1

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

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

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

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

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

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

AVIS

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

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

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

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

**CANADIAN CONSUMER EVALUATIONS OF EASTERN EUROPEAN
COUNTRIES AND THEIR PRODUCTS**

by

DAVID BENNETT, (B.B.A.)

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

School of Business
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
August 1, 1991

copyright
1991, David Bennett

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

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

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

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

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

ISBN 0-315-70892-1

Canada

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

**CANADIAN CONSUMER EVALUATIONS OF EASTERN EUROPEAN
COUNTRIES AND THEIR PRODUCTS**

submitted by David Bennett, B.B.A.
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Management Studies

Thesis Co-Supervisor

Thesis Co-Supervisor

Chair, School of Business

School of Business
Carleton University

September 27, 1991

ABSTRACT

This study examined Canadian consumers' attitudes towards Eastern European countries and their products. A random sample of Canadian consumers living in the Ottawa metropolitan area were surveyed to address study objectives. Respondents were found to have significantly different attitudes towards products from different Eastern European country origins. Further, study results indicated that views of nations can help in predicting attitudes of products. Country-of-origin stereotyping was found to be moderated by product complexity.

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my fellow MMS students for their kind help during the writing of this thesis. I am particularly indebted to my friends: Robert Tannenbaum, Ron Dawson, Peter Vaillancourt, John Barton, and Margie Bourk. A special note of appreciation to Tod-O. I would like to thank my father Peter, my mother Doreen, my brother Andy, and last but not least my sister Laura for their continuing encouragement and support. Most of all I would like to thank my wife Julie, without who's unfailing devotion this study could never have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	11
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	111
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	1v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi1
LIST OF FIGURES.....	vi11
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
Nation evaluation.....	4
Product evaluation.....	8
Eastern European country and product images.....	17
CHAPTER 2: RESEARCH OBJECTIVES.....	22
Primary objectives.....	22
Secondary objectives.....	23
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	25
General overview.....	25
Research design.....	25
Sampling.....	26
Questionnaire.....	27
Data collection procedures.....	31
Data analysis procedures.....	32

CHAPTER 4: THE PRE-ANALYTIC PROCESS.....	35
Error check.....	35
Independent variable development for multiple regressions.....	35
Dependent variable selection for multiple regressions.....	37
Tests of French and Soviet profiles by survey version.....	38
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS AND ANALYSIS.....	39
Descriptive sample statistics.....	39
General results and variance analysis of country ratings.....	41
General results and variance analysis of product ratings.....	55
Correlation and regression analysis.....	66
Analysis of H5 (complexity).....	76
Analysis of hypotheses relating to the demographics of country-of-origin.....	84
Analysis of H6 (gender).....	85
Analysis of H7 (age).....	85
Analysis of H8 (education).....	86
Analysis of H9 (income).....	88
The "new" German product image.....	89
CHAPTER 6: LIMITATIONS.....	92
CHAPTER 7: DISCUSSION.....	95
Views of countries and attitudes towards products....	95
France and French Products.....	97
Eastern Europe and Eastern European Products.....	98
German products.....	102
Country-of-origin and product complexity.....	102
The country-of-origin bias and demographics.....	103
CHAPTER 8: IMPLICATIONS.....	104
Implications for Canadian investors.....	104
Implications for Canadian domestic industries.....	108
Implications for Eastern European producers.....	109
Implications for researchers.....	112
CHAPTER 9: RESEARCH DIRECTIONS.....	115
CHAPTER 10: CONCLUSIONS.....	117
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	119

GENERAL APPENDICES.....	128
A. Version II Questionnaire.....	128
B. Questionnaire Design.....	142
TECHNICAL APPENDICES.....	148
C. Principal Components Analysis.....	148
D. Statistical Assumptions And The Analysis Of Outliers.....	157
E. Variance Analysis Of Country And Product Items (Tests of Null H1 & H2).....	163
F. Regression Analysis (Test of Null H3).....	170
G. Regression Analysis (Test of Null H4).....	173
H. Product Complexity And Country-Of-Origin (Test of Null H5)...	176
I. Analysis Of Gender Differences (Test of Null H6).....	178
J. Analysis Of Age Differences (Test of Null H7).....	182
K. Analysis Of Education Differences (Test of Null H8).....	186
L. Attitudes Towards France By Education Grouping.....	196
M. Analysis Of Income Differences (Test of Null H9).....	204
N. Analysis Of Survey Version Differences (French & Soviet Profiles).....	208

LIST OF TABLES

Description	Page
Table 5.1 - Demographic Breakdown Of Survey And Overall Population	40
Table 5.2 - Means For Country Items	41
Table 5.3 - Differences In Country Ratings, France vs. EE	43
Table 5.4 - Doubly Multivariate Analysis Of EE Country Differences (Survey Grouping #1)	46
Table 5.5 - Doubly Multivariate Analysis Of EE Country Differences (Survey Grouping #2)	47
Table 5.6 - MANOVA Analysis of EE Country Items	49
Table 5.7 - Number Of Significant EE Country Differences By Item	51
Table 5.8 - Means For Product Items	55
Table 5.9 - Distribution Of Response On The Item "Willing To Buy"	56
Table 5.10 - Distribution Of Response On The Item "Good Overall Quality"	57
Table 5.11 - Doubly Multivariate Analysis Of EE Product Differences (Survey Grouping #1)	60
Table 5.12 - Doubly Multivariate Analysis Of EE Product Differences (Survey Grouping #2)	61
Table 5.13 - MANOVA Analysis Of EE Product Differences	62
Table 5.14 - Number Of Significant Product Differences By Item	63
Table 5.15 - Significant Correlations Of Country Variables And "Willing To Buy"	68
Table 5.16 - Significant Correlations Of Country Variables And "Good Overall Products"	69
Table 5.17 - Number Of Significant Country Item Correlations By Variable	70
Table 5.18 - R - Square And Independent Variables For Regressions On Product Item "Willing To Buy"	73

Table 5.19 - R - Square And Independent Variables For Regressions On Product Item "Good Overall Products"	75
Table 5.20 - Specific Products - Means	78
Table 5.21 - Significant Differences in Specific Product Ratings Between Country Pairs	79
Table 5.22 - Significant Differences of Specific Product Ratings by Complexity	80
Table 5.23 - Significant Complexity Differences By Product Pairing	82
Table 5.24 - The "New" German Product Image	90

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Complexity As A Moderating Variable	76
--	----

INTRODUCTION

The international marketplace is becoming increasingly competitive as firms and nations try to capture a larger share of the global market. Increased competition has made attention to international marketing a growing priority. With world trade now exceeding two trillion dollars (U.S.) marketing analysis and planning has become a prerequisite for success in the international arena.

Consumer behaviour researchers have indicated that there is a need to better understand how countries and their products are cognitively represented (Wang and Lamb 1980, 1983; Papadopoulos, Heslop, Graby and Avlonitis 1987). This study explores the extent to which views of nations can help in predicting attitudes towards products made in those nations.

In this research Canadian consumer attitude ratings towards Eastern European nations and their products were collected. Attitudes towards Eastern European countries and their products were examined because it was felt that these countries were ideal for examining the relationship between views of nations and attitudes towards products. Respondent views towards these countries were expected to be good predictors of product attitudes because it is likely that respondents would have been exposed to more Eastern European country information than Eastern European product information.

Examining these product images was also important because Eastern European images have not been frequently sought in the past. Understanding Canadian

consumer attitudes towards Eastern Europe is valuable to Canadian investors who produce products in Eastern Europe to be sold in Canada, Canadian marketers who will face increasing competition from East European companies, and Eastern European companies anxious to understand how their products are viewed in Canada. Further, the results of this study may prove to be valuable to marketing researchers interested in understanding some of the potential determinants of the country-of-origin bias.

The remainder of this thesis is divided into ten chapters. The first chapter is a review of the pertinent literature from the fields of social psychology and marketing. Chapter two focuses on the specific objectives of the research. Chapter three outlines the research methodology. Chapter four discusses the pre-analytic research process. Chapter five presents the results of the study. Chapter six explains the research limitations. The seventh part of this study discusses the main findings of the research and the eight chapter examines the implications of those findings. Chapter nine outlines future research directions and chapter ten summarizes the study's conclusions.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research in social psychology has demonstrated that there is considerable consistency across cultures in the attributes used to evaluate nations (Forgas and O'Driscoll 1984). Marketing research has indicated that consumers use a product's country-of-origin as an evaluative criterion in the assessments of products (Papadopoulos, Heslop and Bamossy 1989). To date, however, relatively little attention has been paid to the underlying cognitive representation of product origin. This study attempted to bridge a gap between the social psychology and marketing literatures. Specifically, the thesis explored the relationship between the views of nations and attitudes towards those nations' products.

This literature review is organized into three sections. The first section of this review discusses research on how individuals evaluate nations. The research discussed is drawn predominantly from the social psychology literature. The second part of the chapter examines marketing research into how country-of-origin affects product evaluation. The final section of the literature review surveys attitudes towards Eastern European (hereafter EE) countries and their products.

1.1 Nation evaluation

1.1.1 Stereotyping

Research done on both nation perception and national product perception can be seen as specific topics within the wider realm of stereotype research. The purpose of stereotype research is to understand the cognitive structures which lead to the categorization of individuals and groups (Forgas and O'Driscoll 1984).

Stereotyping is an important factor in inter-group perception. It is a cognitive shorthand which is intimately involved in the process of categorization (Renwick 1988). In situations where information is lacking, individuals will often use substitute or surrogate indicators to categorize a phenomenon (Cattin, Jolibert and Lohnes 1982). Stereotypes can also occur in situations of cognitive overload (Tajfel 1981). When an individual has had many different experiences, involving many interacting variables, the person will often encounter categorization difficulties (Tajfel 1981). In these situations the experiences which are most available for retrieval from memory will be used to represent an entire class of events (Tversky and Kahnemann 1973).

Stereotypes are important because they can play an integral role in shaping attitudes. Attitudes, in turn, are important because they are seen by most consumer researchers to be one of the most important intrapersonal predictors of behaviour. Attitudes consist of cognitions (beliefs), affect (emotions) and conation (action tendencies) (Foxhall 1983). Individuals make assumptions,

judgements and decisions based on their attitudes towards other people (Renwick 1988). Assumptions and judgements can be clouded due to problems with complex, conflicting, or non-existent information. In these instances it is likely that attitudes will be shaped by stereotypes (Renwick 1988).

1.1.2 Ethnocentrism

Aboud and Skerry (1984) describe an ethnic attitude as a predisposition to respond favourably or unfavourably toward people from different ethnic groups. Ethnic groups can be thought of as a socially and/or psychologically defined set of people who share a common culture or cultural background, usually because of similarity in terms of race, religion, or nationality (Aboud and Skerry 1984). According to Campbell and Levine (1972) ethnocentrism refers to an exaggerated preference for one's own group and a corresponding dislike of other groups. Individuals acquire both in-group and out-group ethnic attitudes (Campbell and Levine 1972).

Social psychologists have devoted considerable attention to the in-group evaluation of out-groups (Jones and Ashmore 1973; Taormina et al. 1988). Research in this area indicates that people tend to evaluate similar and familiar others more positively than they do dissimilar others and strangers at both the individual level (Byrne and Nelson 1965; Hill and Stull 1981) and the group level (Taormina and Messick 1983). Similarity, in terms of attitudes and values, is consistently identified with attraction (Byrne and Nelson 1965; Hill and Stull

1981; Taormina, Messick, Iwawaki, and Wilke 1988). If a group identifies with another group then a high degree of attraction will likely take place.

1.1.3 National ethnic groups

Social psychologists are concerned with the need to describe and explain how the various parts of our social environment are cognitively represented (Forgas 1983). Nation states are one of the most important social groupings to which individuals belong. They play an important role in the formation of social attitudes and in the definition of the social identity of their members (Tajfel 1981).

Nation perception can be seen as a process of social categorization (Tajfel 1981). This process is not a purely rational cognitive process. It is influenced by the values, interests, and the norms of our culture (Tajfel and Forgas 1981). According to Tajfel (1981), membership in a social grouping, like the nation state, has practical significance for an individual insofar as it reinforces the individual's positive social identity. Nationality can contribute to a positive social identity to the extent that the nation affiliation is distinct from other comparable nations and superior to them in identifiable ways (Tajfel 1981). Therefore, people will be motivated to magnify differences between their nation and similar others, especially in those areas where their country does better than do other similar nations. For example, if a country is identical with another except that it allows for more personal freedom then a citizen from the freer country would be inclined to emphasize this distinction. There has been considerable support for

Tajfel's theory of functional perception in laboratory settings (Tajfel 1981) and more recently, in field studies (Forgas and O'Driscoll 1984).

A number of studies have examined how people cognitively represent nations. Various researchers have examined the underlying dimensions along which foreign nations are evaluated. Wish, Deutsch and Biener (1970) discovered four significant evaluation dimensions which they interpreted as Political Alignment and Ideology, Economic Development, Geography and Population, and Culture and Race. Jones and Ashmore (1973) concluded that their respondents evaluated the sample countries primarily on dimensions of dominant/subordinate, communist/non-communist, and Western culture/non-Western culture. Robinson and Hefner (1967) detected the following four factors in respondent perceptual space: affiliation with communism, economic development, geography (European versus Asian), and Spanish influence. Forgas and O'Driscoll (1984) discovered three perceptual dimensions: European-non-European, communist-capitalist, and developed-underdeveloped.

The dimensions that are revealed in each study are to some extent a function of the countries included in the stimulus sample. However, there is considerable consistency across different cultures in the attributes used to describe nations. Nation states are generally evaluated based on economic development, political ideology and culture. Most researchers in this area agree that the cross-cultural rating differences appear to be a function of relative weighting as opposed to differing evaluative criteria (Wish, Deutsch and Biener 1970; Forgas and O'Driscoll 1984).

Research has indicated that demographic and personal characteristics are systematically related to how nations are perceived. Wish, Deustch and Biener (1970) found that the economic development dimension was more important than political alignment to people with anti-war sentiment, males, and subjects from developed countries; whereas, the opposite was true for those more tolerant of war, females, and subjects from underdeveloped countries. Robinson and Hefner (1967) examined the differences between the general public's and academics' perceptions of nations. They found that academics put a stronger emphasis on economic development than on political orientation, while the general public did the opposite. Sherman (1973) reported that the salience of perceptual dimensions is a function of both perceiver characteristics and judgmental conditions.

1.2 Product evaluation

1.2.1 Consumer information cues

Consumers evaluate products on the basis of information cues. These cues can be separated into two categories, intrinsic (e.g., design, features, colour) and extrinsic (e.g., price, brand, seller reputation) (Olson and Jacoby 1972; Bilkey and Nes 1982). Information cues are interpreted differently by different people. Individual non-task variables such as personality, motivation, cognitive structure, learning patterns, predispositions, and preferences will have an influence on purchase behaviour (Webster and Wind 1972; Heslop, Liefeld and Wall 1987). Each individual is also likely to perceive information cues differently. The

meanings which individuals attach to stimuli clearly influence and shape purchase behaviour (White 1979). Olson and Jacoby (1972) found that intrinsic cues had a greater effect on quality judgements than did extrinsic cues.

Consumers often find it difficult to use intrinsic cues in the purchase situation because quality is frequently hard to detect prior to purchase and consumers engage in relatively little information search (Newman and Staelin 1972). So consumers, faced with a high degree of purchase uncertainty, often infer the quality of products from extrinsic cues. Quality can be inferred from such cues as the product brand (Jacoby, Olson, and Haddock 1971), seller reputation (Olson and Jacoby 1972), price (Klein and Leffler 1981), and advertising (Klein and Leffler 1981). A product's country-of-origin has also been found to be an extrinsic cue from which quality is inferred (Nagashima 1970; Schooler 1971; Gaedeke 1973; Lillis and Narayana 1974; Bannister and Saunders 1978, Wang and Lamb 1978; White 1979; Cattin, Jolibert and Lohnes 1982; Wall and Heslop 1986).

1.2.2 The importance of country-of-origin

Country-of-origin information is often used in product evaluations; however, there is no consensus as to the relative importance of this cue. It should be kept in mind that the importance or lack of importance of the country-of-origin cue is heavily influenced by the purchasing situation. Research indicates that information cues are used differently depending on the specific purchase scenario (Haakansson and Wootz 1975; Hampton 1977; Han and Terpstra 1987).

Dickerson (1987) found that country-of-origin was an important cue for both men and women in their evaluations of clothing. Han and Terpstra (1988) found that source country had a greater effect on consumer evaluations of product quality than did brand name. Heslop, Liefeld and Wall (1987) found that country-of-origin was more important than price or brand, particularly for complex products. Their study, however, found very few significant effects for any extrinsic cues. Research by Schellinck (1986) suggests that the country-of-origin cue was not commonly used as a predictor of product quality when compared to other cues. However, when country-of-origin was part of the purchase evaluation the consumer was found to place a lot of confidence in the cue. Nes (1981) found that brand name was more influential than country-of-origin in consumer evaluations of product quality.

Despite disagreement as to the relative importance of country-of-origin, a substantial body of research has indicated that country-of-origin does have an effect on product evaluations. The influence of country-of-origin has been found for, products in general (Nagashima 1977; Wall and Heslop 1986), classes of products (Nagashima 1970; Wang 1978), specific types of products (Gaedeke 1973; Heslop, Liefeld and Wall 1987; Han and Terpstra 1987), specific brands (Han and Terpstra 1987), consumer products (Schooler 1965; Lillis and Narayana 1974; Bannister and Saunders 1978; Papadopoulos, Heslop and Bamossy 1989), and for industrial products (White 1979; Chasin and Jaffe 1979; Cattin, Jolibert and Lohnes 1982). Country-of-origin effects exist for products from more developed nations (Nagashima 1970; Cattin, Jolibert and Lohnes 1982) and for

products from less developed nations (Schooler 1965; Chasin and Jaffe 1979). The literature supports the position that at least some consumers consider country of origin in some purchase situations.

Before outlining more specific research findings it is important to note the dimensions on which consumers evaluate products from different countries. Researchers have found that there is considerable consistency across different cultures in the dimensions used to evaluate products. Papadopoulos, Heslop and Bamossy (1990) concluded that their transnational sample of consumers differentiated products along four dimensions, which were interpreted as: product integrity; price and value; market presence; and response (behaviourial dimension). Bannister and Saunders (1978) interpreted the underlying evaluative dimensions used by their sample of British consumers as: reliability; value for the money; appearance; and workmanship. White (1979) found that French and American industrial purchasers evaluated products along dimensions interpreted as: product quality; marketing characteristics; and product price.

Research indicates that individual dimensions can be more or less susceptible to country-of-origin effects (Han and Terpstra 1988). For example, German products are normally rated high on prestige value but low on economy (White 1979; Cattin, Jolibert and Lohnes 1982). Another example of this phenomenon is the tendency of consumers to rate domestic products highest on availability (Bannister and Saunders 1978) and serviceability (Papadopoulos, Heslop, Graby, and Avlonitis 1987).

1.2.3 Country-of-origin: Halo vs. Summary Construct

Marketing research suggests that country-of-origin information can affect consumers' product evaluations. Han (1989) posited two alternative models which might explain how country image affects brand attitude: 1) the halo model and 2) the summary construct model.

In examining the role of country-of-origin in product evaluation most marketing researchers have conceptualized country image as a "halo" that consumers use to infer the quality of an unknown product (Chasin and Jaffe 1979, Bilkey and Nes 1982). When consumers are unable to detect true product quality they may use country-of-origin to infer the quality of unknown products (Huber and McCann 1982). In these situations consumers will make inferences about product quality from country image. Country image as a halo directly affects consumers' beliefs about product attributes and indirectly affects overall evaluation of products through those beliefs (Johansson, Douglas and Nonaka 1985).

The summary construct model contends that consumers recode and abstract individual components of information into higher order units or "chunks" (Simon 1974). The process of information chunking may evolve around country-of-origin. Consumers may abstract information about a given country's products because products from the same origin have similar product attributes (Han 1989). The summary construct hypothesis maintains that country image directly affects consumer attitude toward a brand from the country rather than affecting it indirectly through product attribute rating (Wright 1975).

Han (1989) suggests that when consumers are not familiar with a country's products, country image may act as a halo from which consumers infer product attributes. However, as consumers become familiar with a country's products, country image may become a construct that summarizes consumers' beliefs about product attributes and directly affects their brand attitude.

1.2.4 The country-of-origin effect

Several studies have discovered that products made in different, more developed countries (DC) are not rated equally (Nagashima 1977; White 1979). Moreover, research has indicated that products in different, less developed nations (LDC) are also subject to a hierarchy of bias (Schooler 1965; Chasin and Jaffe 1979).

Not surprisingly, research has revealed that the difference between DCs and LDCs is more pronounced between the two groups than within each group (Wang and Lamb 1980). When evaluating products, consumers are often risk averse. Most manufactured products made in developing nations are perceived to be of inferior quality and of significantly higher risk. It appears that there is a hierarchy of perceived risk having an inverse relationship with economic development (Hampton 1977). American products which were made abroad were perceived as riskier when compared to the same products made domestically (Hampton 1977). Wall, Liefeld and Heslop (1991) found that consumer use of extrinsic information cues is product dependent. Degree of product risk and complexity modifies the impact of the country-of-origin cue (Haakansson and Wootz 1975; Wall, Liefeld and Heslop 1991).

The relationship between demographics and the country-of-origin effect has not been adequately studied to date. Schooler (1971) found that older people tended to give more positive evaluations to foreign products, while Wang (1978) found no such effect. Schooler (1971) found that females rated foreign products more highly than did males. Women have also been found to rate domestic products more highly than men (Wall and Heslop 1986). However, Dornoff et al. (1974) could not confirm that women rated foreign products higher than men for products made in more developed countries.

While much of the research examining the relationship between demographic characteristics and the country-of-origin effect is contradictory some relationships are becoming more established. Preliminary research indicates that persons with more education rate foreign products more highly than persons with limited education (Wang 1978; Hirsch, Peters and Weinstein 1981) and that persons with higher income levels tend to have a more favourable acceptance of foreign products than do persons with lower income levels (Wang 1978).

1.2.5 Correlates of the country-of-origin bias

Only a few researchers have examined the factors which might be correlates of foreign nation stereotyping. Wang and Lamb (1980) studied the relationship between U.S. consumers' perceptions of foreign environments and their willingness to buy products from foreign origins. This exploratory research found that respondents' willingness to buy European-made products could be partially

explained by variations in perceptions about economic and political environments.

Wang and Lamb (1983) used objective measures to investigate how certain environmental variables might influence judgements about foreign made products. The results of the study suggest that U.S. consumers' willingness to buy foreign products may be partially explained by the economic, political, and cultural environment of the country-of-origin. In both studies by Wang and Lamb (1980, 1983) a general product evaluation was used.

Papadopoulos, Marshall and Heslop (1988) examined how evaluations of a country and its people were related to product quality beliefs. This relationship was studied in the context of a general model of country-of-origin effects. This study found that consumers' beliefs about a country and its people (economically successful, technologically advanced, hardworking) positively affect product quality beliefs.

Papadopoulos and Heslop (1986) examined how travel to a country affects consumer views about the country, its people, and its products. The results of this study indicate that the perceptions of travellers towards a country are modified by the reality of the true conditions that prevail there. Travel to a country does not appear to be directly related to overall product evaluations. However, travellers and non-travellers hold significantly different specific product preferences.

Renwick (1988) looked at how social contact with foreigners affected importer evaluations of foreign goods. This research found that positive social linkages had a strong favourable influence upon importers' country-of-origin preferences. These findings are in agreement with research done by Tims and Miller (1983) who found that an individual's level of approval for a foreign country may be influenced by the degree of trust and perceptions of shared interests he/she has with regard to persons from that country.

Tongberg (1972) identified perceived similarity of belief system as an influence on foreign product quality ratings. This hypothesis is consistent with the work of Hill and Stull (1981) and Taormina and Messick (1983), who found that perceived similarity among individuals and among groups was identified with attraction.

Social psychologists have examined how people evaluate countries (Robinson and Hefner 1967; Wish, Deustch and Biener 1970; Sherman 1973; Jones and Ashmore 1973; Forgas and O'Driscoll 1984; Marin and Salazar 1985). Marketing researchers have determined that consumers evaluate products differently based on country-of-origin (Nagashima 1970, 1977; Gaedeke 1973; Lillis and Naryana 1974; Bannister and Saunders 1978; Schooler 1971; Papadopoulos, Heslop and Bamossy 1989). Unfortunately, only a few researchers have attempted to amalgamate these two bodies of knowledge. The research done in the area of nation stereotyping allows us to see what some important determinants of the country-of-origin bias are likely to be.

Wang and Lamb (1980) note the need for future research to address the full range of possible determinants:

Clearly further research is needed to isolate and measure the influence of [environmental] variables on consumers' willingness to buy products from particular countries. Likewise, the effects of other foreign environmental factors such as culture, political ideology, etc. on consumers' predispositions need to be investigated. (Wang & Lamb, 1980, p. 354)

In the study described in this thesis consumers evaluated nations on a wide range of environmental factors, including economic development, political ideology, and culture. The main objective of this research was to explore the relationship between views of nations and attitudes towards products.

1.3 Eastern European country and product images

1.3.1 The selection of Eastern Europe as the unit of analysis

In this study attitude ratings towards EE countries and products were collected as a means to achieve the study's main objective of examining the relationship between views of nations and attitudes towards products. Dramatic changes in Eastern Europe, over the last two years, made these environments ideal for the purposes of this study. These countries were considered ideal because a strong country halo effect was anticipated.

The majority of Canadian consumers encounter relatively little EE product information. The main reason for this is that few EE consumer products are

sold in Canada. Less than 1% of all imports are from Eastern Europe and few of the products which are imported are consumer goods. The dramatic political and economic changes which have taken place in Eastern Europe have been covered extensively by the Western media. Over the last two years Canadians have been exposed to an increased amount of EE country information. Each EE country has been shown choosing its own path towards reform.

The differences between EE countries are becoming more apparent. It appeared likely that the majority of Canadian consumers would have encountered more EE country information than EE product information. When information is lacking, individuals will often use substitute or surrogate indicators to categorize a phenomenon (Cattin, Jolibert and Lohnes 1982). Therefore, it seemed reasonable to assume that EE country information would likely be used as a surrogate indicator of overall product quality.

1.3.2 Eastern European product ratings

The study of EE product images is important in and of itself. Few researchers have focused on the product images of EE countries. Chasin and Jaffe (1979) studied industrial purchaser's attitudes towards EE products. This study found that Soviet, Czechoslovakian, Hungarian, Polish and Rumanian product images were inferior to the U.S product image. The researchers suggest that this inferiority is part of a halo effect as less than 30 percent of their sample had had business dealings with EE countries. The Soviet Union was found to have a product image superior to that of the other EE Countries. Czechoslovakia's

product image, in turn, was superior to the product images of Hungary, Poland and Rumania.

These researchers once again looked at EE product images in 1987 (Chasin and Jaffe 1987). Their study examined industrial purchaser's attitudes towards the products of the Soviet Union, Poland, Hungary and three Western countries. EE product images were found to be inferior to Western product images. The 1987 Soviet product image was substantially poorer than its 1979 image. Soviet products were perceived as being superior to those of Hungary and Poland but the degree of superiority was found to have diminished.

Chasin, Holzmuller and Jaffe (1989) examined how EE products were perceived by American and Austrian industrial buyers. This cross-cultural study found that EE goods were stereotyped by both American and Austrian purchasing agents. Products from Western country origins were rated significantly higher than products from EE country origins. The study also found that both American and Austrian purchasing agents discriminated between products from different EE countries. American purchasing agents gave Soviet goods marginally higher ratings than Hungarian and Polish goods. Austrian purchasing agents gave Hungarian products marginally higher ratings than Soviet goods. Austrian respondents gave both Hungarian and Soviet products considerably higher ratings than Polish products. The country-of-origin effect was found to be generalized and not specific to any product category.

Hisrich, Peters and Weinstein (1981) examined American consumer attitudes towards EE products. The opportunity for trade expansion with EE countries was analyzed by focusing on consumers' willingness to buy EE goods and their views on East-West trade. When asked if they were willing to buy Soviet goods 62% of respondents gave favourable answers. When asked if they were willing to buy EE goods (the products from any EE country other than the Soviet Union) 76% of respondents gave favourable answers. Further, this study found that a favourable attitude toward engaging in trade as well as a willingness to buy products from EE countries were inversely related to age and positively related to education and open mindedness.

Before October 3, 1990, East Germany was considered part of Eastern Europe. No research papers could be found in which East German product images were examined. West German product images, on the other hand, have been extensively studied (Bannister and Saunders 1978; White 1979; Han and Terpstra 1987, Papadopoulos, Heslop and Bamossy 1990). It remains to be seen how goods from a United Germany will be perceived by the consumer.

1.3.3 Summary

The correlates of the country-of-origin effect have not been adequately studied to date (Wang and Lamb 1980, 1983). Consumer attitudes towards EE products have not been adequately studied (Hisrich, Peters and Weinstein 1981). A unique set of circumstances (e.g., the reforms in Eastern Europe) allow this study to examine both topics at the same time. Eastern European countries and their

products are used to the study of correlates of the country-of-origin effect because most respondents can be expected to use country information as a halo (e.g., they know more about the country than they do about the country's products). Moreover, there should be variations among respondents' country views and product attitudes because the news of reforms in the EE countries will have diffused at different rates within the population (Zaltman 1976; Rogers 1976; Brown 1981).

2.0 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

2.1 Primary objectives

Few studies have examined how products from individual countries in Eastern Europe are evaluated. An important objective of this study was to determine how Eastern Europe and EE products were currently viewed by Canadians. The following null hypotheses were suggested:

- H1: There are no differences in the beliefs held by Canadians about the different countries of Eastern Europe.
- H2: There are no differences in the beliefs held by Canadians about the products made in different Eastern European nations.

The main objective of this research was to explore the relationship between the views of nations and attitudes towards products. The study tested to see if evaluations of foreign environmental conditions were statistically significant predictors of consumer willingness to buy and foreign product quality evaluations. The following null hypotheses were proposed:

- H3: Consumer's attitudes towards a country and its people will not be related to consumer's willingness to buy products from that country.
- H4: Consumer's attitudes towards a country and its people will not be related to their perceptions of the quality of that country's products.

2.2 Secondary objectives

This study had a number of ancillary objectives. The study investigated how product complexity affects foreign quality assessment. Extrinsic information cues influence product risk and quality judgments differently depending on the product being evaluated (Heslop, Liefeld and Wall 1988). Therefore, country-of-origin biases may be different for products which exhibit different degrees of complexity (e.g., shoes, luggage, clock radio, microwave oven). Therefore:

H5: The degree of difference in judgements of product quality across countries will not be related to the level of product complexity.

Demographic information was collected in order to see how gender, age, education, and income are related to foreign product evaluations. There has been relatively little research into the demographics of the country-of-origin bias and results have been largely inconsistent (Bilkey and Nes 1983).

H6: Women will not rate the quality of foreign products higher than men.

H7: Older people will not rate the quality of foreign products higher than younger people.

H8: Individuals with more education will not rate the quality of foreign products higher than persons with less education.

H9: Individuals with a high income will not rate the quality of foreign products higher than persons with a low income.

The survey also asked respondents how they felt the quality of goods made in a United Germany would be relative to the former "East German" and "West German" image.

H10: Respondents will not rate East and West German product quality differently.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 General overview

The study utilized a survey design involving the area sampling of consumers from the Ottawa metropolitan area. The field method used was the drop-off/pick-up technique. The focus of the research method was to ensure that study objectives were achieved in the most appropriate and efficient way. The remainder of this chapter includes a discussion of the research design, the sampling method used, the questionnaire, the data collection techniques, and the data analysis procedures.

3.2 Research design

An *ex post facto* survey design was chosen because it allows large populations to be described and studied with speed and economy (Davis and Cosenza 1988). It is commonly used in social psychological studies which examine views towards nations (Wish, Deustch and Biener 1970; Sherman 1973; and Forgas and O'Driscoll 1984) and in consumer marketing studies that explore attitudes towards different countries' products (Schooler 1965, 1971; Nagashima 1970, 1977; Papadopoulos et al. 1987). The research was cross sectional, measuring the variables of interest at one point in time.

3.3 Sampling

3.2.1 Sample design

The sample was drawn using a probability design. Area sampling was utilized because of its ability to generate an efficient sample (Davis and Cosenza 1988).

3.2.2 The study population

The population under investigation was Canadian citizens over 18 years of age living in households in the Ottawa metropolitan area during the time period, February 5-14, 1991. The Ottawa metropolitan area includes the cities of Ottawa, Nepean, and Gloucester. This area was selected because it was the researcher's place of residence.

3.2.3 Sampling frame

The sample was drawn using multi-stage sampling procedures. In the first stage specific areas were randomly selected from a grid map of the Ottawa metropolitan area. Next, starting points were randomly selected within each area. From each starting point the interviewer then began a prescribed walking pattern systematically sampling every third house. No more than five respondents were sampled from any given city block.

3.2.4 The sample unit

The sampling unit was households in the Ottawa metropolitan area.

3.2.5 The sample element

The sample element was Canadian citizens over eighteen years of age resident in the Ottawa metropolitan area.

3.2.6 Sample size

The study sought a sample size that would efficiently control both Type I and Type II errors. In order to calculate an optimal sample size, the size requirements for each type of statistical analysis were considered. The three most statistically stringent procedures that were carried out were principal components analysis, multiple regression and multivariate analysis of variance. A target sample size was selected based on the general advice of statisticians (Stevens 1986). Where appropriate power tables were consulted. Given the procedures to be performed it appeared that statistical integrity could be achieved with a sample size of approximately 300 respondents, i.e., two groups of 150 each.

3.3 The questionnaire

The questionnaire was comprised of five sections (see Appendix A). The first section consisted of twenty questions which asked respondents how they viewed countries and their people. The second part of the questionnaire was comprised of twenty questions which collected respondent attitude ratings towards a countries' products. The first sixteen of these questions collected general product attitude ratings and the remaining four collected specific product attitude ratings. Section three of the data collection instrument contained two questions which

collected respondent attitude ratings towards products from a reunified Germany. The fourth part of the questionnaire asked respondents to provide basic demographic information. The final portion of the questionnaire asked respondents questions about eight potential sources of country information.

The data on attitudes was collected using semantic differential scales. These scales were comprised of bipolar phrases which anchored seven-point items on which the respondent was asked to evaluate attitude objects. This procedure was selected because it is widely used in image studies where competitive comparisons are made (Davis and Cosenza 1988). Semantic differential scales are commonly used in country-of-origin research (Nagashima 1970,1977).

Most of the specific questions posed in the questionnaire were drawn from the social psychology (Wish, Deutsch and Biener 1970; Sherman 1973; Forgas and O'Driscoll 1984; Marin and Salazar 1985) and marketing literatures (Nagashima 1970, 1977; Papadopoulos and Heslop 1986). Country items were selected based on two criteria: 1) the item had loaded well in previous research on a country evaluation factor (e.g., economic development, political ideology, and culture), 2) the cognitive, affective, and conative aspects of attitude would each be well represented. Product items were selected based on how they had loaded on product dimensions (e.g., product integrity, market presence, etc.) in previous research. Again, it was ensured that each component of attitude would be represented (see Appendix B).

Four questions asked respondents to rate the product quality of the following specific products: shoes, luggage, clock radio, and a microwave oven. These consumer products were selected because it was felt that they represented a broad range of product complexity. Moreover, all of these products are or could be produced in EE countries. Section three of the questionnaire contained two questions : asking how United German goods would be perceived relative to East and West German goods. These questions were asked to try and gauge what the "new" German product quality image will be. Section five of the questionnaire asked respondents about their sources of country information. These questions were included to make sure that respondents of a particular ethnic background were not over-sampled (e.g., the sample was not accidentally collected from a neighbourhood with many citizens of Polish descent, etc.)

