza	Pobre	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Rico
Amabilidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Confiabilidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Ética profesional	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Individualismo	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Estabilidad política del país	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Nivel tecnológico del país	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Estabilidad de la economía	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Calidad de vida	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Papel en la política mundial	Malo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Bueno
Controles medio ambientales/contaminación	Pocos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Muchos
Libertad y derechos individuales	Pocos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Muchos
Su conocimiento sobre Argentina	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto

¿Cómo describiría al país y a la gente de Canadá?

Simpatía de la gente	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Laborioso	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Nivel de educación	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Riqueza	Pobre	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Rico
Amabilidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Confiabilidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Etica profesional	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Individualismo	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Estabilidad política del país	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Nivel tecnológico del país	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Estabilidad de la economía	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Calidad de vida	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Papel en la política mundial	Malo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Bueno
Controles medio ambientales/contaminación	Pocos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Muchos
Libertad y derechos individuales	Pocos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Muchos
Alineación con Argentina	Débil	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Fuerte
Su conocimiento sobre Canadá	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto

¿Cómo le gustaría que fueran en un futuro las relaciones entre Argentina y Canadá?

Vínculos políticos y económicos	Menos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Más
Inmigración desde Canadá	Menos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Más
Inversiones en Canadá	Menos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Más
Inversiones por parte de Canadá	Menos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Más
Exportaciones a Canadá	Menos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Más
Importaciones de Canadá	Menos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Más

¿Cómo describiría al país y a la gente de Chile?

Simpatía de la gente	Baja	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Alta
Laborioso	Bajo	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Alto
Nivel de educación	Baja	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Alta
Riqueza	Pobre	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Rico
Amabilidad	Baja	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Alta
Confiabilidad	Baja	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Alta
Ética profesional	Baja	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Alta
Individualismo	Baja	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Alta
Estabilidad política del país	Baja	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Alta
Nivel tecnológico del país	Baja	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Alta
Estabilidad de la economía	Baja	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Alta
Calidad de vida	Baja	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Alta
Papel en la política mundial	Malo	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Bueno
Controles medio ambientales/contaminación	Pocos	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Muchos
Libertad y derechos individuales	Pocos	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Muchos
Alineación con Argentina	Débil	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Fuerte
Su conocimiento sobre Chile	Bajo	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Alto

¿Cómo le gustaría que fueran en un futuro las relaciones entre Argentina y Chile?

Vínculos políticos y económicos	Menos	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Más
Inmigración desde Chile	Menos	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Más
Inversiones en Chile	Menos	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Más
Inversiones por parte de Chile	Menos	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Más
Exportaciones a Chile	Menos	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Más
Importaciones de Chile	Menos	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Más

¿Cómo describiría al país y a la gente de México?

Simpatía de la gente	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Laborioso	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Nivel de educación	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Riqueza	Pobre	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Rico
Amabilidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Confiabilidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Ética profesional	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Individualismo	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Estabilidad política del país	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Nivel tecnológico del país	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Estabilidad de la economía	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Calidad de vida	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Papel en la política mundial	Malo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Bueno
Controles medio ambientales/contaminación	Pocos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Muchos
Libertad y derechos individuales	Pocos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Muchos
Alineación con Argentina	Débil	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Fuerte
Su conocimiento sobre México	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto

¿Cómo le gustaría que fueran en un futuro las relaciones entre Argentina y México?

Vínculos políticos y económicos	Menos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Más
Inmigración desde México	Menos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Más
Inversiones en México	Menos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Más
Inversiones por parte de México	Menos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Más
Exportaciones a México	Menos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Más
Importaciones de México	Menos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Más

¿Cómo describiría al país y a la gente de los Estados Unidos?

Simpatía de la gente	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Laborioso	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Nivel de educación	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Riqueza	Pobre	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Rico
Amabilidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Confiabilidad	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Ética profesional	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Individualismo	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Estabilidad política del país	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Nivel tecnológico del país	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto
Estabilidad de la economía	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Calidad de vida	Baja	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alta
Papel en la política mundial	Malo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Bueno
Controles medio ambientales/contaminación	Pocos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Muchos
Libertad y derechos individuales	Pocos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Muchos
Alineación con Argentina	Débil	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Fuerte
Su conocimiento sobre Estados Unidos	Bajo	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Alto

¿Cómo le gustaría que fueran en un futuro las relaciones entre Argentina y Estados Unidos?

Vínculos políticos y económicos	Menos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Más
Inmigración desde Estados Unidos	Menos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Más
Inversiones en Estados Unidos	Menos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Más
Inversiones por parte de Estados Unidos	Menos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Más
Exportaciones a Estados Unidos	Menos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Más
Importaciones de Estados Unidos	Menos	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Más

Información Básica

En esta última sección le preguntamos información básica, la cual nos ayudará a clasificar las respuestas que recibamos. Por favor, confíe en que sus respuestas serán confidenciales y utilizadas únicamente para analizar los datos estadísticamente. Gracias por su cooperación.

Para contestar esta sección, sólo necesita marcar una "X" en el espacio apropiado.

1. ¿Es usted hombre _____ o mujer _____ ?

2. ¿En cual rango se encuentra su edad?

Menos de 20	_____	45-49 años	_____
20-24 años	_____	50-54 años	_____
25-29 años	_____	55-59 años	_____
30-34 años	_____	60-64 años	_____
35-39 años	_____	65 o más	_____
40-44 años	_____		

3. ¿Cuál es el nivel de educación más alto que usted alcanzó?

Primario Incompleto	_____	Universitaria Completa	_____
Primario Completo	_____	Terciario Incompleto	_____
Secundario Incompleto	_____	Terciario Completo	_____
Secundario Completo	_____	Posgrado	_____
Universitaria Incompleta	_____	Otro (especifique)	_____

4. ¿En qué rango se encuentra el ingreso total de su familia al mes?

Menos de \$ 500	_____	De \$ 2.100,01 a \$ 2.700	_____
De \$ 500,01 a \$ 900	_____	De \$ 2.700,01 a \$3.300	_____
De \$ 900,01 a \$ 1.500	_____	Más de \$ 3.300	_____
De \$ 1500,01 a \$ 2.100	_____		

¿Le gustaría hacer comentarios adicionales? Su opinión cuenta, cualquier cosa que le gustaría añadir acerca de esta investigación sería muy valioso. Puede hacer comentarios acerca de los países incluidos en esta investigación, sus productos o sobre cualquier otro país o sus productos que sean de su interés. Por favor use este espacio y siéntase en libertad de añadir hojas si es necesario.

Su contribución a esta investigación de carácter internacional es muy apreciada. ¡GRACIAS!

