INFORMATION TO USERS

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

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

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

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

NOTE TO USERS

The original manuscript received by UMI contains indistinct, slanted and or light print. All efforts were made to acquire the highest quality manuscript from the author or school.

Microfilmed as received.

This reproduction is the best copy available

UMI

**The Product and Country Images of NAFTA
from a Canadian Retail Buyer Perspective**

by
John Nadeau (B.Comm)

A thesis submitted to
the faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Management Studies

School of Business
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
March 27, 1998

© copyright
1998 John Nadeau

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

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

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

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

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

0-612-32420-6

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

**The Product and Country Images of NAFTA
from a Canadian Retail Buyer Perspective**

submitted by
John Nadeau (B.Comm)

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Management Studies

Thesis Co-Supervisor

Thesis Co-Supervisor

Director, School of Business

Carleton University
March 27, 1998

Abstract

This study gathered the views of 142 Canadian retail buyers toward NAFTA countries (Canada, United States and Mexico) and potential NAFTA countries (Chile and Argentina) through a mailed questionnaire. The research examined the Product and Country Image (PCI) effects on the profiles, analyzed for demographic relationships, and furthered the theoretical modeling base of PCI. The dominant theme in the examination of the profiles was differentiation of the country, product and business images. Buyer characteristics were not found to be related to the buyer's product quality beliefs of the stimulus countries. The analysis of the PCI model revealed that the product beliefs were indirectly related to buying intentions through the respondent's evaluation of products. Beliefs of supplier service levels and supplier relationships were the most important business factors related to product beliefs. The implications of these findings are also discussed.

Acknowledgments

This thesis could only have been completed with the assistance of some key individuals at Carleton University. First, I'd like to thank the co-supervisors of the research, Dr. Louise Heslop and Dr. Nicolas Papadopoulos; Louise for her great support and for demonstrating patience while I toiled away on various distractions and Nick for offering insightful feedback in a timely manner and kind words to boost my periodically deflated ego. I'd also like to thank the third member of my committee, Dr. Debbie Compeau, for her statistical acumen which made the modeling analysis possible.

Other important members of the community had an impact on my academic experience. Thank you Dr. George Haines for the pleasurable T.A. work, guidance, wisdom, and terrific anecdotes. Thanks to Jean Blair for always being optimistic and keeping the wheels of the University in motion. I'd also like to thank my friends for the reminder that "life is better lived" and for tolerating my winter hibernations. Most importantly, thank you Chelsea Nadeau for your unconditional love and for being the most beautiful puppy in the world.

Thank you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. PROBLEM BACKGROUND	3
2.1 Choice of NAFTA Countries	3
2.2 Importance of Retail Buyers	4
3. LITERATURE REVIEW	7
3.1 Product-Country Images Research	7
3.1.1 Stereotypes	8
3.1.2 "Summary Construct" and "Halo Effect"	9
3.1.3 Application of Cues	9
3.1.4 Patriotism	11
3.1.5 Sensitivity of Product-Country Images	12
3.1.6 Product-Country Images Model Development	12
3.1.7 Other Considerations	14
3.1.8 Summary of Product-Country Images Research	14
3.2 Vendor Selection Research	15
3.2.1 Organizational Buyer Behaviour	15
3.2.2 Emergence of Retail Studies	17
3.2.3 Organizational Buyers and Product-Country Images	19
3.2.4 Summary of Vendor Selection Research	19
3.3 Business and Latin America	20
3.3.1 Business Situation	20
3.3.2 The Effects of Product-Country Images for Latin America	22
3.3.4 Summary of Business and Latin American Studies	25
4. MODEL DISCUSSION AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESES	26
4.1 First Objective of the Research	26
4.2 Second Objective of the Research	27
4.3 Third Objective of the Research	29
4.3.1 The Model	30
4.3.2 Measures	35
4.3.3 Indicators	41
5 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	42

5.1 The Research Instrument	42
5.2 The Sample	45
5.3 Sampling Design	45
5.4 Sample Size	46
5.5 Data Collection	48
6 ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	51
6.1 Descriptive Demographics	51
6.2 PCI Effects on the Country, Product, and Business Profiles	58
6.2.1 Retail Buyer Views of Countries and their People	59
6.2.2 Retail Buyer Views of Products	67
6.2.3 Retail Buyer Views of Doing Business	75
6.3.4 <i>Summary of PCI Effects</i>	83
6.3 Hypotheses of Retail Buyer Characteristics	84
6.4 Model Analysis and Discussion	92
6.4.1 <i>PCI Measurement Model</i>	93
6.4.2 <i>PCI Structural Model</i>	116
6.4.2 <i>PCI Simplified Model</i>	130
6.4.3 <i>Comparison of the PCI Simplified Models</i>	141
7 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	142
7.1 Sample Discussion	142
7.2 PCI Effects on the Country Profiles	142
7.3 Analysis of the Buyer and Organizational Characteristics	144
7.4 PCI Theoretical Modeling	144
8. RESEARCH LIMITATIONS	146
9. IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH	148
9.1 Implications for Policy Makers	148
9.1.1 <i>Canadian Planners</i>	148
9.1.2 <i>American Planners</i>	149
9.1.3 <i>Mexican Planners</i>	149
9.1.4 <i>Chilean Planners</i>	150
9.1.5 <i>Argentine Planners</i>	151

9.2 Implications for Marketers	152
9.2.1 <i>Canadian Practitioners</i>	152
9.2.2 <i>American Practitioners</i>	153
9.2.3 <i>Mexican Practitioners</i>	153
9.2.4 <i>Argentine and Chilean Practitioners</i>	154
9.3 Implications for Future Research	155
REFERENCES	157
APPENDIX A - QUESTIONNAIRE	A-1
APPENDIX B - REPLY CARD	B-1
APPENDIX C - FOLLOW-UP CAMPAIGN	C-1
APPENDIX D - DOUBLY MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE COUNTRY PROFILES	D-1
APPENDIX E - DOUBLY MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE PRODUCT PROFILES	E-1
APPENDIX F - DOUBLY MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DOING BUSINESS PROFILES	F-1
APPENDIX G - MEASUREMENT MODEL INITIAL FINDINGS	G-1
APPENDIX H - MEASUREMENT MODEL FINAL RESULTS	H-1
APPENDIX I - ADJUSTED T-STATISTICS FINAL RESULTS	I-1
APPENDIX J - COMPARISON OF THE PCI MODEL ANOVA RESULTS	J-1
APPENDIX K - MEASUREMENT MODEL SIMPLIFIED PCI MODEL	K-1
APPENDIX L - ADJUSTED T-STATISTIC SIMPLIFIED PCI MODEL	L-1
APPENDIX M - COMPARISON OF THE SIMPLIFIED MODEL - ANOVA RESULTS	M-1