Eastern European country and product images were selected as a stimulus set because they were considered suitable for the study of country/product relationships, and because these images have not been adequately studied in and of themselves (Hisrich, Peters and Weinstein 1981). As of 1990 the United Nations considered Eastern Europe to be composed of the following countries; Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia. Given the set of questions to be asked, the number of countries which could be examined was limited. Survey questionnaires of over twelve pages normally have poor response rates because of respondent fatigue (Dillman 1977). Therefore, all nine countries could not be included in the questionnaire due to length considerations.

The final country selection was based on three criteria: 1) the size of the country, 2) the relative familiarity that Canadians would have with the country (actual trade and exposure) 3) the anticipated importance of the country in international trade. Albania with a population of 3.2 million and exports representing .1% of total EE exports to Canada and Bulgaria with a population of 9 million and exports representing 1.26% of EE exports to Canada were dropped as stimulus countries because of small size and low Canadian export levels (Europa World Year Book 1990; Statistics Canada - Imports By Nation 1990). Rumania was eliminated because of its lack of familiarity in North America (Kraljic 1990). East Germany could not be considered because it no longer existed as a political entity.

The remaining five EE countries were chosen as part of the stimulus set: Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the U.S.S.R., and Yugoslavia. In order to gauge how EE countries and products were perceived relative to the "West" it was felt that a "fully developed" country should be included in the stimulus sample. France was selected over other Western countries because of its physical proximity to Eastern Europe and its political and economic importance.

In total six country and product images were examined. Again, due to length considerations, all six images could not be accommodated in one survey version. Therefore, two survey versions were created, each with a subset of countries. An important goal was to create as much balance as possible between the two versions. It was believed that the U.S.S.R. could not be placed in one version

and not the other. The U.S.S.R. is the seat of communism and was the controlling country of the Eastern communist bloc. The Soviet Union is much larger than any other EE country in terms of population and geography. It has considerably more military and political power than does any other EE country. Largely due to these factors, the U.S.S.R. receives more media coverage than other EE countries. For economic and political reasons the country and product images of the U.S.S.R. are of critical importance. Therefore, it was decided that the U.S.S.R. would be a stimulus sample country in both versions of the questionnaire. France, as the only "Western" nation in the questionnaire, was also included in both versions. The remaining four EE countries were randomly divided between the two versions of the questionnaire with Hungary and Czechoslovakia in one and Poland and Yugoslavia in the other.

3.4 Data collection procedures

The data used in this study was collected by trained interviewers. The interviewers were directed to provide respondents with a standard set of instructions (e.g., respondents were instructed to answer the questionnaire individually) and were advised on how to appropriately answer inquiries. Interviewers collected the data utilizing the drop-off/pick-up technique which proceeded as follows: a household was approached, a questionnaire was left with the complying respondent, the interviewer returned to retrieve the questionnaire after a specified period of time (usually one hour). This data collection technique was selected because it usually yields a high response rate, and data is

collected in a short period of time (Papadopoulos, Heslop, Graby, and Avlonitis 1987). The gender characteristics of the sample were monitored during data collection to ensure equal representation of males and females. However, there was an equal number of women and men in the sample realized. Therefore, quota sampling proved unnecessary.

3.5 Data analysis procedures

An important objective of this research was to see if and how respondents differentiated between country origins. To achieve this objective both within-subject and between-subject designs were used. The study utilized primarily a within-subject design because it was interested in identifying the net effects of stimuli, or within-subject differences between experimental conditions. The net effect of stimuli represents an incremental change in rating based on country stimuli. It refers, for example, to the difference that would result if a Made in Czechoslovakia product cue was replaced with a Made in the U.S.S.R. product cue.

The net effects of stimuli are easily obtainable in within-subject design, but not in between-subject design (Anderson 1982; Davidson and Morrison 1983; Pagel and Davidson 1984). This is because within-subject designs can isolate the variability due to differences between individuals. Due to the many differences in experience and background, the responses of people to the same experimental treatment are likely to show a large variability. If the variability due to the individual can be separated from treatment effects and experimenter error, then

the power of the experiment can be greatly increased. Winer (1962) notes that a main purpose of experiments in which the same subject is observed under numerous treatments is to provide a control on the differences between subjects.

The within-subjects design is appropriate for comparisons within each survey grouping. Using a within-subjects design it was possible to make the following EE country and country product comparisons: U.S.S.R./Hungary (Version I), U.S.S.R./Czechoslovakia (Version I), Hungary/Czechoslovakia (Version I), U.S.S.R./Poland (Version II), U.S.S.R./Yugoslavia (Version II), and Poland/Yugoslavia (Version II). It was possible to compare France to each EE origin as it was common to both survey versions.

A between-subjects design was appropriate for the comparison of country and country products that were being compared across versions. The following between-subjects pairwise comparisons were generated: Hungary/Poland, Hungary/Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia/Poland, and Czechoslovakia/Yugoslavia.

The analysis to be performed on the within-subjects comparisons was quite different from the analysis to be performed on the between-subjects pairwise comparisons. The former required the use of doubly multivariate analysis, while the latter dictated a basic two group multivariate analysis of variance technique.

A doubly multivariate analysis implies that more than one variable is being measured across more than one treatment or occasion (Barcikowski 1983; Thomas 1983; SPSSX User's Guide 1988). The multivariate repeated measures analysis

generates a contrast matrix with $K-1$ dependent variables (K =treatment). In univariate repeated measures there would be one dependent variable measured over K treatments. In the multivariate set up $K-1$ dependent variables are contrasted (Barcikowski 1983).

The main objective of this study was to investigate how views of a country were related to attitudes towards that country's products. Pearson product moment correlations were generated to ascertain the association between country views and product attitudes. Multiple regression analysis was used to estimate how country views predict product attitudes. In the multiple regression analysis there were originally twenty predictor variables. The number of predictors was reduced to eleven by employing four composite variables. These variables were generated using insights gleaned from principal components analysis (see Appendix C)

Each of the data analysis techniques used is based on various underlying assumptions. The importance of these assumptions and the consideration given to model violations are discussed at length in Appendix D. Appendix D also looks at how outliers were handled in each analysis.

4. THE PRE-ANALYTIC PROCESS

After the data was collected, it was checked for clarity, readability, consistency, and completeness. Editing for clarity and readability made the data easily understandable. It also allowed for an efficient transfer of information to computer disk.

4.1 Error check

Before analysis of the data could proceed it had to be ensured that the data was entered accurately. For this study two types of error checks were performed. To ensure that the proper score had been entered for each variable, the entire data set was manually examined. Each questionnaire was read and compared to a hard copy of the data that had been initially entered.

The second type of error check was a pre-analytic computer check. The data was subjected to its final screening for completeness and consistency. Frequency tabulations were generated for the entire set of questions. These frequencies were then assessed for inconsistencies and missing data.

4.2 Independent variable development in multiple regressions

Before a formal analysis of the data could begin the variables to be investigated were selected. Composite variables were desired and were generated for the multiple regression analyses. These composite variables were constructed using information derived through the use of principal components analysis. The

results of a study by Lord and Novick (1968) suggest that a small number of predictors be used in regression analysis. Reducing the number of variables can often clarify interpretations and generate parsimonious results (Stevens 1986). In multiple regression generating a stable equation is desirable. The number of potential predictors eligible for inclusion in a multiple regression equation must be carefully considered. If too many predictors are entered, relative to the number of observations, then the regression equation will be unstable.

Preselection of predictors from a larger set tends to generate a sample-specific regression equation (Nunnally 1978; Wilkinson 1979). Some of the variables would likely have high correlations with the dependent variable due to sampling error. Stevens (1986) notes that it is wise to work with as small a set of predictors as possible. He recommends that the researcher have about fifteen respondents per predictor ($N/K = 15/1$) to establish a reliable regression equation. Based on the analysis outlined in Appendix C, principal components analysis was used to reduce the original number of predictor variables.

COMPOSITE PREDICTORS

AFFILIATION:

Should Not/Should Have Closer Ties With
 Would Not/ Would Welcome More Immigration From
 Would Not/Would Favour Further Canadian Investment In
 Dislike/Like
 Not Trustworthy/Trustworthy People

TECHNICAL ADVANCEMENT:

Not Industrialized/Industrialized
Uneducated People/Educated People

SECURITY:

Poor/Rich
Unstable/Stable

POLITICAL IDEOLOGY:

Few/Many Rights
Autocratic/Democratic

Principal Components Analysis allowed a reduction in the number of dependent variables from twenty to thirteen (four composite and nine simple). This improved the N/K ratio from 7/1 to approximately 11/1 which is close to the N/K ratio proposed by Stevens (1986).

4.3 Dependent variable selection for multiple regressions

There were sixteen product attitude rating questions which could have served as a dependent variable in the study's regression analyses. However, this study was particularly interested in items which would, to some degree, summarize all product items. Two dependent variables were included in the questionnaire for this purpose (see Appendix B). Willingness to buy a country's products was used as one of the dependent variables because it directly asked about future purchase intent. Purchase intentions are of considerable importance to the marketer. Overall product quality evaluation was used as the other dependent variable because it allowed respondents to summarize their overall impression of a

country's products. That is, it allowed each respondent to weigh each individual product attribute in accordance with personal priorities.

4.4 Tests of French and Soviet profiles by survey version

In this study there were two separate survey versions (see section 3.3). French and Soviet country and product attitude ratings were collected in each version. Multivariate analysis of variance was used to ensure that the country and product images of France and the U.S.S.R. did not vary by survey version. The results of the MANOVA analyses indicated that the country and product profiles of these countries did not differ significantly ($p < .05$) by version (see Appendix N). Therefore, the samples for the analysis of these two countries were combined where appropriate. This result also suggests that sampling is not responsible for the differences in views between version I countries (Hungary, Czechoslovakia) and Version II countries (Poland, Yugoslavia).

5.0 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

This chapter describes the results of the study. It is separated into ten sections as follows: 1) descriptive sample statistics, 2) general results and variance analysis of country ratings (significance test of null H1), 3) general results and variance analysis of product attitude ratings (significance test of null H2), 4) correlation and regression analysis (significance tests of null H3, H4), 5-10) analysis of secondary objectives (significance tests of null H5 - H10).

5.1 Descriptive sample statistics

Overall, interviewers approached 729 households. In 236 cases the residents were not at home. Respondents returned a completed questionnaire in 305 of the remaining 496 cases (61.5%). This return rate is similar to rates experienced by other researchers using the drop-off/pick-up technique (Papadopoulos, Heslop, Graby and Avlonitis 1987). Table 6.1 provides a complete breakdown of the sample and the population (Ottawa Metropolitan Area). Male respondents represent 54% of the sample while females account for 46% of overall response. All age groups are represented reasonably well in the sample. Education and income levels were higher than the population of the Ottawa metropolitan area. Education differences may be explained by the fact that educated individuals tend to give their public opinions more freely than do less educated individuals (Fowler 1988). Those with higher education also generally have higher incomes so, the income distribution variance in the sample distribution can be linked to the education distribution. Income differences between the population and the sample can also be explained by wage increases from the time of the census (1986) to the time of this study (1991).

Table 5.1 - Demographic Breakdown Of Survey And Overall Population

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Population</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Sex		
Male	54	49
Female	46	51
Age		
Less than 20	3*	14
20-24 years	10	10
25-29 years	10	10
30-34 years	14	9
35-39 years	13	9
40-44 years	15	7
45-49 years	8	6
50-54 years	6	5
55-59 years	7	5
60-64 years	3	4
65 or more	9	10
Education		
Less than High School	10**	30
High School	13	14
Post Secondary	35	36
University Degree	42	20
Income		
Under \$15,000	6***	16
\$15,000-\$24,999	5	14
\$25,000-\$34,999	15	15
\$35,000-\$44,999	16	15
\$45,000-\$59,999	20	18
\$60,000 and over	37	22

Note:

The population statistics are from the Statistics Canada 1986 census of the Ottawa Metropolitan Area.

- * The main reason only 3% of the sample was under twenty years of age is that survey respondents were required to be a minimum of eighteen years of age. Therefore, the 3% represents respondents aged eighteen or nineteen years.
- ** The survey sample had very few respondents with less than a high school degree largely because there are no respondents under eighteen years of age in the sample
- *** The survey sample has a higher income than the overall population partially due to general increases in income during the period 1986-1991. The Canadian Price Index stood at 125, for base year 1986, when the data from this study was collected.

5.2 General results and variance analysis of country ratings

This section looks at respondent's views of countries and their people. Table 5.2 provides a summary of mean ratings.

Table 5.2 - Means For Country Items

<u>VARIABLE*</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>Y</u>
Know A Lot About	<u>4.08</u> ⁺	3.26	2.42	2.70	2.84	2.24
Industrialized	<u>5.74</u>	4.30	3.84	4.68	4.14	3.85
Educated	<u>5.90</u>	4.21	4.12	4.81	4.23	4.00
Active	<u>5.29</u>	3.97	4.12	4.57	4.67	4.18
Hardworking	4.71	4.83	4.84	<u>5.09</u>	4.94	4.65
Rich	<u>5.16</u>	2.61	2.97	<u>3.36</u>	2.40	2.73
Stable	<u>5.31</u>	2.59	3.54	3.96	3.18	3.43
Safe	<u>5.36</u>	3.32	4.28	4.30	4.08	4.08
Peaceful	<u>4.80</u>	3.37	4.67	4.74	4.68	4.58
Democratic	<u>5.30</u>	2.17	3.39	3.62	3.63	3.04
Many Rights	<u>5.51</u>	2.14	3.12	3.14	3.12	3.14
Individualistic	<u>4.60</u>	2.98	3.49	3.78	3.59	3.67
Western Culture	<u>4.87</u>	2.70	3.28	3.54	3.53	3.39
An Ideal Country	<u>4.80</u>	2.23	3.02	3.46	3.01	3.16
I Like	<u>5.61</u>	4.25	4.75	5.03	4.64	4.70
Trustworthy	<u>5.24</u>	4.31	4.86	5.01	5.00	4.84
Welcome Immigration From	4.57	4.42	4.75	<u>5.06</u>	4.66	4.62
Aligned With Canada	<u>4.84</u>	3.29	3.47	3.79	3.72	3.45
Should Have Closer Ties With	<u>5.10</u>	4.91	4.79	5.00	4.92	4.83
Favour Investment In	4.65	4.43	4.53	<u>4.88</u>	4.74	4.37
Average Score	<u>5.07</u>	3.51	3.91	4.23	3.99	3.85

Legend

F = France, U = U.S.S.R, H = Hungary, C = Czechoslovakia

P = Poland, Y = Yugoslavia

* Variable name given is the positive end of the scale

+ Scores could range from 1 (Low) to 7 (High)

Underline = highest score of all the countries

Bold = lowest score of all the countries

Table 5.2 reveals that there were considerable differences between country profiles. France has the highest average rating score followed by Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and the U.S.S.R.. France received the highest rating on 17 of the 20 country questions. Czechoslovakia received the highest rating on the remaining 3 questions ("Hardworking", "Welcome Immigration From", and Favour Investment In") and the second highest rating on 14 of the questions. The U.S.S.R. received the lowest rating 14 out of 20 times.

5.2.1 France

Study respondents gave France the most positive country rating. France was viewed as being more industrialized, educated, stable, rich, democratic, ideal, safe, active, likeable, and individualistic than the EE countries. Respondents knew more about France and felt that France was more "Western" culturally. Moreover, they felt that France was more aligned with Canada and that the French enjoyed more rights than did Eastern Europeans. On the items "Peaceful" and "Should Have Closer Ties With", France received the highest rating but not a significantly higher rating than the EE countries, except for the U.S.S.R.. On the question of desiring closer ties with, France was not rated significantly higher than the other nations. Table 5.3 provides a summary of within-subjects pairwise differences and similarities between France and the EE countries included in the study.

Table 5.3 - Differences In Country Ratings, France vs.EE

Repeated Measures Tukey's tests at $p < .01$	France Vs.				
	U	H	C	P	Y
Variable\Country Comparison					
Know A Lot About	*	*	*	*	*
Industrialized	*	*	*	*	*
Educated	*	*	*	*	*
Active	*	*	*	*	*
Hardworking	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Rich	*	*	*	*	*
Stable	*	*	*	*	*
Safe	*	*	*	*	*
Peaceful	*	NS	NS	NS	NS
Democratic	*	*	*	*	*
Many Rights	*	*	*	*	*
Individualistic	*	*	*	*	*
Western Culture	*	*	*	*	*
An Ideal Country	*	*	*	*	*
I Like	*	*	*	*	*
Trustworthy	*	*	NS	NS	NS
Welcome Immigration From	NS	NS	Y	NS	NS
Aligned With Canada	*	*	*	*	*
Should Have Closer Ties With	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Favour Investment In	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Total # Of Sig. Differences	16	15	15	14	14

Legend

U = U.S.S.R, H = Hungary, C = Czechoslovakia
P = Poland, Y = Yugoslavia
* = Significant at $p < .01$
NS= Not Significant
Y = Czechoslovakia Sig. more positive at $p < .01$

While France received the highest ratings overall, there remained some areas where it was judged less favourably than the EE countries. On the question of investment worthiness, France was rated third after both Czechoslovakia and Poland. In terms of work ethic only Yugoslavians were judged less hard working than the French. Finally, respondents were more favourably disposed to welcoming immigrants from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia than they were to welcoming French immigrants, but only for Czechoslovakian immigrants was the difference statistically significant.

Given that familiarity and similarity are consistently identified with attraction (Byrne and Nelson 1965; Hill and Stull 1981) it was not surprising to find that France had the most positive country image. Respondents, when comparing the EE countries to France were found to, 1) know significantly more about France and 2) rate France as being significantly more aligned with Canada.

5.2.2 Analysis of H1 (differences in EE country images)

Doubly multivariate within-subjects comparisons were used to test whether there were differences in the beliefs held by Canadians about the different countries of Eastern Europe. If a significant difference existed between country profiles, the null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that respondents had significantly different attitudes towards different EE countries (significance is outlined below).

The within-subjects doubly multivariate analysis involved a set of two tests (one for each survey grouping). Therefore, for each test overall alpha was set at $.05/2 = .025$. Rao's "F" approximation of Wilk's lambda was used as the test statistic in the analysis. The decision rule was to reject null H1 if $p < .025$ for observed "F" (for either doubly multivariate analysis).

Each analysis was run on SPSSX MANOVA (for Wilk's lambda and exact "F" see Appendix E). Both doubly multivariate analyses were significant at $p < .001$, therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that respondents believe there are differences between the countries of Eastern Europe.

Having established overall difference, the next step was to determine which country profiles differed. To establish which country pairings differed, pairwise doubly multivariate tests were performed. Within each survey grouping there were three possible pairwise profile comparisons. To keep overall alpha for a set of pairwise tests under control Stevens (1986) suggests that the researcher select a target overall alpha level and partition this alpha evenly over the individual pairwise multivariate tests. Alpha (the probability of making a Type I error) was set at $.05/3 = .017$ for each pairwise comparison. In this manner overall Type I error remained less than or equal to .05. Country profiles were considered significantly different when "F" observed was significantly large such that $p < .017$. All pairwise country comparisons were significantly different (Version I - USSR/Hungary, USSR/Czechoslovakia, Hungary/Czechoslovakia, Version II -

USSR/Poland, USSR/Yugoslavia, Poland/Yugoslavia). Table 5.4 and 5.5 provide a summary of within-subjects differences and similarities.

Table 5.4 - Doubly Multivariate Analysis Of EE Country Differences

(Survey Grouping #1)

Significant Differences For Country Items

Overall Doubly Multivariate Significance $p = .001$

Pairwise Doubly Multivariate Significance	U/H $p = .001$	U/C $p = .001$	H/C $p = .001$
Variable\Country Comparison	Sig. Of Tukey's Tests		
Know A Lot About	*	*	NS
Industrialized	NS	NS	*
Educated	NS	*	*
Active	NS	*	*
Hardworking	NS	NS	NS
Rich	NS	*	*
Stable	*	*	NS
Safe	*	*	NS
Peaceful	*	*	NS
Democratic	*	*	NS
Many Rights	*	*	NS
Individualistic	*	*	NS
Western Culture	*	*	NS
An Ideal Country	*	*	*
I Like	*	*	NS
Trustworthy	*	*	NS
Welcome Immigration From	NS	*	NS
Aligned With Canada	NS	NS	NS
Should Have Closer Ties With	NS	NS	NS
Favour Investment In	NS	*	NS
Total # Of Sig. Differences	11	16	5

Legend

U = U.S.S.R, H = Hungary, C = Czechoslovakia

* = Significant at $p < .01$

NS = Not Significant

Table 5.5 - Doubly Multivariate Analysis Of EE Country Differences

(Survey Grouping #2)

Significant Differences For Country Items

Overall Doubly Multivariate Significance $p = .001$

Pairwise Doubly Multivariate Significance	U/P $p = .001$	U/Y $p = .001$	P/Y $p = .001$
Variable\Country Comparison	Sig. Of Tukey's Tests		
Know A Lot About	NS	*	*
Industrialized	NS	*	NS
Educated	NS	NS	NS
Active	*	NS	*
Hardworking	NS	NS	NS
Rich	NS	NS	*
Stable	*	*	NS
Safe	*	*	NS
Peaceful	*	*	NS
Democratic	*	*	*
Many Rights	*	*	NS
Individualistic	*	*	NS
Western Culture	*	*	NS
An Ideal Country	*	*	NS
I Like	*	*	NS
Trustworthy	*	*	NS
Welcome Immigration From	NS	NS	NS
Aligned With Canada	*	NS	NS
Should Have Closer Ties With	NS	NS	NS
Favour Investment In	NS	NS	NS
Total # Of Sig. Differences	11	16	5

Legend

U = U.S.S.R, P = Poland, Y = Yugoslavia

* = Significant at $p < .01$

NS = Not Significant

Having established that all country profile comparisons were different, the next logical question was, how do the profiles differ? To answer this question differences at the variable level were examined. To ascertain which variables were rated significantly differently by respondents Tukey confidence intervals were used. In our analysis there were twenty potential differentiating variables. Each variable was assessed individually, and this resulted in twenty separate tests. To control for overall Type I error each variable was tested at $\alpha = .01$. This ensured that overall alpha was less than or equal to .20. Type I error was strictly controlled at the first two levels (for entire survey grouping $\alpha < .05$, pairwise overall profiles $\alpha < .05$). In the final post hoc procedure overall alpha was not set at as stringent a level. Therefore, differences at the variable level should be treated with more caution.

The between-subjects analysis looked at the pairwise groupings that were not possible in the within-subjects format. MANOVA was used to see if there were pairwise differences between country profiles. That is, the objective was to determine whether it was tenable that the population means in the two groups, on variables one through twenty, were equal. Given the survey groupings there were four possible between-subjects pairwise profile comparisons. These comparisons had considerably less power than the within-subjects comparisons. Therefore, it was decided that each comparison would be made at the $\alpha = .05$ level. Table 5.6 provides a summary of between-subject differences and similarities.

Table 5.6 - MANOVA Analysis Of EE Country Differences

Significant Differences For Country Items
Between-Subjects Pairwise Comparisons

Pairwise Multivariate Significance	C/P p=.001	C/Y p=.001	H/P p=.001	H/Y p=.06
Variable\Country Comparison	Sig. Of F - Tests			
Know A Lot About	NS	*	*	-
Industrialized	*	*	NS	-
Educated	*	*	NS	-
Active	NS	*	*	-
Hardworking	NS	*	NS	-
Rich	*	*	*	-
Stable	*	*	*	-
Safe	NS	NS	NS	-
Peaceful	NS	NS	NS	-
Democratic	NS	*	NS	-
Many Rights	NS	NS	NS	-
Individualistic	NS	NS	NS	-
Western Culture	NS	NS	NS	-
An Ideal Country	*	NS	NS	-
I Like	*	NS	NS	-
Trustworthy	NS	NS	NS	-
Welcome Immigration From	NS	NS	NS	-
Aligned With Canada	NS	NS	NS	-
Closer Ties With	NS	NS	NS	-
Favour Investment In	NS	*	NS	-
Total # Of Sig. Differences	6	9	4	-

Legend

C = Czechoslovakia, H = Hungary, P = Poland,
Y = Yugoslavia

* = Significant at $p < .01$

NS = Not Significant

- = Not Significant At Multivariate Level,
Univariate Results Not Interpreted

Country profiles were considered significantly different if the observed "F" was of sufficient size such that $p < .05$. To determine which variables were primarily responsible for group separation univariate "F" statistics were examined. Two countries were considered to be rated significantly differently on a variable when the variable's univariate "F" was significant at $p < .01$. In this way overall Type I error was held at .20 or less.

Tables 5.4, 5.5, and 5.6 clearly demonstrate that respondents had different views towards different EE countries. Study results indicated that EE countries have distinct profiles. All six of the within-subjects and three of the four between-subjects profile comparisons were seen as significantly different. The country profiles of Hungary and Yugoslavia were the only profiles that were seen as analogous (for exact statistics see Appendix E).

Table 5.7 provides a summary of the number of times an item differentiated between two countries. The item "Stable" was the most powerful differentiator significantly separating countries seven times, while the item "Closer Ties With" was the poorest having never been a separating variable. It is clear that respondents differentiate these countries on economic and political grounds. Respondents also differentiate the countries in terms of what they know about them and whether they have a Western culture. For the conative items, ie., those involving actions towards the country, such as receiving immigrants from or investing in, these countries were given much more similar ratings. Respondents did not differentiate among these countries on these items.

Table 5.7 - Number Of Significant EE Country Differences By Item

Variable	# Sig. Differences
Stable	7*
Rich	6
Democratic	6
An Ideal Country	6
Active	6
Know A Lot About	6
I Like	5
Industrialized	4
Educated	4
Western Culture	4
Safe	4
Many Rights	4
Peaceful	4
Trustworthy	4
Individualistic	4
Favour Investment In	2
Welcome Immigration From	1
Aligned With Canada	1
Hardworking	1
Closer Ties With	0

Legend

* = Out of a potential maximum of ten differences

5.2.3 The U.S.S.R.

Tables 5.3 - 5.6 show that the U.S.S.R has a significantly less favourable country image than the other EE countries. It received a significantly lower rating than Czechoslovakia (15 items), Hungary (10 items), Poland (12 items), and Yugoslavia (10 items). The U.S.S.R. was rated significantly lower than all the EE countries on the following items: "Western Culture", "Stable", "Democratic", "Ideal", "Safe", "Many Rights", "I Like", "Peaceful", "Trustworthy", and "Individualistic".

On the item "Industrialized" the Soviet Union was rated second among the EE nations. The U.S.S.R. was viewed as being significantly more industrialized than Yugoslavia, and it was the most well known of the EE countries, having been rated significantly higher on this item than Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia. The Soviet Union was not seen as being less industrialized, rich, and educated than Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia. However, it was seen as being significantly more undemocratic, unstable, and unsafe. Not surprisingly, it was considered the least ideal country.

5.2.4 Czechoslovakia

Czechoslovakia received the most favourable EE country ratings. It collected significantly higher ratings than the U.S.S.R. (16 items), Hungary (5 items), Poland (6 items), and Yugoslavia (10 items). Czechoslovakia was rated significantly higher than the other EE countries on the items "Educated" and "Rich". It was viewed as significantly more industrialized than all EE countries

with the exception of the U.S.S.R.. It was viewed as being significantly more stable than all the EE countries except for Hungary. All EE countries, with the exception of Yugoslavia, were judged to be significantly less ideal than Czechoslovakia, and the only people rated more active than the Czechoslovaks were the Polish. Czechoslovakia was viewed as the most economically developed EE country. The Czechoslovaks were not viewed as having a different political orientation from the Hungarians or the Polish (e.g., no significant differences on the items "Democratic", "Many Rights", and "Individualistic"). They were perceived as having a more Western culture than the Soviets but not more so than the other EE peoples.

5.2.5 Poland

Poland received the third highest average score for the country items. Of the EE countries, Poland was viewed as the most democratic but the least rich. It was perceived as being significantly more unstable than Hungary and Czechoslovakia. The Polish were viewed as being the most active of EE peoples.

5.2.6 Hungary

Hungary had the fourth highest average score for the country items. Hungary was considered the least industrialized of the EE countries in the study. Hungary had a much more positive profile than the U.S.S.R. due largely to its significantly

better ratings on political orientation ("Democratic", "Many Rights", and "Individualistic") and its more Western culture. Hungary had a less positive image than Czechoslovakia largely because it was not seen as being as economically developed ("Industrialized", "Educated", "Rich"). Hungary and Poland were significantly separated on only three items. Hungary was perceived as being more stable and rich but Hungarians were seen as being less active than the Polish. The overall profiles of Hungary and Yugoslavia were not significantly different.

5.2.7 Yugoslavia

Yugoslavia received the lowest rating on the items "Educated" and "Hardworking". Yugoslavia is the country respondents knew the least about. In fact, they knew significantly less about Yugoslavia than they did about the U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, and Poland. Yugoslavia was rated significantly more favourably on political orientation and Western culture than was the U.S.S.R.. However, Yugoslavia was viewed as being significantly less democratic than both Czechoslovakia and Poland. It was seen as being less industrialized, educated, and rich than Czechoslovakia. Yugoslavia was rated less active, but richer than Poland.

5.3 General results and variance analysis of product ratings

This section looks at respondents' attitudes towards nations' products. Table 5.8 provides a summary of product mean ratings.

Table 5.8 - Means For Product Items

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>Y</u>
Know A Lot About*	<u>3.53</u> ⁺	2.40	2.32	2.50	2.39	2.35
Recognizable Brands	<u>4.98</u>	2.70	2.80	3.35	2.80	2.79
Easy to Find	<u>4.09</u>	2.55	2.90	3.32	2.93	3.07
Good After Sales Service	<u>4.05</u>	3.20	3.60	3.73	3.35	3.48
Expensive	<u>5.44</u>	3.44	3.77	3.85	3.46	3.58
Good Value	<u>4.58</u>	3.62	4.15	4.11	4.18	4.33
Proud to Own	<u>4.72</u>	3.04	3.67	3.93	3.52	3.71
Attractive Products	<u>5.63</u>	2.70	3.95	4.13	3.59	3.81
Innovative	<u>5.30</u>	2.80	3.60	3.88	3.31	3.49
Technical Advancement	<u>5.21</u>	3.28	3.46	3.80	3.13	3.41
Reliable	<u>5.03</u>	3.31	4.03	4.30	3.73	3.98
Good Workmanship	<u>5.14</u>	3.30	4.02	4.36	3.77	3.97
Good Quality	<u>5.26</u>	2.98	3.96	4.08	3.66	3.91
Satisfied With	<u>5.04</u>	3.39	4.03	4.27	3.91	4.01
Willing to Buy	<u>5.14</u>	3.10	4.13	4.47	3.97	4.06
Good Overall Products	<u>5.20</u>	3.01	3.97	4.22	3.70	3.97
Average Score	<u>4.90</u>	3.05	3.65	3.90	3.47	3.62

Legend

F = France, U = U.S.S.R, H = Hungary, C = Czechoslovakia

P = Poland, Y = Yugoslavia

* Variable name given is the positive end of the scale

+ Scores could range from 1 (Low) to 7 (High)

Underline = highest score of all the countries

Bold = lowest score of all the countries

Table 5.8 reveals that there were considerable differences between product profiles. France had the highest average rating followed by Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Poland, and the U.S.S.R.. France received the highest rating on all individual product questions. Czechoslovakia received the second highest rating on 15 of the 16 country questions. The U.S.S.R. received the lowest rating on 14 of the 16 questions.

Two product items which are of considerable interest are "Willing To Buy" and "Good Overall Quality". These items provide an overview of the general product attitudes held by respondents. Table 5.9 outlines the distribution of response on the item "Willing To Buy".

Table 5.9 - Distribution Of Response On The Item "Willing To Buy"

Item	Rating	% of Respondents Giving Rating					
		F	U	H	C	P	Y
	7	16	4	3	8	6	5
	6	32	6	18	25	12	14
	5	22	12	15	17	18	18
% Willing To Buy		70	22	36	50	36	37
Undecided	4	18	21	38	27	31	36
	3	5	10	11	8	10	8
	2	5	24	10	9	15	10
	1	2	23	5	6	8	9
% Unwilling To Buy		12	57	26	23	33	27
Total Percentage		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Mean		5.14	3.10	4.13	4.47	3.97	4.06

More respondents were willing to buy French goods than they were EE goods. Seventy percent of respondents indicated that they were willing to buy French products (5 or higher on a 7-point scale). Respondents were least willing to buy products from the U.S.S.R.. In fact 57% were not willing to buy (3 or lower on a 7-point scale) compared to only 22% that were willing to buy. For each of the other EE countries more respondents were willing than unwilling to buy. Czechoslovakia had the highest percentage of favourable response (50%) followed by Yugoslavia (37%), Hungary (36%), and Poland (36%).

Table 5.10 outlines the distribution of response on the item "Good Overall Quality".

Table 5.10 - Distribution Of Response On The Item "Good Overall Quality"

Item	Rating	% of Respondents Giving Rating					
		F	U	H	C	P	Y
	7	10	2	2	2	1	1
	6	33	2	5	17	4	4
	5	31	5	16	14	16	21
% Good Overall Quality		74	9	23	33	21	26
Undecided	4	20	28	59	48	47	53
	3	5	23	8	11	13	10
	2	1	30	7	5	15	8
	1	0	10	3	3	4	3
% Poor Overall Quality		6	63	18	19	32	21
Total Percentage		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Mean		5.20	3.01	3.97	4.22	3.70	3.97

France received higher overall product quality ratings than did any EE country. 74% of respondents gave France a favourable rating (5 or higher on a 7 point scale). The U.S.S.R. on the other hand, received an unfavourable overall product quality rating from 63% of respondents (3 or less on a 7 point scale). For each of the remaining EE countries approximately 50% of respondents gave a median response (4). From this it can be inferred that a large percentage of respondents had neither favourable or unfavourable opinions, perhaps due to lack of knowledge. Czechoslovakia had the highest percentage of positive ratings (33%) followed by Yugoslavia (26%), Hungary (23%), and Poland (21%). Of these countries only Poland had a larger percentage of unfavourable than favourable ratings.

5.3.1 French Products

French products received superior ratings over all items. They were rated significantly higher in 94 out of 100 individual Tukey comparisons with products from EE. On the item "Good Value" France was rated significantly more positively than the U.S.S.R. but not the other EE countries. On the item "Good After Sales Service" France was not rated significantly higher than Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Eastern European products were seen as being significantly less expensive than French products. France's average product rating (4.9) was a full point higher than Czechoslovakia's second highest rating (3.9).

5.3.2 Analysis of hypothesis #2 (differences in EE products)

Doubly multivariate analysis of variance was used to test the null hypothesis that there are no differences in the beliefs held by Canadians about the products made in different EE nations. If a significant difference existed between product profiles the null hypothesis would be rejected and it would be concluded that respondents had significantly different attitudes towards products from different EE origins. This hypothesis was tested using the same within and between-subjects techniques outlined in the analysis of H1.