***Appendix B –
MANOVA Output for Product Image Differences***

**Argentine Consumers' Product Images Evaluations –
Overall Five-Country Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Approximate F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	41.037	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	F	Significance
Quality	125.79	.000
Value	73.79	.000
Workmanship	104.62	.000
Defects	2.13	.075
Attractiveness	109.53	.000
Innovativeness	236.46	.000
Variety	174.85	.000
Awareness of Brands	54.41	.000
Price Level	77.94	.000
Durability	95.92	.000
Technology Level	315.90	.000
Reliability	160.52	.000
Knowledge of Products	245.79	.000
Overall Satisfaction	122.93	.000
Willingness to Buy	205.85	.000
Ease of Finding	88.94	.000
Proud to Own	88.31	.000
After Sales Service	106.84	.000
Overall Comparative Rating	178.51	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Product Images Evaluations –
Argentina vs. Canada Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Canada Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	4.38	4.37	47.413	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	Canada Mean	F	Significance of F
Quality	4.43	5.32	107.46	.000
Value	5.28	4.69	16.92	.000
Workmanship	4.35	5.02	43.08	.000
Defects	4.36	4.59	2.14	.145
Attractiveness	4.35	4.77	24.79	.000
Innovativeness	3.29	4.88	173.85	.000
Variety	3.99	4.63	29.68	.000
Awareness of Brands	4.65	3.24	82.60	.000
Price Level	5.40	4.56	51.01	.000
Durability	4.23	5.16	72.04	.000
Technology Level	3.55	5.66	350.22	.000
Reliability	4.02	5.34	145.32	.000
Knowledge of Products	5.24	2.58	476.81	.000
Overall Satisfaction	4.02	4.45	26.71	.000
Ease of Finding	4.86	2.64	213.11	.000
Willingness to Buy	4.64	3.43	80.63	.000
Proud to Own	4.64	3.47	52.16	.000
After Sales Service	3.41	4.27	48.66	.000
Overall Rating	4.54	5.21	49.50	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Product Images Evaluations –
Argentina vs. Chile Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Chile Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	4.38	3.38	42.821	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	Chile Mean	F	Significance of F
Quality	4.43	3.47	54.10	.000
Value	5.28	3.64	183.93	.000
Workmanship	4.35	3.41	51.63	.000
Defects	4.36	4.33	0.02	.876
Attractiveness	4.35	3.21	90.93	.000
Innovativeness	3.29	3.16	0.63	.427
Variety	3.99	3.31	26.08	.000
Awareness of Brands	4.65	3.63	43.59	.000
Price Level	5.40	3.64	236.18	.000
Durability	4.23	3.56	29.48	.000
Technology Level	3.55	3.36	1.44	.231
Reliability	4.02	3.36	31.20	.000
Knowledge of Products	5.24	3.34	221.66	.000
Overall Satisfaction	4.02	3.31	36.20	.000
Ease of Finding	4.86	3.50	102.46	.000
Willingness to Buy	4.64	2.93	166.97	.000
Proud to Own	4.64	2.41	22.67	.000
After Sales Service	3.41	3.13	1.32	.252
Overall Rating	4.54	3.50	85.52	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Product Images Evaluations –
Argentina vs. Mexico Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Mexico Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	4.38	3.47	38.947	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	Mexico Mean	F	Significance of F
Quality	4.43	3.62	47.12	.000
Value	5.28	3.61	208.28	.000
Workmanship	4.35	3.52	47.67	.000
Defects	4.36	4.48	1.46	.227
Attractiveness	4.35	3.72	27.09	.000
Innovativeness	3.29	3.41	1.19	.276
Variety	3.99	3.67	6.03	.015
Awareness of Brands	4.65	3.61	53.16	.000
Price Level	5.40	3.62	248.46	.000
Durability	4.23	3.65	22.12	.000
Technology Level	3.55	3.51	.00	.975
Reliability	4.02	3.53	14.69	.000
Knowledge of Products	5.24	2.95	343.62	.000
Overall Satisfaction	4.02	3.41	29.39	.000
Ease of Finding	4.86	2.91	227.54	.000
Willingness to Buy	4.64	3.13	161.78	.000
Proud to Own	4.64	2.81	174.38	.000
After Sales Service	3.41	3.24	.92	.337
Overall Rating	4.54	3.69	53.01	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Product Images Evaluations –
Argentina vs. United States Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	U.S. Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	4.38	5.26	53.838	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	U.S. Mean	F	Significance of F
Quality	4.43	5.36	70.37	.000
Value	5.28	4.80	14.51	.000
Workmanship	4.35	5.11	43.75	.000
Defects	4.36	4.51	1.87	.173
Attractiveness	4.35	5.49	104.68	.000
Innovativeness	3.29	5.92	524.17	.000
Variety	3.99	6.09	318.87	.000
Awareness of Brands	4.65	5.11	10.77	.001
Price Level	5.40	4.35	73.21	.000
Durability	4.23	5.11	50.99	.000
Technology Level	3.55	6.20	586.13	.000
Reliability	4.02	5.56	149.79	.000
Knowledge of Products	5.24	5.42	2.76	.098
Overall Satisfaction	4.02	5.35	142.21	.000
Ease of Finding	4.86	5.71	37.78	.000
Willingness to Buy	4.64	4.83	1.79	.183
Proud to Own	4.64	4.17	7.22	.008
After Sales Service	3.41	5.14	194.91	.000
Overall Rating	4.54	5.79	132.77	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Product Images Evaluations –
Canada vs. Chile Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Canada Mean of All Scales	Chile Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	4.37	3.38	35.682	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Canada Mean	Chile Mean	F	Significance of F
Quality	5.32	3.47	312.80	.000
Value	4.69	3.64	152.43	.000
Workmanship	5.02	3.41	329.28	.000
Defects	4.59	4.33	6.27	.088
Attractiveness	4.77	3.21	307.34	.000
Innovativeness	4.88	3.16	368.67	.000
Variety	4.63	3.31	225.80	.000
Awareness of Brands	3.24	3.63	20.88	.006
Price Level	4.56	3.64	114.93	.000
Durability	5.16	3.56	365.30	.000
Technology Level	5.66	3.36	720.70	.000
Reliability	5.34	3.36	526.03	.000
Knowledge of Products	2.58	3.34	85.14	.002
Overall Satisfaction	4.45	3.31	165.73	.000
Ease of Finding	2.64	3.50	119.69	.000
Willingness to Buy	3.43	2.93	22.94	.000
Proud to Own	3.47	2.41	129.50	.000
After Sales Service	4.27	3.13	142.83	.000
Overall Rating	5.21	3.50	377.15	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Product Images Evaluations –
Canada vs. Mexico Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Canada Mean of All Scales	Mexico Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	4.37	3.47	32.845	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Canada Mean	Mexico Mean	F	Significance of F
Quality	5.32	3.62	275.41	.000
Value	4.69	3.61	108.82	.000
Workmanship	5.02	3.52	240.13	.000
Defects	4.59	4.48	.75	.386
Attractiveness	4.77	3.72	96.47	.000
Innovativeness	4.88	3.41	209.47	.000
Variety	4.63	3.67	89.59	.000
Awareness of Brands	3.24	3.61	5.96	0.15
Price Level	4.56	3.62	85.61	.000
Durability	5.16	3.65	230.62	.000
Technology Level	5.66	3.51	427.91	.000
Reliability	5.34	3.53	286.75	.000
Knowledge of Products	2.58	2.95	9.88	.002
Overall Satisfaction	4.45	3.41	124.22	.000
Ease of Finding	2.64	2.91	3.15	.077
Willingness to Buy	3.43	3.13	6.53	.011
Proud to Own	3.47	2.81	38.58	.000
After Sales Service	4.27	3.24	102.98	.000
Overall Rating	5.21	3.69	266.64	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Product Images Evaluations –
Canada vs. United States Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Canada Mean of All Scales	U.S. Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	4.37	5.26	47.330	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Canada Mean	U.S. Mean	F	Significance of F
Quality	5.32	5.36	.35	.552
Value	4.69	4.80	.12	.725
Workmanship	5.02	5.11	.45	.501
Defects	4.59	4.51	.12	.727
Attractiveness	4.77	5.49	37.00	.000
Innovativeness	4.88	5.92	151.28	.000
Variety	4.63	6.09	202.12	.000
Awareness of Brands	3.24	5.11	102.33	.001
Price Level	4.56	4.35	7.95	.005
Durability	5.16	5.11	.26	.611
Technology Level	5.66	6.20	48.55	.000
Reliability	5.34	5.56	4.81	.029
Knowledge of Products	2.58	5.42	574.42	.000
Overall Satisfaction	4.45	5.35	90.21	.000
Ease of Finding	2.64	5.71	620.43	.000
Willingness to Buy	3.43	4.83	166.80	.000
Proud to Own	3.47	4.17	48.31	.000
After Sales Service	4.27	5.14	98.66	.000
Overall Rating	5.21	5.79	66.10	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Product Images Evaluations –
Chile vs. Mexico Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Chile Mean of All Scales	Mexico Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.38	3.47	7.805	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Chile Mean	Mexico Mean	F	Significance of F
Quality	3.47	3.62	1.42	.234
Value	3.64	3.61	.37	.542
Workmanship	3.41	3.52	.65	.420
Defects	4.33	4.48	3.77	.053
Attractiveness	3.21	3.72	20.64	.000
Innovativeness	3.16	3.41	8.89	.003
Variety	3.31	3.67	13.59	.000
Awareness of Brands	3.63	3.61	.23	.630
Price Level	3.64	3.62	.00	1.000
Durability	3.56	3.65	2.698	.102
Technology Level	3.36	3.51	4.90	.028
Reliability	3.36	3.53	5.73	.017
Knowledge of Products	3.34	2.95	24.56	.000
Overall Satisfaction	3.31	3.41	.53	.468
Ease of Finding	3.50	2.91	39.71	.000
Willingness to Buy	2.93	3.13	2.40	.122
Proud to Own	2.41	2.81	12.11	.001
After Sales Service	3.13	3.24	.14	.713
Overall Rating	3.50	3.69	3.22	.074