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 4.1: PRODUCT-COUNTRY IMAGES EFFECTS ON CANADIAN RETAIL BUYER BEHAVIOUR	31
FIGURE 4.2: MEASUREMENT MODEL OF DOING BUSINESS CONSTRUCTS	33
FIGURE 4.3: MEASUREMENT MODEL OF REMAINING CONSTRUCTS	34
FIGURE 5.1: DISTRIBUTION OF QUESTIONNAIRES BY DATE OF ARRIVAL	50
FIGURE 6.2: THE REVISED PCI MEASUREMENT MODEL	117
FIGURE 6.3 PLS RESULTS FOR THE CANADIAN PCI MODEL	121
FIGURE 6.4 PLS RESULTS FOR THE AMERICAN PCI MODEL	123
FIGURE 6.5 PLS RESULTS FOR THE MEXICAN PCI MODEL	124
FIGURE 6.6 PLS RESULTS FOR THE CHILEAN PCI MODEL	126
FIGURE 6.7 PLS RESULTS FOR THE ARGENTINE PCI MODEL	127
FIGURE 6.8 SIMPLIFIED PCI STRUCTURAL MODEL	131
FIGURE 6.9 PLS RESULTS FOR THE SIMPLIFIED CANADIAN PCI MODEL	134
FIGURE 6.10 PLS RESULTS FOR THE SIMPLIFIED AMERICAN PCI MODEL	135
FIGURE 6.11 PLS RESULTS FOR THE SIMPLIFIED MEXICAN PCI MODEL	136
FIGURE 6.12 PLS RESULTS FOR THE SIMPLIFIED CHILEAN PCI MODEL	137
FIGURE 6.13 PLS RESULTS FOR THE SIMPLIFIED ARGENTINE PCI MODEL	138

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 5.1 LANGUAGE USED BY RESPONDENT	44
TABLE 6.1 ANNUAL SALES OF THE RETAIL FIRM	52
TABLE 6.2 NUMBER OF RETAIL OUTLETS STATISTICS	52
TABLE 6.3 NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES BY CLASSIFICATION	53
TABLE 6.4 PRESENCE OF THE RETAIL FIRM	54
TABLE 6.5 DOMESTIC VERSUS INTERNATIONALLY SOURCED GOODS	54
TABLE 6.6 INTERNATIONAL EXPOSURE OF THE RETAIL FIRM	54
TABLE 6.7 CLASSIFICATION OF STORE TYPE	55
TABLE 6.8 PRODUCT TYPES SOLD BY THE RETAIL FIRM	55
TABLE 6.9 TYPE OF BUYING STRUCTURE USED BY THE RETAIL FIRM	56
TABLE 6.10 LEGAL OWNERSHIP OF THE FIRM	56
TABLE 6.11 YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS A BUYER	57
TABLE 6.12 EXPERIENCE WITH THE STIMULUS COUNTRIES	58
TABLE 6.13 RETAIL BUYER RATINGS OF COUNTRY AND PEOPLE SCALES (N=142)	60
TABLE 6.14 DOUBLY MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF RETAIL BUYER PERCEPTIONS OF COUNTRY DIFFERENCES	64
TABLE 6.15 RETAIL BUYER RATINGS OF PRODUCT SCALES (N=142)	68
TABLE 6.16 DOUBLY MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF RETAIL BUYER PERCEPTIONS OF PRODUCT DIFFERENCES	71
TABLE 6.17 RETAIL BUYER RATINGS OF BUSINESS SCALES (N=142)	76
TABLE 6.18 DOUBLY MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF RETAIL BUYER PERCEPTIONS OF DOING BUSINESS DIFFERENCES	80
TABLE 6.19 CORRELATION OF PRODUCT QUALITY BELIEFS AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE	85
TABLE 6.20 CORRELATION OF PRODUCT QUALITY BELIEFS AND RETAILER SIZE	86
TABLE 6.21 SPEARMAN CORRELATION COEFFICIENT OF PRODUCT QUALITY BELIEFS AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE	87
TABLE 6.22 SPEARMAN CORRELATION COEFFICIENT OF PRODUCT QUALITY BELIEFS AND PRODUCT TYPE SOURCED BY BUYERS	90
TABLE 6.23 CORRELATION OF PRODUCT QUALITY BELIEFS AND FORMAL ORGANIZATION	91
TABLE 6.24 COUNTRY AND PEOPLE BELIEFS VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	94
TABLE 6.25 COUNTRY DESCRIPTION VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	96
TABLE 6.26 COUNTRY DESCRIPTION VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	96
TABLE 6.27 PEOPLE DESCRIPTION VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	97
TABLE 6.28 COUNTRY COMPETENCE VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	98
TABLE 6.29 COUNTRY COMPETENCE VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	98
TABLE 6.30 PEOPLE COMPETENCE VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	99
TABLE 6.31 COUNTRY EVALUATION VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	100
TABLE 6.32 LINKS VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	100
TABLE 6.33 FAMILIARITY VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	102
TABLE 6.34 FAMILIARITY VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	102