Both doubly multivariate analyses were significant at $p < .001$ (for Wilk's lambda and exact "F" see Appendix E). Given this result the decision was to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that respondents do believe there are differences between EE products. The doubly multivariate pairwise comparisons revealed that the following profiles were significantly different: USSR/Czechoslovakia, USSR/Hungary, USSR/Poland, and USSR/Yugoslavia. Polish & Yugoslavian ($p < .285$) products and Czechoslovakian & Hungarian ($p < .074$) were not seen as being significantly different in character. The between-subjects pairwise profile comparisons of Czechoslovakia/Poland and Czechoslovakia/Yugoslavia were rated significantly differently. The profile comparisons between Hungary/Poland ($p < .542$) and Hungary/Yugoslavia ($p < .931$) were not perceived as being significantly different.

Sixteen independent Tukey's tests were performed to determine how the product profiles varied. Alpha was set to .01 for each test. This yielded an overall alpha

of $< .16$. Univariate "F" statistics were used to determine which variables were responsible for group differentiation in the between-subjects analyses. Tables 5.11 and 5.12 provide a summary of all within-subjects pairwise differences and similarities. Table 5.13 provides a summary of between-subjects pairwise differences and similarities.

**Table 5.11 - Doubly Multivariate Analysis Of EE Product
Differences (Survey Grouping #1)
Significant Differences For Product Items**

Overall Doubly Multivariate Significance $p = .001$

Pairwise Doubly Multivariate Significance	U/H $p = .001$	U/C $p = .001$	H/C $p = .074$
Variable\Product Comparison	Sig. Of Tukey's Tests		
Know A Lot About	NS	NS	-
Recognizable Brands	NS	*	-
Easy To Find	NS	*	-
Good After Sales Service	NS	*	-
Expensive	NS	*	-
Good Value	*	*	-
Proud to Own	*	*	-
Attractive Products	*	*	-
Innovative	*	*	-
Technically Advanced	NS	*	-
Reliable	*	*	-
Good Workmanship	*	*	-
Good Quality	*	*	-
Satisfied With	*	*	-
Willing to Buy	*	*	-
Good Overall Products	*	*	-
Total # of Sig. Differences	10	15	-

Legend

U = U.S.S.R., C = Czechoslovakia, H = Hungary,
 * = Significant at $p < .01$
 NS = Not Significant
 - = Not Significant At Multivariate Level,
 Univariate Results Not Interpreted

Table 5.12 - Doubly Multivariate Analysis Of EE Product Differences

(Survey Grouping #2)

Significant Differences For Product Items

Overall Doubly Multivariate Significance $p = .001$

Pairwise Doubly Multivariate Significance	U/P $p = .001$	U/Y $p = .001$	P/Y $p = .285$
Variable\Product Comparison	Sig. Of Tukey's Tests		
Know A Lot About	NS	NS	-
Recognizable Brands	NS	NS	-
Easy To Find	*	*	-
Good After Sales Service	NS	*	-
Expensive	NS	NS	-
Good Value	*	*	-
Proud to Own	*	*	-
Attractive Products	*	*	-
Innovative	*	*	-
Technically Advanced	NS	NS	-
Reliable	*	NS	-
Good Workmanship	*	*	-
Good Quality	*	*	-
Satisfied With	*	*	-
Willing to Buy	*	*	-
Good Overall Products	*	*	-
Total # of Sig. Differences	11	11	-

Legend

U = U.S.S.R., P = Poland, Y = Yugoslavia

* = Significant at $p < .01$

NS = Not Significant

- = Not Significant At Multivariate Level,
Univariate Results Not Interpreted

Table 5.13 - MANOVA Analysis Of EE Product Differences

**Significant Differences For Product Items
Between Subjects Pairwise Comparisons**

Pairwise Multivariate Significance	C/P p=.012	C/Y p=.026	H/P p=.542	H/Y p=.931
Variable\Product Comparison	Sig. Of F - Tests			
Know A Lot About	NS	NS	-	-
Recognizable Brands	*	*	-	-
Easy To Find	NS	NS	-	-
Good After Sales Service	*	NS	-	-
Expensive	NS	NS	-	-
Good Value	NS	NS	-	-
Proud to Own	NS	NS	-	-
Attractive Products	*	NS	-	-
Innovative	*	*	-	-
Technically Advanced	*	*	-	-
Reliable	*	NS	-	-
Good Workmanship	*	*	-	-
Good Quality	NS	NS	-	-
Satisfied With	*	NS	-	-
Willing to Buy	NS	NS	-	-
Good Overall Products	*	NS	-	-
Total # of Sig. Differences	9	4	-	-

Legend

C = Czechoslovakia, H = Hungary, P = Poland, Y = Yugoslavia

* = Significant at $p < .01$

NS = Not Significant

- = Not Significant At Multivariate Level,
Univariate Results Not Interpreted

The tables presented above show that respondents had different views towards the products of different EE countries. Study results indicate that some EE countries have different product profiles. Six of ten possible pairwise profile comparisons were seen as significantly different by respondents. The products of EE were differentiated on some items more than on others. Table 5.14 provides a summary of the number of times an item differentiated between two product profiles.

Table 5.14 - Number Of Significant Product Differences By Item

Variable	# Of Sig. Differences
Innovative	6*
Good Workmanship	6
Attractive Products	5
Satisfied With	5
Good Overall Products	5
Good Value	4
Willing To Buy	4
Good Quality	4
Reliable	4
Proud	4
Recognizable Brands	3
Technically Advanced	3
Good After Sales Service	3
Easy To Find	3
Expensive	1
Know A Lot About	0

Legend

* = Out of a potential maximum of ten differences

The items "Innovative" and "Good Workmanship" were the best differentiators each having significantly separated countries' products six times. Other items which referred to a product's integrity such as "Attractive" and "Good Overall Products" were also good differentiators. The items which referred to a product's market presence such as "Recognizable Brands", "Easy To Find", and "Know A Lot About" were poor separators for these countries' products. Respondents tended to use these items in a similar fashion for all the countries examined. The items "Expensive" and "Technically Advanced" were also poor product differentiators.

5.3.3 Soviet products

Tables 5.8 - 5.13 reveal that the U.S.S.R. had a significantly less favourable product image than the other EE countries. The U.S.S.R. received a significantly lower rating than Czechoslovakia (15 items), Poland (11 items), Yugoslavia (11 items), and Hungary (10 items). It was rated significantly lower than the other EE countries on the following items: "Attractive Products", "Good Value", "Willing To Buy", "Innovative", "Good Quality", "Proud To Own", "Good Workmanship", "Satisfied With", and "Good Overall Products". The U.S.S.R. had the lowest rating on fourteen of the sixteen product questions. The only items that it was not the lowest rated in were "Know A Lot About" and "Technically Advanced".

5.3.4 Czechoslovakian products

Czechoslovakia received the most favourable product ratings of any of the EE countries. It had a significantly more positive product image than the U.S.S.R., Poland, and Yugoslavia. Compared to these countries Czechoslovakia was rated significantly higher on the following items: "Innovative", "Recognizable Brands", "Technically Advanced", and "Good Workmanship". However Czechoslovakia did not have a significantly more positive product image than Hungary.

5.3.5 Polish products

Polish products were rated more highly than Soviet products, less highly than Czechoslovakian products, and not significantly differently from Hungarian or Yugoslavian products. Only the Soviet Union had a lower average product rating score than Poland. Polish products were rated the least technically advanced. Table 5.8 reveals that Polish goods were rated low on product integrity items, low on market presence items, and low on price.

5.3.6 Hungarian products

Hungarian products received more favourable product ratings than Soviet products but were not rated significantly differently from Czechoslovakian, Polish, and Yugoslavian goods. When compared to the products of the other EE origins Hungarian goods were rated second or tied for second on 12 of the 16 product items. Their goods received the third highest average product profile score. Respondents knew the least about Hungarian products.

5.3.7 Yugoslavian products

Yugoslavian products were rated more favourably than Soviet products but less favourably than Czechoslovakian products. Yugoslavia's product profile was not significantly different from either Hungary's or Poland's. Its average product profile score ranked fourth overall. Yugoslavia had the highest rating of the EE countries on the product item "Good Value".

5.3.8 Overview - country and product differences

The results of this study show that respondents believe there are many differences in the country and product profiles they examined. However, the country images were much more distinct than were the product images. France had the most favourable country and product images and the U.S.S.R. had the most unfavourable country and product images. Czechoslovakia had a country image and a product image that was superior to that of the U.S.S.R. and more favourable than that of the other EE countries. There were a few significant country differences and no significant product differences, between the countries Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia. The country profiles of these countries were neither more favourable nor less favourable than one another.

5.4 Correlation and regression analysis

This portion of the results section examines the relationship between views of countries and attitudes towards products. Pearson product moment correlations were used to examine how country items were associated with 1) the product

item "Willing To Buy" and 2) the product item "Good Overall Products". Next, null H3 and null H4 were tested using regression analysis.

Simple correlations give a measure of association between variables. Tables 5.15 and 5.16 report significant simple correlations ($p < .001$) between the country items and "Willing To Buy" and "Good Overall Products" respectively. These tables contain the original twenty items plus four composite items. A stringent level of significance was required because of the number of tests performed (144 for each product item), since correlations at lower levels of significance might easily be chance occurrences. Interpreting the practical significance of a correlation is a highly subjective exercise. A stringent test of significance allowed correlations to be examined which, at the very least, were not likely to be chance occurrences. It should be noted that the significance of a correlation is affected by sample size. The sample size for the French and Soviet country profiles was approximately 305, while it was only approximately 150 for the other countries. This means that it is more likely that significant results will be found for France and the U.S.S.R.. Therefore, the actual size of the correlation must be taken into account. Tabachnick and Fidell (1983) suggest that only correlations of approximately .30 or greater be interpreted. The majority of the correlations in presented in tables 5.15 and 5.16 meet this criterion.

**Table 5.15 - Significant Correlations Of Country Variables
And "Willing To Buy"**

Country Variable	Willing To Buy					
	U	H	C	P	Y	F
*Tech. Advan. Industrialized Educated	.19			.26		.21 .18 .18
*Security Stable Rich						.20
*Polit. Align Democratic Many Rights						.17
*Affiliation	.32	.43	.38	.31	.33	.39
Closer Ties With	.21	.31	.38		.29	.35
Welcome Imm. From		.42	.27	.24	.25	.27
Favour Invest. In	.24	.30	.38		.27	.26
I Like	.37	.36	.27		.29	.33
Trustworthy	.26	.29		.31		.24
Know A Lot About Western Culture				.25		.18 .18
Individualistic						
An Ideal Country	.24					.33
Aligned With Can.						
Safe				.29		.21
Peaceful						
Active						.23
Hardworking						
# Sig. Diff.+	7	6	5	6	5	16

Legend

U = U.S.S.R., C = Czechoslovakia, H = Hungary,
P = Poland, Y = Yugoslavia, and F = France
* Composite Variable
+ Correlations Shown Are Significant at $p < .001$

**Table 5.16 - Significant Correlations Of Country Variables
And "Good Overall Products"**

Country Variable	Overall Product Evaluation					
	U	H	C	P	Y	F
*Tech. Advan. Industrialized Educated	.20 .20			.31 .26 .26		.37 .33 .32
*Security Stable Rich				.28 .27		.35 .30 .30
*Polit. Align. Democratic Many Rights						.23 .19 .19
*Affiliation Closer Ties With Welcome Imm. From Favour Invest. In I Like Trustworthy		.41 .40 .29 .36 .33	.30 .28		.26	.37 .30 .21 .29 .35 .27
Know A Lot About Western Culture Individualistic An Ideal Country Aligned With Can. Safe Peaceful Active Hardworking	.18	.27	.27	.29	.28 .25 .32	.27 .25 .36 .18 .18 .23 .17
# Of Sig. Diff.+	3	6	3	7	4	22

Legend

U = U.S.S.R., C = Czechoslovakia, H = Hungary,
P = Poland, Y = Yugoslavia, and F = France
* Composite Variable
+ Correlations Shown Are Significant at $p < .001$

Tables 5.15 and 5.16 reveal that there are a relatively large number of highly significant correlations between country views and product attitude items. The product items "Willing To Buy" and "Good Overall Products" were each significantly correlated with the nation variables 45 out of 144 times. Table 5.17 shows that certain items are more consistently associated with the product items.

Table 5.17 - Number Of Significant Country Item Correlations By Variable

Country Var.\Product Var.	"Willing"	"Quality"	Total
I Like	5	4	9+
Favour Investment In	5	3	8
Affiliation*	6	2	8
Should Have Closer Ties With	5	2	7
Trustworthy	4	3	7
Welcome Immigration From	5	1	6
Industrialized	2	3	5
Educated	2	2	4
An Ideal Country	2	2	4
Aligned With Canada	0	4	4
Technical Advancedment*	1	3	4
Western Culture	2	1	3
Safe	2	1	3
Security*	1	2	3
Know A Lot About	1	1	2
Rich	0	2	2
Active	1	1	2
Many Rights	1	1	2
Hard Working	0	2	2
Stable	0	1	1
Democratic	0	1	1
Peaceful	0	1	1
Individualistic	0	1	1
Political Alignment*			
Total # Of Sig. Differences	45	45	90

Legend

+ = Out of a potential maximum of twelve differences

* = Composite variable

The following items were frequently strongly correlated with the item "Willing To Buy": "Affiliation", "Welcome Immigration From", "I Like", "Should Have Closer Ties With", "Favour Investment In", and "Trustworthy". The following items were frequently strongly correlated with the item "Good Overall Products": "I Like", "Aligned With Canada", "Industrialized", "Trustworthy", "Favour Investment In", and "Technical Advancedment".

Considering the number of significant results jointly, numerous items bearing on the conative aspects of attitude were found, including: "Favour Investment In", "Affiliation", "Should Have Closer Ties With", and "Welcome Immigration From". Three affective items, "I Like", "Affiliation", and "Trustworthy", were also frequently significantly correlated with the product items. The affective and conative items were more often significantly correlated with "Willing to Buy" than they were with "Good Overall Products". There were many significant correlations for the items which touched on a country's degree of economic development, such as, "Industrialized", "Educated", and "Technical Advancedment". These items were more often significantly correlated with "Good Overall Products" than they were with "Willing To Buy". Items measuring a country's political orientation were not frequently significantly correlated with either of the product items.

5.4.1 Analysis of H3 (country attitudes and product willingness to buy)

The hypothesis that consumer's attitudes towards a country will be related to consumer's willingness to buy products from that country was tested using multiple regression analysis. For each stimulus sample country, nation variables (13), were regressed on the dependent variable consumer's "willingness to buy". F-tests were used to determine whether the sample multiple correlations were significantly different from zero (each country image was tested). The decision rule for this hypothesis was to reject null H3 if F observed was greater than F critical at $\alpha < .05$ for any of the multiple regressions. Each multiple regression was run on SPSSX Regression (For detailed results see Appendix F). Multiple regression equations were generated using the "Stepwise" variable entry procedure (Draper and Smith 1981; Stevens 1986). Regression coefficients were tested for significance using t-tests. Only those regression coefficients with "t" values significant at $\alpha < .05$ were included in the multiple regression equation. The number of significant regression coefficients included in the regression equation ranges from one to three.

In all six cases (for all countries) F observed was greater than F critical at $\alpha < .05$. Given these results the null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that consumer attitudes towards a country and its people are related to consumer's willingness to buy products from that country. Table 5.18 provides a brief summary of the six regression equations.

Table 5.18 - R - Square And Independent Variables For Regressions
On Product Item "Willing To Buy"

Country	Independent Variables (Predictors)	R-Square +
The U.S.S.R.	Affiliation*, An Ideal Country, Technical Advancedment*	.1372
Hungary	Affiliation*	.1868
Czechoslovakia	Affiliation*	.1352
Poland	Affiliation*, Active, Western Culture	.0873
Yugoslavia	Affiliation*, Active, Peaceful	.1571
France	Affiliation*, Active	.1761

Legend

* = Composite Variable

+ = Adjusted R-Square

The composite variable Affiliation was consistently the best predictor of consumer's willingness to buy a country's products. The Affiliation composite variable is essentially a measure of the respondent's affective predisposition towards a country ("I Like", "Trustworthy", "Welcome immigration from", etc.).

The item "Active" was included in three of the six regression equations. In the multiple regression on consumer's willingness to buy Polish products the beta coefficient for the item "Active" had a negative value. This result appeared odd

until the correlations between the items "Active" & "Willing to buy", and the correlations between "Active" & "Affiliation" were examined. These two correlations reveal that the item "Active" has a very low correlation with "Willing To Buy", and a strong correlation with the variable Affiliation. In this case the "Active" item was acting as a suppressor variable. Including this variable in the analysis allowed some of the variance on Affiliation to be partialled out. When this variance was suppressed, the remaining variance on Affiliation was more strongly tied to the dependent variable. The variable "Peaceful" acted as a suppressor in a similar fashion in the Yugoslavia regression. Suppressor variables can improve an equations R-square but they themselves are not good predictors of the dependent variable under consideration (Stevens 1986). Detailed regression results are found in Appendix F.

5.4.2 Analysis of H4 (country attitudes and "Overall Product Quality")

The hypothesis that consumer's attitudes towards a country and its people will not be related to their perceptions of the quality of that country's products was tested using multiple regression analysis. For each stimulus sample country, nation variables were regressed on the respondents overall product quality rating. Multiple regression equations were formed using the techniques and significance levels outlined in the analysis of H3. The decision rule for this hypothesis was, reject H_0 if observed F was greater than critical F at the $\alpha < .05$ level, for any of the multiple regressions.

The results indicate that the sample multiple correlations were all significantly different from zero (for detailed results see Appendix G). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that attitudes towards a country and its people were related to attitudes towards the quality of that country's products.

Table 5.19 provides a summary of the six regression equations.

Table 5.1^a - R - Square And Independent Variables For Regressions
On Product Item "Good Overall Products"

Country	Independent Variables (Predictors)	R-Square
The U.S.S.R.	Technical Advancedment*, Ideal	.0953+
Hungary	Affiliation*, Security*, Western Culture	.2213
Czechoslovakia	Aligned With Canada	.0595
Poland	Technical Advancedment*, Aligned With Canada	.1282
Yugoslavia	Hard Working, Active, Aligned With Canada	.1810
France	Affiliation*, Technically Adv.* Know A Lot About, An Ideal Coun.	.2527

Legend

- * = Composite Variable
- + = Adjusted R-Square

Table 5.19 shows that certain variables appeared in more than one regression equation. The composite variable Technical Advancedment appeared in three

equations (U.S.S.R., Poland, France) as did the item "Aligned With Canada" (Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia). The composite variable Affiliation, the items "An Ideal Country", and "Hardworking People" all appeared in two equations. The composite variable Security and the item "Western Culture" were suppressor variables in the multiple regression for Hungary.

5.5 Analysis of H5 (complexity)

The null hypothesis that the degree of difference in judgements of product quality across countries would not be related to the level of product complexity was tested using two-way within subjects multivariate analysis of variance. Two two-way analyses were performed, one for each of the survey groupings. A multivariate design was used owing to the within-subjects nature of the research. The selection of a two-way design allowed for the examination of the joint effect of the independent variables, country-of-origin and complexity, on the dependent variable, product quality. A significant interaction between country-of-origin and level of product complexity would indicate that the superiority of one country-of-origin profile over another is moderated by product complexity. The model proposed was,

FIG. 1 - COMPLEXITY AS A MODERATING VARIABLE

The test statistic for the stated hypothesis was Wilk's Lambda. The sampling distribution of Wilk's Lambda was once again estimated by Rao's F approximation. To analyze this hypothesis it was necessary to perform a set of two tests, one for each survey grouping. To ensure that actual alpha remains less than or equal to nominal alpha the Bonferroni Inequality was applied. Overall alpha was set at the .05 level, therefore, each individual two-way analysis had its alpha level set at $.05/2 = .025$. The decision rule was, reject H_0 if the interaction between country-of-origin and product complexity was significant at $p < .025$ for either analysis.

Each analysis was run on SPSSX MANOVA (For Wilk's lambda, exact F, and other detailed results see Appendix H). The interaction between country-of-origin and product complexity was significant at $p < .001$ for both two-way within subjects MANOVA's. Both analyses were highly significant therefore the null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that country-of-origin stereotyping was moderated by product complexity.

For both analyses the main effects were highly significant. In fact, they were both significant at $p < .001$. However, since there was a highly significant interaction between country-of-origin and complexity the focus of the post hoc analysis was on the examination of simple effects (Stevens 1986). To determine what specific "treatments", differed all the simple pairwise comparisons were examined. Pairwise procedures were preferred because 1) they are easily interpreted, 2) they are quite meaningful, and 3) some of the procedures are fairly powerful

(Stevens 1986). The Tukey procedure for within-subjects pairwise comparisons was used because of its excellent power (Stevens 1986). Differences between specific products were tested at $p < .01$. A stringent alpha level was used because of the large number of Tukey's tests involved. Table 5.20 presents a summary of individual specific product means. Tables 5.21 and 5.22 present a summary of pairwise product significance.

Table 5.20 - Specific Products - Means

Survey Version #1

Prod.\Coun.	F	U	H	C
Shoes	5.56	2.88	3.80	3.95
Luggage	5.39	3.05	3.78	3.85
Clock Radio	4.38	3.12	3.54	3.72
Microwave Oven	4.31	2.95	3.42	3.54

Survey Version #2

Prod.\Coun.	F	U	P	Y
Shoes	5.44	2.97	3.59	3.72
Luggage	5.40	3.09	3.61	3.80
Clock Radio	4.40	3.02	3.49	3.43
Microwave Oven	4.16	2.94	3.23	3.33

Legend

F = France, U = U.S.S.R, H = Hungary,
C = Czechoslovakia, P = Poland, Y = Yugoslavia

Table 5.21 - Significant Differences in Specific
Product Ratings Between Country Pairs

Survey Version #1

Country Pairwise Simple Effects

Countries\Product	Shoes	Luggage	C.Radio	M.Oven
France\USSR	*	*	*	*
France\Hungary	*	*	*	*
France\Czech.	*	*	*	*
Czech.\Hungary	NS	NS	NS	NS
Czech.\USSR	*	*	*	*
Hungary\USSR	*	*	*	*

Survey Version #2

Country Pairwise Simple Effects

Countries\Product	Shoes	Luggage	C.Radio	M.Oven
France\USSR	*	*	*	*
France\Poland	*	*	*	*
France\Yugo.	*	*	*	*
Yugo.\Poland	NS	NS	NS	NS
Yugo.\USSR	*	*	*	*
Poland\USSR	*	*	*	NS

Legend

NS = Not Statistically Significant
 * = Statistically Significant at $p < .01$

Table 5.22 - Significant Differences of Specific Product Ratings
by Complexity

Survey Version #1

Complexity Pairwise Simple Effects

Products\Country	France	USSR	Hungary	Czech.	Poland	Yugo.
Shoes\Luggage	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Shoes\C.Radio	*	NS	NS	NS	NS	*
Shoes\M.Oven	*	NS	*	*	*	*
Luggage\C.Radio	*	NS	NS	NS	NS	*
Luggage\M.Oven	*	NS	*	*	*	*
C.Radio\M.Oven	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

Legend

NS = Not Statistically Significant

* = Statistically Significant at $p < .01$

The preceding tables reveal many things. First, it was clear that there was a strong country effect. France, the Western country, was rated significantly higher than all the EE countries on all specific products. In turn, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Yugoslavia were rated significantly higher than the U.S.S.R. on all specific products. In group #1 Hungarian and Czechoslovakian products were not significantly different while in group #2 the products of Poland and Yugoslavia were not perceived differently.

Previous research suggests that a product's country-of-origin becomes more important as complexity increases (Nes 1981). Therefore, it was anticipated that there would be more significant pairwise country differences for the more complex products (e.g., clock radio and microwave). Analysis of the simple country effects did not support this supposition, i.e., there were no differences in the number of significant country differences across the different products. The specific product images in this study were selected on the assumption that they represented a complexity continuum. Complexity is defined as something "complicated, involved or intricate" (Funk and Wagnall 1981). Shoes were deemed the least complex product followed by luggage, a clock radio, and a microwave oven. Moving from shoes to microwave ovens the products become more intricate and the intrinsic quality of the product becomes progressively more difficult to infer. Table 5.23 provides a summary of the number of significant pairwise complexity differences by product combination.

Table 5.23 - Significant Complexity Differences By Product Pairing

Product Pairing	Shoes	Luggage	Clock Radio	Microwave Oven
Shoes	-	0	2	5
Luggage		-	2	5
Clock Radio			-	0

The table of complexity differences by product pairing does support the hypothesized complexity continuum. The further apart products are on a complexity continuum the more powerful the moderating effect should be. Analysis of the pairwise complexity differences indicated that the larger the difference on the complexity continuum, the more likely it was to find statistically significant pairwise differences.

For group #1 the interaction between country image and complexity was strictly ordinal. All specific French products were always rated higher than Czechoslovakian products, specific Czechoslovakian products were always rated higher than their Hungarian counterparts, and specific Hungarian products were seen as being uniformly better than Soviet goods. The country/complexity factors interact because the degree of superiority changes. The most striking example of the ordinal interaction is how France's product superiority over the EE countries declined sharply as the products become more complex.

In group two France's superior product ratings declined in magnitude (ordinal) as complexity increases. However, it was interesting to note that in group two

there is also a disordinal interaction. Yugoslavia enjoyed a superior product image compared to Poland for shoes, luggage, and microwaves. Poland has the superior image for clock radios. However, this disordinal interaction is not of much importance because Yugoslavia's and Poland's image were not significantly different over the products in question. Once again the interaction effect was based on ordinal differences.

The pairwise complexity profile of the U.S.S.R. was considerably different from the profiles of the other countries. For the U.S.S.R. no significantly different pairwise product comparisons were found to be statistically significant. From Table 5.21 it appears that complexity did not have a strong moderating effect on products from the U.S.S.R.. Respondents did not rate specific Soviet goods significantly differently. Soviet products received the lowest rating in every product category.

For all the countries, with the exception of the U.S.S.R., product image got progressively worse as the products became more complex. This trend was particularly obvious in the case of France. However, the complex products of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Yugoslavia were also rated significantly lower than their non-complex counterparts (For all countries there were at least two significant pairwise complexity differences). In conclusion the data support the position that country-of-origin stereotypes were moderated by product complexity.

5.6 Analysis of hypotheses relating to the demographics of country-of-origin

Multivariate analysis of variance was the statistical technique used to analyze H6-H9. For these hypotheses two MANOVA analyses were conducted because there were two separate survey groupings. The objective of the analysis was to ascertain whether demographic groupings differed on the average on a set of dependent variables. These groups were then compared on the product item "Good Overall Quality" for each country treatment. The item "Good Overall Quality" was used as the dependent variable for all MANOVA analyses of the demographics of country-of-origin. There were four country treatments per version so there were four dependent variables in all MANOVA analyses.

Since this analysis involves a set of tests (two separate tests based on survey version) the Bonferroni inequality was applied. Overall alpha was set at the .10 level. This more lenient alpha level was used in the testing of all the hypotheses which pertain to the demographics of country-of-origin. For these hypotheses the conflicting nature of previous research was recognized and the alpha level was increased to enhance the study's chances of identifying possible differences. For each individual MANOVA analysis alpha was set at the .05 level. The decision rule was, reject H_0 if the F approximation of Wilk's Lambda was significant at $p < 0.05$, for either MANOVA analysis.

5.7 Analysis of H6 (gender)

For the analysis of H6, MANOVA yielded a $p < .370$ for version one and a $p < .606$ for version two (for detailed results see Appendix I). Neither MANOVA was significant at the $p < 0.05$ level, therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected. The data did not support the conclusion that women rate the quality of foreign products higher than men.

5.8 Analysis of H7 (age)

The objective of the analysis was to ascertain whether a respondent's age affected his/her average rating of a set of dependent variables. The original eleven categories were transformed so that four reasonable and equitable groupings could be created. These categories were constructed as young (18-29 years, 23% of sample), early middle age (30-39 years, 29%), later middle age (40-54 years, 29%), and elderly (54 years and over, 19%).

The multivariate analysis of variance yielded a $p < .549$ for version one and a $p < .513$ for version two (for details see Appendix J). Neither MANOVA was significant at $p < 0.05$, therefore, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The data did not support the conclusion that older people rate the quality of foreign products higher than younger people.

5.9 Analysis of H8 (education)

The objective of the analysis was to ascertain whether a respondent's education level affected his/her average rating of a set of dependent variables. Originally, there were eight education categories. These categories were condensed into three groupings. The groupings selected assured that the group sizes would be sufficient and comparable, and that interpretation would be straight forward. The first group included respondents who had a high school level education or less (23% of sample). The second group consisted of respondents who had some college or university experience (34%). The last group consisted of individuals who had at least a university degree (43%).

The multivariate analysis of variance yielded a $\eta^2 < .195$ for version I and a significant $p < .027$ for version II. To determine which groups were significantly different in version II three MANOVAs were performed (for further details see Appendix K). Each analyses was performed at $\alpha .10/3 = .033$. The multivariate analysis which compares group one (high school or less) to group two (some college/university) was not significant with $p < .20$. The comparison between group two (some college/university) to group three (university degree or more) was not significant with $p < .25$. The comparison between group one (high school or less) and group three (university degree or more) was significant at $p < .027$. The two group analyses showed that people with a university degree or more gave a higher foreign product quality rating than people with an education of high school or less.

2

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

The next task was to isolate the dependent variables (country product quality evaluations) which were significantly different between those with a university degree or more and those with a high school education or less. To do this the univariate tests produced by SPSSX were examined (see Appendix K). Examination of the univariate results showed that the "Good Overall Products" item for France was significant at $\alpha = .003$. The other variables were not significant at the $\alpha .025$ level (.10/4 dependent variables).

The post hoc analysis demonstrated that overall multivariate significance was attributable to the difference between group one (high school or less) and group three (university degree or more). These two groups had substantially different views of the overall quality of French products. More educated consumers gave French products a much higher rating than less educated consumers.

Many statisticians advise against interpreting univariate results when overall multivariate significance is not found (Stevens 1986; Barcikowski 1983). They warn that univariate significance under these circumstances is likely to be spurious. Due to the research design of this study France was included in both versions of the questionnaire. Therefore, it was possible to check for significant univariate results in version one. In this circumstance there was cause to examine the univariate significance level of educational differences for France's overall product score in version one. Not surprisingly, respondents with different education levels gave French products significantly different ratings. Again it was the difference between those with the most and the least education which was

responsible for the significant result.

In an attempt to explain this finding two supplemental MANOVA analyses were performed (see Appendix L). The first analysis examined how people with different education levels perceived France as a country (all twenty items), and the second MANOVA looked at how education level affected French product ratings (all 16 items). From analysis one it was discovered that people with more education rate France significantly higher ($p < .01$) on the items: "Industrialized", "Educated", "Western Culture", "Favour Further Investment In", "Ideal Country", and "Rich". Further, more educated persons knew more about France. From the second analysis it was determined that people with more education rate French products significantly higher ($p < .01$) on the following items: "Attractive", "Innovative", "Good Quality", "Recognizable Brands", "Proud To Own", "Technical Advancement", "Workmanship" and "Satisfied With". Additionally, more educated persons knew significantly more ($p < .01$) about French products than less educated people.

5.10 Analysis of H9 (income)

The objective of the analysis was to ascertain whether a respondent's household income level affected his/her average rating of a set of dependent variables. Originally, there were six education categories. These categories were condensed into three groupings. The groupings selected were intuitively appealing as they represented lower (\$35,000 or less, 25% of sample), middle (\$35,000 - \$59,999,

37% of sample) and upper level household incomes (\$60,000 and over, 38% of sample). Moreover, this categorization assured that the groups would be of similar size.

The multivariate analysis of variance yielded a $p < .119$ for version one and a $p < .711$ for version two (for details see Appendix K). Neither result was significant at the test level. Income did not have a statistically significant effect on foreign product evaluation. The data did not support the conclusion that high income individuals give a more favourable evaluation of foreign products than low income individuals.

5.11 The "new" German product image.

On October 3, 1990, East and West Germany were reunified. Since that time it was no longer feasible to refer to the foreign image of East German goods as this product image ceased to exist. The opportunity for an interesting research question was posed by this unprecedented merger - How will the product image of a reunified Germany be perceived relative to the old images of East and West Germany? Table 5.24 shows what respondents felt the "new" German product image would be like relative to the East German product image and the West German product image.

Table 5.24 - The "New" German Product Image

Variable\Profile	Rating	E.German Products	W. German Products
	7	27	8
	6	40	18
	5	20	15
% Higher In Quality		87	41
% Undecided		10	32
	3	2	17
	2	1	7
	1	0	3
% Lower In Quality		3	27
Total		100%	100%
Mean		5.77+	4.36

Legend

- + Scores could range from 1 (Lower in quality) to 7 (Higher in quality)

Table 5.24 shows that respondents viewed the products of a United Germany more favourably than either East or West German Products. Eighty-seven percent of respondents believed that products from a United Germany would be of higher quality than East German products had been. Forty-one percent of respondents believed that United German products would be higher in quality than West German products had been. However, twenty-seven percent felt that United German products would be lower in quality than West German products had been. United German products were anticipated to be superior to both the

former East and West German images. However, the degree of superiority was much greater over the East German product image.

5.10.1 Analysis of H10 (Germany)

A t-test was used in the analysis of this hypothesis. The objective of the analysis was to see if the former East and West German products were rated differently on quality. The decision rule was, reject H_0 if the mean product ratings were significantly different at $p < .05$. The t-test was significant at $p < .001$, therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that East and West German products were not considered to be of the same quality. East German product quality was perceived as benefiting more from reunification than was West German product quality. From this result it can be inferred that West German products were considered to be of higher quality than East German products and that West Germany is more likely to take a leadership role in determining the quality of United German products.

6. LIMITATIONS

The results of this research should be tempered with the knowledge of the study's limitations. First, this was a single cue study: that is, country-of-origin was the only information on which respondents based their evaluations. Respondents may have overemphasized country-of-origin considerations due to the fact that other important product cues were not considered (e.g., brand, price, etc.). A single cue study can yield a significant cue effect that might not exist in the real world (Bilkey and Nes 1982). Research by Schellinck (1986) indicates that the country-of-origin cue decreases in importance when several product cues are evaluated contemporaneously. This limitation could not be overcome given that this study was concerned primarily with the effects of country-of-origin. A complete modelling of all product information cues was beyond the scope of this research.

Demand effects were also possible in this research. Respondents might have answered the way they felt they were supposed to, rather than how they actually felt. For example, some respondents may have guessed that the researcher was interested in the country/product relationship. These respondents may have rated a country and its products in a similar fashion because they believed that was what they were supposed to do. Demand effects should not be considered a serious problem as the true objectives of the research were purposely not divulged to respondents. Moreover, the data from this study could be used for

many different purposes. A respondent would have great difficulty trying to determine the specific aims of the study.

Respondents of this study were residents of the Ottawa metropolitan area. Ottawans are not representative of the "average" Canadian. The Ottawa metropolitan population is more highly educated and wealthier than the Canadian norm (Statistics Canada 1986). The Ottawa metropolitan population was selected as the study population due to convenience (researcher's location) and cost considerations. It was hypothesized that residents of a large urban area would be more knowledgeable about foreign countries and their products. It was also felt that a large urban area would contain larger numbers of opinion leaders, whose views would reflect future views of the average Canadian consumers. It is possible that the Canadian population as a whole might differentiate less among EE countries. However, as news of the economic and political change occurring in EE diffuses, the views of Canadians should approach the views of the survey respondents.

Concerning the interaction between country-of-origin and product complexity it should be acknowledged that few country images and even fewer products were examined. Study results in this area must be interpreted within the context of a small data set. This short coming could not be avoided since the investigation of the relationship between country-of-origin and product complexity was not the main objective of the study.