**Argentine Consumers' Product Images Evaluations –
Chile vs. United States Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Chile Mean of All Scales	U.S. Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.38	5.26	57.127	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Chile Mean	U.S. Mean	F	Significance of F
Quality	3.47	5.36	253.19	.000
Value	3.64	4.80	89.70	.000
Workmanship	3.41	5.11	216.93	.000
Defects	4.33	4.51	3.67	.057
Attractiveness	3.21	5.49	359.34	.000
Innovativeness	3.16	5.92	720.60	.000
Variety	3.31	6.09	749.78	.000
Awareness of Brands	3.63	5.11	73.55	.000
Price Level	3.64	4.35	32.20	.000
Durability	3.56	5.11	188.14	.000
Technology Level	3.36	6.20	771.27	.000
Reliability	3.36	5.56	363.54	.000
Knowledge of Products	3.34	5.42	287.02	.000
Overall Satisfaction	3.31	5.35	34.59	.000
Ease of Finding	3.50	5.71	249.62	.000
Willingness to Buy	2.93	4.83	237.16	.000
Proud to Own	2.41	4.17	205.51	.000
After Sales Service	3.13	5.14	323.00	.000
Overall Rating	3.50	5.79	466.11	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Product Images Evaluations –
Mexico vs. United States Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Mexico Mean of All Scales	U.S. Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.47	5.26	57.335	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Mexico Mean	U.S. Mean	F	Significance of F
Quality	3.62	5.36	254.60	.000
Value	3.61	4.80	112.80	.000
Workmanship	3.52	5.11	241.18	.000
Defects	4.48	4.51	.26	.614
Attractiveness	3.72	5.49	214.60	.000
Innovativeness	3.41	5.92	593.50	.000
Variety	3.67	6.09	526.12	.000
Awareness of Brands	3.61	5.11	81.04	.000
Price Level	3.62	4.35	36.80	.000
Durability	3.65	5.11	163.72	.000
Technology Level	3.51	6.20	698.28	.000
Reliability	3.53	5.56	293.01	.000
Knowledge of Products	2.95	5.42	412.86	.000
Overall Satisfaction	3.41	5.35	300.39	.000
Ease of Finding	2.91	5.71	558.15	.000
Willingness to Buy	3.13	4.83	184.45	.000
Proud to Own	2.81	4.17	125.52	.000
After Sales Service	3.24	5.14	303.77	.000
Overall Rating	3.69	5.79	440.44	.000