TABLE 6.35 FAMILIARITY VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	103
TABLE 6.36 SUPPLIER SERVICE VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	104
TABLE 6.37 LOGISTICS FACTOR - FACTOR LOADINGS AND THE PERCENTAGE OF VARIANCE EXPLAINED FROM THE PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS FACTOR ANALYSIS	105
TABLE 6.38 SERVICE FACTOR - FACTOR LOADINGS AND THE PERCENTAGE OF VARIANCE EXPLAINED FROM THE PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS FACTOR ANALYSIS	105
TABLE 6.39 SUPPLIER SERVICE VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	106
TABLE 6.40 SUPPLIER LOGISTICS VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	107
TABLE 6.41 PROFITABILITY VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	107
TABLE 6.42 PROFITABILITY VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	108
TABLE 6.43 BUSINESS COSTS - FACTOR LOADINGS AND THE PERCENTAGE OF VARIANCE EXPLAINED FROM THE PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS FACTOR ANALYSIS	109
TABLE 6.44 PROFITABILITY - FACTOR LOADINGS AND THE PERCENTAGE OF VARIANCE EXPLAINED FROM THE PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS FACTOR ANALYSIS	109
TABLE 6.45 PROFITABILITY VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	110
TABLE 6.46 SUPPLIER RELATIONSHIPS VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	111
TABLE 6.47 SUPPLIER RELATIONS VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	112
TABLE 6.48 PRODUCT BELIEFS VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	113
TABLE 6.49 PRODUCT BELIEFS VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	114
TABLE 6.50 PRODUCT EVALUATION VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	114
TABLE 6.51 PRODUCT EVALUATION VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY	115
TABLE 6.52 WILLINGNESS TO BUY VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVG. VARIANCE EXTRACTED	116
TABLE 6.53 PLS RESULTS SUMMARY TABLE	120
TABLE 6.54 SUMMARY OF PCI MODEL HYPOTHESES	130
TABLE 6.56 SUMMARY OF THE SIMPLIFIED MODEL HYPOTHESES	139

1. INTRODUCTION

The negotiation and acceptance of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) heightened the importance of trade among the member nations; Canada, Mexico, and the United States. There is speculation on the expansion of the boundaries of the NAFTA to include Chile and possibly Argentina (Financial Post 1995). This agreement may promote trade interdependence and increase the frequency of business oriented contacts within the member states.

International trade is a focus of Product-Country Image (PCI) research examining the image of countries, the image of products from those countries, and the effects of these images on purchasing behaviour. PCI research has broadened in recent years to include a variety of studies and sample groups, however, there are still many questions that require answers. For instance, although some studies have examined retailers and industrial buyers most PCI studies have focused on consumer buying behaviour. Additionally, only a few models have been developed to represent and test the mechanisms of PCI effects.

The purpose of this paper is to determine the patterns of relationships between the views of countries, their products and doing business with the country¹. These patterns were studied using retail buyer sourcing decisions within the context of NAFTA and potential NAFTA countries. The business dimension of PCI has been explored in a limited fashion

¹ The proposed research is funded by a Global Competitiveness Strategic grant to Dr. Louise Heslop (P.I.), Dr. Nicolas Papadopoulos, Dr. John Liefeld, and Dr. Marjorie Wall from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada

through previous studies but the results have not been represented in a theoretical model. Retail buyers, in particular, present a unique opportunity to examine organizational buying because they also act as gatekeepers, regulating the flow of goods from the producer to the consumer. There are three primary objectives of this research. The first is to determine the PCI images held by retail buyers for Canada, United States, Mexico, Argentina, and Chile including perceptions of the countries and their people, their products, and doing business with the present and potential future members of NAFTA. The second objective is to determine the relationship between certain characteristics of buyers and their organizations and the images of source countries and their products. The third objective is to incorporate the business dimension into an existing PCI theoretical model linking images to behavioural outcome.

This document explains the research endeavour through eight major sections. The first outlines the underlying problem and motivation for the study. Previous literature has been examined to present relevant information in the second section. This review highlights gaps in the existing literature base and builds a basis for the proposed model in the third section, which discusses the theoretical model and states the hypotheses to be tested in this study. The fourth section presents the methodology employed. The results of the analysis and major findings are discussed in section five. The sixth section presents a brief synopsis of the findings and draws conclusions on the research. Limitations of the research are discussed in the seventh section. The paper concludes with the implications of the research for policy makers, marketers and academic researchers.

2. PROBLEM BACKGROUND

The knowledge base surrounding the PCI phenomenon is not complete. A key weakness in the research is the inadequacy of model formulation and testing. Additionally, current theoretical models are not consistent with recent studies. These models do not reflect the multidimensional nature of the country-of-origin cue or the aspect of conducting business with other nations. In addition, PCI research of NAFTA countries has primarily focused on consumer buying behaviour. As the number of member countries in the NAFTA increases, the importance of research involving these countries and different purchasing groups will also increase for Canadians. Although a few general studies involving retail buying and PCI exist and some organizational buyer studies have been conducted, there is a need to determine the influence of the country of origin cue on retail buyers within the expanded NAFTA context.

2.1 Choice of NAFTA Countries

The effects of PCI are of considerable importance to Canadians because the NAFTA will make goods from member countries more accessible to Canadian retailers. This advantage will grow as the burgeoning economies of Latin America join the NAFTA and as they acquire the ability to produce a wider assortment of goods to service developed nations.

The NAFTA reduces barriers to trade and works to encourage international business among the current member countries; Canada, the United States and Mexico. The United States is Canada's most important international source of products. Canada imported over \$157 billion from the United States in 1996 (Government of Canada 1997). Mexico

has also become a key trading partner as Canadians sourced over \$6 billion of goods from Mexico (Government of Canada 1997). This places Mexico fourth in countries importing to Canada, preceded only by the U.S., Japan, and the United Kingdom.

Prospective countries for the NAFTA are also considered because their influence on the Canadian retailing market could increase significantly in a few years. The most likely candidate for the first accession into the NAFTA is Chile. Chile has a relatively stable economy, exports many goods to the United States, and currently has an open and independent trade policy (Harris 1995). In addition, Canada has recently negotiated a bilateral trade agreement with Chile to link the two economies more closely together (Government of Canada 1997). The fifth member of the NAFTA is more difficult to predict. However, the opinion from an informed source in the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade is that Argentina is likely to follow Chile into the NAFTA (Financial Post 1995). Argentina has a fairly developed economy when compared to other countries in Latin America, however, it is currently suffering from a low growth rate (Economist Intelligence Unit 1995). Yet overall, the economic and political stability of this country makes it an attractive entrant to the NAFTA.

2.2 Importance of Retail Buyers

The role of the retail buyer in Western society is significant. Retail organizations are no longer merely part of the distribution chain but are recognized as an important link between manufacturers and the customer (Brown and Burt 1992). Retailers filter product

flow, influence consumer choice, and exhibit significantly different behaviour from industrial buyers.