Finally, this study did not examine country views and product attitudes for all EE countries. Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania were not examined due to limitations in the scope of the research project. Therefore, this research does not provide a complete survey of EE images, but rather only those of the major EE countries. Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania probably have non-distinct unfavourable country and product images given that these countries are: 1) not familiar to Canadians and 2) behind most other EE countries in terms of economic and political reform (Kraljic 1990).

7. DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the main findings of the study. The first section of the chapter discusses the relationship between views of countries and attitudes towards products. The second section examines how respondents rated France and its products. The third section of the chapter looks at how respondents viewed Eastern Europe and EE products. It examines how the various country and product profiles differ. Part four examines how the "new" United German product image was evaluated relative to the "old" West German and East German images. Part five investigates the interaction between country-of-origin and product complexity. Finally, section six looks at how demographics impacts country-of-origin stereotyping.

7.1 Views of countries and attitudes towards products.

The main finding of this study was that views towards a country can predict attitudes towards products. Country items were statistically significant predictors of both consumer willingness to buy and overall product evaluation. Country items which tapped the affective and conative aspects of attitude were found to be particularly strongly correlated to the product items. Items bearing on economic development were frequently significantly correlated to product evaluation, while items measuring political orientation were poor predictors of product attitudes.

It appears that how people "feel" about a country can help to predict how they will judge that country's products. When respondents liked and trusted a country's people they tended to give that country's products a more positive evaluation. There also was a positive relationship between respondents "intentions" towards a country and their product evaluations. For example, respondents who said they would welcome more Hungarian immigrants were more likely to think Hungarian products were good. Items which touched on a country's economic health such as, "Industrialized" and "Educated" were positively related to product ratings. This relationship seems intuitively logical as educated workers with modern tools are more likely to make good products than uneducated workers with inferior machinery.

Political items such as "Democratic", "Many Rights", and "Individualistic" were not strongly tied to product evaluations. This result is somewhat surprising considering that democracy and individualism are ideals which are cherished by most Canadians. One might have expected that many respondents would have had some strong "feelings" associated with these concepts. The results of this study are similar to the findings of Crawford and Garland (1987), who studied how political ideology affected product quality ratings. Their study found that political freedom in a country was not strongly tied to positive product evaluation. Early studies into the potential correlates of the country-of-origin effect indicated that political ideology was related to foreign product evaluation. However, these results may have been due to the fact that the economic development factor and the political ideology factor were often lumped together

(Wang 1983). The results of this study suggest that respondents may not consider a country's political ideology when they evaluate its products. Further research will be necessary before the association or lack of association between political ideology and product evaluation can be firmly established.

7.2 France and French products

France's country and product images were found to be more favourable than EE images. This result was consistent with previous research findings. Studies that have examined Western and Eastern images contemporaneously have found that Western images were rated significantly more favourably than EE images (Chasin and Jaffe 1979; Wang and Lamb 1980; Chasin, Holzmuller and Jaffe 1989). France was rated as being more industrialized and democratic than the EE countries. It was also judged to have a significantly more Western culture. French products received the highest rating over all product attributes. All specific French products were judged to be of higher quality than specific EE products. Relative to France, the study's Western nation, the EE countries have a significantly less favourable country and product image. However, the differences between France and each individual EE country are not the same. For example, Czechoslovakia's image is not nearly as unfavourable as the Soviet Union's.

France did not receive the most favourable rating on all country items. On the conative items "Welcome Immigration From", and "Favour Investment In", France ranked 5th and 3rd respectively. The unfavourable result on the item

"Welcome Immigration From" coupled with non-significant differences on the items "Trustworthy" and "Should Have Closer Ties With" may indicate that respondents do not have more favourable views towards the French as a people. Moreover, the poor result on the item "Welcome Immigration From" may indicate that respondents are looking for new immigration sources. The sample was drawn from a majority english speaking population. Given the current constitutional debate and language based tensions perhaps respondents were particularly averse to the further immigration of french speaking individuals. On the affective item "Hardworking" France ranked second to last. The French were viewed as being significantly more active than Eastern Europeans but Canadians did not believe that their "activity" energy is channelled into a rigorous work ethic.

7.3 Eastern Europe and Eastern European products

The results of this study suggest that the EE countries and products are perceived significantly differently from each other. They are not viewed as an homogenous entity. The U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia had country and product profiles which were significantly and consistently different from the profiles of the other EE countries. The country which was considered to be the most different from other EE countries was the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R. and its products were rated much less favourably than the other EE countries and their products. Conversely, Czechoslovakia was given the most favourable country and product ratings.

Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia were perceived as being somewhat different as countries but their products were seen as being essentially the same.

Eastern European country images exhibited much more difference than did EE product images. This result is probably due to the fact that most respondents would have been exposed to more EE country information than EE product information. For example respondents will likely have had some exposure to EE country information through such things as school, the media, EE friends, etc.. However, few respondents have had extensive experience with EE consumer goods. In this study the respondents claimed that they knew more about EE countries than they did about their products (except in the case of Yugoslavia).

An important finding of this research is that the U.S.S.R. had both the most unfavourable country image, and the most unfavourable product image. Respondents knew more about the Soviet Union and its products than they did about other EE countries and products. Given the unfavourable ratings received it can be inferred that the information Canadians receive about the Soviet Union is not positive. The Soviet Union was not viewed as being significantly less industrialized, educated, and rich than the other EE countries (with the exception of Czechoslovakia for the items "Educated" and "Rich"). The unfavourable country ratings were on the items that are associated with political orientation (e.g., "Democratic", "Many Rights", "Individualistic"). The Soviet Union was also rated lower on the item "Western Culture". The U.S.S.R. was rated last over all product attributes, with the exception of the item "Know A Lot About".

Previous research into EE product images had found the U.S.S.R. to be rated better or no differently than the rest of EE (Chasin and Jaffe 1979; Chasin, Holzmuller, and Jaffe 1987). In this study the Soviet Union and its products were rated significantly lower than the rest of Eastern Europe. A plausible explanation for this occurrence may lie in the Soviet Union's inability to achieve a degree of reform commensurate with that of other EE countries. Recent autocratic behaviour in the republics (e.g., Lithuania), and the continued deterioration of the Soviet economy, have highlighted the country's problems.

Soviet products might have received significantly lower quality ratings due to the negative exposure generated by their marquis consumer product, the Lada automobile. The Lada represents the Soviet Union's most notable foray into the North American consumer market. Unfortunately for the Soviets, this product received extremely unfavourable reviews. The Lada experience may have seriously damaged the general Soviet product image.

An interesting finding of this research was the significantly more favourable evaluations given by Canadians to Czechoslovakia and its products. Czechoslovakia was perceived as the most economically developed ("Industrialized", "Educated", "Rich") of the EE countries. It received the highest EE product rating on 15 of 16 product attributes. Czechoslovakian products had significantly higher ratings on items referring to product integrity ("Innovative", "Technically Advanced", and "Good Workmanship") and market presence

("Recognizable Brands). The Czechoslovakian product profile was not rated significantly differently than the Hungarian product profile.

There were a few significant differences in how Poland, Hungary, and Yugoslavia were perceived. Canadians knew more about Poland and viewed the Polish as being more active than both Hungarians and Yugoslavians. However, Poland was viewed as the poorest of the three countries. Hungary and Yugoslavia were not rated significantly differently as countries. Poland, Hungary and Yugoslavia were not rated significantly differently on the items bearing on economic development or political ideology.

Polish, Hungarian and Yugoslavian products were not rated significantly differently. However, products from Poland were generally rated slightly less favourably than Hungarian or Yugoslavian products. Respondents rated Polish products slightly lower than Hungarian or Yugoslavian products on the item "Good Overall Quality", but they did not rate these countries differently on the item "Willing To Buy". These countries have very similar product profiles. Therefore, they may be seen as each others most direct competition.

An important finding of this study was that many Canadians were willing to buy EE products. In the case of Czechoslovakia fully 50% of respondents had favourable purchase intentions. Of the other EE countries only in the case of the U.S.S.R. were more respondents not willing to buy (57%) than were willing to buy (22%). For three of the five EE countries (Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Yugoslavia) more respondents gave a favourable overall quality assessment than

an unfavourable one. These results suggest that products from most of the different EE countries will not be "resisted" by Canadian consumers.

7.4 German Products

Research results indicate that the reunified German product quality image was more favourable than either the West or East German product images. West German products were rated slightly lower in quality, and East German products were rated substantially lower in quality, than United German products. East German products have gained the most in product image from re-unification.

Canadians may perceive the re-unified Germany as being bigger and more powerful. Perhaps, Canadians felt that West German product quality could be maintained due to the great human potential of East Germany. East Germany was the most industrialized of EE countries (Kraljic 1990). Moreover, this country had a highly skilled workforce. Canadians may appreciate the synergistic opportunities inherent in re-unification. With West German capital supplied to the skilled East German workforce, Canadians may feel that the West German product quality image would improve rather than suffer.

7.5 Country-of-origin and product complexity

This study found that the country-of-origin effect was moderated by product complexity. Complexity had a particularly strong moderating effect in the case of France. Complex French products were rated significantly lower than relatively non-complex French products. Eastern European products, with the

exception of the U.S.S.R., received progressively lower ratings as the products rated became more complex. Complexity does not appear to have a moderating effect on the image of Soviet goods, i.e., all Soviet products examined received very low ratings. This result indicates that Soviet marketers must overcome serious marketing obstacles if they wish to sell their products in Canada. At the present time there appear to be no attractive niches in which Soviet marketers might position their products. Even non-complex Soviet goods receive extremely low product ratings.

7.6 The country-of-origin bias and demographics

Canadians, in this study, do not appear to judge foreign products differently on the basis of sex, age or income. However, they do appear to rate some foreign products differently based on educational level. Ratings differences, based on education, are particularly noticeable in the case of France. Persons with more education rated French products more highly than persons with limited education. Moreover, highly educated people rated France statistically higher ($P < .01$) on the several country items.

8. IMPLICATIONS

The results of this research may be of interest to both the business and academic communities. Canadian investors might recognize the insights which this research can provide as to the suitability of a particular EE production site. Domestic producers may take note of the product profiles of emerging competitors. East European producers might well be interested in how their country's products are viewed in the West. Academics might be interested in the above and, more importantly, in the correlations that were found to exist between country and product profiles.

8.1 Implications for Canadian Investors

Movement towards democracy and capitalism has stimulated Western investment in EE (Ghosh 1990; Maslov 1990; Nigh, Walters and Kuhlman 1990). In Hungary, for example, there are now more than 1,800 joint ventures, most with Western firms (Ghosh 1990). The Canadian government and Canadian companies have not been blind to EE reform. In May 1990, the Canadian government announced that it would be contributing \$30 million annually for the next five years to a new bank promoting development in EE. The government's goal is to enhance Canadian business access to commercial opportunities in the area and to facilitate procurement and co-financing arrangements for Canadian firms.

The private sector has also perceived the emergence of new investment opportunities in EE. Newbridge Networks Corporation, for example, already has two joint ventures under way in the U.S.S.R.. Macdonald's of Canada recently opened the first Soviet Macdonald's restaurant. Edgar Bronfman, chairman of Seagram Ltd., recently announced that Seagram's is assessing the newly liberalized East Bloc as a place to invest. Seagram is examining Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary as possible investment sites.

As a function of the various types of trading and investment agreements, many Western firms have begun to move an increasing amounts of EE goods into Western markets. The frequency with which investing Western firms export EE production back to the West is not commonly appreciated. Many EE trading partners insist on counter-trade agreements to help offset their lack of financial capabilities in purchasing Western technology and goods. Insistence on counter-trade has been a major barrier to increased East-West trade (Hisrich and Peters 1983). Buy-back and turn-key agreements are also very popular investment schemes. In these types of agreements technology and production capability are supplied by the Western partner. In return the partner acquires rights to the goods produced in the newly constructed facilities (for a predetermined amount of time). The goods acquired are often exported to the West.

For any company investing in EE the location decision is pivotal. Each EE country has unique strengths and deficiencies. To decide on an investment site the investor, looking at EE, must examine existing inter-country differences.

Consideration of consumer attitudes towards a country's general product image is just one of the many factors which must be considered. Still, if EE products are rated differently based on their country-of-origin, then investors will, all things being equal, prefer to invest in EE countries which project the most positive product images. This study demonstrated that products from certain EE countries are preferred over other EE countries.

Country-of-origin can significantly affect end user attitudes (Nagashima 1970, 1977; Papadopoulos, Heslop, Graby, and Bamossy 1989), and end user attitudes profoundly affect market potential (Zaltman 1976). Therefore, it is incumbent upon any company investing in EE to consider how consumers will react to a product's place of production. If respondents did not distinguish between the products of EE, then country-of-origin considerations would not be an important location criterion. However, this study suggests that Canadians do have significantly different views concerning the countries and products of EE. This means that companies investing in EE should consider consumer attitudes along with other variables in making their location decisions.

Western companies, investing in EE, must first consider that EE general product images will be inferior to those of their Western counterparts (here the reference is to economically developed Western counterparts). In general, a Western company that has a choice of which country-of-origin to register on its products (e.g., a product with component parts) should put forward the Western origin. In this study, for example, French products were rated significantly more

favourably than EE products. The consumer, while willing to buy products from EE, will likely be more willing to buy products with a Western origin. In most cases the Western company, producing in EE, should emphasize its Western affiliations (e.g., Western base, Western brand name, etc.). However, for certain specific products it might very well be to the investing company's advantage to emphasize a product's EE origin. For example, a Western vodka producer might very well want to emphasize that its product was, "Made In The U.S.S.R.", if it had produced the product in that country.

Differences between EE product images are particularly important when location of production must be revealed (due to legal constraints). In these situations the foreign investor will, all other things being equal, prefer to invest in the EE country with the most positive product image or to down play the product origin. This research suggests that products from certain EE countries are preferred over other EE countries.

Companies investing in Czechoslovakia may have an edge over companies investing in other EE countries. Of the EE countries studied, respondents were found to have the most favourable views towards Czechoslovakia and its products. Western investors who plan on exporting consumer goods back to the West should be aware of the Soviet Union's poor product image. If a suitable production site is available in another EE country, then this option should be carefully considered.

8.2 Implications for Canadian domestic industries

Between 1980-1989 Canadian imports of EE goods increased by 72% (Statistics Canada - Imports By Country). In recent years the trend towards greater East-West trade has accelerated (Ghosh 1990). If this trend continues, Canadian producers will face increasing competition from EE. Canadian industry would be well advised to pay serious attention to EE. Eastern Europe has a population of over 120 million. Much of this population is well educated. The EE land mass is rich in many natural resources. In the short term there are many obstacles to overcome but in the long term there is incredible potential.

Western aid has already had a buoying effect on the economies of many EE countries. Political leadership, in most EE countries, continues to advocate rapid reform. The transformation of EE is under way. For example, the Finance Minister of Czechoslovakia, Dr. Vaclav Klaus, recently tabled a paper entitled "Shock Transformation Economics" (Holman, Sevcik and Schwartz 1990). This paper calls for speedy economic reform. Specifically, the paper calls for rapid privatization, foreign trade liberalization, and price liberalization. It also stresses the importance of fiscal restraint. Other EE countries, such as Hungary and Poland, have already passed major economic reforms.

Western producers should not ignore EE competition on the assumption that Western consumers are not willing to buy EE goods. If the results of this study are a true reflection of opinion in Canada, then a large percentage of the Canadians are willing to purchase products from these countries. More

respondents were willing to buy Czechoslovakian, Hungarian, Polish, and Yugoslavian products, than were unwilling to buy.

To combat EE imports Canadian marketers could try to capitalize on Canadian consumer's lack of knowledge concerning EE goods. This lack of knowledge is evidenced by low mean scores on the item "Know A Lot About". Marketing strategy could reinforce the lingering doubts Canadians have regarding EE product quality. Maintaining buyer uncertainty, about EE goods, will increase perceived risk and may deter purchase. Study results indicate that Canadians would not be proud to own EE goods. Eastern European countries appear to be evaluated as developing countries (DC). The relative advantages of buying Canadian (patriotism & status) could be stressed. Canadian marketers may want to question EE companies' ability to service their goods. In terms of service, Canadian producers will be seen as possessing a relative advantage.

8.3 Implications for Eastern European producers

Research results indicate that EE product images are inferior to Western product images. This inferior image is likely partially due to a negative halo effect. Eastern Europe currently accounts for only a very small percentage of Canadian imports. Canadians have had only very limited experience with products from these countries. Research has indicated that when consumers are not familiar with a country's products, country image may serve as a halo from which product attributes are inferred (Han 1989). Results of this study give a preliminary indication that attitude toward the country itself may be generalized to attitude

towards that country's product attributes. These findings support the role of country image as a halo in product evaluation.

Eastern European countries must strive to improve their image. They may attempt to modify views so that the direction of the halo effect is reversed. If these countries can reverse their negative stereotype, then country image can start to work for them, rather than against them. Changing stereotypes will not be accomplished quickly or easily. Japan's experience, however, shows that country and product images can be improved (Nagashima 1970, 1977).

To change old images EE countries may want to disseminate the type of information that will cause shifts in the perceptions of product attributes and improve overall product image. Here, EE industries could mount marketing campaigns aimed at pointing out the strengths of their products. Government administrators and industry marketers could stress positive country characteristics. The results of this study indicate that EE countries may want to distance themselves from the U.S.S.R. and stress their own political orientation and economic progress. More importantly, EE countries should promote the kindness and warmth of their people. Results of this study suggest that Canadians who have strong positive affective feelings towards Eastern Europeans also are more willing to buy EE products. Detente has opened up many opportunities for EE countries to improve their images. Eastern European governments should promote tourism and encourage citizens to treat tourists well.

Eastern European countries may attempt to build up their industrial base taking advantage of the goodwill their current reforms have engendered. However, with increased exposure product quality will have to reinforce positive views or the goodwill will quickly evaporate. Eastern European countries should concentrate on exporting the products that they make well. Establishing reasonable quality levels will assist EE countries in improving their general product image, and it will allow for sustainable future export growth. Eastern European countries should continue to take advantage of joint-ventures with Western partners. These agreements allow EE companies to take advantage of their Western partners technology and know-how and may improve country image.

Each EE country must work to improve its image in areas where it is perceived as being particularly weak. Soviet country and product images are perceived much less favourably than the other EE images studied. The U.S.S.R. must work on all areas of its country and product images. Poland must work to improve its image as a poor economically underdeveloped country incapable of making technical or high quality goods. To a lesser extent, Yugoslavia and Hungary must also strive to improve their backward images. It may prove easier for these nations to do so given that Canadian respondents knew less about them than the other EE countries studied. Respondents may have more entrenched negative views towards Polish and Soviet products. Czechoslovakia had consistently the most favourable country and product images. It must now strive to improve its images to the point where they approach those of Western nations.

8.4 Implications for marketers

The research reported here was concerned with the relationship between views of country and attitudes toward products. Previous research suggests that country image affects consumers' evaluation of product attributes (Johansson, Douglas, and Nonaka 1985; Han 1989). The results of this study provide further evidence that views towards a country may act as a halo on product attitudes. If future research confirms that there is a direct relationship between country views and product attitudes then marketing strategies can be developed accordingly. Producers in countries which have favourable country images (i.e. industrialized, democratic, etc.) should exploit their advantageous image in their promotion. Packaging and labelling strategies might be developed which would emphasize country-of-origin. Many companies already have promotional strategies in which the accentuation of country-of-origin is an important objective. For example, IKEA has advertised itself in Canada as "The Impossible Furniture Store From Sweden". Pricing decisions may also be influenced by whether products from a specific country are perceived favourably or unfavourably. A high price strategy can be used to reinforce a high quality image (Keegan 1980). At the present time this strategy would probably not be advisable for EE producers. However, they could use this strategy in various market niches once good quality is established.

Producers which have unfavourable country images should attempt to minimize the impact of country-of-origin. Reiersen (1967) found that the image of foreign

products can be improved by associating the products with a prestigious retailer from a country with a favourable image. Some companies try to enhance their image by directly associating their product with a country that has a favourable image in a given product category. A recent example of this was Toyota's promotional campaign in which Germans were shown mistaking the Toyota Acura as a German car. Here, Toyota was likely trying to associate its top of the line car with the quality German car image. Eastern European producers would probably not be able to use this strategy successfully until they establish a reasonable international market presence. Another option for producers from unfavoured nations is to down play or camouflage country-of-origin. Here, no country information would be better than information which would reveal that the product was from an undesired origin. Schooler (1971) noted that price concessions can also be used by the unfavoured nation as a means of generating market acceptance.

Marketers should be interested in the strong correlations between conative & affective country items and product items. Given the strong correlations international consumer marketers may gain important information on market potential and marketing strategy by asking consumers how they feel about the country as well as how they feel about its products.

Some studies have found that general national product stereotypes can be significantly different from specific product attitudes (Reiersen 1966; Gaedeke 1973), while other research has revealed that product class and product item

stereotypes are congruent among themselves (Gaedeke 1973; Crawford and Garland 1987). If the first group of studies are correct then it may be inappropriate for marketers to base advertising on general national product attitudes, as specific product attitudes may be more relevant. Complexity is a factor which may, to some extent, determine why some specific product perceptions deviate from "general" product perception. It is important that marketers further investigate this phenomena so that appropriate promotional strategies can be undertaken.

9. RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The results of this study suggest that views of nations are related to attitudes towards products. Future research examining country/product correlations is necessary if this finding is to be confirmed. Attention should also be given to the study of country and product images which are familiar to respondents. In this way more could be learned into how and when country-of-origin may act as a summary construct as opposed to a halo. Other potential correlates of the country-of-origin bias need to be further examined (e.g., travel, ethnic background, social contact, etc.).

Affective and conative country items were found to be the best predictors of the product items "Willing to Buy" and "Good Overall Products". Cognitive items bearing on economic development were found to be good predictors in the case of the product item "Good Overall Products". Further study is needed to determine whether or not this pattern of association is unique to the country images examined in this study. In this research scales were developed largely from the existing literature. However, there is a need for further testing and development of both country attitude and product attitude scales.

Eastern European country and product profiles merit continued investigation. The country and product profiles of these countries will likely change as the actual country environments change. At the present time these environments are proving to be particularly dynamic. If future investigations are made, researchers

may gain a more complete understanding of EE country profiles by including Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania in their projects.

This study examined mainly EE country and product images. Countries and products from other "blocs" (e.g., South East Asia) need to be studied in order to determine if their member states have distinct or homogenous images.

Further study is needed on the interaction between country-of-origin and product complexity. This project examined only four specific products and six country images. Future researchers may want to investigate the interaction between country-of-origin and complexity on a broader scale.

Previous research into how demographics affect the country-of-origin bias have been largely contradictory (Bilkey and Nes 1982). The results of this study do little to clear up the confusion in this area of study. Further research is required before even limited generalizations can be made.

10. CONCLUSIONS

The main findings of this research fall in four general areas. The study has examined potential correlates of the country-of-origin bias, EE country and product profile differences, the interaction between complexity and country-of-origin, and demographic differences in the country-of-origin-bias.

The results of this study indicate that country views can predict product attitudes. The nature of the data does not allow clear establishment of causality. That is, product attitudes may impact on views of countries as much as views of countries may impact on product attitudes (Han 1989). However, in the case of the EE profiles causality may be surmised given the very limited knowledge respondents had with EE products. For all profiles examined, with the exception of Yugoslavia, respondents indicated that they knew more about the country than they did about its products. This result, coupled with the fact that most respondents can have had only limited experience with EE products, leads to a strong suspicion that country halos do exist.

The results of this study suggest that Canadians have significantly different views towards both EE countries and EE products. The U.S.S.R. was found to have significantly poorer country and product images than the other EE countries studied. Czechoslovakia's images were found to be the most favourable. France's superior product ratings indicate that, to differing degrees, all EE products suffer from an image problem with respect to Western, developed countries.

In this study product complexity was found to moderate the influence of country-of-origin. Therefore, it can be concluded that general product stereotypes will not always be the same as specific product stereotypes.

The results of this study indicate that individuals with a high level of education rate French products more favourably than individuals with a low level of education. No significant ratings differences were found on the basis of gender, age, and income. From these findings it can be concluded that country-of-origin ratings differences, based on demographics, are specific to particular environmental conditions (e.g., education level and French product ratings). There do not appear to be any general consistent ratings differences based on demographics (e.g., women rate foreign products higher than men).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdel-Malek, T. (1978). "Comparative Profiles of Foreign Customers and Intermediaries", European Journal of Marketing, Vol.9, 198-214.
- Aboud, F. and S. Skerry (1984). "The Development of Ethnic Attitudes", Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Vol.15, 3-34.
- Anderson, N.H. (1982). Methods of Information Integration Theory. New York: Academic Press.
- Artisien, P.F.R. and P.J. Buckley (1985). "Joint Ventures in Yugoslavia: Opportunities and Constraints", Journal of International Business Studies, Spring, Vol.16, 111-135.
- Bannister, J.P. and J.A. Saunders (1978). "U.K. Consumers' Attitudes Towards Imports: The Measurement of National Stereotype Image", European Journal of Marketing, Vol.12, 562-570.
- Barcikowski, R.S. (1983). Computer Packages and Research Design, Volume 3: SPSS and SPSSX. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.
- Barker, H.R. and B.M. Barker (1984). Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA). A Practical Guide to its Use in Scientific Decision Making. Birmingham: The University of Alabama Press.
- Barnett, D. and T. Lewis (1978). Outliers in Statistical Data. New York: John Wiley.
- Bilkey, W. and E. Nes (1982). "Country-of-Origin Effects on Product Evaluations", Journal of International Business Studies, Spring/Summer, Vol.13, 89-99.
- Bock, R.D. (1975). Multivariate Statistical Methods In Behavioural Research. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brown, L.A. (1981). Innovation Diffusion: A New Perspective. New York: Methuen and Co..
- Byrne, D. and D. Nelson (1965). "Attraction as a Linear Function of Proportion of Positive Reinforcements", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol.1, 659-663.
- Campbell, D. and R. Levine (1972). Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes and Group Behaviour. New York: John Wiley.

- Cattin, P., A. Jolibert and C. Lohnes (1982). "A Cross Cultural Study of "Made In " Concepts", Journal of International Business Studies, Winter, Vol.13, 131-140.
- Chasin, J.B. and E.D. Jaffe (1979). "Industrial Buyer Attitudes Toward Goods Made in Eastern Europe", Columbia Journal of World Business, Summer, Vol.14, 74-81.
- Chasin, J.B. and E.D. Jaffe (1987). "Industrial Buyer Attitudes Towards Goods Made In Eastern Europe: An Update", European Management Journal, Vol.5, 180-189.
- Chasin, J.B., H.H. Holzmuller and E.D. Jaffe (1989). "Stereotyping, Buyer Familiarity and Ethnocentrism: A Cross-Cultural Analysis", Journal of International Consumer Marketing, Vol.1, 9-25.
- Cohen, J. and P. Cohen (1983). Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. Hillsdale (N.J.): Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.
- Cook, R.D. and S. Weisberg (1982). Residuals and Influence in Regression. New York: Chapman and Hall.
- Crawford, J.C. and B.C. Garland (1987). "East-West Trading Relationships: The Importance of Political Freedom", Journal of Global Marketing, Fall/Winter, Vol.1, 105-112.
- Davidson, A.R. and D.M. Morrison (1983). "Predicting Contraceptive Behaviour From Attitudes: A Comparison of Within - Versus Across-Subjects Attitudes, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 45, 997-1009.
- Davis, D. and R. Cosenza (1988). Business Research for Decision Making. Boston: PWS-Kent Publishing Company.
- Dickerson, K.G. (1987). "Relative Importance of Country-of- Origin as an Attribute in Apparel Choices", Journal of Consumer Studies and Home Economics, Vol.11, 333-343.
- Dillman, D. (1977). Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method. New York: John Wiley.
- Dornoff, R.J. et al. (1974). "Consumers' Perceptions of Imports", Akron Business and Economic Review, Vol.5, Summer, 26-29.
- Draper, N.R. and H. Smith (1981). Applied Regression Analysis. New York: John Wiley.

- The Europa World Year Book (1990). London: Europa Publications Limited.
- Forgas, J.P. (1983). "What is Social About Cognition?". British Journal of Social Psychology, Vol.22, 129-144.
- Forgas, J.P. and M. O'Driscoll (1984). "Cross-Cultural And Demographic Differences In The Perception Of Nations", Journal Of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Vol.15, 199-222.
- Fowler, F.J. (1988). Survey Research Methods, London: Sage Publications Inc.
- Foxhall, G.R. (1983). Consumer Choice. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Funk and Wagnall's Standard Dictionary (1983). New York: Harper and Row.
- Gaedeke, R. (1973). "Consumer Attitudes Toward Products "Made In" Developing Countries," Journal of Retailing, Vol.49, 14-24.
- Ghosh, B. (1990). "Money Can't Buy Reform", Journal of European Affairs, Summer, Vol.12, 98-105.
- Gorsuch, R.L. (1983). Factor Analysis. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Grace, H.A. and J.O. Neuhaus (1952). "Information and Social Distance as Predictors of Hostility Toward Nations", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol.47, 540-545.
- Hakkansson, H. and B. Wootz (1975). "Supplier Selection in an International Environment - An Experimental Study", Journal of Marketing Research, Vol.12, 46-51.
- Hampton, G. (1977). "Perceived Risk in Buying Products Made Abroad By American Firms", Baylor Business Studies, October, 53-64.
- Han, M.C. and V. Terpstra (1988). "Country-of-Origin Effects for Uni-National and Bi-National Products", Journal of International Business Studies, Summer, Vol.19, 235-255.
- Han, M.C. (1989). "Country Image: Halo or Summary Construct?", Journal of Marketing Research, Vol.26, 222-229.
- Heslop, L.A., J. Liefeld and M. Wall (1987). "An Experimental Study of the Impact of Country-of-Origin Information", In: Turner, R., ed., Marketing, Proceedings of The Administrative Science Association of Canada, Annual Conference, Marketing Division, Toronto, Ontario, 179-185.

- Hill, C.E. and D.E. Stull (1981). "Sex Differences in Effects of Social Value Similarity in Same Sex Friendship", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol.78, 165-171.
- Hisrich R.D., M.P. Peters and A.K. Weinstein (1981). "East-West Trade: The View From The United States", Journal of International Business Studies, Winter, Vol.12, 109-121.
- Hisrich, R.D. and M.P. Peters (1983). "East-West Trade: An Assessment by U.S. Manufacturers", Columbia Journal of World Business, Winter, Vol.18, 44-49.
- Holman, R., M. Sevcik and J. Schwartz (1990). "Transformation of a Post-Communist Economy: Czechoslovakian Example", Columbia Journal of World Business, Winter, Vol.25, 5-7.
- Huber, J. and J. McCann (1982). "Price, Brand Name and Product Composition Characteristics as Determinants of Perceived Quality", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol.56, 570-579.
- Jacoby, J., J.C. Olson and Haddock, R.A. (1971). "Price, Brand Name and Product Composition Characteristics as Determinants of Perceived Quality", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol.55, 570-579.
- Johansson, J., S. Douglas and I. Nenaka (1985). "Assessing the Impact of Country-of-Origin on Product Evaluations: A New Methodological Perspective", Journal of Marketing Research, Vol.22, 388-396.
- Jones, R.A. and R.D. Ashmore (1973). "The Structure of Intergroup Perception", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol.25, 428-438.
- Kaynak, E. and A. C. Samli (1986). "Eastern European Marketing Systems and Western Marketing Research Voids: A Research Agenda", Journal of Business Research, Vol.14, 109-116.
- Keegan, W.J. (1974). Multinational Marketing Management, New York: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Klein, B. and K.B. Leffler (1981). "The Role of Market Forces in Assuring Contractual Performance", Journal of Political Economy, Vol.89, 615-641.
- Kraljik, P. (1990). "The Economic Gap Separating East and West", Columbia Journal of World Business, Winter, Vol.25, 14-19.

- Krishnakumar, P. (1974). "An Exploratory Study of the Influence of Origin on the Product Images of Persons From Selected Countries", Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Florida.
- Lillis, C.M. and C.L. Narayana (1974). "Analysis of 'Made In' Product Images An Exploratory Study", Journal of International Business Studies, Spring, Vol.5, 119-127.
- Linn, R.L. (1968). "A Monte Carlo Approach to the Number of Factors Problem", Psychometrika, Vol.33, 37-71.
- Lord, R. and M. Novick, (1968). Statistical Theories of Mental Test Scores, Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Marin, G. and J.M. Salazar (1985). "Determinants of Hetero and Auto stereotypes", Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology, Vol.16, 403-421.
- Maslov, A. (1990). "Bankrolling Soviet Joint Ventures", Journal of European Affairs, Summer, Vol.12, 59-65.
- Maxwell, S.E. (1980). "Pairwise Multiple Comparisons in Repeated Measures Designs", Journal of Educational Statistics, Vol.5, 269-287.
- Morrison, D.F. (1976). Multivariate Statistical Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nagashima A. (1970). "A Comparison of Japanese and U.S. Attitudes Toward Foreign Products", Journal of Marketing, Vol.34, 68-74.
- Nagashima A. (1977). "A Comparative 'Made In' Product Image Survey Among Japanese Businessmen", Journal of Marketing, Vol.41, 95-100.
- Nes, E.B., (1981). "Consumer Perception of Product Risk and Quality for Goods Manufactured in Developing versus Industrial Nations", Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, University of Wisconsin.
- Newman, J. and R. Staelin (1972). "Prepurchase Information Seeking for New Cars and Major Household Appliances", Journal of Marketing Research, Vol.9, 249-257.
- Nigh, D., P. Walters and J.A. Kuhlman (1990). "US-USSR Joint Ventures: An Examination of Early Entrants", Columbia Journal of World Business, Winter, Vol.25, 20-27.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). Psychometric Theory, New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Oddou, G. and M. Mendenhall (1985). "Person Perception in Cross Cultural Settings: A Review Off Cross-Cultural and Related Literature", International Journal of Intercultural Relations, Vol.8, 77-96.
- Olson, C.L. (1976). "On Choosng a Test Statistic in Manova", Psychological Bulletin, Vol.83, 579-586.
- Pagel, M.D. and A.R. Davidson (1984). "A Comparison of Three Social-Psychological Models of Attitude and Behavioral Plan; Prediction of Contraception Behaviour. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol.47, 517-533.
- Papadopoulos, N. and L.A. Heslop (1986). "Travel As A Correlate Of Product And Country Images", In: Marketing, Proceedings of The Administrative Science Association of Canada, Annual Conference, Marketing Division, Whistler, B.C., 191-200.
- Papadopoulos, N., L.A. Heslop, F. Graby and G. Avlonitis (1987). "Does 'Country-Of-Origin' Matter? Some Findings From a Cross-Cultural Study of Consumer Views About Foreign Products", Marketing Science Institute Report, No. 87-104, Boston, Mass.: Marketing Science Institute.
- Papadopoulos N., J. Marshall and L.A. Heslop (1988). "Strategic Implications Of Product And Country Images: A Modelling Approach", The 41st E.S.O.M.A.R. Marketing Research Congress, Lisbon, Portugal, 69-90.
- Papadopoulos, N., L.A. Heslop and G. Bamossy (1990). "A Comparative Image Analysis Of Domestic Versus Imported Products", International Journal of Research Marketing, Vol.7, 283-294.
- Reierson, C. (1964). "An Investigation Of Attitude Toward The Products Of Selected Nations Among College Students And The Test Of Certain Methods For Changing Existing Attitudes", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University Of Texas.
- Reierson, C. (1967). "Attitude Changes Toward Foreign Products", Journal of Marketing Research, Vol.4, 385-387.
- Renwick, F. and R. Renwick (1988). "Country Of Origin Images: Influence of Purchasing Experience and Social Linkages Upon Cross-Cultural Stereotyping", Unpublished Working Paper.
- Robinson, J.P. and R. Hefner (1967). "Multidimensional Differences in Public and Academic Perceptions of Nations", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol.25, 428-438.