***Appendix C –
MANOVA Output for Country Image Differences***

**Argentine Consumers' Country Images Evaluations –
Overall Five-Country Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Approximate F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	79.455	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	F	Significance
Likeability of People	110.38	.000
Industriousness	85.02	.000
Education Level	229.79	.000
Wealth	324.48	.000
Friendliness	46.24	.000
Trustworthiness	107.04	.000
Work Ethic	124.98	.000
Individualism	54.59	.000
Political Stability of Country	577.60	.000
Technology Level of Country	590.10	.000
Stability of the Economy	717.01	.000
Quality of Life	534.59	.000
Role in World Politics	274.57	.000
Environmental/Pollution Controls	359.65	.000
Individual Rights and Freedoms	211.88	.000
Your Knowledge of the Country	257.28	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Country Images Evaluations –
Argentina vs. Canada Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Canada Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.52	5.19	163.164	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	Canada Mean	F	Significance of F
Likeability of People	5.07	3.92	87.53	.000
Industriousness	4.18	5.39	108.08	.000
Education Level	3.78	5.81	365.87	.000
Wealth	3.12	5.58	405.77	.000
Friendliness	4.35	4.31	.03	.874
Trustworthiness	3.42	5.01	192.89	.000
Work Ethic	3.52	5.34	238.83	.000
Individualism	5.28	4.59	38.01	.000
Political Stability of Country	2.10	5.89	1480.83	.000
Technology Level	2.94	6.02	920.14	.000
Stability of the Economy	1.92	6.00	1639.03	.000
Quality of Life	2.53	6.00	1085.91	.000
Role in World Politics	2.31	5.15	638.60	.000
Environmental Controls	1.96	5.40	806.24	.000
Individual Rights	3.72	5.54	206.15	.000
Knowledge of Country	6.15	3.52	689.57	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Country Images Evaluations –
Argentina vs. Chile Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Chile Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.52	3.46	90.846	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	Chile Mean	F	Significance of F
Likeability of People	5.07	3.33	197.58	.000
Industriousness	4.18	3.70	11.46	.001
Education Level	3.78	3.45	10.61	.001
Wealth	3.12	3.26	1.92	.167
Friendliness	4.35	3.46	48.47	.000
Trustworthiness	3.42	2.93	15.15	.000
Work Ethic	3.52	3.64	.46	.496
Individualism	5.28	4.16	117.42	.000
Political Stability of Country	2.10	3.67	231.28	.000
Technology Level	2.94	3.44	30.32	.000
Stability of the Economy	1.92	3.97	410.52	.000
Quality of Life	2.53	3.23	59.42	.000
Role in World Politics	2.31	3.02	52.33	.000
Environmental Controls	1.96	3.05	136.93	.000
Individual Rights	3.72	2.95	37.41	.000
Knowledge of Country	6.15	4.13	504.55	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Country Images Evaluations –
Argentina vs. Mexico Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Mexico Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.52	3.75	82.476	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	Mexico Mean	F	Significance of F
Likeability of People	5.07	5.22	1.01	.315
Industriousness	4.18	4.09	.02	.901
Education Level	3.78	3.36	19.90	.000
Wealth	3.12	3.33	3.05	.082
Friendliness	4.35	4.93	25.07	.000
Trustworthiness	3.42	4.05	31.13	.000
Work Ethic	3.52	4.04	19.84	.000
Individualism	5.28	3.95	174.60	.000
Political Stability of Country	2.10	3.68	228.54	.000
Technology Level	2.94	3.57	38.63	.000
Stability of the Economy	1.92	3.35	251.29	.000
Quality of Life	2.53	3.09	32.89	.000
Role in World Politics	2.31	3.42	142.14	.000
Environmental Controls	1.96	2.73	83.11	.000
Individual Rights	3.72	3.56	1.68	.196
Knowledge of Country	6.15	3.61	654.66	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Country Images Evaluations –
Argentina vs. United States Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	U.S. Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.52	5.24	164.511	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	U.S. Mean	F	Significance of F
Likeability of People	5.07	3.18	200.92	.000
Industriousness	4.18	5.26	75.74	.000
Education Level	3.78	5.22	121.42	.000
Wealth	3.12	5.80	548.36	.000
Friendliness	4.35	3.64	26.86	.000
Trustworthiness	3.42	4.51	77.32	.000
Work Ethic	3.52	5.10	153.12	.000
Individualism	5.28	5.27	.79	.375
Political Stability of Country	2.10	6.24	1542.84	.000
Technology Level	2.94	6.54	1250.69	.000
Stability of the Economy	1.92	6.23	1867.53	.000
Quality of Life	2.53	5.85	910.51	.000
Role in World Politics	2.31	5.60	561.71	.000
Environmental Controls	1.96	5.04	611.79	.000
Individual Rights	3.72	5.48	193.48	.000
Knowledge of Country	6.15	4.93	169.13	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Country Images and Desired Relations Evaluations –
Overall Four-Country (excluding home) Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Approximate F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	47.419	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	F	Significance
Likeability of People	110.898	.000
Industriousness	117.115	.000
Education Level	335.909	.000
Wealth	419.222	.000
Friendliness	68.619	.000
Trustworthiness	133.702	.000
Work Ethic	151.942	.000
Individualism	43.625	.000
Political Stability of Country	427.171	.000
Technology Level of Country	680.801	.000
Stability of the Economy	494.149	.000
Quality of Life	551.795	.000
Role in World Politics	231.302	.000
Environmental/Pollution Controls	294.429	.000
Individual Rights and Freedoms	318.975	.000
Alignment with Argentina	61.526	.000
Your Knowledge of the Country	94.401	.000
Political and Economic Ties	35.540	.000
Immigration from the Country	130.889	.000
Desire for Investment in the Country	27.614	.000
Desire for Investment from the Country	92.739	.000
Desire for Exports to the Country	29.229	.000
Desire for Imports from the Country	39.64	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Country Images and Desired Relations Evaluations –
Canada vs. Chile Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Canada Mean of All Scales	Chile Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	5.16	3.52	64.057	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Canada Mean	Chile Mean	F	Significance of F
Likeability of People	3.92	3.33	20.99	.000
Industriousness	5.39	3.70	262.23	.000
Education Level	5.81	3.45	731.44	.000
Wealth	5.58	3.26	603.27	.000
Friendliness	4.31	3.46	50.93	.000
Trustworthiness	5.01	2.93	408.74	.000
Work Ethic	5.34	3.64	362.29	.000
Individualism	4.59	4.16	9.28	.003
Political Stability of Country	5.89	3.67	589.72	.000
Technology Level	6.02	3.44	854.97	.000
Stability of the Economy	6.00	3.97	573.62	.000
Quality of Life	6.00	3.23	883.57	.000
Role in World Politics	5.15	3.02	463.01	.000
Environmental Controls	5.40	3.05	457.67	.000
Individual Rights	5.54	2.95	529.49	.000
Alignment with Argentina	3.33	2.84	21.21	.000
Your Knowledge of Country	3.52	4.13	34.41	.000
Political and Economic Ties	5.71	4.35	107.64	.000
Immigration from	4.74	2.31	303.18	.000
Desire for Investment in	4.88	3.64	74.43	.000
Desire for Investment from	5.87	3.93	212.19	.000
Desire for Exports	6.24	5.47	63.31	.000
Desire for Imports	4.39	3.01	93.90	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Country Images and Desired Relations Evaluations –
Canada vs. Mexico Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Canada Mean of All Scales	Mexico Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	5.16	3.93	52.323	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Canada Mean	Mexico Mean	F	Significance of F
Likeability of People	3.92	5.22	121.68	.000
Industriousness	5.39	4.09	167.05	.000
Education Level	5.81	3.36	731.55	.000
Wealth	5.58	3.33	483.86	.000
Friendliness	4.31	4.93	36.12	.000
Trustworthiness	5.01	4.05	96.30	.000
Work Ethic	5.34	4.04	229.51	.000
Individualism	4.59	3.95	29.44	.000
Political Stability of Country	5.89	3.68	468.37	.000
Technology Level	6.02	3.57	709.33	.000
Stability of the Economy	6.00	3.35	703.24	.000
Quality of Life	6.00	3.09	773.28	.000
Role in World Politics	5.15	3.42	306.97	.000
Environmental Controls	5.40	2.73	487.05	.000
Individual Rights	5.54	3.56	357.95	.000
Alignment with Argentina	3.33	3.27	.25	.620
Your Knowledge of Country	3.52	3.61	.64	.426
Political and Economic Ties	5.71	5.01	57.93	.000
Immigration from	4.74	3.28	122.91	.000
Desire for Investment in	4.88	4.35	11.65	.001
Desire for Investment from	5.87	5.00	82.45	.000
Desire for Exports	6.24	5.81	41.64	.000
Desire for Imports	4.39	3.63	43.41	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Country Images and Desired Relations Evaluations –
Canada vs. United States Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Canada Mean of All Scales	U.S. Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	5.16	5.11	24.410	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Canada Mean	U.S. Mean	F	Significance of F
Likeability of People	3.92	3.18	50.07	.000
Industriousness	5.39	5.26	3.83	.052
Education Level	5.81	5.22	50.84	.000
Wealth	5.58	5.80	6.96	.009
Friendliness	4.31	3.64	44.28	.000
Trustworthiness	5.01	4.51	27.60	.000
Work Ethic	5.34	5.10	9.89	.002
Individualism	4.59	5.27	38.99	.000
Political Stability of Country	5.89	6.24	19.24	.000
Technology Level	6.02	6.54	86.71	.000
Stability of the Economy	6.00	6.23	10.63	.001
Quality of Life	6.00	5.85	6.55	.011
Role in World Politics	5.15	5.60	14.78	.000
Environmental Controls	5.40	5.04	7.17	.008
Individual Rights	5.54	5.48	.19	.662
Alignment with Argentina	3.33	4.29	77.51	.000
Your Knowledge of Country	3.52	4.93	235.77	.000
Political and Economic Ties	5.71	4.84	41.95	.000
Immigration from	4.74	4.24	18.33	.000
Desire for Investment in	4.88	4.69	2.45	.119
Desire for Investment from	5.87	5.45	22.45	.000
Desire for Exports	6.24	6.22	.45	.505
Desire for Imports	4.39	4.00	8.21	.004