Retail buyers affect the flow of products to the consumer by selecting what will be made available. They act as a filter or gatekeeper, regulating product flow between the manufacturer and the ultimate consumer (Hirschman 1981). This flow regulation can occur when the retail buyer makes product selections based on criteria such as styles or colours to sell to customers. Discrepancies in these criteria used by retail buyers and consumers could create market disequilibria. An exploratory study found significant differences in the choices of apparel goods by buyers and consumers (Leshner Taylor 1984). The discrepancy could demonstrate that some consumer demands are not being met within the existing criteria. PCI may be an area of study where this discrepancy lies. One study (Atkins and Jenkins 1988) found that 31 percent of department stores claimed that consumers didn't notice the difference in quality of imports or domestic goods. However, other studies have shown that consumers perceive significant differences in the quality of products based on country-of-origin (Gaedeke 1973; Witt and Rao 1992; Ahmed and d'Astous 1993; Ahmed and d'Astous 1995; Ahmed, d'Astous, and Mendez 1995). Therefore, retail buyers may be selecting products from countries which are not popular with their customers.

The retailing organization can communicate valuable cues and yield great power over consumer decision making. The buyer's decisions regarding vendor selection can influence consumer product choice. For instance, Kiecker and Duhan (1992) found the

NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.

UMI

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

The NAFTA has made the Canadian retail market more accessible to foreign manufacturers through the decrease in government imposed barriers to trade. The expansion of member countries may facilitate the provision of different products to Canadian retail buyers. Their selection decisions may be influenced by the perceptions they have of these countries, products from these nations, and business activities in these countries. The current literature does not present the PCI effects on retail buyers in either the current or the possible expanded NAFTA context. Existing literature also lacks a recently developed model to accommodate PCI and retail supplier selection theory. This project examines three relevant streams of research, general PCI, vendor selection, and business with Latin America.

3.1 Product-Country Images Research

PCI research is a well established area, with a plethora of studies, reports, and journal and conference proceedings. A definition of country and product image effects has been furnished by an early researcher (Nagashima 1970, p.68);

The “made-in” image is the picture, the reputation, the stereotype that businessmen and consumers attach to products of a specific country. This image is created by such variables as representative products, national characteristics, economic and political background, history and traditions.

Essentially, PCI research is focused on the image of nations and their particular influence on buying behaviour. “The image of a nation constitutes the totality of attributes that a person recognizes when he contemplates that nation” (Scott 1965). These images

influence a person's behaviour because people act on perceived truths (Papadopoulos 1993). To that person, his or her images are the true reality, allowing judgments and evaluations to be made based on these images. The following sections discuss images as created through initial stereotypes and influenced by the summary construct or halo effect. Images are also stimulated in the marketplace through various cues which are important aspects of PCI applications. Patriotism is discussed specific to the PCI effect as a motivator of buying behaviour. The images of nations and their products are also shown to be sensitive to the passage of time and exposure to the country through travel. Theoretical modeling is demonstrated to be weak in the research area and other considerations of PCI are discussed.

3.1.1 Stereotypes

Stereotyping is an integral part of the application of images and is an important aspect of PCI research. The creation of a stereotype occurs during the formation of an image. According to Scott (1965) stereotyping is expanding the "perception on a central attribute ... to all other attributes". He divided stereotype formation into 2 distinct categories; closed image and open image. The closed image is rigid because the attributes included are considered complete. The open image is more flexible because the person recognizes that key aspects may in fact be missing. The association of stereotypes with a person's or object's country of origin has been demonstrated by researchers (Bamossy and Papadopoulos 1987a; Labrie, Propeck, and Arellano 1994). People will make evaluations of quality, perceived risk, product value, and other considerations based on the PCI

(Niffenegger, White, and Marmet 1982; Wall, Heslop, and Hofstra 1990; Witt and Rao 1992).

3.1.2 “Summary Construct” and “Halo Effect”

One researcher has postulated that PCI information influences product evaluation and buying behaviour through two image formation processes, the “summary construct” and “halo effect”. The “summary construct” effect is an application of product information to the creation of a country image (Han 1989). People familiar with products from a country, but much less familiar with the country, will take the qualities of those products and apply them to the formation of a country image. In contrast, the “halo effect” occurs when there is little or no knowledge of the product, therefore, inferences are drawn about its quality from a nation image or other products from that country (Han 1989). Han’s research was narrowly based on the country as a manufacturer of products and did not holistically approach nations as the source for products and services. However, other research suggests that the image of people from a country can help to form evaluative judgments of products of that origin (Bamossy and Papadopoulos 1987).

3.1.3 Application of Cues

Images and evaluations of quality and suitability are often triggered by extrinsic or intrinsic cues. Cues are bundles of information that act as signs or signals to guide people in their decision making process. They can be classified as extrinsic or intrinsic cues. Extrinsic cues may be considered separate to the product, such as price, brand, store, and country

of origin (Liefeld, Heslop, and Wall 1994). Alternatively, intrinsic cues are more closely associated to the product, including materials, design, and workmanship (Liefeld, Heslop, and Wall 1994). The use of cues in the marketplace may affect the evaluation of different product attributes. For instance, product origin was found to be important for product quality appraisal but not for a price-value estimation (Wall, Liefeld, and Heslop 1991). Earlier studies on cue usage by consumers have been criticized for over-reliance on single cue methodology to measure PCI effects. Such studies only presented country information to subjects and measured quality perceptions. PCI research has shown stronger effects in single cue studies, compared to ones employing a multi-cue environment (Lim, Darley, and Summers 1994, Ahmed, d'Astous, and Adraoui 1994; Peterson and Jolibert 1995). However, the country-of-origin cue has been found to be salient in multi-cue settings (Nes and Bilkey 1993; Peterson and Jolibert 1995). Also, extrinsic multi-cue conditions present larger PCI effects than intrinsic multi-cue environment (Lim, Darley, and Summers 1994). Although research has not clearly shown that PCI may have positive effects on purchasing activities, it has been determined that the display of country of origin information can also have negative results (Kiecker and Duhan 1992). Therefore, it is not always beneficial to supply PCI as an extrinsic cue. There may be a solution to communicating, intrinsically or extrinsically, a negative PCI cue. Offering a good product warranty and possessing a strong store image can lessen the effects of a negative PCI (Thorelli, Lim, and Ye 1989).