- Rogers, E.M. (1976). "A Personal History Of Research On The Diffusion Of Innovations", In: A. Andreasen and S. Sudman eds., Public Policy And Marketing Thought: Proceedings From The Ninth Paul D. Coven Symposium, 43-65.
- Samli, A.C. and W. Jermakowicz (1983). "The Stages of Marketing Evolution in Eastern European Countries", European Journal of Marketing, Vol.17, 26-33.
- Schellinck, D.A. (1986), "An Exploratory Study into the Impact of Country-Of-Origin as a Cue in Product Choice", In: Muller, T., Marketing, Proceedings of The Administrative Science Association of Canada, Annual Conference, Marketing Division, Whistler, B.C., 181-190.
- Schooler, R. (1965). "Product Bias In Central American Common Market", Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 2, 394-397.
- Schooler, R. and A. Wildt (1968). "Elasticity of Product Bias", Journal of Marketing Research, Vol.5, 78-81.
- Schooler, R. (1971). "Bias Phenomena Attendant to the Marketing of Foreign Goods in the U.S.", Journal of International Business Studies, Spring, 71-80.
- Sherman, R.C. (1973). "Divisional Salience in the Perception of Nations as a Function of Attitude Toward War and Anticipated Social Interaction". Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol.20, 65-73.
- Simon, H.A. (1974). "How Big is a Chunk", Science, Vol.183, 1-23.
- Srivasta, M.S. and E.M. Carter (1983). An Introduction to Applied Multivariate Statistics. New York: Elsevier Science Publishing Co., Inc..
- Statistics Canada (1986). "Profiles: Population And Dwelling Characteristics: Census Metropolitan Areas And Census Agglomerations, Vol. 93-156, Part 1, 56-60.
- Statistics Canada (1989). "Exports By Country", Vol.46, 54-66.
- Statistics Canada (1990). "Imports: Merchandise Trade - Imports By Country Of Origin", Vol.48, 2.
- Steiger, J.H. (1979). "Factor Indeterminacy in The 1930's And The 1970's: Some Interesting Parallels", Psychometrika, Vol.44, 157-167.
- Stevens, J. (1986). Applied Multivariate Statistics For The Social Sciences. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Tabachnick, B.G. and L.S. Fidell (1983). Using Multivariate Statistics, New York: Harper and Row.
- Tajfel, H. and J.P. Forgas (1981). "Social Categorization: Cognition, Values and Groups", In: J.P. Forgas ed., Social Cognition: Perspectives on Everyday Understanding, New York: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). Human Groups and Social Categories. Cambridge: University Press.
- Taormina, R.J. and D. Messick (1983). "Deservingness for Foreign Aid: Effects of Need, Similarity, and Estimated Effectiveness", Journal of Applied Social Psychology, Vol. 13, 371-391.
- Taormina, R.J., D. Messick, S. Iwawaki and H. Wilke (1988). "Cross Cultural Perspectives on Foreign Aid Deservingness Decisions", Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Vol.19, 387-412.
- Thomas, R.T. (1983). "Univariate Repeated Measures Techniques Applied to Multivariate Data", Psychometrika, Vol.48, No.3, 451-464.
- Tims, A.R. and M.M. Miller (1983). "Another Look at What Affects Attitudes Toward Foreign Countries", Proceedings of the American Association of Public Opinion Research, Annual Convention, Buck Hill Falls, Pennsylvania.
- Tongberg, R.C. (1972). "An Empirical Study of Relationships Between Dogmatism and Consumer Attitudes Towards Foreign Products", Ph.D. Dissertation, Pennsylvania State University.
- Triandis, H.C. et al. (1982). "Stereotyping Among Hispanics and Anglos", Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Vol.13, 409-426.
- Tversky, A. and D. Kahnemann (1973). "Availability: A Heuristic for Judging Frequency and Probability", Cognitive Psychology, Vol.5, 207-232.
- Wall, M. and L.A. Heslop (1986). "Consumer Attitudes Toward Canadian Made Versus Import Products", Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Vol.14, 27-36.
- Wall, M., J. Liefeld and L.A. Heslop (1991). "Impact of Country-Of-Origin Cues On Consumer Judgements In Multi-Cue Situations: A Covariance Analysis", Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Vol.19, 105-113.

- Wang, C.K. (1978). "The Effect of Foreign Economic, Political and Cultural Environment on Consumers' Willingness to Buy Foreign Products.", Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Texas A & M University, 1978.
- Wang, C.K. and C. Lamb (1980). "Foreign Environmental Factors Influencing American Consumers' Predispositions Toward European Products", Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Vol.8, 345-356.
- Wang, C.K. and C. Lamb (1983). "The Impact of Selected Environmental Forces Upon Consumers' Willingness to Buy Foreign Products", Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Vol.11, 71-83.
- Webster, F.E. and Y. Wind (1972). Organizational Buying Behaviour. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Weisberg, S. (1985). Applied Linear Regression. New York: John Wiley.
- Wilkinson, L. (1979). "Tests of Significance in Stepwise Regression", Psychological Bulletin, Vol.86, 168-174.
- Winer, B.J. (1962). Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- White, P.D. (1979). "Attitudes of U.S. Purchasing Managers Toward Industrial Products Manufactured in Selected European Nations", Journal of International Business Studies, Spring/Summer, Vol.10, 81-90.
- Wish, M., M. Deustchand and L. Biener (1970). "Differences in Conceptual Structures of Nations: An Exploratory Study", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol.16, 361-373.
- Wright, P.L. (1975), "Consumer Choice Strategies: Simplifying vs. Optimizing", Journal of Marketing Research, Vol.11, 60-67.
- Zaltman, G. (1983). Process and Phenomena Of Social Change. New York: John Wiley.

APPENDIX A - VERSION II QUESTIONNAIRE**INTERNATIONAL TRADE: THE QUALITY OF PRODUCTS FROM
FOREIGN NATIONS**

The object of this survey is to understand better the views of Canadian consumers about products made in various countries. This is part of a larger study. Different parts of the sample are asked to assess different sets of countries.

Please answer all the questions; incomplete questionnaires cannot be included in the statistical analysis. If you wish to comment on any questions please feel free to do so in the margins or in the space provided on the back cover. Your comments will be read and taken into account.

Thanks a lot for your help.

DAVID BENNETT
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
CARLETON UNIVERSITY
OTTAWA, ONTARIO
K1S 5B6

613-788-2392

We will be glad to provide you with a summary of our findings once analysis is complete. If you would like to receive the summary, please check here ____

SECTION I

This section examines how you feel about four countries and their people: France, The Union Of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.), Poland, and Yugoslavia. Your opinions are highly valued whether you consider yourself knowledgeable about these countries or not.

On each of the following pages you will find a different country to be judged along a set of scales. To do this, simply put an "X" in the space that is closest to your opinion. For example, if your opinion is very closely related to the word on the left, please mark the scale as follows:

Rich: X : __ : __ : __ : __ : __ : __ : Poor

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

Rich: __ : __ : __ : __ : X : __ : __ : Poor

And so on.

IMPORTANT NOTES

Place all check marks in the middle of spaces, not on the dividing line.

For example:

Rich: __ : __ : X : __ X : __ : __ : Poor

THIS NOT THIS

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

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

FRANCE AND THE FRENCH

Industrialized	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Industrialized
Educated People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Uneducated People
Non-Western Culture	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Western Culture
I Know Little About France And The French	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Know A Lot About France And The French
Stable	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Unstable
Rich	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor
Autocratic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Democratic
Not An Ideal Country	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	An Ideal Country
Dangerous	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Safe
Passive People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Active People
Would Not Welcome More Immigration From	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Would Welcome More Immigration From
People Have Many Rights	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People Have Few Rights
I Dislike France	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Like France
Aggressive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Peaceful
Aligned With Canada	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Aligned With Canada
We Should Not Have Closer Ties With	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	We Should Have Closer Ties With
Not Trustworthy People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Trustworthy People
People Are Very Hardworking	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People Are Not Very Hardworking
Individualistic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Group Oriented
I Would Not Favour Further Canadian Investment In	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Would Favour Further Canadian Investment In

THE U.S.S.R. AND THE SOVIETS

Industrialized	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Industrialized
Educated People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Uneducated People
Non-Western Culture	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Western Culture
I Know Little About The USSR And The Soviets	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Know A Lot About The USSR And The Soviets
Stable	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Unstable
Rich	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor
Autocratic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Democratic
Not An Ideal Country	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	An Ideal Country
Dangerous	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Safe
Passive People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Active People
Would Not Welcome More Immigration From	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Would Welcome More Immigration From
People Have Many Rights	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People Have Few Rights
I Dislike The USSR	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Like The USSR
Aggressive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Peaceful
Aligned With Canada	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Aligned With Canada
We Should Not Have Closer Ties With	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	We Should Have Closer Ties With
Not Trustworthy People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Trustworthy People
People Are Very Hardworking	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People Are Not Very Hardworking
Individualistic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Group Oriented
I Would Not Favour Further Canadian Investment In	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Would Favour Further Canadian Investment In

POLAND AND THE POLISH

Industrialized	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Industrialized
Educated People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Uneducated People
Non-Western Culture	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Western Culture
I Know Little About Poland And The Polish	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Know A Lot About Poland And The Polish
Stable	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Unstable
Rich	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor
Autocratic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Democratic
Not An Ideal Country	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	An Ideal Country
Dangerous	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Safe
Passive People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Active People
Would Not Welcome More Immigration From	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Would Welcome More Immigration From
People Have Many Rights	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People Have Few Rights
I Dislike Poland	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Like Poland
Aggressive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Peaceful
Aligned With Canada	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Aligned With Canada
We Should Not Have Closer Ties With	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	We Should Have Closer Ties With
Not Trustworthy People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Trustworthy People
People Are Very Hardworking	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People Are Not Very Hardworking
Individualistic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Group Oriented
I Would Not Favour Further Canadian Investment In	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Would Favour Further Canadian Investment In

YUGOSLAVIA AND THE YUGOSLAVIANS

Industrialized	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Industrialized
Educated People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Uneducated People
Non-Western Culture	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Western Culture
I Know Little About Yugoslavia An Yugoslavians	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Know A Lot About Yugoslavia An Yugoslavians
Stable	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Unstable
Rich	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor
Autocratic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Democratic
Not An Ideal Country	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	An Ideal Country
Dangerous	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Safe
Passive People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Active People
Would Not Welcome More Immigration From	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Would Welcome More Immigration From
People Have Many Rights	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People Have Few Rights
I Dislike Yugoslavia	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Like Yugoslavia
Aggressive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Peaceful
Aligned With Canada	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Aligned With Canada
We Should Not Have Closer Ties With	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	We Should Have Closer Ties With
Not Trustworthy People	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Trustworthy People
People Are Very Hardworking	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	People Are Not Very Hardworking
Individualistic	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Group Oriented
I Would Not Favour Further Canadian Investment In	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	I Would Favour Further Canadian Investment In

SECTION II

This section examines how you feel about the countries' products. It does not matter whether or not you have had personal experience with the products from the country in question. By "products" we mean both physical products and services (everything from soap and cars to ships and medical research). You will be asked to evaluate the products of the following countries, France, The U.S.S.R, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

On each of the following pages you will find the products of a different country to judge along a set of scales. Once again, simply put an "X" in the space that is closest to your opinion.

Please remember to check every scale for every country, and do not omit any.

PRODUCTS OF FRANCE

Products Are Unattractive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Products Are Attractive
Good Value For The Money	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor Value For The Money
Not Willing To Buy	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Willing To Buy
Imitative	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Innovative
Good Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor Quality
Unrecognizable Brands	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Recognizable Brands
Expensive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Inexpensive
Know A Lot About	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Know Little About
Unreliable	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Reliable
Proud To Own	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Proud To Own
Not Technically Advanced	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Technically Advanced
Good After Sales Service	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor After Sales Service
Products Are Hard To Find	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Products Are Easy To Find
Poor Workmanship	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Workmanship
Not Satisfied With	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Satisfied With

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

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

And how would you rate the quality of specific French products?

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

PRODUCTS OF THE U.S.S.R.

Products Are Unattractive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Products Are Attractive
Good Value For The Money	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor Value For The Money
Not Willing To Buy	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Willing To Buy
Imitative	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Innovative
Good Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor Quality
Unrecognizable Brands	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Recognizable Brands
Expensive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Inexpensive
Know A Lot About	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Know Little About
Unreliable	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Reliable
Proud To Own	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Proud To Own
Not Technically Advanced	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Technically Advanced
Good After Sales Service	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor After Sales Service
Products Are Hard To Find	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Products Are Easy To Find
Poor Workmanship	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Workmanship
Not Satisfied With	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Satisfied With

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

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

And how would you rate the quality of specific Soviet products?

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

PRODUCTS OF POLAND

Products Are Unattractive	: : : : : : : :	Products Are Attractive
Good Value For The Money	: : : : : : : :	Poor Value For The Money
Not Willing To Buy	: : : : : : : :	Willing To Buy
Imitative	: : : : : : : :	Innovative
Good Quality	: : : : : : : :	Poor Quality
Unrecognizable Brands	: : : : : : : :	Recognizable Brands
Expensive	: : : : : : : :	Inexpensive
Know A Lot About	: : : : : : : :	Know Little About
Unreliable	: : : : : : : :	Reliable
Proud To Own	: : : : : : : :	Not Proud To Own
Not Technically Advanced	: : : : : : : :	Technically Advanced
Good After Sales Service	: : : : : : : :	Poor After Sales Service
Products Are Hard To Find	: : : : : : : :	Products Are Easy To Find
Poor Workmanship	: : : : : : : :	Good Workmanship
Not Satisfied With	: : : : : : : :	Satisfied With

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

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

And how would you rate the quality of specific Polish products?

Poor Quality	Polish Microwave Ovens	Good Quality
Poor Quality	Polish Shoes	Good Quality
Poor Quality	Polish Clock Radios	Good Quality
Poor Quality	Polish Luggage	Good Quality

PRODUCTS OF YUGOSLAVIA

Products Are Unattractive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Products Are Attractive
Good Value For The Money	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor Value For The Money
Not Willing To Buy	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Willing To Buy
Imitative	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Innovative
Good Quality	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor Quality
Unrecognizable Brands	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Recognizable Brands
Expensive	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Inexpensive
Know A Lot About	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Know Little About
Unreliable	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Reliable
Proud To Own	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Not Proud To Own
Not Technically Advanced	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Technically Advanced
Good After Sales Service	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Poor After Sales Service
Products Are Hard To Find	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Products Are Easy To Find
Poor Workmanship	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good Workmanship
Not Satisfied With	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Satisfied With

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

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

And how would you rate the quality of specific Yugoslavian products?

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

SECTION III

On October 3, 1990, East and West Germany were reunified. The two questions in this section ask you what you feel the quality of goods manufactured in a United Germany will be like.

Compared to goods previously made in West Germany, goods made in a United Germany will be,

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

Compared to goods previously made in East Germany, goods made in a United Germany will be,

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

SECTION IV

This section of the questionnaire asks for some background information which will help us classify the answers we receive. Your responses are given anonymously and will be used only to analyze the data statistically. Please put a check mark in the appropriate space:

1) Are you a male__ or a female__ ?

2) In which bracket is your age?

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

3) What is your educational level?

grade school __ college graduate __
 some high school __ some university __
 high school graduate __ university graduate __
 some college __ Other (please specify) _____

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

Under \$15,000__ \$35,000-\$44,999__
 \$15,000-\$24,999__ \$45,000-\$59,999__
 \$25,000-\$34,999__ \$60,000 and over__

SECTION V

The following questions ask you to identify some of the factors which may have played a role in your assessment of the countries included in this questionnaire. For each country place a check mark next to any source of information which you feel has been important in shaping your views.

Please note that you may place a. many check marks as you feel are appropriate for each country image.

FRANCE

Things I learned in school _____
 Things I learned through
 the media (T.V., newspapers, etc) _____
 I have travelled there _____
 I have immigrated from there _____
 I have friends or relatives
 relatives who live there _____
 My family roots are there _____
 Other (please specify) _____

The USSR

Things I learned in school _____
 Things I learned through
 the media (T.V., newspapers, etc) _____
 I have travelled there _____
 I have immigrated from there _____
 I have friends or relatives
 relatives who live there _____
 My family roots are there _____
 Other (please specify) _____

Poland

Things I learned in school _____
 Things I learned through
 the media (T.V., newspapers, etc) _____
 I have travelled there _____
 I have immigrated from there _____
 I have friends or relatives
 relatives who live there _____
 My family roots are there _____
 Other (please specify) _____

Yugoslavia

Things I learned in school _____
 Things I learned through
 the media (T.V., newspapers, etc) _____
 I have travelled there _____
 I have immigrated from there _____
 I have friends or relatives
 relatives who live there _____
 My family roots are there _____
 Other (please specify) _____

We would appreciate any additional comments you would like to make about foreign products? Feel free to comment on the products of the countries included in the survey or on the products of any other country that interests you. Please use this space and attach additional sheets if necessary.

Your contribution to this effort is very greatly appreciated. Thank You!

APPENDIX B - QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

The research instrument was designed taking into account empirical evidence on survey sampling provided by Dillman (1977). Dillman's "total design method" (TDM) is based on the principle of maximizing quantity and quality of responses by identifying and shaping each aspect of the survey process in a manner which will encourage good response. Surveys that have followed the TDM approach provide convincing evidence that the TDM is capable of producing excellent results. The average response rates for 48 mail surveys and 31 telephone surveys following the TDM was 74 and 91 percent, respectively.

Examples of how TDM suggestions were used in this study include: A) The front cover, where a simple design was added, and the back cover which thanked respondents and allowed them to expand on their initial attitude ratings and B) The placement of the demographics section at the end of the research instrument, following the suggestion that objectionable questions should be placed after less (potentially) objectionable ones (Dillman 1977).

SECTION I

Section I consisted of twenty semantic differential items designed to measure attitudes towards nation states. Most of these items were drawn from the literature (Wish, Deutsch and Biener 1970; Sherman 1973; Forgas and O'Driscoll 1984; Marin and Salazar 1985; and Papadopoulos and Heslop 1986). The "Nation Perception Scale" (NPS) was arranged with the objective of overcoming some of the deficiencies of previous scales used in the literature. Scales developed by

other researchers suffer from problems such as, too few items, unreliable items, redundant items, etc.. To improve on previous work items were screened according to two criteria. First, the items had to load highly and distinctively on the dimensions of nation evaluation which have been extensively discussed by social psychologists (Forgas and O'Driscoll 1984). The second criterion was that the items in the scale reflect the composite nature of attitudes (i.e. cognition, affect, and conation) (Foxhall 1983).

The items on the NPS were chosen from the literature taking advantage of insights gleaned by previous researchers. Social psychologists, studying nation perception, have found that respondents evaluate nations based on Economic Development, Political Alignment, Culture and Race, and Geography and Population. The dimension, Geography and Population, arose in some studies where many countries from different continents were examined (Wish, Deutsch and Biener 1970). This factor was not a result of countries being rated similarly on an item (there are no Geography and Population items per se), rather, it was the result of certain countries being rated similarly over an entire scale. Therefore, no items were specifically designed to load on the dimension Geography and Population.

Items were selected if they had previously loaded highly on the Economic Development factor or the Political Alignment factor or the Culture and Race factor. The aim was to find items which loaded highly on one dimension and one dimension only. All efforts were made to achieve this end, however,

redundancy could not be completely eliminated. A problem existed in that there were strong relationships between the dimensions themselves. For example a highly developed economy was more likely to be associated with capitalism than communism. These two items would likely exhibit a certain synchronicity from stimulus country to stimulus country.

The items included in the NPS were also chosen taking into account what part of "attitude" they tapped. Attitudes consist of cognitions (beliefs), affect (emotion) and conation (action tendencies) (Foxhall 1983). The items on the NPS were selected such that each facet of attitude was well represented. Items like "Educated" and "Individualistic" tapped respondent beliefs, while items like "Trustworthy" and "I Like" elicited feelings towards the countries. Conative items such as "Should Have Closer Ties With" and "Favour Investment In" probed respondents' intentions towards the sample countries.

SECTION II

Section II consisted of sixteen semantic differential items designed to measure attitudes towards the products of foreign nations. The section also included four questions on specific products (see section 3.3). As with the NPS items, the items for foreign product attitudes were primarily taken from the literature. In the Country-of-origin literature most researchers have used items from Nagashima's (1970,1977) scale. A few researchers have modified Nagashima's work (Papadopoulos, Heslop and Bamossy 1990) but they have, for the most part, produced very similar scales. Nagashima's scale has become the standard in the country-of-origin literature.

The product perception scale (PPS) used here was primarily based on Nagashima's work. The PPS modified Nagashima's work taking into account the findings of the paper "Country Image-Product Image Scales" (Heslop 1988). The items included in the PPS scale take into account the three facets of attitude (e.g., cognition, affect, conation).

Nagashima (1970,1977) separated the items on his scale into five groups using his personal knowledge and intuition. He did not address the question of whether his sub-groupings fit the actual mind set of consumers. Heslop (1988), using data collected in a large multi-national survey, employed factor analysis and inter-item tests of reliability in an attempt to understand the actual mind set of consumers. This study found four main dimensions in respondent perceptual space. Only three of the dimensions were clearly interpretable. These

dimensions were Product Integrity, Market Presence, and Price & Value.

The PPS included items which had loaded well on the aforementioned dimensions. Six items were designed to collect consumer attitudes about a foreign product's engineering and design (product integrity):

- 1) Poor Workmanship/Good Workmanship
- 2) Poor Quality/Good Quality
- 3) Not Technically Advanced/Technically Advanced
- 4) Imitative/Innovative
- 5) Products Are Unattractive/Products Are Attractive
- 6) Reliable/Unreliable

These items have been found to load well in the past on the product integrity dimension (Heslop 1988). Moreover, the items appropriately touched on the different facets of product engineering and design. Six items were included because of the importance of product quality to consumers.

Three items in the PPS were designed to collect attitudes on a foreign product's market presence:

- 7) Products Are Hard To Find/Products Are Easy To Find
- 8) Unrecognizable Brands/Recognizable Brands
- 9) Know Little About/Know A Lot About

These items were included because of their high loadings on the market presence factor in previous research (Heslop 1988). It was felt that a large array of market presence items was not needed due to the very small market presence of Eastern European goods. Too many items concerning availability might have disturbed respondents.

Two items were selected to be used as the dependent variables on which country items would be regressed:

- 10) "Poor Overall Products"/"Good Overall Products"
- 11) " Not Willing To Buy"/"Willing To Buy"

These items are commonly used as product attitude summary variables (Wang 1980). The item Not Satisfied With/Satisfied With (12) joined item (11) as a second conative item in the PPS.

Two items were designed to collect foreign product attitude ratings on "price and value". It was felt that only a few items were needed to measure this factor due to its straightforwardness and due to the fact that this was the smallest factor, in terms of explained variance, in previous research (Heslop 1988). The items included were:

- 13) Poor Value/ Good Value
- 14) Inexpensive/Expensive

Finally, two commonly used items were added:

- 15) Good After Sales Service/Poor After Sales Service
- 16) Proud To Own/Not Proud To Own

After sales service is an important marketing function and an important consideration when buying a foreign product. The second item is also frequently an important consideration when considering the purchase of a foreign product. For a description of section III, IV, and V of the questionnaire see section 3.3. in the main body of the thesis.

APPENDIX C - PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS

Principal components analysis is commonly used in both exploratory regression analysis and in scale development. This statistical technique is often used as a variable reduction method. The main aim of this study was to test whether twenty nationality variables could predict overall foreign product quality. Here, the twenty independent variables were undoubtedly not measuring twenty different constructs. Many statisticians advise against working with a large number of predictors (Lord and Novick 1968; Stevens 1986). If a stable regression equation is to be created a ratio of about fifteen respondents per predictor is necessary (Stevens 1986). Given the size of the survey sample (140 for four of the six regressions) only approximately ten predictors should have been considered.

The Kaiser criterion was used for retaining components for interpretation (Kaiser 1960). This states that only those components whose eigenvalues are greater than one should be retained. The Kaiser criterion is the default procedure on SPSSX. This rule will usually result in the retention of only the most important factors. The rotation used in this study was varimax. The varimax rotation is designed so that each factor tends to load high on a smaller number of variables and very low on the other variables. Stevens (1986) recommends varimax as the best orthogonal rotation.

Having decided on a component retention rule and on component rotation the next decision centred on what loadings to use in the interpretation of a

component. Any loading which was going to be used to interpret a factor would have to be statistically significant at the very least. The formula for the standard error of a correlation coefficient cannot be used to determine significance because components analysis is a maximization procedure and in rotating there is a substantial opportunity to capitalize on chance (Stevens 1986). Due to this capitalization on chance the formula for the standard error of a correlation can seriously underestimate the actual amount of error in a factor loading (Stevens 1986). To adjust for this capitalization on chance Stevens (1986) suggests doubling the critical value required for significance in an ordinary correlation. Furthermore, he suggests testing each loading for significance at $\alpha = .01$ because there are usually a large number of tests which have to be performed (e.g., 20 variables > 20 tests). Following Stevens' technique only loadings > .434 were interpreted.

Principal components analysis can be used as a variable reduction scheme in at least two ways: 1) principally generated factors can be used as artificial variables or 2) simple correlations and factor loadings can be used to combine highly similar response measures (Pruzek 1971). In order to improve reliability while reducing the number of variables it was decided that highly similar response measures would be combined. The next step in the process was to decide on what basis variables would be combined. The evaluation proceeded by determining which factor loadings were highly correlated with components on a consistent basis. A loading was judged to be consistent if it appeared repeatedly in the same factor across country treatments (at least 2/3 of the time). A

occurrence was judged repeated if it loaded equal to or greater than .434 on more than one occasion. A variable was judged to be highly correlated with a factor if its average loading, across country treatments, was .60 or greater (36% shared variance with component).

Principal components analysis was used to reduce the original number of predictor variables from 20 to 13. This improved the N/K ratio from 7/1 to approximately 11/1. The new ratio was close to the N/K ratio proposed by Stevens (1986). Composite variables were created only in those situations where the same variables could be logically combined for each of the six treatments. The composite variables created were Affiliation, Technical Advancement, Security, and Political Ideology.

APPENDIX C (Ctnd.) - PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS

PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS - FRANCE 20 ITEMS (COUNTRY)

FINAL STATISTICS:

VARIABLE	COMMUNALITY	* *	FACTOR	EIGENVALUE	PCT OF VAR	CUM PCT
FINDUS	.64845	*	1	5.53436	27.7	27.7
FEDUC	.64609	*	2	1.96067	9.8	37.5
FWest	.43443	*	3	1.54976	7.7	45.2
FKNOWC	.57203	*	4	1.15222	5.8	51.0
FSTAB	.54638	*	5	1.04757	5.2	56.2
FRICH	.57512	*				
FAUTO	.54911	*				
FIDEAL	.63144	*				
FDANG	.43238	*				
FPASS	.32534	*				
FIMMIG	.53969	*				

VARIMAX ROTATION 1 FOR EXTRACTION 1 IN ANALYSIS 1 - KAISER NORMALIZATION.

VARIMAX CONVERGED IN 7 ITERATIONS.

ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX:

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5
FLIKE	.76344				
FTIES	.73420				
FTRUST	.70512				
FINVEST	.68247				
FIMMIG	.67494				
FIDEAL	.56518				
FEDUC		.76605			
FINDUS		.76588			
FRICH		.69927			
FSTAB		.60904			
FAUTO			.62571		
FAGGES			.59167		
FALIGN			.56906		
FRIGHT			.47136		
FDANG					
FKNOWC				.73500	
FWest				.64614	
FPASS				.49408	
FINDIV					.84860
FWORK					.52134

PRINCIPAL COMPONENT ANALYSIS - THE USSR 20 ITEMS (COUNTRY)

FINAL STATISTICS:

VARIABLE	COMMUNALITY	#	FACTOR	EIGENVALUE	PCT OF VAR	CUM PCT
UINDUS	.73572	#	1	3.96267	19.8	19.8
UEDUC	.64448	#	2	2.46664	12.3	32.1
UWest	.50255	#	3	1.36722	6.8	39.0
UKNOWC	.60222	#	4	1.27882	6.4	45.4
USTAB	.52994	#	5	1.10422	5.5	50.9
URICH	.64829	#	6	1.04298	5.2	56.1
UAUTO	.54779	#				
UIDEAL	.44213	#				
UDANG	.42151	#				
UPASS	.66155	#				

VARIMAX ROTATION 1 FOR EXTRACTION 1 IN ANALYSIS 1 - KAISER NORMALIZATION.

VARIMAX CONVERGED IN 7 ITERATIONS.

ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX:

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6
UTRUST	.73876					
UINVEST	.73085					
UTIES	.72659					
ULIKE	.71727					
UIMMIG	.67670					
UAGGES	.61353					
UDANG	.55443					
URICH		.70680				
USTAB		.69768				
URIGHT		.62884				
UAUTO		.59064				
UIDEAL		.51983				
UINDUS			.84454			
UEDUC			.72721			
UALIGN				.73909		
UINDIV				.47919		
UPASS					.77221	
UWORK					.72767	
UKNOWC						.74747
UWEST						-.57654

PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS - HUNGARY 20 ITEMS (COUNTRY)

FINAL STATISTICS:

VARIABLE	COMMUNALITY	* #	FACTOR	EIGENVALUE	PCT OF VAR	CUM PCT
HINDUS	.55967	*	1	4.46884	22.3	22.3
HEDUC	.70573	*	2	2.39686	12.0	34.3
HWest	.67230	*	3	1.70144	8.5	42.8
HKNOWC	.70421	*	4	1.36064	6.8	49.6
HSTAB	.68910	*	5	1.16013	5.8	55.4
HRICH	.69403	*	6	1.07470	5.4	60.8
HAUTO	.47402	*				
HIDEAL	.56508	*				
HDANG	.53567	*				
HPASS	.55370	*				

VARIMAX ROTATION 1 FOR EXTRACTION 1 IN ANALYSIS 1 - KAISER NORMALIZATION.

VARIMAX CONVERGED IN 13 ITERATIONS.

ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX:

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6
HTIES	.79834					
HINVEST	.77790					
HLIKE	.75338					
HTRUST	.71134					
HIMMIG	.70581					
HAGGES	.57573				.44380	
HDANG	.49749					
HSTAB		.78865				
HRICH		.76988				
HINDIV			.69447			
HALIGN			.61312			
HIDEAL		.50110	.54354			
HAUTO			.52012			
HRIGHT			.46466			
HINDUS				.68271		
HPASS				.64296		
HEDUC		.53164		.59352		
HKNOWC					.79964	
HWORK						.77022
HWest				.47476		-.57971

PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS - CZECHOSLOVAKIA 20 ITEMS (COUNTRY)

FINAL STATISTICS:

VARIABLE	COMMUNALITY	#	FACTOR	EIGENVALUE	PCT OF VAR	CUM PCT
CINDUS	.62610	#	1	4.85075	24.3	24.3
CEduc	.61307	#	2	2.71756	13.6	37.8
CWoot	.52539	#	3	1.67819	8.4	46.2
CKNOWC	.82358	#	4	1.33397	6.7	52.9
CSTAB	.64897	#	5	1.11762	5.6	58.5
CRICH	.72223	#	6	1.05060	5.3	63.7
CAUTO	.55541	#				
CIDEAL	.51042	#				
CDANG	.62623	#				
CPASS	.59679	#				

VARIMAX ROTATION 1 FOR EXTRACTION 1 IN ANALYSIS 1 - KAISER NORMALIZATION.

VARIMAX CONVERGED IN 8 ITERATIONS.

ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX:

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6
CLIKE	.82161					
CINVEST	.81778					
CTIES	.80288					
CIMMIG	.73454					
CTRUST	.71811					
CAGGES	.65434					
CRIGHT		.72283				
CAUTO		.66762				
CWoot		.63743				
CDANG		.56893				
CIDEAL		.47894				
CEduc			.73992			
CINDUS			.73896			
CSTAB			.69337			
CRICH			.67505			
CINDIV				.75777		
CALIGN				.67412		
CWORK					.87883	
CPASS		.46779			.48478	
CKNOWC						.89943

PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS - POLAND 20 ITEMS (COUNTRY)

FINAL STATISTICS:

VARIABLE	COMMUNALITY	#	FACTOR	EIGENVALUE	PCT OF VAR	CUM PCT
		*				
PINDUS	.69176	*	1	4.57786	22.9	22.9
PEDUC	.66732	*	2	2.20196	11.0	33.9
PWest	.63183	*	3	1.53527	7.7	41.6
PKNOWC	.51254	*	4	1.29792	6.5	48.1
PSTAB	.59853	*	5	1.24504	6.2	54.3
PRICH	.69159	*	6	1.10955	5.5	59.8
PAUTO	.65496	*	7	1.02047	5.1	64.9
PIDEAL	.74912	*				
PDANG	.74986	*				
PPASS	.62097	*				
PIMMIG	.69460	*				
PRIGHT	.73688	*				

VARIMAX ROTATION 1 FOR EXTRACTION 1 IN ANALYSIS 1 - KAISER NORMALIZATION.

VARIMAX CONVERGED IN 13 ITERATIONS.

ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX:

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6
FACTOR7						
PIMMIG	.80078					
PLIKE	.74690					
PTIES	.66475					
PINVEST	.61696					
PPASS	.50408					
PINDUL		.80365				
PEDUC		.78298				
PINDIV			.71860			
PSTAB			.65506			
PRICH		.46154	.63598			
PAGGES				.87080		
PDANG				.63599		
PTRUST	.43544			.51764		
PRIGHT					.76277	
PAUTO					.69483	
PKNOWC					.44461	
PIDEAL						.81342
PWORK						
.79365						
PWest						
-.48402						
PALIGN						
.44111						

PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS - YUGOSLAVIA 20 ITEMS (COUNTRY)

FINAL STATISTICS:

VARIABLE	COMMUNALITY	#	FACTOR	EIGENVALUE	PCT OF VAR	CUM PCT
YINDUS	.68111	*	1	4.45237	22.3	22.3
YEDUC	.76856	*	2	2.60531	13.0	35.3
YWest	.53596	*	3	1.64771	8.2	43.5
YKNOWC	.60152	*	4	1.40663	7.0	50.6
YSTAB	.58408	*	5	1.09730	5.5	56.0
YRICH	.70345	*	6	1.08930	5.4	61.5
YAUTO	.51024	*				
YIDFAL	.68580	*				
YDANG	.55213	*				
YPASS	.46958	*				
YIMMIG	.68224	*				

VARIMAX ROTATION 1 FOR EXTRACTION 1 IN ANALYSIS 1 - KATSER NORMALIZATION.

VARIMAX CONVERGED IN 13 ITERATIONS.

ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX:

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6
YTIES	.83301					
YIMMIG	.80010					
YLIKE	.71172					
YINVEST	.58458					
YTRUST	.56098			.55366		
YRICH		.79932				
YEDUC		.75843				
YINDUS		.73640				
YSTAB		.63670				
YINDIV			.73630			
YPASS			.62417			
YAUTO			.60271			
YRIGHT			.46225			
YWest						
YAGGES				.74134		
YDANG				.66537		
YALIGN					.83257	
YWORK					.52914	
YKNOWC						.67989
YIDEAL		.46056				.53498

APPENDIX D - STATISTICAL ASSUMPTIONS AND THE ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

I. Assumptions in Regression

The linear regression model assumes that the observed errors are independent and that they follow a normal distribution with a constant variance. The independence assumption, is by far the most important assumption, for even a small violation of it produces a substantial effect on both the level of significance and the power of the "F" statistic (Stevens 1986). A small amount of dependence among observations can cause actual alpha to be much greater than nominal alpha. In this study the independence assumption was not violated as survey treatments were individually administered. Subjects responded independently of one another.