**Argentine Consumers' Country Images and Desired Relations Evaluations –
Chile vs. Mexico Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Chile Mean of All Scales	Mexico Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.52	3.93	19.887	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Chile Mean	Mexico Mean	F	Significance of F
Likeability of People	3.33	5.22	254.68	.000
Industriousness	3.70	4.09	10.33	.001
Education Level	3.45	3.36	1.22	.271
Wealth	3.26	3.33	.00	1.000
Friendliness	3.46	4.93	182.00	.000
Trustworthiness	2.93	4.05	115.02	.000
Work Ethic	3.64	4.04	22.66	.000
Individualism	4.16	3.95	5.61	.019
Political Stability of Country	3.67	3.68	.34	.561
Technology Level	3.44	3.57	.65	.421
Stability of the Economy	3.97	3.35	44.66	.000
Quality of Life	3.23	3.09	5.52	.019
Role in World Politics	3.02	3.42	22.77	.000
Environmental Controls	3.05	2.73	13.66	.000
Individual Rights	2.95	3.56	34.61	.000
Alignment with Argentina	2.84	3.27	16.65	.000
Your Knowledge of Country	4.13	3.61	36.01	.000
Political and Economic Ties	4.35	5.01	36.58	.000
Immigration from	2.31	3.28	89.03	.000
Desire for Investment in	3.64	4.35	42.11	.000
Desire for Investment from	3.93	5.00	82.10	.000
Desire for Exports	5.47	5.81	14.16	.000
Desire for Imports	3.01	3.63	29.95	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Country Images and Desired Relations Evaluations –
Chile vs. United States Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Chile Mean of All Scales	U.S. Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.52	5.11	75.887	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Chile Mean	U.S. Mean	F	Significance of F
Likeability of People	3.33	3.18	1.70	.194
Industriousness	3.70	5.26	183.02	.000
Education Level	3.45	5.22	261.68	.000
Wealth	3.26	5.80	650.26	.000
Friendliness	3.46	3.64	1.01	.317
Trustworthiness	2.93	4.51	196.52	.000
Work Ethic	3.64	5.10	188.91	.000
Individualism	4.16	5.27	69.06	.000
Political Stability of Country	3.67	6.24	641.35	.000
Technology Level	3.44	6.54	1186.62	.000
Stability of the Economy	3.97	6.23	574.84	.000
Quality of Life	3.23	5.85	686.39	.000
Role in World Politics	3.02	5.60	381.39	.000
Environmental Controls	3.05	5.04	275.01	.000
Individual Rights	2.95	5.48	540.15	.000
Alignment with Argentina	2.84	4.29	144.53	.000
Your Knowledge of Country	4.13	4.93	72.40	.000
Political and Economic Ties	4.35	4.84	9.81	.002
Immigration from	2.31	4.24	200.30	.000
Desire for Investment in	3.64	4.69	45.64	.000
Desire for Investment from	3.93	5.45	110.76	.000
Desire for Exports	5.47	6.22	39.41	.000
Desire for Imports	3.01	4.00	42.34	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Country Images and Desired Relations Evaluations –
Mexico vs. United States Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Mexico Mean of All Scales	U.S. Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.93	5.11	64.080	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Mexico Mean	U.S. Mean	F	Significance of F
Likeability of People	5.22	3.18	286.84	.000
Industriousness	4.09	5.26	102.79	.000
Education Level	3.36	5.22	285.30	.000
Wealth	3.33	5.80	560.11	.000
Friendliness	4.93	3.64	137.15	.000
Trustworthiness	4.05	4.51	16.01	.000
Work Ethic	4.04	5.10	112.09	.000
Individualism	3.95	5.27	89.62	.000
Political Stability of Country	3.68	6.24	644.46	.000
Technology Level	3.57	6.54	1073.34	.000
Stability of the Economy	3.35	6.23	893.18	.000
Quality of Life	3.09	5.85	660.71	.000
Role in World Politics	3.42	5.60	242.19	.000
Environmental Controls	2.73	5.04	366.26	.000
Individual Rights	3.56	5.48	352.73	.000
Alignment with Argentina	3.27	4.29	76.10	.000
Your Knowledge of Country	3.61	4.93	214.13	.000
Political and Economic Ties	5.01	4.84	1.48	.226
Immigration from	3.28	4.24	42.58	.000
Desire for Investment in	4.35	4.69	3.49	.063
Desire for Investment from	5.00	5.45	10.08	.002
Desire for Exports	5.81	6.22	19.58	.000
Desire for Imports	3.63	4.00	9.69	.002