3.1.4 Patriotism

Past research has shown that patriotism, an emotional association with one's own country of origin, was significant in product choice (Han 1988). A recent study showed a strong domestic bias (Ahmed, d'Astous and Mendez 1995). The term bias is used in PCI research to denote a general and positive or negative evaluation of a country or their products when compared to other countries in a study. A bias should not be assumed to be a prejudice, although it may be formed on the basis of relatively little and incomplete information about the country and/or its products. Bilkey and Nes (1982) and Heslop and Papadopoulos (1993) reported that many studies have concluded consumers prefer domestically produced goods. However, the concept of unquestionable patriotism influencing consumers is dispelled by additional research designed to specifically determine its effects (Heslop and Papadopoulos 1993).

There are a variety of explanations for this phenomena, including the category of goods and the perceived strengths of the PCI (Wall and Heslop 1986; Wall, Liefeld, and Heslop 1989, Roth and Romeo 1992; Peris et al 1993). Some items may be preferred by consumers to be domestically produced or manufactured, especially perishable food products. There appears to be an assumption by the public that domestic perishable goods are fresher. Yet, attempts of local governments to stimulate and convince their populations to support other domestic industries have had little effect. For instance, Ettenson, Wagner, and Gaeth (1988) found no change in consumers' use of domestic origin attributes for evaluation after a 'buy domestic' campaign.

3.1.5 Sensitivity of Product-Country Images

Researchers have demonstrated that the attitudes of consumers, with respect to the effects of PCI on product evaluation, can change over time or as the result of specific activities or events. Nagashima (1977) recorded a change in the image of 'made in Japan' over an eight-year period towards a more positive evaluation. Travel experience has also been shown to be related to differences in the image of nations (Papadopoulos and Heslop 1986; Heslop and Papadopoulos 1993). People who experience a country may hold more polarized evaluations of the country's image than those who have not directly experienced the country. In summary, the images of products and their countries can change.

3.1.6 Product-Country Images Model Development

There are three important models in the field of PCI research which have been developed in the last two decades. However, none of these models present an accurate reflection of contemporary PCI research and each is flawed by various methodological glitches. The model developed by Johansson, Douglas, and Nonaka (1985) offered an explanation of PCI effects in the belief-attitude relationship. The model loosely suggested experience with the product, the product's country of origin, and the respondent's demographics influenced attitude ratings and perceptual beliefs of the product. The interplay of attitude and beliefs was examined through the "halo effect" and the "summary construct". However, it did not account for certain important factors, such as knowledge of the country or other measures of the country perceptions. Additionally, the model was based

on a non-representative sample of university students and used only automobiles as the stimulus product.

A second model developed to test PCI effects was also incomplete. Johansson and Nebenzahl's 1987 model was not a holistic test as correlational testing was only conducted on certain links between the constructs. Thus, the directional flow of the model was not ascertained.

The most recent model predicted that familiarity with products and the beliefs about a country would influence product quality beliefs (Papadopoulos, Marshall, and Heslop 1988). These beliefs would influence the overall product evaluation and then buying behaviour. The model is essentially stable even though testing has only involved consumer samples. However, it does not reflect more recent literature regarding PCI research. The country of origin construct is now considered a multidimensional construct (Ahmed, d'Astous, and Adraoui 1994). Also, factor analysis of the country image measures have yielded multi-factor solutions (Szamosi 1995). This may imply the beliefs about the country and the familiarity with their products are multidimensional constructs. The PCI model presented by Papadopoulos, Marshall, and Heslop (1988) requires further development to include organizational buying and these new research findings.

3.1.7 Other Considerations

Research findings have confirmed that the products from established, developed countries are perceived to be of higher quality than the products from developing nations (Gaedeke 1973; Ahmed, d'Astous, and Mendez 1995). However, a well known brand name carries lower perceived risk to consumers in developed countries than little known competitors in the same country (Gaedeke 1973 and Nes and Bilkey 1993). Also, it is no longer adequate to discuss the country of origin cue in terms of unidimensionality. The simple phrase "made in ..." does not encompass the complexity of the present global market. A distinction may be made between the country of design and the country of manufacture and/or assembly. The country of design describes the origin of product conception or the establishment of engineering plans (Ahmed, d'Astous, and Adraoui 1994). The country of assembly is the nation where the final product is physically made. Each may have different implications for PCI research. Less developed nations are perceived more favourably as countries of assembly, rather than countries of design. Conversely, people prefer developed nations to be the origin of design (Ahmed, d'Astous, and Adraoui 1994).

3.1.8 Summary of Product-Country Images Research

Origin information is used to form images and help guide decisions in the marketplace. The images of countries and the products from those countries are created through aspects of stereotypes, patriotism, the summary construct, and the halo effect. Their communication by explicit or implicit cues may lead to a positive or negative effect on purchase intentions. Generally, patriotism appears to be a weak motivator for purchases.

Also, the images of products and their origin can change over time or with the occurrence of a major national event. In general, developed countries are preferred as the origin of product design. The PCI models developed at this time do not have the depth to optimally explain the effects of the country of origin cue. Further model development is required in this area and particularly with regards to organization buying.

3.2 Vendor Selection Research

The methods employed by buyers to select their source of supplies for their organization have been an area of study for decades. The area's roots can be traced to organizational buying behaviour. Interest in this domain has led to studies, both exploratory and specific in nature, involving retail buyers.

3.2.1 Organizational Buyer Behaviour

Business purchases are made through the organization's buying centre which involves multiple people with an interest in a potential buying opportunity. A buying centre will include those who can influence the final outcome, persons with input on the specifications desired, the decision making authority, and those who physically place the order with the supplier (Sommers, Barnes, and Stanton 1992). The person who holds the decision making authority is central to the process coordinating input and providing feedback to members of the centre.

The motivations of the business buyer are distinct from those of a consumer. An organizational buyer makes purchase decisions to achieve two goals; enhance their professional position within the organization's structure and improve the company's position in the marketplace or society (Sommers, Barnes, and Stanton 1992). The balancing of the two objectives, not present in the consumer setting, result in a methodical and quantitative buying process. The studies by Wind, Green, and Robinson (1968) and Crow, Olshavsky, and Summers (1980) highlighted the rational essence of organizational buying and demonstrated the use of a sequential choice strategy (i.e. buyers evaluated vendors on criteria and disregarded unworthy suppliers). Product quality was a strong influence on buyers in both studies.