To see if the observed errors were normally distributed a histogram of the standardized residuals was generated. Examination of the histograms of standardized residuals showed that the assumption of normality of residuals was tenable for all regression equations.

To assess other potential problems with the regression model residual plots were examined. Of particular interest was the plot of studentized residuals. In this plot actual versus predicted residuals were examined. Any systematic pattern or clustering of the residuals would have suggested a model violation. Residuals should be linearly distributed with a constant variance. An examination of the residual plots indicated that the assumptions of linear distribution and constant variance were tenable. The data from this study conformed to the requirements of the linear regression model.

II. Assumptions in MANOVA

The assumptions in MANOVA are:

- 1) The observations are independent
- 2) The observations on the dependent variables follow a multivariate normal distribution in each group.
- 3) The population covariance matrices for the dependent variables in each group are equal.

The importance of the independence assumption has been discussed in the context of regression and it is of similar importance in MANOVA. The multivariate normality assumption means that all variables must be normally distributed. Also, any linear combination of the variables must be normally distributed, and all subsets of the set of variables must have a multivariate normal distribution (Stevens 1986). Multivariate normality is a stringent assumption which will likely not be met in most practical situations. However, results from many Monte Carlo studies (Olson 1973) indicate that the deviation from multivariate normality has only a small effect on Type I error, i.e., the "F" statistic is robust with respect to Type I error against non-normality (Stevens 1986). The multivariate extension of the central limit theorem implies that the sum of independent observations having any distribution whatsoever approaches a normal distribution as the number of observations increases (Stevens 1986). In general, sums of fifty or more observations approximate to normality even for distributions which depart markedly from normality (Bock 1975).

Given the sample size in this study even markedly non-normal distributions should approximate to normality. Therefore, deviation of actual alpha from nominal alpha will be very small or non-existent. Univariate studies have shown that skewness has little effect on power. Stevens (1986) notes that this may be a good indication of what happens in the multivariate case (although this has not been thoroughly studied). In terms of power, however, platykurtosis has been shown to have a significant effect. A few of the variables in this study displayed significant skewness and leptokurtosis. However, there is very little evidence of platykurtosis.

For this study (given sample size and observed distributions), non-normality is not a serious concern in and of itself. However, the Box test for the homogeneity of covariance matrices is very sensitive to non-normality. Therefore, if a significant result is generated for the Box test it is important to know whether covariance matrices actually are different or whether the significant result is due to non-normality. The assumption of homogeneous covariance matrices is very restrictive. Again, in practice it is unusual to actually have equal covariance matrices. The question is how different must the matrices be before Type I and Type II error are affected. If group sizes are equal or approximately equal (largest group < 1.5 size of smallest group) then actual Type I error is very close to the nominal error rate for all but extreme cases (Stevens 1986). When group sizes are sharply unequal even mild heterogeneity can produce sizable distortions in Type I error. In this research group sizes are always equal or approximately equal, therefore, violation of the assumption of equal covariance matrices will not significantly impact on our Type I error rate.

Heterogeneity of covariance matrices can substantially affect Type II error. Small heterogeneity does have an effect on power, even with equal group sizes (Stevens 1986). The more heterogeneous the covariance matrices, and larger the differences in group size, the more Type II error will be affected.

Normality was assessed using a combination of skewness and kurtosis coefficients, and normal probability plots. In practice, the presence of joint normality (multivariate) can usually (except in extremely rare circumstances) be detected by studying the marginal (univariate) normality of the observations on each variable (Stevens 1986). Heterogeneity of covariance matrices was assessed using the Box test. The Box test is very sensitive to non-normality; thus one may reject the Box test because the variables are not multivariate normal, rather than because covariance matrices are different.

The violations of assumptions in this research are such that they will not seriously affect Type I error. There is a slight concern, however, for Type II error in those cases where the Box Test is violated. Here, power may be affected causing a failure to note significant differences that do exist. Transformations were employed in those situations where the Box test was significant at the $\alpha < .05$ level. Markedly non-normal variables were adjusted to normality using square root, log, and inverse transformations. Transformation of problem variables resulted in non-significant Box tests.

III. Assumptions in Repeated Measures Analysis

Multivariate repeated measures analysis is based on two underlying assumptions. The first assumption is independence of observations and the second assumption is

multivariate normality. As discussed above the observations in this study are independent. Multivariate normality is not an important consideration in our analysis as sample size is sufficiently large such that our observations will approach normality (multivariate extension of the central limit theorem). The doubly multivariate approach to repeated measures is robust against violation of multivariate normality (Stevens 1986). This approach to repeated measures was used because it did not require sphericity of transformation matrices. Sphericity is an assumption in univariate repeated measures analysis. Univariate pooled results were used in the post hoc analysis. The univariate pooled error term was used in the Tukey procedure. The Tukey procedure was appropriate because eta was consistently high ($\eta > .70$).

IV. Outliers

Since multiple regression is a mathematical maximization procedure, it can be very sensitive to outliers. Just a few outliers can sometimes affect the interpretation of results. Obviously, it is important to be able to detect outliers and influential data points. There is a distinction between an outlier and an influential data point in that an outlier will not necessarily strongly influence a regression equation. Influential data points were tested using Cook's distance. Cook's distance is a measure of the change in the regression coefficients that would occur if the case in question was omitted (Stevens 1986). Cook's distance reveals which cases are most influential in affecting the regression equation. It is affected by the case being an outlier on the dependent and the independent variables. Cook's distances greater than one are generally considered large (Cook and Weisberg 1982). Therefore, any Cook's distance greater than one will be

considered an influential data point. Analysis of the Cook's distances for each of the twelve multiple regressions revealed that there were no influential cases (no Cook's distances > 1). Given this result there is no need to delete any cases from the analysis.

APPENDIX E - VARIANCE ANALYSIS OF COUNTRY AND PRODUCT ITEMS

(TESTS OF NULL H1 & H2)

OVERALL THREE COUNTRY MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS - (COUNTRY PROFILES)

Group #1 - USSR, Hungary, Czechoslovakia

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 19, N = 42 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.84659	12.00246	40.00	87.00	.000
Hotellings	5.51837	12.00246	40.00	87.00	.000
Wilks	.15341	12.00246	40.00	87.00	.000
Roy's	.84659				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

Group #2 - USSR, Poland, Yugoslavia

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 19, N = 48 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.82669	11.80581	40.00	99.00	.000
Hotellings	4.77003	11.80581	40.00	99.00	.000
Wilks	.17331	11.80581	40.00	99.00	.000
Roy's	.82669				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

OVERALL THREE COUNTRY MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS - Product Profiles

Group #1 - USSR, Hungary, Czechoslovakia

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 15, N = 41 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.67993	5.64265	32.00	85.00	.000
Hotellings	2.12429	5.64265	32.00	85.00	.000
Wilks	.32007	5.64265	32.00	85.00	.000
Roy's	.67993				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

Group #2 - USSR, Poland, Yugoslavia

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 15, N = 50 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.57745	4.39861	32.00	103.00	.000
Hotellings	1.36656	4.39861	32.00	103.00	.000
Wilks	.42255	4.39861	32.00	103.00	.000
Roy's	.57745				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

TWO GROUP WITHIN SUBJECTS ANALYSIS (COUNTRY PROFILES)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA\U.S.S.R

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 9, N = 55)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig.of F
Pillais	.76164	17.89405	20.00	112.00	.000
Hotellings	3.19537	17.89405	20.00	112.00	.000
Wilks	.23836	17.89405	20.00	112.00	.000
Rois	.76164				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA\HUNGARY

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 9, N = 54)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig.of F
Pillais	.39225	3.54975	20.00	110.00	.000
Hotellings	.64541	3.54975	20.00	110.00	.000
Wilks	.60775	3.54975	20.00	110.00	.000
Rois	.39225				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

U.S.S.R\HUNGARY

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 9, N = 54 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig.of F
Pillais	.76503	18.06980	20.00	111.00	.000
Hotellings	3.25582	18.06980	20.00	111.00	.000
Wilks	.23497	18.06980	20.00	111.00	.000
Rois	.76503				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

POLAND\U.S.S.R.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 9, N = 61)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig.of F
Pillais	.72712	16.52055	20.00	124.00	.000
Hotellings	2.66460	16.52055	20.00	124.00	.000
Wilks	.27288	16.52055	20.00	124.00	.000
Rois	.72712				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

POLAND\YUGOSLAVIA

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 9, N = 61 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig.of F
Pillais	.38676	3.94181	20.00	125.00	.000
Hotellings	.63069	3.94181	20.00	125.00	.000
Wilks	.61324	3.94181	20.00	125.00	.000
Rois	.38676				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

U.S.S.R.\YUGOSLAVIA

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 9, N = 59)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig.of F
Pillais	.73708	16.82100	20.00	120.00	.000
Hotellings	2.80350	16.82100	20.00	120.00	.000
Wilks	.26292	16.82100	20.00	120.00	.000
Rois	.73708				

TWO GROUP WITHIN SUBJECTS ANALYSIS (PRODUCT PROFILES)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA\U.S.S.R.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 7 , N = 53)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig.of F
Pillais	.60492	10.33504	16.00	108.00	.000
Hotellings	1.53112	10.33504	16.00	108.00	.000
Wilks	.39508	10.33504	16.00	108.00	.000
Roy's	.60492				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA\HUNGARY

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 7 , N = 52)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig.of F
Pillais	.19728	1.62818	16.00	106.00	.074
Hotellings	.24576	1.62818	16.00	106.00	.074
Wilks	.80272	1.62818	16.00	106.00	.074
Roy's	.19728				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

U.S.S.R.\HUNGARY

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 7 , N = 51 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig.of F
Pillais	.52240	7.17815	16.00	105.00	.000
Hotellings	1.09381	7.17815	16.00	105.00	.000
Wilks	.47760	7.17815	16.00	105.00	.000
Roy's	.52240				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

POLAND\U.S.S.R.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 7 , N = 60)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig.of F
Pillais	.49204	7.38612	16.00	122.00	.000
Hotellings	.96867	7.38612	16.00	122.00	.000
Wilks	.50796	7.38612	16.00	122.00	.000
Roy's	.49204				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

POLAND\YUGOSLAVIA

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 7 , N = 59 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig.of F
Pillais	.13609	1.19132	16.00	121.00	.285
Hotellings	.15753	1.19132	16.00	121.00	.285
Wilks	.86391	1.19132	16.00	121.00	.285
Roy's	.13609				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

U.S.S.R.\YUGOSLAVIA

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 7 , N = 60 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig.of F
Pillais	.46346	6.64030	16.00	123.00	.000
Hotellings	.86378	6.64030	16.00	123.00	.000
Wilks	.53654	6.64030	16.00	123.00	.000
Roy's	.46346				

TWO GROUP BETWEEN SUBJECTS ANALYSIS (COUNTRY PROFILES)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA\POLAND

EFFECT .. VER

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 9, N = 131)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.27340	4.96678	20.00	264.00	.000
Hotellings	.37627	4.96678	20.00	264.00	.000
Wilks	.72660	4.96678	20.00	264.00	.000
Rays	.27340				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. VER (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,283) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. off
INDUS	22.63719	638.50667	22.63719	2.25621	10.03329	.002
EDUCAT	28.50000	450.43333	28.50000	1.59164	17.80609	.000
WEST	.00035	724.40667	.00035	2.55974	.00014	.991
KNOWC	1.55945	586.63704	1.55945	2.07292	.75230	.386
STAB	49.95805	514.74370	49.95805	1.81888	27.46635	.000
RICH	70.84226	347.54370	70.84226	1.22807	57.68587	.000
AUTO	.06554	609.14148	.06554	2.15244	.03045	.862
IDEAL	15.03474	418.59333	15.03474	1.47913	10.16459	.002
DANG	3.60296	451.99704	3.60296	1.59716	2.25585	.134
PASS	.94877	472.82667	.94877	1.67077	.56787	.452
IMMIG	13.94168	647.72148	13.94168	2.25377	6.09134	.014
RIGHT	.00472	405.09704	.00472	1.43144	.00330	.954
LIKE	12.80035	411.07333	12.80035	1.45256	8.81229	.003
AGGES	.32998	480.07704	.32998	1.69639	.19452	.660
ALIGN	.56140	571.06667	.56140	2.01790	.27821	.598
TIES	1.78542	524.93037	1.78542	1.85488	.96255	.327
TRUST	.19103	362.63704	.19103	1.28140	.14908	.700
WORK	1.71930	672.26667	1.71930	2.37550	.72376	.396
INDIV	3.21127	510.73259	3.21127	1.80471	1.77938	.183
INVEST	3.62671	562.75926	3.62671	1.98855	1.82380	.178

CZECHOSLOVAKIA\YUGOSLAVIA

EFFECT .. VER

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 9, N = 129 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.24220	4.17088	20.00	261.00	.000
Hotellings	.31961	4.17088	20.00	261.00	.000
Wilks	.75780	4.17088	20.00	261.00	.000
Rays	.24220				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. VER (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,280) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. off
INDUS	55.48942	531.13469	55.48942	1.89691	29.25254	.000
EDUCAT	55.37612	438.53878	55.37612	1.56621	35.35677	.000
WEST	1.01643	605.46939	1.01643	2.16239	.47005	.494
KNOWC	14.89177	555.48057	14.89177	1.98386	7.50646	.007
STAB	20.23320	552.33772	20.23320	1.97263	10.25694	.002
RICH	31.03593	361.53500	31.03593	1.29120	24.03656	.000
AUTO	25.53871	525.37264	25.53871	1.87633	13.61098	.000
IDEAL	6.47794	389.68163	6.47794	1.39172	4.65463	.032
DANG	3.50835	389.97037	3.50835	1.39275	2.51901	.114
PASS	11.31070	436.33469	11.31070	1.55834	7.25818	.007
IMMIG	14.68694	597.63930	14.68694	2.13443	6.88098	.009
RIGHT	.01029	394.31595	.01029	1.40827	.00731	.932
LIKE	8.31617	362.56327	8.31617	1.29487	6.42240	.012
AGGES	1.57302	394.75676	1.57302	1.40985	1.11574	.292
ALIGN	9.80358	498.10068	9.80358	1.77893	5.51094	.020
TIES	3.05380	508.03840	3.05380	1.81442	1.68307	.196
TRUST	3.05380	378.03840	3.05380	1.35014	2.26185	.134
WORK	15.98786	633.83129	15.98786	2.26368	7.06276	.008
INDIV	1.50693	479.79803	1.50693	1.71356	.87941	.349
INVEST	20.38179	530.15722	20.38179	1.89342	10.76454	.001

TWO GROUP BETWEEN SUBJECTS ANALYSIS (COUNTRY PROFILES)

HUNGARY\POLAND

EFFECT .. VER

Multivariate Tests of Significance ($S = 1, M = 9, N = 130 \frac{1}{2}$)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.21000	3.49561	20.00	263.00	.000
Hotellings	.26583	3.49561	20.00	263.00	.000
Wilks	.79000	3.49561	20.00	263.00	.000
Roys	.21000				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. VER (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,282) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
INDUS	3.70360	700.87035	3.70360	2.48536	1.49017	.223
EDUCAT	.33847	513.22139	.33847	1.81993	.18598	.667
WEST	3.34847	732.96139	3.34847	2.59915	1.28829	.257
KNOWC	12.41966	612.46766	12.41966	2.17187	5.71842	.017
STAB	14.83372	516.81065	14.83372	1.83266	8.09408	.005
RICH	27.93539	317.54348	27.93539	1.12604	24.80851	.000
AUTO	2.75544	556.97243	2.75544	1.97508	1.39510	.239
IDEAL	.32688	456.24706	.32688	1.61790	.20204	.653
DANG	1.99423	442.55154	1.99423	1.56933	1.27075	.261
PASS	25.16716	493.63214	25.16716	1.75047	14.37738	.000
IMMIG	1.20067	738.69721	1.20067	2.61949	.45836	.499
RIGHT	.04138	408.44806	.04138	1.44840	.02857	.866
LIKE	1.41095	427.69821	1.41095	1.51666	.93030	.336
AGES	.00305	483.47582	.00305	1.71445	.00178	.966
ALIGN	4.10371	564.82587	4.10371	2.00293	2.04985	.153
TIES	.97238	559.57692	.97238	1.98432	.49003	.484
TRUST	1.13911	364.84328	1.13911	1.29377	.88046	.349
WORK	.14507	630.65423	.14507	2.23636	.06487	.799
INDIV	.74195	517.97284	.74195	1.83678	.40394	.526
INVEST	1.24884	622.39552	1.24884	2.20708	.56584	.453

HUNGARY\YUGOSLAVIA

EFFECT .. VER

Multivariate Tests of Significance ($S = 1, M = 9, N = 129$)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.10776	1.57006	20.00	260.00	.060
Hotellings	.12077	1.57006	20.00	260.00	.060
Wilks	.89224	1.57006	20.00	260.00	.060
Roys	.10776				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. VER (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,279) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
INDUS	.62974	593.49838	.62974	2.12723	.29604	.587
EDUCAT	2.38847	501.32684	2.38847	1.79687	1.32924	.250
WEST	.69475	614.02411	.69475	2.20080	.31568	.575
KNOWC	2.51086	581.31120	2.51086	2.08355	1.0509	.273
STAB	1.69498	554.40466	1.69498	1.98711	.85299	.357
RICH	6.05241	331.53478	6.05241	1.18830	5.09335	.025
AUTO	13.29363	473.20459	13.29363	1.69607	7.83788	.005
IDEAL	.55076	427.33536	.55076	1.53167	.35958	.549
DANG	1.93064	380.52488	1.93064	1.36389	1.41554	.235
PASS	.44702	457.14017	.44702	1.63850	.27282	.602
IMMIG	1.45614	688.61504	1.45614	2.46815	.58997	.443
RIGHT	.05545	397.66697	.05545	1.42533	.03890	.844
LIKE	.25670	379.18814	.25670	1.35910	.18887	.664
AGES	.54196	398.5555	.54196	1.42708	.37977	.538
ALIGN	.13300	491.85988	.13300	1.76294	.07544	.784
TIES	.31862	542.68494	.31862	1.94511	.16380	.686
TRUST	.06141	380.24464	.06141	1.36288	.04506	.832
WORK	5.33275	592.21885	5.33275	2.12265	2.51251	.114
INDIV	1.99375	487.03828	1.99375	1.74566	1.14212	.286
INVEST	2.25634	589.79348	2.25634	2.11396	1.06735	.302

TWO GROUP BETWEEN SUBJECTS ANALYSIS (PRODUCT PROFILES)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA/POLAND

EFFECT .. VER

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 7, N = 125 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.11379	2.03026	16,00	253,00	.012
Hotellings	.12840	2.03026	16,00	253,00	.012
Wilks	.88621	2.03026	16,00	253,00	.012
Rois	.11379				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. VER (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,268) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
ATTRACT	18.61376	467.49365	18.61376	1.74438	10.67071	.001
VALUE	.55436	481.51971	.55436	1.79672	.30854	.579
BUY	16.40564	683.97955	16.40564	2.55216	6.42813	.012
IMIT	24.88542	415.13310	24.88542	1.54900	16.06543	.000
QUAL	8.38478	424.58189	8.38478	1.58426	5.29255	.022
BRAND	27.78829	667.67838	27.78829	2.49134	11.15397	.001
EXPEN	7.64155	418.29919	7.64155	1.57782	4.89586	.028
KNOWP	1.97453	573.89213	1.97453	2.14139	.92208	.338
REL	22.37255	357.39040	22.37255	1.33355	16.77674	.000
PROUD	8.95875	484.00792	8.95875	1.80600	4.96055	.027
ADVAN	32.62038	437.97592	32.62038	1.63424	19.96060	.000
SERV	10.29358	400.37308	10.29358	1.49393	6.89027	.009
FINO	12.98632	544.50998	12.98632	2.03175	6.39168	.012
WORK2	27.17797	411.19611	27.17797	1.53431	17.71343	.000
SATIS	11.57324	306.08972	11.57324	1.14213	10.13307	.002
OVER	14.37792	389.55171	14.37792	1.45355	9.89158	.002

CZECHOSLOVAKIA/YUGOSLAVIA

EFFECT .. VER

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 7, N = 125 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.10473	1.84986	16,00	253,00	.026
Hotellings	.11699	1.84986	16,00	253,00	.026
Wilks	.89527	1.84986	16,00	253,00	.026
Rois	.10473				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. VER (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,268) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
ATTRACT	7.52227	448.68514	7.52227	1.67420	4.49306	.035
VALUE	3.64341	439.02326	3.64341	1.63815	2.22411	.137
BUY	15.07148	665.08593	15.07148	2.48166	6.05299	.015
IMIT	12.07596	399.58700	12.07596	1.49100	8.09926	.005
QUAL	1.75286	406.11381	1.75286	1.51535	1.15674	.283
BRAND	29.02927	616.60036	29.02927	2.30075	12.61732	.000
EXPEN	3.14974	403.81692	3.14974	1.50678	2.09038	.149
KNOWP	2.14152	529.56589	2.14152	1.97599	1.08377	.299
REL	5.76736	314.44005	5.76736	1.17328	4.91557	.027
PROUD	2.93259	436.41926	2.93259	1.62843	1.80087	.181
ADVAN	11.44465	439.52202	11.44465	1.64001	6.97841	.009
SERV	6.29926	376.50074	6.29926	1.40485	4.48392	.035
FINO	6.23825	551.26175	6.23825	2.05695	3.03277	.083
WORK2	13.26095	360.81313	13.26095	1.34632	9.84979	.002
SATIS	7.30846	308.13228	7.30846	1.14975	6.35658	.012
OVER	2.68312	353.83540	2.68312	1.32028	2.03224	.155

TWO GROUP BETWEEN SUBJECTS ANALYSIS (PRODUCT ITEMS)

HUNGARY/POLAND

EFFECT .. VER

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 7, N = 124)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.05585	.92435	16,00	250,00	.542
Hotellings	.05916	.92435	16,00	250,00	.542
Wilks	.94415	.92435	16,00	250,00	.542
Rays	.05585				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. VER (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,265) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
ATTRACT	11.55665	420.57818	11.55665	1.58709	7.28167	.007
VALUE	.03458	413.04407	.03458	1.55866	.02218	.882
BUY	2.95993	608.68811	2.95993	2.29694	1.28860	.257
IMIT	9.35520	372.97788	9.35520	1.40746	6.64969	.010
QUAL	6.25710	375.04627	6.25710	1.41527	4.42114	.036
BRAND	.51304	579.44951	.51304	2.18660	.23463	.629
EXPEN	5.374.5	385.30750	5.37415	1.45399	3.69614	.056
KNOWP	.06354	588.58815	.06354	2.22109	.02861	.866
REL	7.90365	286.68811	7.90365	1.08184	7.30573	.007
PROUD	2.95509	454.96251	2.95509	1.71684	1.72124	.191
ADVAN	10.46015	383.72712	10.46015	1.44803	7.22372	.008
SERV	3.17695	355.36238	3.17695	1.34099	2.36911	.125
FIND	.00207	515.39868	.00207	1.94490	.00106	.974
WORK2	7.81098	372.84819	7.81098	1.40697	5.55162	.019
SATIS	2.63736	274.05927	2.63736	1.03419	2.55018	.111
OVER	4.49385	357.58105	4.49385	1.34936	3.33035	.069

HUNGARY/YUGOSLAVIA

EFFECT .. VER

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 7, N = 124)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.03271	.52845	16,00	250,00	.931
Hotellings	.03382	.52845	16,00	250,00	.931
Wilks	.96729	.52845	16,00	250,00	.931
Rays	.03271				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. VER (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,265) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
ATTRACT	3.37640	401.76967	3.37640	1.51611	2.24011	.137
VALUE	.94302	370.54762	.94302	1.39829	.67441	.412
BUY	2.39277	589.79450	2.39277	2.22564	1.07509	.301
IMIT	2.41841	357.43178	2.41841	1.34880	1.79301	.182
QUAL	.88249	356.57818	.88249	1.34558	.65585	.419
BRAND	.69217	528.37150	.69217	1.99385	.34715	.556
EXPEN	1.78151	370.82523	1.78151	1.39934	1.27311	.260
KNOWP	.03772	544.26190	.03772	2.05382	.01837	.892
REL	.24726	243.73776	.24726	.91977	.26883	.605
PROUD	.19917	407.37386	.19917	1.53727	.12956	.719
ADVAN	.84663	385.722	.84663	1.4538	.58233	.446
SERV	1.18412	331.104	1.18412	1.25091	.94661	.331
FIND	1.31022	522.15046	1.31022	1.97038	.66496	.416
WORK2	1.51980	322.46521	1.51980	1.21685	1.24897	.265
SATIS	.86447	276.10182	.86447	1.04189	.82971	.363
OVER	.00043	321.86474	.00043	1.21458	.00035	.985

APPENDIX F - REGRESSION ANALYSIS

(TEST OF NULL H3)

Dependent Variable - Willing To Buy

The U.S.S.R.
 Variable(s) Entered on Step Number 3.. UTECH
 Multiple R .38246
 R Square .14628
 Adjusted R Square .13719
 Standard Error 1.60632

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	3	124.67202	41.55734
Residual	282	727.63567	2.58027

F = 16.10582 Signif F = .0000

* * * * MULTIPLE REGRESSION * * * *

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. UBUY USSR PRODUCTS - WILLING TO BU

Variables in the Equation					Variables not in the Equation						
Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T	Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T	Sig T
UILLIKE	.434871	.084494	.291250	5.147	.0000	UWEALTH	.010687	.010402	.808904	.174	.8617
UIDEAL	.205817	.084252	.139681	2.443	.0152	UPOLIT	-.024835	-.025710	.845558	-.419	.6753
UTECH	.144465	.071942	.112115	2.008	.0456	UWEST	-.010360	-.010824	.917805	-.181	.8561
(Constant)	.057094	.470600		.121	.9033	UKNOWC	-.008092	-.008691	.923857	-.146	.8843
						UQANG	-.094525	-.086279	.711266	-1.452	.1477
						UPASS	-.017255	-.018509	.920674	-.310	.7565
						UAGGES	-.103433	-.095903	.733945	-1.615	.1074
						UALIGN	-.082263	-.086740	.907704	1.460	.1455
						UWORK	.048283	.052128	.923169	.875	.3823
						UINDIV	.063258	.067692	.918306	1.137	.2564

HUNGARY

* * * * MULTIPLE REGRESSION * * *

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. HBUY HUNGARIAN PRODUCTS - WILLING
 Beginning Block Number 1, Method: Stepwise

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number 1.. HILLIKE
 Multiple R .43920
 R Square .19290
 Adjusted R Square .18683
 Standard Error 1.28731

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	1	52.67674	52.67674
Residual	133	220.40474	1.65718

F = 31.78701 Signif F = .0000

Variables in the Equation					Variables not in the Equation						
Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T	Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T	Sig T
HILLIKE	.568490	.100832	.439201	5.638	.0000	HTECH	.003590	.003868	.937218	.044	.9646
(Constant)	1.472778	.491127		2.999	.0032	HWEALTH	.059449	.066075	.997028	.761	.4481
						HPOLIT	.036819	.040034	.954195	.460	.6460
						HWEST	-.131594	-.143147	.955042	-1.662	.0989
						HKNOWC	.007742	.008613	.998940	.099	.9213
						HIDEAL	.109454	.120354	.975854	1.393	.1660
						HQANG	-.055204	-.056077	.832841	-.645	.5199
						HPASS	.126983	.140234	.984336	1.627	.1061
						HAGGES	-.011716	-.011423	.767256	-.131	.8958
						HALIGN	.017077	.018244	.921145	.210	.8343
						HWORK	.033461	.037155	.995157	.427	.6693
						HINDIV	.009198	.010233	.998901	.118	.9066

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

* * * * * M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * * *

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. CBUY CZECH PRODUCTS - WILLING TO C

Beginning Block Number 1, Method: Stepwise

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number 1.. CILIKE

Multiple R	.37628	Analysis of Variance	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
R Square	.14159		1	51.00371	51.00371
Adjusted R Square	.13523	Regression	1	309.22986	2.29059
Standard Error	1.51347	Residual	135		
		F =	22.26661	Signif F =	.0000

----- Variables in the Equation -----				
Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T Sig T
CILIKE	.581128	.123153	.376278	4.719 .0000
(Constant)	1.586594	.628534		2.524 .0128

----- Variables not in the Equation -----				
Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T Sig T
CTECH	.152641	.161661	.962866	1.896 .0601
CWEALTH	.073047	.078675	.995781	.914 .3626
CPOLIT	-.090022	-.093741	.930823	-1.090 .2777
CWEST	-.075682	-.079333	.943231	-.921 .3586
CKNOWC	-.048454	-.052183	.995643	-.605 .5463
CIDEAL	.066403	.070901	.98663	.823 .4121
CDANG	-.090972	-.091420	.966898	-1.063 .2898
CPASS	-.064136	-.068175	.969935	-.791 .4303
CAGGES	-.090809	-.079383	.655980	-.922 .3583
CALIGN	.045976	.046992	.896799	.545 .5869
CWORK	-.021732	-.023335	.989729	-.270 .7874
CINDIV	-.021765	-.023384	.990329	-.271 .7870

POLAND

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number 3.. PMEST POLISH CULTURE

Multiple R	.39323	Analysis of Variance	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
R Square	.15463		3	60.43546	20.14515
Adjusted R Square	.13702	Regression	3	330.39562	2.29441
Standard Error	1.51473	Residual	144		
		F =	8.78009	Signif F =	.0000

* * * * * M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * * *

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. PBUY POLISH PRODUCTS - WILLING TO

----- Variables in the Equation -----				
Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T Sig T
PILIKE	.558126	.15193	.331739	3.844 .0002
PPASS	-.250372	.104930	-.200125	-2.386 .0183
PMEST	.185649	.079694	.187007	2.330 .0212
(Constant)	1.798425	.673388		2.671 .0084

----- Variables not in the Equation -----				
Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T Sig T
PTECH	.077864	.079570	.770325	.955 .3414
PWEALTH	.079057	.082362	.783308	.988 .3247
PPOLIT	.027579	.028402	.778813	.340 .7345
PKNOWC	-.043696	-.045100	.750525	-.540 .5901
PIDEAL	.070824	.075897	.768138	.910 .3642
PDANG	.130106	.123542	.638308	1.489 .1388
PAGES	.096610	.096092	.698038	1.154 .2502
PALIGN	.044957	.046984	.734597	.562 .5747
PWORK	.017768	.018556	.784220	.222 .8247
PINDIV	.064229	.067504	.764833	.809 .4198

YUGOSLAVIA

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number 3.. YAGGES YUGOSLAVIA - AGGRESSIVE?
 Multiple R .41767
 R Square .17445
 Adjusted R Square .15713
 Standard Error 1.43713

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	3	62.40995	20.80332
Residual	143	295.34516	2.06535

F = 10.07253 Signif F = .0000

**** MULTIPLE REGRESSION ****

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. YBUY YUGO PRODUCTS - WILLING TO YU

Variables in the Equation					Variables not in the Equation				
Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T Sig T	Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T Sig T
YTLIKE	.625818	.137702	.383325	4.681 .0000	YTECH	.059865	.062510	.824620	.746 .4567
YPASS	.249164	.099599	.190842	2.502 .0135	YWEALTH	.008886	.009513	.858334	.113 .9099
YAGGES	-.282993	.116268	-.198996	-2.434 .0162	YPOLIT	.042102	.044359	.851445	.529 .5976
(Constant)	1.356561	.759525		1.786 .0762	YWEST	.014602	.015781	.846391	.188 .8511
					YKNOWC	.025834	.026973	.783427	.322 .7483
					YIDEAL	.079519	.083967	.845703	1.004 .3170
					YDANG	-.023819	-.023924	.801953	-.285 .7759
					YALIGN	.039980	.043800	.859492	.522 .6022
					YWORK	.055267	.060598	.856224	.723 .4706
					YINDIV	.082158	.085949	.860723	1.028 .3057

FRANCE

**** MULTIPLE REGRESSION ****

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. FBUY FRENCH PRODUCTS - WILLING TO

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number 2.. FPASS FRENCH PASSIVITY
 Multiple R .42649
 R Square .18189
 Adjusted R Square .17605
 Standard Error 1.31593

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	2	107.80387	53.90194
Residual	280	484.86750	1.73167

F = 31.12715 Signif F = .0000

Variables in the Equation					Variables not in the Equation				
Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T Sig T	Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T Sig T
FILIKE	.474484	.071519	.363114	6.634 .0000	FTECH	.061989	.064418	.883473	1.078 .2819
FPASS	.182982	.057606	.173853	3.176 .0017	FWEALTH	-.007973	-.007863	.795656	-.131 .8956
(Constant)	1.743842	.443441		3.933 .0001	FPOLIT	.102160	.107184	.900555	1.801 .0728
					FWEST	.090194	.097495	.952702	1.636 .1029
					FKNOWC	.086973	.092799	.931371	1.557 .1207
					FIDEAL	.111166	.096322	.614206	1.616 .1071
					FUANG	.015070	.015033	.814031	.251 .8019
					FAGGES	-.005878	-.005960	.825202	-.100 .9208
					FALIGN	-.012487	-.013016	.871317	-.217 .8280
					FWORK	-.067283	-.068839	.848507	-1.153 .2501
					FINDIV	-.009380	-.010320	.965936	-.172 .8633

APPENDIX G - REGRESSION ANALYSIS (TEST OF NULL H4)

Dependent Variable - Overall Product Evaluation

THE U.S.S.R.

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number 3.. UWORK USSR - HARDWORKING?

Multiple R	.32436	Analysis of Variance			
R Square	.10521		DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Adjusted R Square	.09527	Regression	3	46.60822	15.53607
Standard Error	1.21165	Residual	270	396.38813	1.46810
F =			10.58240	Signif F = .0000	

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 1		Dependent Variable..		UOVER		USSR PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCOR		Variables not in the Equation				Variable	
		Variables in the Equation											
B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T	Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T	Sig T	Variable		
UTECH	.168732	.055722	.176654	3.028	.0027	UILLIKE	.046243	.047209	.909778	.775	.4384		
UIDEAL	.220727	.066051	.195955	3.342	.0010	UWEALTH	.053670	.051565	.825974	.847	.3978		
UWORK	.130466	.042622	.177150	3.061	.0024	UPOLIT	.017274	.016860	.852396	.277	.7823		
(Constant)	1.175242	.341221		3.444	.0007	UWEST	-.036713	-.037640	.937556	-.618	.5372		
						UKNOWC	-.006536	-.006858	.962184	-.112	.9105		
						UDANG	-.054095	-.050442	.778017	-.828	.4082		
						UPASS	-.005331	-.005489	.947415	-.090	.9283		
						UAGGES	.064935	.064502	.882888	1.060	.2900		
						UALIGN	.084477	.087118	.940447	1.434	.1526		
						UINDIV	-.018235	-.019228	.959205	-.315	.7527		

HUNGARY

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number 3.. HWEST HUNGARIAN CULTURE

Multiple R	.48970	Analysis of Variance			
R Square	.23980		DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Adjusted R Square	.22126	Regression	3	35.63797	11.87932
Standard Error	.95839	Residual	123	12.97620	.91851
F =			12.93332	Signif F = .0000	

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 1		Dependent Variable..		HWEAL		HUNGARIAN PRODUCTS - OVERALL		Variables not in the Equation				Variable	
		Variables in the Equation											
B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T	Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T	Sig T	Variable		
HILLIKE	.441957	.083336	.424049	5.303	.0000	HTECH	.053806	.052152	.714200	.577	.5651		
HWEALTH	.209483	.082145	.206580	2.550	.0120	HPOLIT	.056945	.058735	.803196	.670	.5170		
HWEST	-.116762	.056059	-.168843	-2.083	.0393	HKNOWC	-.078220	-.087029	.893920	-.965	.3165		
(Constant)	1.527713	.461464		3.311	.0012	HIDEAL	-.019711	-.020710	.816741	-.229	.8194		
						HIDANG	-.020647	-.021816	.848714	-.241	.8099		
						HPASS	.018409	.020436	.916245	.226	.8218		
						HAGGES	.024712	.024364	.738951	.269	.7882		
						HALIGN	.050619	.056392	.916385	.624	.5339		
						HWORK	-.071092	-.079563	.917690	-.682	.3797		
						HINDIV	-.028604	-.032120	.908153	-.355	.7232		

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. COVER CZECH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SD

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number 1.. CALIGN CZECHOSLOVAKIA - ALIGNED WITH CANADA?