***Appendix D –
MANOVA Output for Product Beliefs Function and Appeal
Differences***

**Argentine Consumers' Product Beliefs Function Ratings –
Argentina vs. Canada Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Canada Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	4.00	5.13	61.214	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	Canada Mean	F	Significance of F
Quality	4.43	5.32	115.30	.000
Workmanship	4.35	5.02	47.00	.000
Durability	4.23	5.16	79.57	.000
Technology Level	3.55	5.66	363.96	.000
Reliability	4.02	5.34	150.54	.000
After Sales Service	3.41	4.27	45.37	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Product Beliefs Appeal Ratings –
Argentina vs. Canada Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Canada Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.88	4.76	61.117	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	Canada Mean	F	Significance of F
Attractiveness	4.35	4.77	21.72	.000
Innovativeness	3.29	4.88	182.64	.000
Variety	3.99	4.63	27.08	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Product Beliefs Function Ratings –
Argentina vs. Chile Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Chile Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	4.00	3.38	17.600	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	Chile Mean	F	Significance of F
Quality	4.43	3.47	64.87	.000
Workmanship	4.35	3.41	60.07	.000
Durability	4.23	3.56	33.37	.000
Technology Level	3.55	3.36	2.47	.118
Reliability	4.02	3.36	30.40	.000
After Sales Service	3.41	3.13	3.78	.053

**Argentine Consumers' Product Beliefs Appeal Ratings –
Argentina vs. Chile Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA
Multivariate Test of Significance**

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Chile Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.88	3.23	40.582	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	Chile Mean	F	Significance of F
Attractiveness	4.35	3.21	94.27	.000
Innovativeness	3.29	3.16	.65	.421
Variety	3.99	3.31	28.96	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Product Beliefs Function Ratings –
Argentina vs. Mexico Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Mexico Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	4.00	3.51	16.573	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	Mexico Mean	F	Significance of F
Quality	4.43	3.62	52.50	.000
Workmanship	4.35	3.52	52.38	.000
Durability	4.23	3.65	23.90	.000
Technology Level	3.55	3.51	.08	.784
Reliability	4.02	3.53	16.51	.000
After Sales Service	3.41	3.24	1.94	.165

**Argentine Consumers' Product Beliefs Appeal Ratings –
Argentina vs. Mexico Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Mexico Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.88	3.60	17.614	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	Mexico Mean	F	Significance of F
Attractiveness	4.35	3.72	29.17	.000
Innovativeness	3.29	3.41	1.86	.174
Variety	3.99	3.67	5.71	.017

**Argentine Consumers' Product Beliefs Appeal Ratings –
Argentina vs. United States Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	U.S. Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	4.00	5.41	101.266	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	U.S. Mean	F	Significance of F
Quality	4.43	5.36	75.59	.000
Workmanship	4.35	5.11	45.06	.000
Durability	4.23	5.11	53.48	.000
Technology Level	3.55	6.20	578.50	.000
Reliability	4.02	5.56	161.37	.000
After Sales Service	3.41	5.14	170.07	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Product Beliefs Appeal Ratings –
Argentina vs. United States Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	U.S. Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.88	5.83	178.735	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	U.S. Mean	F	Significance of F
Attractiveness	4.35	5.49	105.97	.000
Innovativeness	3.29	5.92	508.87	.000
Variety	3.99	6.09	312.57	.000

***Appendix E –
MANOVA Output for Argentine People and Relations Animosity
towards Chile***

**Argentine Consumers' People Animosity –
Chile vs. Argentina Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Chile Mean of All Scales	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.34	4.09	60.145	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Chile Mean	Argentina Mean	F	Significance of F
Likeability of People	3.33	5.07	212.58	.000
Friendliness	3.46	4.35	52.90	.000
Trustworthiness	2.93	3.42	17.98	.000
Work Ethic	3.64	3.52	.89	.347

**Argentine Consumers' People Animosity –
Chile vs. Canada Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Chile Mean of All Scales	Canada Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.34	4.65	133.217	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Chile Mean	Canada Mean	F	Significance of F
Likeability of People	3.33	3.92	20.97	.000
Friendliness	3.46	4.31	56.93	.000
Trustworthiness	2.93	5.01	448.71	.000
Work Ethic	3.64	5.34	331.82	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Relations Animosity –
Chile vs. Canada Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Chile Mean of All Scales	Canada Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.78	5.30	66.156	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Chile Mean	Canada Mean	F	Significance of F
Political and economic ties	4.35	5.71	121.27	.000
Immigration	2.31	4.74	327.44	.000
Investment in	3.64	4.88	84.75	.000
Investment from	3.93	5.87	241.96	.000
Exports	5.47	6.24	64.77	.000
Imports	3.01	4.39	104.37	.000

**Argentine Consumers' People Animosity –
Chile vs. Mexico Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Chile Mean of All Scales	Mexico Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.34	4.56	77.977	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Chile Mean	Mexico Mean	F	Significance of F
Likeability of People	3.33	5.22	286.61	.000
Friendliness	3.46	4.93	181.90	.000
Trustworthiness	2.93	4.95	134.17	.000
Work Ethic	3.64	4.04	22.74	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Relations Animosity –
Chile vs. Mexico Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Chile Mean of All Scales	Mexico Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.78	4.52	22.886	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Chile Mean	Mexico Mean	F	Significance of F
Political and economic ties	4.35	5.01	33.61	.000
Immigration	2.31	3.28	87.98	.000
Investment in	3.64	4.35	43.38	.000
Investment from	3.93	5.00	90.84	.000
Exports	5.47	5.81	15.57	.000
Imports	3.01	3.63	35.35	.000