The different environments in which businesses and consumers conduct purchasing activities have led marketers to consider additional factors in the organizational buyer decision-making process. These factors include sourcing directly from the producer, purchases are made infrequently, the size of orders can be large, the decision cycle time may be lengthy to allow for internal consultation, post-sales service may be important, ensuring a continued supply of quality product, and the opportunity to lease the product from the manufacturer (Sommers, Barnes, and Stanton 1992).

These differences have stimulated research into vendor selection processes targeted at developing theoretical models which clearly distinguished their decision making process from consumer behaviour (Howard and Sheth 1969 and Sheth 1973). The Howard-Sheth (1969) model explained several influences on the buyer during the purchasing decision

process. The general framework could be applied to a consumer or organizational setting because it included many factors. The model provided a strong theoretical base for other researchers. The Sheth (1973) model refocused on the organizational buyer, allowing for the impact of group decision making and incorporating fewer variables. However, this model adjustment to include group decision making reduced its applicability to the autonomous retail buyers. These models later helped to shape retail vendor selection theory.

3.2.2 Emergence of Retail Studies

The attention given to general organization buyers began to raise questions about the applicability of results to retail buyers. Retail buyers represent a special case of organizational buying because their main task is to purchase goods solely for resale. Other organizational buyers may purchase raw material or components used to manufacture or assemble a final product. However, the organizational buyer base of knowledge spawned exploratory studies (Hirschman 1981; Leshner Taylor 1984) and the development of models for the retail supplier selection process (Cravens 1981; Wall, Sommers, and Wilcock 1994).

Retail buyers primarily rely on quantitative information to systematically evaluate products and suppliers on saleability. Ettenson and Wagner (1986) found that buyers were more influenced by quantitative cues (markup, selling history, and advertising allowance) as opposed to qualitative ones (fiber, cut, colour, brand, and country-of-origin) . Retail

studies have highlighted several criteria relevant to the vendor selection process. The most salient criteria utilized by buyers to select suppliers are mark up and selling history (Ettenson and Wagner 1986; Wagner, Ettenson, and Parrish 1989; Sternquist 1993). Other important influences on buyer behaviour are delivery (Wagner, Ettenson, and Parrish 1989; Wall, Sommers, and Wilcock 1994), price (Atkins and Jenkins 1988; and Sternquist 1993), and unique and exclusive merchandise (Sternquist 1993 and Wall, Sommers, and Wilcock 1994). Retail buyers are also interested in quality, branding opportunities, and specification of products (Sternquist 1993). The emphasis that retail buyers place on selection criteria may differ on the basis of their nationality (Sternquist 1993) and the type of store, such as a department store or a chain store (Hirschman 1981).

Other selection criteria used by retail buyers to choose products and suppliers were outlined in the qualitative study by Wall, Sommers, and Wilcock (1994). They showed the product sourcing concerns of retail buyers involved lead time, turnaround time on re-orders, working relationships, communication, quality control, additional costs (duties and quotas), payment terms, minimum order size, return policies, and market information. The study also displayed the influences on source selection including selection variety, fashionability, quality of materials, finishing, foreign exchange costs, profitability, product defects, order filling errors, variances from specifications, total costs (i.e. management time), accessibility, language used for interaction, and cultural distance (Wall, Sommers, and Wilcock 1994).

3.2.3 Organizational Buyers and Product-Country Images

The PCI effects have not been a major focus in the studies of retail buyer selection behaviour (Hirschman 1981; Cravens 1981; Leshner Taylor 1984). Those studies which have considered country-of-origin have come to contradictory conclusions. Some studies have found the origin of goods to significantly affect purchasing decisions, while others have failed to demonstrate its importance.

PCI was shown to affect organizational buying with a preference towards domestic goods (Hakansson and Wootz 1975) and the presence of stereotyped attitudes among British retail managers (Niffenegger, White, and Marmet 1982). Another study introduced the difference between country of design and country of assembly (Ahmed, d'Astous, and Adraoui 1994). Country of design was seen as more important to industrial purchasing managers than country of assembly and brand name. In contrast, two studies found that country of origin had little effect on apparel and department store buyers' decision making processes (Ettenson and Wagner 1986; and Wagner, Ettenson, and Parrish 1989). Only a few of the PCI studies examining the affect of country-of-origin on organizational buying have looked specifically at retailing companies. However, the findings of these studies were constrained through their restricted and focused sampling of the profession.

3.2.4 Summary of Vendor Selection Research

The field of retail buyer research has evolved from the industrial and organizational buying theories. However, the inherent differences in the tasks and objectives associated with

retail buying positions have encouraged a separate stream of research. Previous retail studies were conducted to determine the criteria used in the product and source selection decision process. These studies did not extensively examine the PCI implications on product and supplier selection or integrate the knowledge into a new theoretical model. However, they have provided a strong basis for the measurement of retail buyers' attitudes toward foreign suppliers.

3.3 Business and Latin America

Interest in business with Latin America has increased substantially over the past few years. The region has been characterized by rapid economic growth and the long term potential for opportunities (Herbig and Day 1993). The optimistic outlook is accentuated by the possibility of the accession of Latin American countries into the NAFTA. Previous theoretical and practical reports help to guide this project by highlighting differences in conducting business between Latin American countries and North American nations. Business variations may alter the image of Latin American countries from the perspective of the Canadian retail buyer. A basis for these differences are exposed through an examination of Latin America's current business situation and PCI research of the region.

3.3.1 Business Situation

A general understanding of business in Latin America starts with a look at the present situation. The long term growth of the area is being stimulated by the loosening of trade barriers, regional integration and enthusiastic support of their governments (Martinez,

Quelch, Ganitsky 1992). However, growth is partially offset by some negatives. For example, a major deterrent to business in Mexico is poor infrastructure (Roussel 1993; Brewer 1994; Fraser 1994; Richardson 1994). Poor infrastructure inhibits communication and can contribute to late deliveries of supplies to foreign buyers.