Multiple R	.25828	Analysis of Variance			
R Square	.06671		DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Adjusted R Square	.05953	Regression	1	12.99137	12.99137
Standard Error	1.18243	Residual	130	181.75863	1.39814
		F =	9.29187	Signif F =	.0028

Variables in the Equation					Variables not in the Equation						
B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T	Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T	Sig T	
CALIGN	.243969	.080036	.258279	3.048	.0028	CILIKE	.171940	.169221	.904009	1.950	.0533
(Constant)	3.320329	.321881		10.315	.0000	CTECH	.082823	.084199	.964561	.960	.3390
						CWEALTH	.090911	.088561	.885655	1.010	.3145
						CPOLIT	.108413	.109762	.956651	1.254	.2120
						CWEST	.104766	.108069	.993072	1.235	.2192
						CKNOWC	.052307	.054002	.994732	.614	.5401
						CIDEAL	.098611	.093533	.839651	1.067	.2880
						CDANG	.021847	.022330	.974966	.254	.8001
						CPASS	-.051232	-.052796	.991113	-.600	.5492
						CAGES	.075857	.077754	.980544	.886	.3774
						CWORK	.031519	.032395	.985944	.368	.7134
						CINDIV	-.011930	-.012073	.955806	-.137	.8911

POLAND

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. POVER POLISH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SD

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number 2.. PALIGN POLAND - ALIGNED WITH CANADA?

Multiple R	.37519	Analysis of Variance			
R Square	.14077		DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Adjusted R Square	.12822	Regression	2	29.19495	14.59748
Standard Error	1.14051	Residual	137	178.20505	1.30077
		F =	11.22221	Signif F =	.0000

Variables in the Equation					Variables not in the Equation						
Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T	Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T	Sig T
PTIECH	.239914	.080777	.245057	2.970	.0035	PILIKE	.068794	.069683	.864986	.815	.4167
PALIGN	.181184	.066870	.223553	2.709	.0076	PWEALTH	.126610	.119894	.770507	1.408	.1613
(Constant)	2.018481	.372092		5.425	.0000	PPOLIT	.059288	.061383	.887871	.717	.4745
						PWEST	.045961	.047110	.844436	.550	.5832
						PKNOWC	-.054146	-.057761	.910765	-.675	.5010
						PIDEAL	.075711	.079903	.897678	.935	.3515
						PDANG	.033164	.035459	.912855	.414	.6797
						PPASS	.086442	.092191	.904321	1.080	.2822
						PAGES	.008602	.009015	.883184	.105	.9164
						PWORK	.104039	.111588	.912472	1.310	.1926
						PINDIV	.050771	.053424	.890381	.624	.5337

YUGOSLAVIA

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number 3.. YALIGN YUGOSLAVIA - ALIGNED WITH CANADA?

Multiple R	.44573	Analysis of Variance	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
R Square	.19868		3	32.17999	10.72666
Adjusted R Square	.18100	Regression			
Standard Error	.97691	Residual	136	129.79143	.95435

F = 11.23977 Signif F = .0000

**** MULTIPLE REGRESSION ****

Equation Number 1					Dependent Variable.. YOVER YUGO PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE				
Variables in the Equation					Variables not in the Equation				
Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T Sig T	Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T Sig T
YWORK	.209311	.057949	.281487	3.612 .0004	YILIKE	.122798	.135938	.964623	1.594 .1132
YPASS	.209265	.069063	.232848	3.030 .0029	YTECH	.137970	.147502	.915868	1.733 .0854
YALIGN	.173434	.062966	.214787	2.754 .0067	YWEALTH	.059307	.162829	.899326	.731 .4658
(Constant)	1.548104	.436124		3.550 .0005	YPOLIT	.015599	.016176	.861675	.188 .8512
					YWEST	.015897	.017511	.961483	.203 .8391
					YKNOWC	-.099168	-.110349	.967314	-1.290 .1993
					YIDEAL	.088378	.094138	.909175	1.009 .2739
					YDANG	.080196	.089179	.967199	1.040 .3001
					YAGGES	.041891	.046535	.960620	.541 .5892
					YINDIV	.114262	.114754	.808236	1.342 .1818

FRANCE

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number 4.. FIDEAL FRANCE AS AN IDEAL COUNTRY

Multiple R	.51318	Analysis of Variance	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
R Square	.26336		4	87.36647	21.84162
Adjusted R Square	.25268	Regression			
Standard Error	.94097	Residual	276	244.37730	.88542

F = 24.66795 Signif F = .0000

Variables in the Equation					Variables not in the Equation				
B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T	Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T Sig T
FILIKE	.162676	.064210	.168618	2.534 .0118	FWEALTH	.094161	.085475	.584381	1.423 .1560
FTECH	.248452	.059079	.232983	4.205 .0000	FPOLIT	-.037791	-.035893	.569507	-.596 .5519
FKNOWC	.115012	.037528	.165615	3.065 .0024	FWEST	.098856	.107703	.602391	1.797 .0735
FIDEAL	.140728	.052097	.176569	2.701 .0073	FDANG	-.048809	-.050082	.586284	-.832 .4064
(Constant)	1.759008	.368564		4.773 .0000	FPASS	.081297	.089608	.595700	1.492 .1369
					FAGGES	.024085	.025598	.547619	.425 .6714
					FALIGN	.002003	.002145	.588058	.036 .9717
					FWORK	.063436	.065907	.559045	1.095 .2743
					FINDIV	.098586	.111678	.601897	1.864 .0634

APPENDIX H - "PRODUCT COMPLEXITY AND
COUNTRY OF ORIGIN" (TEST OF NULL H5)

TESTS OF MULTIVARIATE SIGNIFICANCE -

TWO WAY WITHIN SUBJECTS MANOVA

(Group #1 - France, USSR, Hungary, Czech)

Effect Country

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 1/2, N = 62)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.61298	66.52128	3.00	126.00	.000
Hotellings	1.58384	66.52128	3.00	126.00	.000
Wilks	.38702	66.52128	3.00	126.00	.000
Rois	.61298				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

Effect Complex

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 1/2, N = 62)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.39481	27.39930	3.00	126.00	.000
Hotellings	.65236	27.39930	3.00	126.00	.000
Wilks	.60519	27.39930	3.00	126.00	.000
Rois	.39481				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

Effect Country By Complex

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 3 1/2, N = 59)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.42510	9.85912	9.00	120.00	.000
Hotellings	.73943	9.85912	9.00	120.00	.000
Wilks	.57490	9.85912	9.00	120.00	.000
Rois	.42510				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

TESTS OF MULTIVARIATE SIGNIFICANCE -

TWO-WAY WITHIN SUBJECTS MANOVA

(Group #2 - France, USSR, Poland, Yugoslavia)

Effect - Country

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 1/2, N = 68 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.57415	62.46865	3.00	139.00	.000
Hotellings	1.34824	62.46865	3.00	139.00	.000
Wilks	.42585	62.46865	3.00	139.00	.000
Rois	.57415				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

Effect - Complex

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 1/2, N = 68 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.37175	27.41671	3.00	139.00	.000
Hotellings	.59173	27.41671	3.00	139.00	.000
Wilks	.62825	27.41671	3.00	139.00	.000
Rois	.37175				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

Effect Country By Complex

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 3 1/2, N = 65 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.36146	8.36530	9.00	133.00	.000
Hotellings	.56607	8.36530	9.00	133.00	.000
Wilks	.63854	8.36530	9.00	133.00	.000
Rois	.36146				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

APPENDIX I - ANALYSIS OF GENDER DIFFERENCES

(TEST OF NULL H6)

OVERALL FOREIGN PRODUCT QUALITY ASSESSMENTS BY GENDER

SURVEY VERSION #1

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. FOVER		FRENCH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
SEX	MALE	2.947	1.156	57	2.641	3.254
SEX	FEMALE	2.672	1.009	64	2.420	2.924
For entire sample		2.802	1.085	121	2.606	2.997

Variable .. UOVER		USSR PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
SEX	MALE	5.123	1.364	57	4.761	5.485
SEX	FEMALE	4.781	1.266	64	4.465	5.097
For entire sample		4.942	1.318	121	4.705	5.179

Variable .. HOVER		HUNGARIAN PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
SEX	MALE	4.105	1.235	57	3.778	4.433
SEX	FEMALE	3.953	1.030	64	3.696	4.210
For entire sample		4.025	1.129	121	3.822	4.228

Variable .. COVER		CZECH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
SEX	MALE	3.807	1.369	57	3.444	4.170
SEX	FEMALE	3.625	1.000	64	3.375	3.875
For entire sample		3.711	1.186	121	3.497	3.924

Multivariate test for Homogeneity of Dispersion matrices

Boxs M = 14.33058
 F WITH (10,65636) DF = 1.38082, P = .182 (Approx.)
 Chi-Square with 10 DF = 13.81035, P = .182 (Approx.)

EFFECT .. SEX

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 1, N = 57)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.03589	1.07945	4.00	116.00	.370
Hotellings	.03722	1.07945	4.00	116.00	.370
Wilks	.96411	1.07945	4.00	116.00	.370
Roy's	.03589				
Note.. F statistics are exact.					

EFFECT .. SEX (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,119) D. F.

Variable		Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F
	Sig. of F					
FOVER		2.28819	138.95148	2.28819	1.16766	1.95964
	.164					
UOVER		3.51719	205.07785	3.51719	1.72334	2.04091
	.156					
HQVER		.69782	152.22780	.69782	1.27923	.54551
	.462					
CQVER		.99884	167.87719	.99884	1.41073	.70803
	.402					

OVERALL FOREIGN PRODUCT QUALITY ASSESSMENTS BY GENDER

SURVEY VERSION #2

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. FOVER		FRENCH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE			95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N		
SEX	MALE	2.826	1.008	86	2.609	3.042
SEX	FEMALE	2.640	1.120	50	2.322	2.958
For entire sample		2.757	1.051	136	2.579	2.936

Variable .. UOVER		USSR PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE			95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N		
SEX	MALE	4.988	1.269	86	4.716	5.261
SEX	FEMALE	5.000	1.212	50	4.656	5.344
For entire sample		4.993	1.244	136	4.782	5.204

Variable .. POVER		POLISH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE			95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N		
SEX	MALE	4.291	1.167	86	4.041	4.541
SEX	FEMALE	4.240	1.287	50	3.874	4.606
For entire sample		4.272	1.208	136	4.067	4.477

Variable .. YOVER		YUGO PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE			95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N		
SEX	MALE	4.128	1.027	86	3.908	4.348
SEX	FEMALE	3.880	1.189	50	3.542	4.218
For entire sample		4.037	1.091	136	3.852	4.222

Multivariate test for Homogeneity of Dispersion matrices

Box's M = 9.69131
 F WITH (10,49342) DF = .93461, P = .500 (Approx.)
 Chi-Square with 10 DF = 9.34806, P = .499 (Approx.)

EFFECT .. SEX

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 1, N = 64 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillai's	.02039	.68163	4.00	131.00	.606
Hotellings	.02081	.68163	4.00	131.00	.606
Wilks	.97961	.68163	4.00	131.00	.606
Roy's	.02039				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. SEX (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,134) F.

Variable		Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F
	Sig. of F					
FOVER		1.08893	147.90372	1.08893	1.10376	.98656
	.322					
UOVER		.00427	208.98837	.00427	1.55961	.00274
	.958					
POVER		.08127	196.85256	.08127	1.46905	.05532
	.814					
YOVER		1.94315	158.87302	1.94315	1.18562	1.63893
	.203					

APPENDIX J - ANALYSIS OF AGE DIFFERENCES

(TEST OF NULL H7)

OVERALL FOREIGN PRODUCT QUALITY ASSESSMENTS BY AGE

SURVEY VERSION #1--FOUR GROUP CATEGORIZATION

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. FOVER		FRENCH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
AGECAT	0-29	3.154	1.255	26	2.647	3.661
AGECAT	30-39	2.686	.993	35	2.345	3.027
AGECAT	40-54	2.780	1.129	41	2.424	3.137
AGECAT	54-OVER	2.500	.889	20	2.084	2.916
For entire sample		2.787	1.093	122	2.591	2.983

Variable .. UOVER		USSR PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
AGECAT	0-29	5.000	1.523	26	4.385	5.615
AGECAT	30-39	5.000	1.283	35	4.559	5.441
AGECAT	40-54	4.854	1.174	41	4.483	5.224
AGECAT	54-OVER	5.000	1.451	20	4.321	5.679
For entire sample		4.951	1.316	122	4.715	5.187

Variable .. HOVER		HUNGARIAN PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
AGECAT	0-29	4.154	1.120	26	3.701	4.606
AGECAT	30-39	3.857	1.167	35	3.456	4.258
AGECAT	40-54	4.171	.946	41	3.872	4.469
AGECAT	54-OVER	3.850	1.387	20	3.201	4.499
For entire sample		4.025	1.124	122	3.823	4.226

Variable .. COVER		CZECH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
AGECAT	0-29	4.038	.958	26	3.651	4.426
AGECAT	30-39	3.629	1.060	35	3.265	3.993
AGECAT	40-54	3.732	1.245	41	3.339	4.125
AGECAT	54-OVER	3.400	1.465	20	2.714	4.086
For entire sample		3.713	1.182	122	3.501	3.925

Multivariate test for Homogeneity of Dispersion matrices
 Box's M = 53.42457
 F WITH (30,22772) DF = 1.66057, P = .013 (Approx.)
 Chi-Square with 30 DF = 49.88759, P = .013 (Approx.)

EFFECT .. AGECAT

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 3, M = 0, N = 56 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.08888	.89306	12.00	351.00	.554
Hotellings	.09544	.90399	12.00	341.00	.543
Wilks	.91204	.89876	12.00	304.55	.549
Rois	.07700				

EFFECT .. AGECAT (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (3,118) D. F.

Variable		Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F
	Sig. of F					
FOVER		5.50715	138.95186	1.83572	1.17756	1.55872
	.203					
UOVER		.58297	209.12195	.19432	1.77222	.10765
	.954					
HQVER		2.90102	150.02521	.96701	1.27140	.76058
	.518					
COVER		4.97727	163.98175	1.65909	1.38968	1.19387
	.315					

3 of/de 3

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

OVERALL FOREIGN PRODUCT QUALITY ASSESSMENTS BY AGE

SURVEY VERSION #2--FOUR GROUP CATEGORIZATION

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. FOVER		FRENCH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
AGECAT	0-29	2.676	1.199	34	2.258	3.095
AGECAT	30-39	2.829	.892	41	2.548	3.111
AGECAT	40-54	2.727	1.008	33	2.370	3.085
AGECAT	54-OVER	2.786	1.166	28	2.334	3.238
For entire sample		2.757	1.051	136	2.579	2.936

Variable .. UOVER		USSR PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
AGECAT	0-29	5.000	1.255	34	4.562	5.438
AGECAT	30-39	5.049	1.396	41	4.608	5.489
AGECAT	40-54	5.242	1.091	33	4.856	5.629
AGECAT	54-OVER	4.607	1.133	28	4.168	5.047
For entire sample		4.993	1.244	136	4.782	5.204

Variable .. POVER		POLISH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
AGECAT	0-29	4.294	1.292	34	3.843	4.745
AGECAT	30-39	4.244	1.200	41	3.865	4.623
AGECAT	40-54	4.606	.998	33	4.252	4.960
AGECAT	54-OVER	3.893	1.286	28	3.394	4.392
For entire sample		4.272	1.208	136	4.067	4.477

Variable .. YOVER		YUGO PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
AGECAT	0-29	3.824	1.167	34	3.416	4.231
AGECAT	30-39	4.098	1.158	41	3.732	4.463
AGECAT	40-54	4.424	.902	33	4.104	4.744
AGECAT	54-OVER	3.750	1.005	28	3.360	4.140
For entire sample		4.037	1.091	136	3.852	4.222

Multivariate test for Homogeneity of Dispersion matrices

Boxs M = 29.86272
 F WITH (30,42005) DF = .93954, P = .561 (Approx.)
 Chi-Square with 30 DF = 28.20746, P = .559 (Approx.)

EFFECT .. AGECAT

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 3, M = 0, N = 63 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.08315	.93359	12.00	393.00	.513
Hotellings	.08777	.93382	12.00	383.00	.513
Wilks	.91813	.93397	12.00	341.59	.513
Rois	.06378				

 EFFECT .. AGECAT (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (3,132) D. F.

Variable		Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F
	Sig. of F					
FOVER		.48685	148.50579	.16228	1.12504	.14425
	.933					
UOVER		6.35103	202.64162	2.11701	1.53516	1.37901
	.252					
POVER		7.75667	189.17716	2.58556	1.43316	1.80409
	.150					
YOVER		8.95464	151.86154	2.98488	1.15047	2.59450
	.055					

APPENDIX K - ANALYSIS OF EDUCATION DIFFERENCES

(TEST OF NULL H8)

OVERALL FOREIGN PRODUCT QUALITY ASSESSMENT BY EDUCATION

SURVEY VERSION #1

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. FOVER		FRENCH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	3.207	1.207	29	2.748	3.666
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	2.771	1.134	48	2.411	3.100
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	2.533	.894	45	2.265	2.802
For entire sample		2.787	1.093	122	2.591	2.983

Variable .. UOVER		USSR PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.931	1.280	29	4.444	5.418
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.771	1.462	48	4.346	5.195
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.156	1.167	45	4.805	5.506
For entire sample		4.951	1.316	122	4.715	5.187

Variable .. HOVER		HUNGARIAN PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	3.862	1.246	29	3.388	4.336
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.167	1.136	48	3.837	4.497
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	3.978	1.033	45	3.667	4.288
For entire sample		4.025	1.124	122	3.823	4.226

Variable .. COVER		CZECH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	3.759	1.123	29	3.331	4.186
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	3.604	1.300	48	3.227	3.982
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	3.800	1.100	45	3.470	4.130
For entire sample		3.713	1.182	122	3.501	3.925

Multivariate test for Homogeneity of Dispersion matrices

Boxs M = 15.36692
 F WITH (20,33895) DF = .72862, P = .800 (Approx.)
 Chi-Square with 20 DF = 14.58153, P = .800 (Approx.)

EFFECT .. EDUCCAT

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 2, M = 1/2, N = 57)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.09220	1.41359	8.00	234.00	.191
Hotellings	.09723	1.39770	8.00	230.00	.198
Wilks	.90968	1.40568	8.00	232.00	.195
Roys	.06190				

Note.. F statistic for WILK'S Lambda is exact.

EFFECT .. EDUCAT (Cont.)					
Univariate F-tests with (2,119) D. F.					
Variable		Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS
Sig. of F					F
FOVER		8.02123	136.43779	4.01061	1.14654
	.033				3.49803
UOVER		3.45257	206.25235	1.72629	1.73321
	.372				.99600
HQVER		1.83351	151.09272	.91675	1.26969
	.488				.72203
COVER		.96950	167.98951	.48475	1.41168
	.710				.34339

OVERALL FOREIGN PRODUCT QUALITY ASSESSMENT BY EDUCATION

SURVEY VERSION #2

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. FOVER		FRENCH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE			95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N		
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	3.267	1.202	30	2.818	3.715
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	2.846	1.040	39	2.509	3.183
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	2.500	.881	66	2.283	2.717
For entire sample		2.770	1.043	135	2.593	2.948

Variable .. UOVER		USSR PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE			95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N		
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.700	1.343	30	4.199	5.201
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.026	1.203	39	4.636	5.416
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.136	1.201	66	4.841	5.432
For entire sample		5.007	1.237	135	4.797	5.218

Variable .. POVER		POLISH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE			95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N		
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	3.967	.765	30	3.681	4.252
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.487	1.189	39	4.102	4.873
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	4.333	1.305	66	4.013	4.654
For entire sample		4.296	1.179	135	4.096	4.497

Variable .. YOVER		YUGO PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE			95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N		
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	3.967	.850	30	3.649	4.284
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.026	1.135	39	3.658	4.394
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	4.121	1.117	66	3.847	4.396
For entire sample		4.059	1.063	135	3.878	4.240

Multivariate test for Homogeneity of Dispersion matrices

Boxs M = 32.10895
 F WITH (20,32652) DF = 1.52553, P = .062 (Approx.)
 Chi-Square with 20 DF = 30.53020, P = .062 (Approx.)

EFFECT .. EDUCCAT

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 2, M = 1/2, N = 63 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.12656	2.19560	8.00	260.00	.028
Hotellings	.13941	2.23055	8.00	256.00	.026
Wilks	.87568	2.21333	8.00	258.00	.027
Rois	.10525				

Note.. F statistic for WILK'S Lambda is exact.

EFFECT .. EDUCCAT (Cont.)
 Univariate F-tests with (2,132) D. F.

Variable		Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F
	Sig. of F					
FOVER		12.43789	133.44359	6.21895	1.01094	6.15167
	.003					
UOVER		3.94551	201.04709	1.97275	1.52308	1.29524
	.277					
POVER		4.77123	181.37692	2.38561	1.37407	1.73617
	.180					
YOVER		.55460	150.97133	.27730	1.14372	.24245
	.785					

APPENDIX K - ANALYSIS OF EDUCATION DIFFERENCES (POST HOC)

OVERALL FOREIGN PRODUCT QUALITY ASSESSMENT BY EDUCATION

SURVEY VERSION #2--HIGH/SOME COLL.

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. FOVER		FRENCH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent	Conf. Interval
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	3.267	1.202	30	2.818	3.715
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	2.846	1.040	39	2.509	3.183
For entire sample		3.029	1.124	69	2.759	3.299

Variable .. UOVER		USSR PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent	Conf. Interval
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.700	1.343	30	4.199	5.201
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.026	1.203	39	4.636	5.416
For entire sample		4.884	1.266	69	4.580	5.188

Variable .. POVER		POLISH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent	Conf. Interval
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	3.967	.765	30	3.681	4.252
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.487	1.189	39	4.102	4.873
For entire sample		4.261	1.052	69	4.008	4.514

Variable .. YOVER		YUGO PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent	Conf. Interval
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	3.967	.850	30	3.649	4.284
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.026	1.135	39	3.658	4.394
For entire sample		4.000	1.015	69	3.756	4.244

Multivariate test for Homogeneity of Dispersion matrices

Boxs M = 16.84311
 F WITH (10,18371) DF = 1.57265, P = .108 (Approx.)
 Chi-Square with 10 DF = 15.73565, P = .107 (Approx.)

EFFECT .. EDUCCAT

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 1, N = 31)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.08806	1.54503	4.00	64.00	.200
Hotellings	.09656	1.54503	4.00	64.00	.200
Wilks	.91194	1.54503	4.00	64.00	.200
Roy's	.08806				
Note.. F statistics are exact.					

EFFECT .. EDUCCAT (Cont.)
 Univariate F-tests with (1,67) D. F.

Variable		Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F
	Sig. of F					
FOVER		2.99844	82.94359	2.99844	1.23796	2.42207
UOVER	.124	1.79810	107.27436	1.79810	1.60111	1.12304
	.293					
POVER		4.59409	70.71026	4.59409	1.05538	4.35303
	.041					
YOVER		.05897	69.94103	.05897	1.04390	.05649
	.813					

OVERALL FOREIGN PRODUCT QUALITY ASSESSMENT BY EDUCATION

SURVEY VERSION #2--SOME COLL./UNIVER.DEG.

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. FOVER		FRENCH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	2.846	1.040	39	2.509	3.183
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	2.500	.881	66	2.283	2.717
For entire sample		2.629	.953	105	2.444	2.813

Variable .. UOVER		USUR PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.026	1.203	39	4.636	5.416
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.136	1.201	66	4.841	5.432
For entire sample		5.095	1.197	105	4.864	5.327

Variable .. POVER		POLISH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.487	1.189	39	4.102	4.873
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	4.333	1.305	66	4.013	4.654
For entire sample		4.390	1.260	105	4.147	4.634

Variable .. YOVER		YUGO PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.026	1.135	39	3.658	4.394
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	4.121	1.117	66	3.847	4.396
For entire sample		4.086	1.119	105	3.869	4.302

Multivariate test for Homogeneity of Dispersion matrices

Box's M = 10.51141
 F WITH (10.29836) DF = 1.00259, P = .438 (Approx.)
 Chi-Square with 10 DF = 10.02941, P = .438 (Approx.)

EFFECT .. EDUCCAT

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 1, N = 49)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.05171	1.36318	4.00	100.00	.252
Hotellings	.05453	1.36318	4.00	100.00	.252
Wilks	.94829	1.36318	4.00	100.00	.252
Rois	.05171				
Note.. F statistics are exact.					

EFFECT .. EDUCCAT (Cont.)
 Univariate F-tests with (1,103) D. F.

Variable Sig. of F	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F
FOVER .072	2.93736	91.57692	2.93736	.88910	3.30376
UOVER .649	.30053	148.74709	.30053	1.44415	.20810
POVER .548	.58022	164.41026	.58022	1.59622	.36350
YOVER .674	.22391	130.00466	.22391	1.26218	.17740

OVERALL FOREIGN PRODUCT QUALITY ASSESSMENT BY EDUCATION

SURVEY VERSION #2--HIGH./UNIV.D&G.

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. FCOVER		FRENCH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	3.267	1.202	30	2.818	3.715
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	2.846	1.040	39	2.509	3.183
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	2.500	.881	66	2.283	2.717
For entire sample		2.770	1.043	135	2.593	2.948

Variable .. UOVER		USSR PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.700	1.343	30	4.199	5.201
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.026	1.203	39	4.636	5.416
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.136	1.201	66	4.841	5.432
For entire sample		5.007	1.237	135	4.797	5.218

Variable .. POVER		POLISH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	3.967	.765	30	3.681	4.252
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.487	1.189	39	4.102	4.873
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	4.333	1.305	66	4.013	4.654
For entire sample		4.296	1.179	135	4.096	4.497

Variable .. YOVER		YUGO PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	3.967	.850	30	3.649	4.284
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.026	1.135	39	3.658	4.394
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	4.121	1.117	66	3.847	4.396
For entire sample		4.059	1.063	135	3.878	4.240

Multivariate test for Homogeneity of Dispersion matrices

Boxs M = 32.10895
 F WITH (20,32652) DF = 1.52553, P = .062 (Approx.)
 Chi-Square with 20 DF = 30.53020, P = .062 (Approx.)

EFFECT .. EDUCCAT

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 2, M = 1/2, N = 63 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.12656	2.19560	8.00	260.00	.028
Hotellings	.13941	2.23055	8.00	256.00	.026
Wilks	.87568	2.21333	8.00	258.00	.027
Rois	.10525				

Note.. F statistic for WILK'S Lambda is exact.

EFFECT .. EDUCCAT (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (2,132) D. F.

Variable		Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F
	Sig. of F					
FOVER		12.43789	133.44359	6.21895	1.01094	6.15167
UDVER	.003	3.94551	201.04709	1.97275	1.52308	1.29524
	.277					
POVER		4.77123	181.37692	2.38561	1.37407	1.73617
	.180					
YOVER		.55460	150.97133	.27730	1.14372	.24245
	.785					

APPENDIX L - ATTITUDES TOWARDS FRANCE BY EDUCATION GROUPING

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. FINDUS		FRENCH INDUSTRIALIZATION		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	5.085	1.418	59	4.715	5.454
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.766	1.331	94	5.493	6.039
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	6.050	1.011	120	5.867	6.233
For entire sample		5.744	1.272	273	5.592	5.895

Variable .. FEDUC		FRENCH EDUCATION		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	5.492	1.265	59	5.162	5.821
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.989	1.011	94	5.782	6.196
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	6.075	.881	120	5.916	6.234
For entire sample		5.919	1.040	273	5.795	6.043

Variable .. FWEST		FRENCH CULTURE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.102	1.891	59	3.609	4.594
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.638	1.961	94	4.237	5.040
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.558	1.748	120	5.242	5.874
For entire sample		4.927	1.941	273	4.695	5.158

Variable .. FKNOWC		KNOWLEDGE OF FRANCE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	3.356	1.710	59	2.910	3.801
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	3.936	1.374	94	3.655	4.218
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	4.750	1.367	120	4.503	4.997
For entire sample		4.168	1.549	273	3.984	4.353

Variable .. FSTAB		FRENCH STABILITY		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	5.000	1.426	59	4.628	5.372
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.468	1.152	94	5.232	5.704
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.317	1.353	120	5.072	5.561
For entire sample		5.300	1.311	273	5.144	5.457

Variable .. FRICH		FRENCH WEALTH		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.763	1.135	59	4.467	5.058
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.074	1.019	94	4.866	5.283
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.425	1.142	120	5.218	5.632
For entire sample		5.161	1.126	273	5.027	5.295

Variable .. FAUTO		FRENCH AUTOCRACY		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.983	1.613	59	4.563	5.404
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.234	1.548	94	4.917	5.551
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.583	1.382	120	5.334	5.833
For entire sample		5.333	1.506	273	5.154	5.513

Variable .. FIDEAL		FRANCE AS AN IDEAL COUNTRY		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.339	1.560	59	3.932	4.746
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.628	1.352	94	4.351	4.905
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.158	1.167	120	4.947	5.369
For entire sample		4.799	1.361	273	4.636	4.961

Variable .. FDANG		FRANCE AS A DANGEROUS COUNTRY		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	5.068	1.258	59	4.740	5.396
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.372	1.057	94	5.156	5.589
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.542	1.068	120	5.349	5.735
For entire sample		5.381	1.119	273	5.248	5.514

Variable .. FPASS		FRENCH PASSIVITY		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.915	1.643	59	4.487	5.343
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.330	1.462	94	5.030	5.629
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.475	1.152	120	5.267	5.683
For entire sample		5.304	1.390	273	5.138	5.470

Variable .. FIMMIG		FRENCH IMMIGRATION		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	3.729	1.740	59	3.275	4.182
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.606	1.628	94	4.273	4.940
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.117	1.594	120	4.829	5.405
For entire sample		4.641	1.716	273	4.437	4.845

Variable .. FRIGHT		FRENCH RIGHTS		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	5.186	1.634	59	4.760	5.612
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.309	1.510	94	4.999	5.618
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.850	1.200	120	5.633	6.067
For entire sample		5.520	1.438	273	5.349	5.691

Variable .. FLIKE		FRANCE - DISLIKE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	5.169	1.544	59	4.767	5.572
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.745	1.261	94	5.486	6.003
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.767	1.228	120	5.545	5.989
For entire sample		5.630	1.331	273	5.471	5.789

Variable .. FAGGES		FRANCE - AGGRESSIVE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	5.136	1.479	59	4.750	5.521
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.713	1.604	94	4.384	5.041
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	4.617	1.546	120	4.337	4.896
For entire sample		4.762	1.560	273	4.576	4.948

Variable .. FALIGN		FRANCE - ALIGNED WITH CANADA?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.525	2.062	59	3.988	5.063
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.777	1.673	94	4.434	5.119
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	4.975	1.486	120	4.706	5.244
For entire sample		4.810	1.691	273	4.608	5.011

Variable .. FTIES		FRANCE - CLOSER TIES?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	5.017	1.687	59	4.577	5.456
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.979	1.503	94	4.671	5.286
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.250	1.422	120	4.993	5.507
For entire sample		5.106	1.510	273	4.926	5.286

Variable .. FTRUST		FRANCE - TRUSTWORTHY?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	5.186	1.358	59	4.833	5.540
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.128	1.297	94	4.862	5.393
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.350	1.275	120	5.120	5.580
For entire sample		5.238	1.300	273	5.083	5.393

Variable .. FWORK		FRANCE - HARDWORKING?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.627	1.541	59	4.225	5.029
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.819	1.303	94	4.552	5.086
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	4.633	1.443	120	4.372	4.894
For entire sample		4.696	1.417	273	4.527	4.865

Variable .. FINDIV		FRANCE - INDIVIDUALISTIC?				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent Cnfn. Interval	
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.136	1.717	59	3.688	4.583
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.596	1.648	94	4.258	4.933
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	4.950	1.598	120	4.661	5.239
For entire sample		4.652	1.665	273	4.454	4.850

Variable .. FINVEST		FRANCE - INVESTMENT WORTHY?				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.186	1.737	59	3.734	4.639
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.574	1.499	94	4.267	4.881
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	4.983	1.539	120	4.705	5.262
For entire sample		4.670	1.595	273	4.480	4.860

***** ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE — DESIGN 1 *****

EFFECT .. EDUCCAT

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 2, M = 8 1/2, N = 124 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.36966	2.85686	40.00	504.00	.000
Hotellings	.49469	3.09182	40.00	500.00	.000
Wilks	.65353	2.97432	40.00	502.00	.000

Rois .28961

Note.. F statistic for WILK'S Lambda is exact.