**Argentine Consumers' People Animosity –
Chile vs. United States Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Chile Mean of All Scales	U.S. Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.34	4.11	86.099	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Chile Mean	U.S. Mean	F	Significance of F
Likeability of People	3.33	3.18	1.90	.169
Friendliness	3.46	3.64	1.98	.161
Trustworthiness	2.93	4.51	205.28	.000
Work Ethic	3.64	5.10	192.43	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Relations Animosity –
Chile vs. United States Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Chile Mean of All Scales	U.S. Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.78	4.90	50.560	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Chile Mean	U.S. Mean	F	Significance of F
Political and economic ties	4.35	4.84	9.31	.002
Immigration	2.31	4.24	198.62	.000
Investment in	3.64	4.69	48.70	.000
Investment from	3.93	5.45	113.70	.000
Exports	5.47	6.22	41.96	.000
Imports	3.01	4.00	42.17	.000

***Appendix F –
MANOVA Output for Chilean People and Relations Animosity
Towards Argentina***

**Chilean Consumers' People Animosity –
Overall Five-Country Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Approximate F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	72.042	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	F	Significance
Likeability of People	145.05	.000
Friendliness	119.26	.000
Trustworthiness	73.21	.000
Work Ethic	119.82	.000

**Chilean Consumers' Relations Animosity –
Overall Four-Country (excluding home) Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Approximate F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	16.37	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	F	Significance
Political and Economic Ties	18.32	.000
Immigration from the Country	57.33	.000
Desire for Investment in the Country	25.74	.000
Desire for Investment from the Country	64.41	.000
Desire for Exports to the Country	22.69	.000
Desire for Imports from the Country	50.78	.000

**Chilean Consumers' People Animosity –
Argentina vs. Canada Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Canada Mean of All Scales	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	4.90	3.62	102.02	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Canada Mean	Argentina Mean	F	Significance of F
Likeability of People	4.42	3.65	87.07	.000
Friendliness	4.70	3.56	184.33	.000
Trustworthiness	5.10	3.45	377.11	.000
Work Ethic	5.39	3.80	368.99	.000

**Chilean Consumers' Relations Animosity –
Argentina vs. Canada Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Canada Mean of All Scales	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	5.50	4.73	28.375	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Canada Mean	Argentina Mean	F	Significance of F
Political and Economic Ties	5.89	5.41	29.494	.000
Immigration from	4.62	3.47	114.890	.000
Desire for Investment in	5.49	4.89	42.129	.000
Desire for Investment from	5.80	4.69	116.117	.000
Desire for Exports	6.13	5.75	19.462	.000
Desire for Imports	5.10	4.13	78.371	.000

**Chilean Consumers' People Animosity –
Argentina vs. Chile Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Chile Mean of All Scales	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	5.07	3.62	82.783	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Chile Mean	Argentina Mean	F	Significance of F
Likeability of People	5.70	3.65	289.10	.000
Friendliness	5.55	3.56	277.88	.000
Trustworthiness	4.59	3.45	119.90	.000
Work Ethic	4.43	3.80	40.38	.000

**Chilean Consumers' People Animosity –
Argentina vs. Mexico Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Mexico Mean of All Scales	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	4.90	3.62	90.36	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Mexico Mean	Argentina Mean	F	Significance of F
Likeability of People	5.68	3.65	311.09	.000
Friendliness	5.42	3.56	309.13	.000
Trustworthiness	4.35	3.45	78.82	.000
Work Ethic	4.13	3.80	15.89	.000

**Chilean Consumers' Relations Animosity –
Argentina vs. Mexico Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Mexico Mean of All Scales	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	4.87	4.73	4.020	.001

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Mexico Mean	Argentina Mean	F	Significance of F
Political and Economic Ties	5.33	5.41	.70	.403
Immigration from	3.56	3.47	.82	.366
Desire for Investment in	5.05	4.89	3.42	.065
Desire for Investment from	5.07	4.69	14.18	.000
Desire for Exports	5.82	5.75	.17	.684
Desire for Imports	4.41	4.13	6.42	.012

**Chilean Consumers' People Animosity –
Argentina vs. United States Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	U.S. Mean of All Scales	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	4.55	3.62	72.161	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	U.S. Mean	Argentina Mean	F	Significance of F
Likeability of People	3.97	3.65	7.74	.006
Friendliness	4.06	3.56	23.94	.000
Trustworthiness	4.90	3.45	198.23	.000
Work Ethic	5.26	3.80	221.60	.000

**Chilean Consumers' Relations Animosity –
Argentina vs. United States Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	U.S. Mean of All Scales*	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	5.52	4.73	23.018	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	U.S. Mean	Argentina Mean	F	Significance of F
Political and Economic Ties	5.80	5.41	13.21	.000
Immigration from	4.37	3.47	58.26	.000
Desire for Investment in	5.57	4.89	36.86	.000
Desire for Investment from	5.87	4.69	103.00	.000
Desire for Exports	6.30	5.75	38.54	.000
Desire for Imports	5.18	4.13	76.80	.000

***Appendix G –
MANOVA Output for Argentine Consumers' Country Admiration***

**Argentine Consumers' Country Admiration –
Argentina vs. Canada Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Canada Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	2.58	5.70	286.20	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	Canada Mean	F	Significance of F
Wealth	3.12	5.58	413.25	.000
Political stability	2.10	5.89	1499.32	.000
Technology level	2.94	6.02	933.01	.000
Stability of the economy	1.92	6.00	1654.88	.000
Quality of life	2.53	6.00	1094.33	.000
Role in world politics	2.31	5.15	646.60	.000
Environmental controls	1.96	5.40	818.18	.000
Individual rights	3.72	5.54	207.86	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Country Admiration –
Argentina vs. Chile Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Chile Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	2.58	3.33	83.852	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	Chile Mean	F	Significance of F
Wealth	3.12	3.26	2.26	.134
Political stability	2.10	3.67	234.78	.000
Technology level	2.94	3.44	32.63	.000
Stability of the economy	1.92	3.97	408.22	.000
Quality of life	2.53	3.23	59.89	.000
Role in world politics	2.31	3.02	53.75	.000
Environmental controls	1.96	3.05	138.30	.000
Individual rights	3.72	2.95	39.00	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Country Admiration –
Argentina vs. Mexico Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	Mexico Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	2.58	3.34	57.811	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	Mexico Mean	F	Significance of F
Wealth	3.12	3.33	3.72	.055
Political stability	2.10	3.68	235.50	.000
Technology level	2.94	3.57	39.55	.000
Stability of the economy	1.92	3.35	248.11	.000
Quality of life	2.53	3.09	33.97	.000
Role in world politics	2.31	3.42	147.16	.000
Environmental controls	1.96	2.73	85.98	.000
Individual rights	3.72	3.56	1.31	.253