Culture has a powerful effect on international transactions and is defined as “the values, ideas, artifacts, and other meaningful symbols that help individuals communicate, interpret, and evaluate as members of society” (Engel, Blackwell, and Miniard 1993). The cultural differences between Canada and Latin American countries has the potential to impact business. For instance, in the Mexican culture a dominant feature is the importance of friendship (Government of Canada 1992; Williams 1994; and Alessi 1995). This is a critical feature for business leaders to recognize it dramatically increases the value of relationship marketing. Another aspect of the Mexican culture is the low importance of time (Government of Canada 1992 and Alessi 1995). This has the effect of slowing business to a pace below the expectations of many American and Canadian managers through erratic business activity, missed deadlines, and long turn around time.

The promotion of products based on culture can also have a significant impact on business. Studies have shown differences among the advertisements of South and North American countries (Gilly 1988; Tansey, Hyman, and Zinkhan 1990; and Hart, Roberts, and Valderrey 1994). Advertisements in Latin America displayed a higher frequency of urban themes and less of an emphasis on leisure themes than in the United States (Tansey, Hyman, and Zinkhan 1990). Mexican and American cultural differences were reflected in

advertisements through Mexican advertisers' more frequent use of a family unit and the portrayal of women as sex objects (Hart, Roberts, and Valderrey 1994). Women were also shown in Mexico as being younger than the men and to be in need of assistance (Gilly 1988). These cultural differences may affect the attitude formation and image construction of international business participants.

3.3.2 The Effects of Product-Country Images for Latin America

The effects of PCI have been documented for Latin American countries. Studies have involved consumers, buyers, and corporate executives as subjects expressing their views and perceptions (Buriel and Vasquez 1982; Ganitsky 1989; Lim, Darley, and Summers 1994). Country of origin effects have been demonstrated within Latin America and toward North American countries. North American perceptions of Latin America have also been recorded.

The Latin American origin influences the business environment and how business leaders behave. The economies of Latin America are dynamic and can be very volatile. The heads of major corporations hold differing views on the future of the region (Ganitsky 1989). Executives from multinational corporations and local firms expressed dissatisfaction with the environment of Latin America. However, local companies saw domestic opportunities as being more attractive than elsewhere. There was a split within the multinationals, some wanting to stay while others were planning on leaving the area.

They also perceived the local competitors as gaining strength at a higher rate than foreign firms.

The use of cues for product evaluation of Latin American goods is fairly consistent across studies (Ahmed and d'Astous 1993; Ahmed, d'Astous, and Adraoui 1994; Ahmed, d'Astous and Mendez 1995; Alden, Hoyer, and Crowley 1993). In research to date on cue usage, brand name and country-of-origin have been found to be the two cues most frequently relied upon for product evaluation (Ahmed and d'Astous 1993; Ahmed, d'Astous, and Adraoui 1994; d'Astous and Mendez 1995). However, these studies have not conclusively determined the order of importance of the brand name and country-of-origin cues in subjects' evaluations. One study found that the perception of higher risk regarding the quality of Mexican products can lead to a change in evaluation strategy (Alden, Hoyer, and Crowley 1993). The consumer might shift from a stereotype basis of evaluation to a strategy based on product attributes.

Latin American perceptions and attitudes towards North America may influence business relations with the region. Studies of Latin Americans as respondents displayed their preference for the products of the United States, Canada, or other developed nations (Forsythe 1993; Brewer 1994; Labrie, Propeck, and Arellano 1994; Ahmed, d'Astous, and Mendez 1995; Ahmed and d'Astous 1995). These foreign products are seen to be superior in quality. The evaluation of the quality of goods from other nations can vary depending on the category of the product (Labrie, Propeck, and Arellano 1994). For example, Canada is seen as similar to Mexico in producing quality goods in the automotive, mining,

and petrochemical industries. Perceived equivalencies between countries may also be found in a more general sense. For instance, although Chile has a strong domestic bias (Ahmed, d'Astous, and Mendez 1995), Chileans perceive themselves as comparable to Canadians in their economy and quality of products (Ahmed and d'Astous 1995).

Views of Latin America from North Americans may also influence the perception of conducting business with Latin Americans. The presence of stereotypes was found to exist with Americans and persons of Mexican descent (Buriel and Vasquez 1982). The Anglo Americans perceived Mexican descendants less favourably than themselves. Also, second and third generation Mexican Americans had similar views to those of Anglo Americans. This demonstrates, on a basic level, that Anglo Americans see themselves as being different from persons of Mexican descent. Also, Bilkey and Nes (1982) noted that researchers found non-whites tended to rate goods from Latin America relatively higher than the Caucasian respondents.

Consumers from developed countries perceived goods from Latin American countries to be less desirable (Gaedeke 1973; Wall and Heslop 1986; Ahmed and d'Astous 1993; Alden, Hoyer, and Crowley 1993; Labrie, Propeck, and Arelleno 1994). One study ranked products from the United States higher than any developing countries around the world, including Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico (Gaedeke 1973). However, these Latin American countries were among the upper half of developing nations. Also, another study of consumers in the United States found that products from developing nations, including Mexico, were not rated significantly different in quality or value than those from Canada,

another developed country (Liefeld, Heslop, and Wall 1994). This suggests that it may be difficult to make any universal predictions of product preferences based on the developmental level of the origin country.

3.3.4 Summary of Business and Latin American Studies

Published works on Latin America have displayed the business practices in the region and the cultural differences which can affect business strategy. These differences have particular importance for Canadian retail buyers affecting PCI formation and application for Latin America. However, PCI research regarding Latin America is quite limited, especially in a potentially expanded NAFTA context and from the perspective of retail buyers.

4. MODEL DISCUSSION AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The research for this project was designed to fulfill three main objectives. First, the research will describe the PCI of Canadian retail buyers for Canada, United States, Mexico, Argentina, and Chile, including perceptions of products, people and countries, and conducting business with those countries. Second, the research will determine the relationship of selected buyer and company characteristics to PCI. Third, an expansion of the Papadopoulos, Marshall, and Heslop (1988) theoretical model to include retail buyers was developed to be tested. This section discusses the composition of measurement items used to estimate the latent constructs. A brief explanation of the indicators employed in the model is given to justify the selection.

4.1 First Objective of the Research

The first objective of the research was to determine if differences exist in the preferences held by Canadian retail buyers with respect to the five countries and their products. PCI studies have often reported preferential ratings of countries and their products based on the country-of-origin cue (Nagashima 1970; Gaedeke 1973; Wall and Heslop 1986; Ahmed and d'Astous 1993; Labrie, Propeck, and Arelleno 1994). Therefore, the research has examined for differences with the hypotheses stated in the null form.