EFFECT .. EDUCCAT (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (2,270) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
FINDUS	36.92395	403.12734	18.46197	1.49306	12.36516	.000
FEDUC	14.16698	280.06012	7.08349	1.03726	6.82904	.001
FWEST	95.85117	928.68362	47.92559	3.43957	13.93360	.000
FKNIMC	84.60664	567.64245	42.30332	2.10238	20.12164	.000
FSTAB	7.99904	459.37092	3.99952	1.70137	2.35076	.097
FRICH	18.42674	326.48169	9.21337	1.20919	7.61945	.001
FAUTO	15.66589	601.00078	7.83294	2.22593	3.51895	.031
FIDEAL	30.73932	473.18009	15.36966	1.75252	8.77004	.000
FOANG	8.89239	331.48857	4.44619	1.22774	3.62146	.028
FPASS	12.48770	513.27787	6.24385	1.90103	3.28446	.039
FIMMIG	76.35666	724.46385	38.17833	2.68320	14.72866	.000
FRIGHT	23.83685	538.30234	11.91843	1.99371	5.97801	.003
FLIKE	15.98961	465.64409	7.99480	1.72461	4.63572	.010
FAGGES	10.99721	650.52660	5.49866	2.40936	2.28219	.104
FALIGN	8.14986	769.94538	4.07413	2.85165	1.42897	.241
FTIES	4.47892	615.44050	2.23916	2.27941	.98247	.376
FTRUST	2.80657	456.71724	1.40329	1.69155	.82959	.437
FWORK	2.17676	543.58881	1.08838	2.01329	.54060	.583
FINDIV	26.68784	727.25355	13.34392	2.69353	4.95406	.008
FINVEST	26.43513	565.89454	13.21756	2.46628	5.35932	.005

APPENDIX L (CTND.)- ATTITUDES TOWARDS FRENCH PRODUCTS BY EDUCATION GROUPING

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. FATTRACT		FRENCH PRODUCTS - ATTRACTIVE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	5.032	1.534	63	4.645	5.418
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.719	1.374	96	5.440	5.997
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.916	1.139	119	5.709	6.123
For entire sample		5.647	1.359	278	5.487	5.808

Variable .. FVALUE		FRENCH PRODUCTS - GOOD VALUE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.222	1.486	63	3.848	4.596
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.521	1.472	96	4.222	4.819
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	4.815	1.467	119	4.549	5.081
For entire sample		4.579	1.486	278	4.404	4.755

Variable .. FBUY		FRENCH PRODUCTS - WILLING TO BUY?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.841	1.472	63	4.470	5.212
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.073	1.386	96	4.792	5.354
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.387	1.468	119	5.120	5.653
For entire sample		5.155	1.452	278	4.983	5.326

Variable .. FIMIT		FRENCH PRODUCTS - IMITATIVE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.810	1.413	63	4.454	5.165
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.198	1.404	96	4.913	5.482
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.731	1.095	119	5.532	5.930
For entire sample		5.338	1.330	278	5.181	5.495

Variable .. FQUAL		FRENCH PRODUCTS - GOOD QUALITY?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.841	1.310	63	4.511	5.171
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.094	1.494	96	4.791	5.397
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.597	1.230	119	5.373	5.820
For entire sample		5.252	1.376	278	5.089	5.414

Variable .. FBRAND		FRENCH PRODUCTS - RECOGNIZABLE?				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.460	1.865	63	3.991	4.930
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.000	1.487	96	4.699	5.301
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.269	1.544	119	4.989	5.549
For entire sample		4.993	1.628	278	4.801	5.185

Variable .. FEXPEN		FRENCH PRODUCTS - EXPENSIVE?				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	5.381	1.275	63	5.060	5.702
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.448	1.313	96	5.182	5.714
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.538	1.313	119	5.299	5.776
For entire sample		5.471	1.302	278	5.318	5.625

Variable .. FKNOWP		FRENCH PRODUCTS - KNOW A LOT?				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	2.889	1.536	63	2.502	3.276
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	3.458	1.436	96	3.167	3.749
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	4.042	1.581	119	3.755	4.329
For entire sample		3.579	1.583	278	3.392	3.766

Variable .. FREL		FRENCH PRODUCTS - RELIABLE?				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.921	1.154	63	4.630	5.211
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.937	1.238	96	4.687	5.188
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.181	1.221	119	4.963	5.407
For entire sample		5.040	1.214	278	4.896	5.183

Variable .. FPROUD		FRENCH PRODUCTS - PROUD TO OWN?				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.444	1.532	63	4.059	4.830
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.562	1.471	96	4.264	4.861
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.017	1.365	119	4.769	5.265
For entire sample		4.730	1.458	278	4.558	4.902

Variable .. FADVAN		FRENCH PRODUCTS - TECHNICALLY ADVANCED?				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.841	1.417	63	4.485	5.198
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.135	1.434	96	4.845	5.426
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.504	1.199	119	5.286	5.722
For entire sample		5.227	1.355	278	5.067	5.387

Variable .. FSERV		FRENCH PRODUCTS - GOOD SERVICE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.159	1.139	63	3.872	4.446
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.042	1.025	96	3.834	4.249
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	3.975	1.085	119	3.778	4.172
For entire sample		4.040	1.076	278	3.913	4.167

Variable .. FFIND		FRENCH PRODUCTS - HARD TO FIND?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	3.714	1.385	63	3.366	4.063
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	4.052	1.558	96	3.736	4.368
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	4.319	1.512	119	4.045	4.594
For entire sample		4.090	1.514	278	3.911	4.269

Variable .. FWORK2		FRENCH PRODUCTS - WORKMANSHIP?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.778	1.142	63	4.490	5.065
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.156	1.225	96	4.908	5.405
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.353	1.062	119	5.160	5.546
For entire sample		5.155	1.156	278	5.018	5.291

Variable .. FSATIS		FRENCH PRODUCTS - SATISFIED?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.698	1.253	63	4.383	5.014
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.021	1.151	96	4.788	5.254
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.277	1.104	119	5.077	5.478
For entire sample		5.058	1.173	278	4.919	5.196

Variable .. FOVER		FRENCH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
EDUCCAT	HIGH SCH	4.730	1.208	63	4.426	5.034
EDUCCAT	SOME COL	5.219	1.048	96	5.006	5.431
EDUCCAT	UNIVERSI	5.496	.910	119	5.331	5.661
For entire sample		5.227	1.069	278	5.100	5.353

 * * * * * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- DESIGN 1 * * * * *
 * * * * *

EFFECT .. EDUCCAT

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 2, M = 6 1/2, N = 129)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.23178	2.13829	32.00	522.00	.000
Hotellings	.28047	2.27003	32.00	518.00	.000
Wilks	.77537	2.20430	32.00	520.00	.000

Roy's .19509

Note.. F statistic for WILK'S Lambda is exact.

 EFFECT .. EDUCCAT (Cont.)
 Univariate F-tests with (2,275) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
FATTRACT	32.95082	478.50242	16.47541	1.74001	9.46858	.000
FVALUE	14.97900	596.78000	7.48950	2.17011	3.45121	.033
FBUY	13.27815	571.12077	6.61408	2.07680	3.18474	.043
FIMIT	37.86700	452.34883	18.93350	1.64490	11.51039	.000
FQUAL	27.16650	497.20760	13.58325	1.80803	7.51274	.001
FBRAND	26.93986	707.04575	13.46993	2.57108	5.23903	.006
FEXPEN	1.09323	468.17656	.54661	1.70246	.32107	.726
FKNOWP	56.91352	636.84547	28.45676	2.31580	12.28808	.000
FREL	4.40380	404.16095	2.20190	1.46968	1.49822	.225
FPRODID	17.61924	571.14694	8.80962	2.07690	4.24172	.015
FADVAN	19.32284	489.40018	9.66142	1.77964	5.42887	.005
FSEPV	1.39435	319.17040	.69717	1.16062	.60069	.549
FFIND	15.28953	619.46227	7.64476	2.25259	3.39377	.035
FWORK2	13.62731	356.72161	6.81366	1.29717	5.25271	.006
FSATIS	14.00222	367.07691	7.00111	1.33483	5.24497	.006
FOVER	24.15617	292.56685	12.07809	1.06388	11.35287	.000

 11772 words of memory are needed for MANOVA execution

APPENDIX M - ANALYSIS OF INCOME DIFFERENCES

(TEST OF NULL H9)

OVERALL FOREIGN PRODUCT QUALITY ASSESSMENT BY INCOME

SURVEY VERSION #1 --THREE GROUP CATEGORIZATION

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. FOVER		FRENCH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
NEWINC	\$0-\$34,9	2.724	1.099	29	2.306	3.142
NEWINC	\$35,000-	2.952	1.209	42	2.576	3.329
NEWINC	\$60,000-	2.628	.952	43	2.335	2.921
For entire sample		2.772	1.089	114	2.570	2.974

Variable .. UOVER		USSR PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
NEWINC	\$0-\$34,9	4.759	1.405	29	4.224	5.293
NEWINC	\$35,000-	4.786	1.406	42	4.348	5.224
NEWINC	\$60,000-	5.279	1.120	43	4.934	5.624
For entire sample		4.965	1.317	114	4.721	5.209

Variable .. HOVER		HUNGARIAN PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
NEWINC	\$0-\$34,9	4.103	1.472	29	3.543	4.663
NEWINC	\$35,000-	4.095	1.031	42	3.774	4.417
NEWINC	\$60,000-	4.000	1.000	43	3.692	4.308
For entire sample		4.061	1.139	114	3.850	4.273

Variable .. COVER		CZECH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
NEWINC	\$0-\$34,9	4.034	1.451	29	3.482	4.586
NEWINC	\$35,000-	3.381	1.168	42	3.017	3.745
NEWINC	\$60,000-	3.767	.922	43	3.484	4.051
For entire sample		3.693	1.183	114	3.473	3.913

Multivariate test for Homogeneity of Dispersion matrices

Boxs M = 25.76230
 F WITH (20,33719) DF = 1.21820, P = .227 (Approx.)
 Chi-Square with 20 DF = 24.37933, P = .226 (Approx.)

EFFECT .. NEWINC

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 2, M = 1/2, N = 53)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.11351	1.63966	8.00	218.00	.115
Hotellings	.12063	1.61339	8.00	214.00	.122
Wilks	.88959	1.62654	8.00	216.00	.119
Roys	.06770				
Note.. F statistic for WILK'S Lambda is exact.					

EFFECT .. NEWINC (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (2,111) D. F.

Variable		Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F
	Sig. of F					
FOVER		2.32580	131.74438	1.16290	1.18689	.97979
	.379					
UOVER		6.82671	189.03294	3.41336	1.70300	2.00432
	.140					
HOVER		.26147	146.30870	.13074	1.31810	.09919
	.906					
COVER		7.70969	150.54470	3.85484	1.35626	2.84226
	.063					

OVERALL FOREIGN PRODUCT QUALITY ASSESSMENT BY INCOME

SURVEY VERSION #2--THREE GROUP CATEGORIZATION

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. FOVER		FRENCH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
NEWINC	\$0-\$34,9	2.750	1.164	32	2.330	3.170
NEWINC	\$35,000-	2.796	1.080	49	2.486	3.106
NEWINC	\$60,000-	2.706	.944	51	2.440	2.971
For entire sample		2.750	1.044	132	2.570	2.930

Variable .. UOVER		USSR PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
NEWINC	\$0-\$34,9	5.000	1.320	32	4.524	5.476
NEWINC	\$35,000-	4.755	1.377	49	4.359	5.151
NEWINC	\$60,000-	5.235	1.012	51	4.951	5.520
For entire sample		5.000	1.242	132	4.786	5.214

Variable .. POVER		POLISH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
NEWINC	\$0-\$34,9	4.375	1.314	32	3.901	4.849
NEWINC	\$35,000-	4.122	1.111	49	3.803	4.442
NEWINC	\$60,000-	4.451	1.172	51	4.121	4.780
For entire sample		4.311	1.186	132	4.106	4.515

Variable .. YOVER		YUGO PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
NEWINC	\$0-\$34,9	3.969	1.204	32	3.535	4.403
NEWINC	\$35,000-	4.061	1.029	49	3.766	4.357
NEWINC	\$60,000-	4.098	1.044	51	3.804	4.392
For entire sample		4.053	1.072	132	3.868	4.238

Multivariate test for Homogeneity of Dispersion matrices

Box's M = 28.53503
 F WITH (20,41584) DF = 1.35926, P = .130 (Approx.)
 Chi-Square with 20 DF = 27.19883, P = .130 (Approx.)

EFFECT .. NEWINC

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 2, M = 1/2, N = 62)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.04187	.67886	8.00	254.00	.710
Hotellings	.04333	.67706	8.00	250.00	.712
Wilks	.95830	.67800	8.00	252.00	.711
Roys	.03727				

Note.. F statistic for WILK'S Lambda is exact.

 EFFECT .. NEWINC (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (2,129) D. F.

Variable		Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F
	Sig. of F					
FOVER		.20258	142.54742	.10129	1.10502	.09166
	.912					
UOVER		5.76230	196.23770	2.88115	1.52122	1.89397
	.155					
POVER		2.87239	181.39276	1.43620	1.40615	1.02137
	.363					
YQVER		.33391	150.29488	.16695	1.16508	.14330
	.867					

APPENDIX N - ANALYSIS OF SURVEY VERSION DIFFERENCES (French & Soviet Profiles)

FRENCH PRODUCTS

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. FATTRACT		FRENCH PRODUCTS - ATTRACTIVE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	5.527	1.490	131	5.269	5.784
VER	2	5.722	1.255	151	5.520	5.924
For entire sample		5.631	1.370	282	5.471	5.792

Variable .. FVALUE		FRENCH PRODUCTS - GOOD VALUE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.580	1.509	131	4.319	4.841
VER	2	4.609	1.479	151	4.372	4.847
For entire sample		4.596	1.490	282	4.421	4.770

Variable .. FBUY		FRENCH PRODUCTS - WILLING TO BUY?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	5.198	1.389	131	4.958	5.439
VER	2	5.139	1.501	151	4.898	5.380
For entire sample		5.167	1.448	282	4.997	5.336

Variable .. FIMIT		FRENCH PRODUCTS - IMITATIVE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	5.374	1.383	131	5.135	5.613
VER	2	5.285	1.308	151	5.074	5.495
For entire sample		5.326	1.342	282	5.169	5.484

Variable .. FQUAL		FRENCH PRODUCTS - GOOD QUALITY?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	5.183	1.482	131	4.927	5.439
VER	2	5.318	1.277	151	5.112	5.523
For entire sample		5.255	1.375	282	5.094	5.417

Variable .. FBRAND		FRENCH PRODUCTS - RECOGNIZABLE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.870	1.738	131	4.570	5.171
VER	2	5.086	1.523	151	4.841	5.331
For entire sample		4.986	1.627	282	4.795	5.177

Variable .. FEXPEN		FRENCH PRODUCTS - EXPENSIVE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	5.489	1.378	131	5.250	5.727
VER	2	5.430	1.257	151	5.228	5.633
For entire sample		5.457	1.312	282	5.304	5.611

Variable .. FKNOWP		FRENCH PRODUCTS - KNOW A LOT?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	3.573	1.452	131	3.322	3.823
VER	2	3.563	1.688	151	3.292	3.834
For entire sample		3.567	1.580	282	3.382	3.753

Variable .. FREL		FRENCH PRODUCTS - RELIABLE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	5.214	1.137	131	5.017	5.410
VER	2	4.907	1.272	151	4.703	5.112
For entire sample		5.050	1.219	282	4.907	5.192

Variable .. FPROUD		FRENCH PRODUCTS - PROUD TO OWN?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.702	1.543	131	4.436	4.969
VER	2	4.775	1.391	151	4.551	4.999
For entire sample		4.741	1.461	282	4.570	4.912

Variable .. FADVAN		FRENCH PRODUCTS - TECHNICALLY ADVANCED?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	5.130	1.422	131	4.884	5.376
VER	2	5.305	1.301	151	5.095	5.514
For entire sample		5.223	1.359	282	5.064	5.383

Variable .. FSERV		FRENCH PRODUCTS - GOOD SERVICE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	3.954	.983	131	3.784	4.124
VER	2	4.132	1.153	151	3.947	4.318
For entire sample		4.050	1.079	282	3.923	4.176

Variable .. FFIND		FRENCH PRODUCTS - HARD TO FIND?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.076	1.547	131	3.809	4.344
VER	2	4.093	1.494	151	3.853	4.333
For entire sample		4.085	1.516	282	3.907	4.263

Variable .. FWORK2		FRENCH PRODUCTS - WORKMANSHIP?				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
VER	1	5.115	1.187	131	4.909	5.320
VER	2	5.199	1.143	151	5.015	5.383
For entire sample		5.160	1.163	282	5.023	5.296

Variable .. FSATIS		FRENCH PRODUCTS - SATISFIED?				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
VER	1	5.084	1.130	131	4.889	5.279
VER	2	5.046	1.213	151	4.851	5.241
For entire sample		5.064	1.173	282	4.926	5.201

Variable .. FOVER		FRENCH PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
VER	1	5.183	1.101	131	4.993	5.374
VER	2	5.252	1.078	151	5.078	5.425
For entire sample		5.220	1.088	282	5.092	5.347

***** ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- DESIGN 1 *****

EFFECT .. VER

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 7, N = 131 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.09197	1.67753	16.00	265.00	.051
Hotellings	.10128	1.67753	16.00	265.00	.051
Wilks	.90803	1.67753	16.00	265.00	.051
Rois	.09197				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. VER (Cont.)
Univariate F-tests with (1,230) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
FATTRACT	2.67102	524.97437	2.67102	1.87491	1.42461	.234
FVALUE	.05948	623.85542	.05948	2.22806	.02669	.870
FBUY	.24750	588.91916	.24750	2.10328	.11767	.732
FIMIT	.55909	505.42672	.55909	1.80510	.30973	.578
FQUAL	1.27225	530.34478	1.27225	1.89409	.67169	.413
FBRAND	3.26857	740.67469	3.26857	2.64527	1.23563	.267
FEXPEN	.23667	483.75269	.23667	1.72769	.13699	.712
FKNOWP	.00647	701.21339	.00647	2.50433	.00258	.959
FREL	6.58771	410.71725	6.58771	1.46685	4.49107	.035
FPROUD	.36915	599.73368	.36915	2.14191	.17235	.678
FADVAN	2.14488	516.78065	2.14488	1.84565	1.16213	.282
FSERV	2.22878	325.07618	2.22878	1.16099	1.91973	.167
FFIND	.01882	645.93863	.01882	2.30692	.00816	.928
FWORK2	.49697	379.32218	.49697	1.35472	.36684	.545
FSATIS	.09923	386.75183	.09923	1.38126	.07184	.789
FOVER	.32865	332.04014	.32865	1.18586	.27715	.599

FRANCE THE COUNTRY AND ITS PEOPLE

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. FINDUS		FRENCH INDUSTRIALIZATION		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	5.748	1.309	127	5.518	5.978
VER	2	5.727	1.242	150	5.526	5.927
For entire sample		5.736	1.271	277	5.586	5.887

Variable .. FEDUC		FRENCH EDUCATION		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	5.890	1.121	127	5.693	6.087
VER	2	5.920	.973	150	5.763	6.077
For entire sample		5.906	1.042	277	5.783	6.029

Variable .. FWEST		FRENCH CULTURE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.984	1.881	127	4.654	5.315
VER	2	4.833	2.011	150	4.509	5.158
For entire sample		4.903	1.951	277	4.672	5.133

Variable .. FKNOWC		KNOWLEDGE OF FRANCE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.126	1.538	127	3.856	4.396
VER	2	4.207	1.556	150	3.956	4.458
For entire sample		4.170	1.545	277	3.987	4.352

Variable .. FSTAB		FRENCH STABILITY		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	5.252	1.351	127	5.015	5.489
VER	2	5.293	1.308	150	5.082	5.504
For entire sample		5.274	1.326	277	5.118	5.431

Variable .. FRICH		FRENCH WEALTH		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	5.094	1.123	127	4.897	5.292
VER	2	5.200	1.147	150	5.015	5.385
For entire sample		5.152	1.135	277	5.017	5.286

Variable .. FAUTO		FRENCH AUTOCRACY		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	5.236	1.571	127	4.960	5.512
VER	2	5.367	1.463	150	5.131	5.603
For entire sample		5.307	1.512	277	5.128	5.486

Variable .. FIDEAL		FRANCE AS AN IDEAL COUNTRY		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.780	1.436	127	4.527	5.032
VER	2	4.800	1.321	150	4.587	5.013
For entire sample		4.791	1.372	277	4.628	4.953

Variable .. FDANG		FRANCE AS A DANGEROUS COUNTRY		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	5.378	1.188	127	5.169	5.587
VER	2	5.327	1.161	150	5.139	5.514
For entire sample		5.350	1.172	277	5.212	5.489

Variable .. FPASS		FRENCH PASSIVITY		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	5.220	1.447	127	4.966	5.475
VER	2	5.333	1.369	150	5.112	5.554
For entire sample		5.282	1.404	277	5.116	5.448

Variable .. FIMMIG		FRENCH IMMIGRATION		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.677	1.718	127	4.376	4.979
VER	2	4.587	1.719	150	4.309	4.864
For entire sample		4.628	1.716	277	4.425	4.831

Variable .. FRIGHT		FRENCH RIGHTS		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	5.394	1.507	127	5.129	5.658
VER	2	5.587	1.372	150	5.365	5.808
For entire sample		5.498	1.436	277	5.328	5.668

Variable .. FLIKE		FRANCE - DISLIKE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	5.654	1.405	127	5.407	5.900
VER	2	5.560	1.313	150	5.348	5.772
For entire sample		5.603	1.354	277	5.443	5.763

Variable .. FAGGES		FRANCE - AGGRESSIVE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.622	1.618	127	4.338	4.906
VER	2	4.867	1.509	150	4.623	5.110
For entire sample		4.755	1.562	277	4.570	4.939

Variable .. FALIGN		FRANCE - ALIGNED WITH CANADA?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.787	1.698	127	4.489	5.086
VER	2	4.787	1.673	150	4.517	5.057
For entire sample		4.787	1.682	277	4.588	4.986

Variable .. FTIES		FRANCE - CLOSER TIES?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	5.079	1.489	127	4.817	5.340
VER	2	5.107	1.542	150	4.858	5.355
For entire sample		5.094	1.515	277	4.915	5.273

Variable .. FTRUST		FRANCE - TRUSTWORTHY?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	5.268	1.250	127	5.048	5.487
VER	2	5.173	1.355	150	4.955	5.392
For entire sample		5.217	1.306	277	5.062	5.371

Variable .. FWORK		FRANCE - HARDWORKING?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.709	1.470	127	4.451	4.967
VER	2	4.687	1.376	150	4.465	4.909
For entire sample		4.697	1.417	277	4.529	4.864

Variable .. FINDIV		FRANCE - INDIVIDUALISTIC?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.598	1.710	127	4.298	4.899
VER	2	4.633	1.632	150	4.370	4.897
For entire sample		4.617	1.665	277	4.420	4.814

Variable .. FINVEST		FRANCE - INVESTMENT WORTHY?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.646	1.626	127	4.360	4.931
VER	2	4.673	1.578	150	4.419	4.928
For entire sample		4.661	1.597	277	4.472	4.850

 * * * * * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- DESIGN 1 * * * * *
 * * * * *

EFFECT .. VER

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, h = 9, N = 127)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.03485	.46222	20.00	256.00	.978
Hotellings	.03611	.46222	20.00	256.00	.978
Wilks	.96515	.46222	20.00	256.00	.978
Rois	.03485	.			

Note.. F statistics are exact.

 EFFECT .. VER (Cont.)
 Univariate F-tests with (1,275) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
FINDUC	.03139	445.73034	.03139	1.62084	.01937	.889
FEDUC	.06287	299.49669	.06287	1.08908	.05773	.810
FWEST	1.56639	1048.80184	1.56639	3.81382	.41071	.522
FKNDWC	.44769	658.57759	.44769	7.39483	.18694	.666
FSTAB	.11767	485.03034	.11767	1.76375	.06672	.796
FRICH	.76563	354.86614	.76563	1.29042	.59332	.442
FAUTO	1.17025	629.74672	1.17025	2.28999	.51103	.475
FIDEAL	.02882	519.82677	.02882	1.89028	.01525	.902
FDANG	.18089	378.85160	.18089	1.37764	.13130	.717
FPASS	.87600	543.16010	.87600	1.97513	.44351	.506
FIMMIG	.56325	812.13711	.56325	2.95323	.19072	.663
FRIGHT	2.56080	566.9829	2.56080	2.06068	1.24270	.266
FLIKE	.60178	505.71591	.60178	1.83897	.32724	.568
FABGES	4.11526	689.19160	4.11526	2.43342	1.69114	.195
FALIGN	.00004	780.43318	.00004	2.83794	.00001	.907
FTIES	.05364	633.50593	.05364	2.30366	.02328	.879
FTRUST	.61264	470.39097	.61264	1.71051	.35816	.550
FWORK	.03327	554.49781	.03327	2.01634	.01650	.898
FINDIV	.08380	765.35302	.08380	2.78310	.03011	.862
FINVEST	.05263	704.04845	.05263	2.56018	.02056	.886

SOVIET PRODUCTS

Cell Means and Standard Deviations						
Variable .. UATTRACT		USSR PRODUCTS - ATTRACTIVE?				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent	Conf. Interval
VER	1	2.693	1.445	127	2.439	2.947
VER	2	2.726	1.441	146	2.490	2.962
For entire sample		2.711	1.440	273	2.539	2.882

Variable .. UVALUE		USSR PRODUCTS - GOOD VALUE?				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent	Conf. Interval
VER	1	3.472	1.689	127	3.176	3.769
VER	2	3.692	1.667	146	3.419	3.965
For entire sample		3.590	1.678	273	3.390	3.790

Variable .. UBUY		USSR PRODUCTS - WILLING TO BUY?				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent	Conf. Interval
VER	1	3.016	1.686	127	2.720	3.312
VER	2	3.171	1.786	146	2.879	3.463
For entire sample		3.099	1.739	273	2.892	3.306

Variable .. UIMIT		USSR PRODUCTS - IMITATIVE?				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent	Conf. Interval
VER	1	2.811	1.468	127	2.553	3.069
VER	2	2.808	1.401	146	2.579	3.037
For entire sample		2.810	1.430	273	2.639	2.980

Variable .. UQUAL		USSR PRODUCTS - GOOD QUALITY?				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent	Conf. Interval
VER	1	2.984	1.464	127	2.727	3.241
VER	2	2.952	1.445	146	2.716	3.188
For entire sample		2.967	1.451	273	2.794	3.140

Variable .. UBRAND		USSR PRODUCTS - RECOGNIZABLE?				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent	Conf. Interval
VER	1	2.646	1.683	127	2.350	2.941
VER	2	2.658	1.667	146	2.385	2.930
For entire sample		2.652	1.671	273	2.453	2.851

Variable .. UEXPEN		USSR PRODUCTS - EXPENSIVE?				
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	95 percent	Conf. Interval
VER	1	3.472	1.532	127	3.203	3.741
VER	2	3.425	1.466	146	3.185	3.664
For entire sample		3.447	1.494	273	3.269	3.625

Variable .. UKNOWP		USSR PRODUCTS - KNOW A LOT?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	2.449	1.516	127	2.183	2.715
VER	2	2.315	1.466	146	2.075	2.555
For entire sample		2.377	1.488	273	2.200	2.555

Variable .. UREL		USSR PRODUCTS - RELIABLE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	3.370	1.265	127	3.148	3.592
VER	2	3.205	1.419	146	2.973	3.438
For entire sample		3.282	1.349	273	3.121	3.443

Variable .. UPROUD		USSR PRODUCTS - PROUD TO OWN?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	2.969	1.362	127	2.729	3.208
VER	2	3.116	1.431	146	2.882	3.351
For entire sample		3.048	1.399	273	2.881	3.214

Variable .. UADVAN		USSR PRODUCTS - TECHNICALLY ADVANCED?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	3.244	1.627	127	2.958	3.530
VER	2	3.199	1.655	146	2.928	3.469
For entire sample		3.220	1.639	273	3.024	3.415

Variable .. USERV		USSR PRODUCTS - GOOD SERVICE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	3.315	1.446	127	3.061	3.569
VER	2	3.116	1.460	146	2.878	3.355
For entire sample		3.209	1.454	273	3.036	3.382

Variable .. UFINO		USSR PRODUCTS - HARD TO FIND?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	2.630	1.622	127	2.345	2.915
VER	2	2.432	1.354	146	2.210	2.653
For entire sample		2.524	1.485	273	2.347	2.701

Variable .. UWORK2		USSR PRODUCTS - WORKMANSHIP?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	3.291	1.470	127	3.033	3.549
VER	2	3.247	1.446	146	3.010	3.483
For entire sample		3.267	1.455	273	3.094	3.441

Variable .. USATIS		USSR PRODUCTS - SATISFIED?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	3.425	1.306	127	3.196	3.655
VER	2	3.356	1.353	146	3.135	3.577
For entire sample		3.398	1.330	273	3.230	3.547

Variable .. UOVER		USSR PRODUCTS - OVERALL SCORE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	3.047	1.308	127	2.817	3.277
VER	2	3.007	1.273	146	2.799	3.215
For entire sample		3.026	1.287	273	2.872	3.179

***** ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- DESIGN 1 *****

EFFECT .. VER

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 7 , N = 127)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.03552	.58917	16.00	256.00	.891
Hotellings	.03682	.58917	16.00	256.00	.891
Wilks	.96448	.58917	16.00	256.00	.891
Roy's	.03552				
Note.. F statistics are exact.					

EFFECT .. VER (Cont.)
Univariate F-tests with (1,271) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
UATTRACT	.07448	564.06472	.07448	2.08142	.03578	.850
UVALUE	3.26760	762.78368	3.26760	2.81470	1.16091	.282
UBUY	1.64199	820.68768	1.64199	3.02837	.54220	.462
UIMIT	.00053	556.09470	.00053	2.05201	.00026	.987
UQUAL	.07041	572.63289	.07041	2.11304	.03332	.855
UBRAND	.00956	759.93103	.00956	2.80418	.00341	.953
UEXPEN	.15508	607.32478	.15508	2.24105	.06920	.793
UKNOWP	1.21502	600.92417	1.21502	2.21743	.54794	.460
UREL	1.84014	493.44192	1.84014	1.82082	1.01061	.316
UPRODU	1.48639	530.89456	1.48639	1.95902	.75874	.384
UADVAN	.14039	730.67280	.14039	2.69621	.05207	.820
USERV	2.67678	572.42212	2.67678	2.11226	1.26726	.261
UFINO	2.67387	597.42137	2.67387	2.20451	1.21291	.272
UWORK2	.13609	575.34376	.13609	2.12304	.06410	.800
USATIS	.32367	480.51882	.32367	1.77313	.18254	.670
UOVER	.11083	450.70969	.11083	1.66314	.06664	.796

THE U.S.S.R. AND ITS PEOPLE

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. UINDUS		RUSSIAN INDUSTRIALIZATION		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.265	1.847	136	3.952	4.578
VER	2	4.324	1.596	148	4.065	4.578
For entire sample		4.296	1.718	284	4.095	4.496

Variable .. UEDUC		RUSSIAN EDUCATION		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.243	1.478	136	3.992	4.493
VER	2	4.149	1.449	148	3.913	4.384
For entire sample		4.194	1.461	284	4.023	4.364

Variable .. UWEST		RUSSIAN CULTURE		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	2.743	1.615	136	2.469	3.016
VER	2	2.703	1.431	148	2.470	2.935
For entire sample		2.722	1.519	284	2.544	2.899

Variable .. UKNOWC		KNOWLEDGE OF USSR		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	3.434	1.538	136	3.173	3.695
VER	2	3.128	1.557	148	2.875	3.381
For entire sample		3.275	1.553	284	3.093	3.456

Variable .. USTAB		RUSSIAN STABILITY		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	2.757	1.612	136	2.484	3.031
VER	2	2.480	1.412	148	2.250	2.709
For entire sample		2.613	1.515	284	2.436	2.790

Variable .. URICH		RUSSIAN WEALTH		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	2.691	1.385	136	2.456	2.926
VER	2	2.541	1.163	148	2.352	2.729
For entire sample		2.613	1.274	284	2.464	2.761

Variable .. UAUTO		RUSSIAN AUTOCRACY		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	2.235	1.357	136	2.005	2.465
VER	2	2.108	1.161	148	1.919	2.297
For entire sample		2.169	1.258	284	2.022	2.316

Variable .. UIDEAL		USSR AS AN IDEAL COUNTRY		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	2.118	1.136	136	1.925	2.310
VER	2	2.291	1.197	148	2.096	2.485
For entire sample		2.208	1.169	284	2.071	2.344

Variable .. UDANG		USSR AS A DANGEROUS COUNTRY		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	3.353	1.443	136	3.108	3.598
VER	2	3.345	1.364	148	3.123	3.566
For entire sample		3.349	1.400	284	3.185	3.512

Variable .. UPASS		RUSSIAN PASSIVITY		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	3.875	1.437	136	3.631	4.119
VER	2	3.993	1.580	148	3.737	4.250
For entire sample		3.937	1.512	284	3.760	4.113

Variable .. UIMMIG		RUSSIAN IMMIGRATION		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.390	1.790	136	4.086	4.693
VER	2	4.399	1.705	148	4.122	4.676
For entire sample		4.394	1.743	284	4.191	4.598

Variable .. URIGHT		RUSSIAN RIGHTS		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	2.029	1.102	136	1.843	2.216
VER	2	2.236	1.357	148	2.016	2.457
For entire sample		2.137	1.244	284	1.992	2.283

Variable .. ULIKE		USSR - DISLIKE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.338	1.312	136	4.116	4.561
VER	2	4.223	1.461	148	3.986	4.460
For entire sample		4.278	1.390	284	4.116	4.441

Variable .. UAGGES		USSR - AGGRESSIVE?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	3.353	1.385	136	3.118	3.588
VER	2	3.358	1.405	148	3.130	3.586
For entire sample		3.356	1.393	284	3.193	3.518

Variable .. UALIGN		USSR - ALIGNED WITH CANADA?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	3.449	1.490	136	3.196	3.701
VER	2	3.054	1.418	148	2.824	3.284
For entire sample		3.243	1.464	284	3.072	3.414

Variable .. UTIES		USSR - CLOSER TIES?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.993	1.552	136	4.730	5.256
VER	2	4.899	1.590	148	4.640	5.157
For entire sample		4.944	1.569	284	4.760	5.127

Variable .. UTRUST		USSR - TRUSTWORTHY?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.368	1.281	136	4.150	4.585
VER	2	4.284	1.424	148	4.052	4.515
For entire sample		4.324	1.356	284	4.166	4.482

Variable .. UWORK		USSR - HARDWORKING?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.868	1.750	136	4.571	5.164
VER	2	4.743	1.715	148	4.465	5.022
For entire sample		4.803	1.730	284	4.601	5.005

Variable .. UINDIV		USSR - INDIVIDUALISTIC?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	2.985	1.651	136	2.705	3.265
VER	2	2.926	1.381	148	2.701	3.150
For entire sample		2.954	1.514	284	2.777	3.131

Variable .. UINVEST		USSR - INVESTMENT WORTHY?		N	95 percent Conf. Interval	
FACTOR	CODE	Mean	Std. Dev.			
VER	1	4.419	1.571	136	4.153	4.686
VER	2	4.480	1.696	148	4.204	4.755
For entire sample		4.451	1.635	284	4.260	4.642

***** ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- DESIGN 1 *****

EFFECT .. VER

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 9, N = 130 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.09328	1.35286	20.00	263.00	.146
Hotellings	.10288	1.35286	20.00	263.00	.146
Wilks	.90672	1.35286	20.00	263.00	.146
Roy's	.09328				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. VER (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,282) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
UINDUS	.25191	834.90302	.25191	2.96065	.08509	.771
UEQUC	.62621	603.72238	.62621	2.14086	.29251	.589
UWEST	.11308	652.91157	.11308	2.31529	.04884	.825
UKNOMC	6.61224	675.96522	6.61224	2.39704	2.75850	.098
USTAB	5.46253	643.93184	5.46253	2.28345	2.39223	.123
URICH	1.60820	457.78617	1.60820	1.62336	.99066	.320
UAUTO	1.14647	446.74086	1.14647	1.58419	.72369	.396
UIDEAL	2.11855	384.62440	2.11855	1.36392	1.55329	.214
UDANG	.00494	554.48450	.00494	1.96626	.00251	.960
UPASS	.99091	645.86824	.99091	2.29031	.43265	.511
UINWIG	.00567	859.82532	.00567	3.04903	.00186	.966
URIGHT	3.03904	434.60533	3.03904	1.54115	1.97193	.161
ULIKE	.94158	546.08307	.94158	1.93646	.48624	.486
UASGES	.00189	549.07909	.00189	1.94709	.00097	.975
UALIGN	11.02864	595.20727	11.02864	2.11066	5.22520	.023
UTIES	.62621	696.47238	.62621	2.46976	.25355	.615
UTRUST	.49845	519.69873	.49845	1.84290	.27047	.603
UNDRK	1.09686	845.86089	1.09686	2.99951	.36568	.546
UINDIV	.25191	648.15302	.25191	2.29841	.10960	.741
UINVEST	.26038	756.04948	.26038	2.68103	.09712	.756

END

27·05·92

FIN