**Argentine Consumers' Country Admiration –
Argentina vs. United States Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Argentina Mean of All Scales	U.S. Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	2.58	5.85	289.050	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Argentina Mean	U.S. Mean	F	Significance of F
Wealth	3.12	5.80	547.20	.000
Political stability	2.10	6.24	1498.54	.000
Technology level	2.94	6.54	1258.39	.000
Stability of the economy	1.92	6.23	1801.66	.000
Quality of life	2.53	5.85	896.87	.000
Role in world politics	2.31	5.60	564.59	.000
Environmental controls	1.96	5.04	616.18	.000
Individual rights	3.72	5.48	193.71	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Country Admiration –
Canada vs. Chile Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Canada Mean of All Scales	Chile Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	5.70	3.33	157.325	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Canada Mean	Chile Mean	F	Significance of F
Wealth	5.58	3.26	620.62	.000
Political stability	5.89	3.67	592.01	.000
Technology level	6.02	3.44	883.48	.000
Stability of the economy	6.00	3.97	592.22	.000
Quality of life	6.00	3.23	901.56	.000
Role in world politics	5.15	3.02	470.59	.000
Environmental controls	5.40	3.05	482.19	.000
Individual rights	5.54	2.95	550.68	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Country Admiration –
Canada vs. Mexico Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Canada Mean of All Scales	Mexico Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	5.70	3.34	120.724	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Canada Mean	Mexico Mean	F	Significance of F
Wealth	5.58	3.33	495.89	.000
Political stability	5.89	3.68	487.21	.000
Technology level	6.02	3.57	726.68	.000
Stability of the economy	6.00	3.35	722.26	.000
Quality of life	6.00	3.09	816.00	.000
Role in world politics	5.15	3.42	310.87	.000
Environmental controls	5.40	2.73	507.53	.000
Individual rights	5.54	3.56	377.31	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Country Admiration –
Canada vs. United States Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Canada Mean of All Scales	U.S. Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	5.70	5.85	21.002	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Canada Mean	U.S. Mean	F	Significance of F
Wealth	5.58	5.80	8.21	.004
Political stability	5.89	6.24	23.03	.000
Technology level	6.02	6.54	90.32	.000
Stability of the economy	6.00	6.23	11.38	.001
Quality of life	6.00	5.85	4.49	.035
Role in world politics	5.15	5.60	15.64	.000
Environmental controls	5.40	5.04	9.84	.002
Individual rights	5.54	5.48	.60	.438

**Argentine Consumers' Country Admiration –
Chile vs. Mexico Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Chile Mean of All Scales	Mexico Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.33	3.34	22.919	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Chile Mean	Mexico Mean	F	Significance of F
Wealth	3.26	3.33	.02	.900
Political stability	3.67	3.68	.08	.776
Technology level	3.44	3.57	.89	.346
Stability of the economy	3.97	3.35	43.97	.000
Quality of life	3.23	3.09	5.84	.016
Role in world politics	3.02	3.42	25.93	.000
Environmental controls	3.05	2.73	12.82	.000
Individual rights	2.95	3.56	38.93	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Country Admiration –
Chile vs. United States Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Chile Mean of All Scales	U.S. Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.33	5.85	190.224	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Chile Mean	U.S. Mean	F	Significance of F
Wealth	3.26	5.80	676.82	.000
Political stability	3.67	6.24	671.37	.000
Technology level	3.44	6.54	1203.61	.000
Stability of the economy	3.97	6.23	606.905	.000
Quality of life	3.23	5.85	720.63	.000
Role in world politics	3.02	5.60	374.27	.000
Environmental controls	3.05	5.04	296.75	.000
Individual rights	2.95	5.48	543.42	.000

**Argentine Consumers' Country Admiration –
Mexico vs. United States Paired Comparison:
Results for MANOVA**

Multivariate Test of Significance

Test	Mexico Mean of All Scales	U.S. Mean of All Scales	Exact F	Significance of F
Wilks' Lambda	3.34	5.85	155.378	.000

Univariate F-Tests

Scale	Mexico Mean	U.S. Mean	F	Significance of F
Wealth	3.33	5.80	591.91	.000
Political stability	3.68	6.24	617.76	.000
Technology level	3.57	6.54	1106.64	.000
Stability of the economy	3.35	6.23	912.08	.000
Quality of life	3.09	5.85	701.97	.000
Role in world politics	3.42	5.60	251.78	.000
Environmental controls	2.73	5.04	385.17	.000
Individual rights	3.56	5.48	350.07	.000

***Appendix H –
MANOVA Output for Between Country Construct Differences***

Doubly Multivariate Analysis of Argentine Consumer Perceptions of (Sum of Scales) Construct Differences

	Pairwise Comparisons									
Variable	A/C p<.005	A/Ch p<.005	A/M p<.005	A/US p<.005	C/Ch p<.005	C/M p<.005	C/US p<.005	Ch/M p<.005	Ch/US p<.005	M/US p<.005
Product Beliefs Function	C 204.22 .000	A 48.07 .000	A 33.39 .000	US 274.60 .000	C 571.86 .000	C 522.98 .000	US 26.67 .000	M 4.26 .040	US 569.13 .000	US 605.08 .000
Product Beliefs Appeal	C 95.61 .000	A 46.24 .000	A 7.83 .005	US 417.05 .000	C 299.02 .000	C 205.44 .000	US 194.96 .000	M 25.73 .000	US 838.16 .000	US 663.06 .000
People Animosity	C 44.20 .000	A 66.69 .000	M 30.01 .000	US .81 .060	C 250.90 .000	C 1.76 .186	C 55.05 .000	M 253.61 .000	US 77.52 .000	M 29.28 .000
Relations Animosity	-	-	-	-	C 290.35 .000	C 114.68 .000	C 29.13 .000	M 106.93 .000	US 109.17 .000	US 15.27 .000
Country Admiration	C 1706.91 .000	Ch 127.80 .000	M 141.25 .000	US 1852.56 .000	C 1250.00 .000	C 996.51 .000	US 11.06 .001	M .125 .724	US 1321.49 .000	US 1163.04 .000
Product Evaluations	A .42 .838	A 197.07 .000	A 124.04 .000	US 44.82 .000	C 292.24 .000	C 203.56 .000	US 113.19 .000	M 11.09 .000	US 519.54 .000	US 406.89 .000
Familiarity	A 803.68 .000	A 477.76 .000	A 712.44 .000	A 1.02 .312	Ch 82.54 .000	M 11.52 .001	US 919.27 .000	Ch 52.37 .000	US 453.73 .000	US 822.63 .000
Willingness to Buy	A 91.52 .000	A 194.03 .000	A 161.24 .000	US 2.02 .157	C 21.83 .000	C 9.38 .000	US 181.90 .000	M 4.22 .041	US 268.67 .000	US 215.33 .000

A = Argentina, C = Canada, Ch = Chile, M = Mexico, US = United States

Bolded Country letter(s) and significance indicate higher mean of Significant Difference at p < .005, F-value below country letter, significance below F-value