H_{1a} : Canadian retail buyers will not distinguish between the countries of an expanded NAFTA (Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, Argentina)

H_{1b} : Canadian retail buyers will not distinguish between the products from an expanded NAFTA (Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, Argentina)

- H_{1c}: Canadian retail buyers will not distinguish between aspects of doing business with an expanded NAFTA (Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, Argentina)

4.2 Second Objective of the Research

The second goal of the research was to examine the relationships between demographic buyer characteristics and PCI. The characteristics considered in this research are years of experience as a buyer, size of the retailing organization, international exposure of the company, product line responsibility of the buyer, and the formal organization of the firm.

- H₂: Retail buying experience of Canadian buyers will be positively related to their views of product quality from the extended NAFTA countries (Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, Argentina)

Hypothesis 2 examines the link between the respondent's level of buying experience and views of products from the five countries. One study found that buyers from different countries relied heavily on their own knowledge to assess products (Sternquist 1993). Knowledge developed through buying experiences can decrease the amount of perceived risk in product assessment. Therefore, low levels of experience as a buyer could lead to a perception of higher product quality risk and a lower product evaluation.

- H₃: The size of the retailing company of Canadian buyers will be positively related to their views of product quality from the extended NAFTA countries (Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, Argentina)

Hypothesis 3 examines the relationship between the scale of the organization and the views about products from the five countries. Wall, Sommers, and Wilcock (1994) cited

the importance of using the size of a company to interpret retail sourcing themes. It is conceivable that larger organizations have more access to resources which would aid in the assessment of products. This ability could decrease the perceived risk associated with product quality from little known nations and lead to higher assessments.

- H₄: International experience of the Canadian buyers' organizations will be positively related to the views of product quality from the extended NAFTA countries (Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, Argentina)

Hypothesis 4 examines the relationship between the international exposure of the firm and the buyer's views of products from the five countries. The level of international experience could provide the buyer with sources of information, influential organizational culture, or provide access to other resources which lead to a reduction of perceived risk associated with international sourcing. Lower perceived risk should lead to higher product evaluations.

- H₅: Product type purchased by the Canadian buyer will be related to their views of product quality from the extended NAFTA countries (Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, Argentina)

Hypothesis 5 examines the link between the buyer's product class and their perceptions of products from the five countries. Wall, Sommers, and Wilcock (1994) highlighted the different product specializations of buyers and their organizations. Wagner, Ettenson, and Parish (1989) found that buyers from different backgrounds weighted criteria slightly differently in their selection process. The different environments in which they operate may lead to variations in product assessments.

H₆: The type of formal organization of the firm of the Canadian buyer will be related to their views of product quality from the extended NAFTA countries (Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, Argentina)

Hypothesis 6 examines the relationship between the organization of the firm and the buyer's views about products from the five countries. Wall, Sommers, and Wilcock (1994) discussed the level of management control and ownership as a theme in their study of retail buying. It is plausible that the type of ownership and organization could influence the assessment of products through an entrepreneurial culture. Decentralized buying offices would encourage entrepreneurial activities and increase the amount of risk the buyer will absorb. It is also likely a sole proprietorship would encourage entrepreneurship and a more favourable assessment of products.

The testing of hypotheses 2 through 6 clarified the relationships between retail buyer demographics and the perceptions of products from the five countries.

4.3 Third Objective of the Research

The third goal of the study was drawn from the modeling void in PCI research. The structural model is presented below, followed by a discussion of the measures and indicators.

4.3.1 The Model

The initial model for the research had been derived from the Papadopoulos, Heslop and Marshall (1988) PCI model. These authors found positive relationships among five latent constructs to describe the effects of PCI on consumer quality beliefs, product evaluations, and ultimately their buying intentions. This research attempts to identify the relationships of these constructs in a retail buying context (see Figure 4.1). Therefore, the presence of additional relationships was also tested. The research examines the “beliefs about doing business with the country” and its relationship to “product quality beliefs” and “beliefs about the country and people” to reveal how the business dimension is related to the more established PCI constructs.

Figure 4.1 illustrates the empirical model subjected to testing. It posits that the beliefs about country and people and beliefs about doing business with the five countries will directly affect product quality beliefs (halo effect). Also, familiarity with products from the expanded NAFTA countries will directly affect both product quality beliefs and beliefs about country and people. The relationship between product familiarity and the country image was not present in the Papadopoulos et al. (1988) model, however, it was added for this study as an indirect representation of the summary construct. The construct does not completely capture product images. However, information regarding familiarity with the products of a nation is modeled as being applied to the formation of country images. Beliefs about country and people and beliefs about doing business are modeled as having reciprocal effects reflecting the importance of personal relationships to business

relationship success. The beliefs about doing business are modeled as multidimensional to reflect the dominant themes portrayed in buying decision criteria research (Ettenson and Wagner 1986; Atkins and Jenkins 1988; Wagner, Ettenson, and Parrish 1989; and Sternquist 1993), supplier service, anticipated profitability, and the formation of relationships. The beliefs about doing business, beliefs about country and people, and product familiarity have effects on product evaluations and buyer intentions only indirectly through their influence on product quality beliefs. Product quality beliefs directly affect product evaluations and through this effect indirectly affect buyer intentions. Product evaluations are modeled as the only direct influence on buyer intentions.

FIGURE 4.1: PRODUCT-COUNTRY IMAGES EFFECTS ON CANADIAN RETAIL BUYER BEHAVIOUR

The following hypotheses were developed to test the model described in figure 4.1.

- H₇: Canadian retail buyers' familiarity with a country's products is positively related to their product quality beliefs
- H₈: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about a country and its people are positively related to their product quality beliefs
- H₉: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about doing business with a country are positively related to their product quality beliefs
- H₁₀: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about doing business with a country are positively related to their beliefs about the country and its people and their beliefs about the country and its people are positively related to their beliefs about doing business with a country
- H₁₁: Canadian retail buyers' familiarity with a country's products is positively related to their beliefs about the country and its people
- H₁₂: Canadian retail buyers' product quality beliefs are positively related to their evaluation of a country's products
- H₁₃: Canadian retail buyers' evaluation of a country's products is positively related to their buying intentions
- H₁₄: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about the supplier service from a country are positively related to the beliefs about doing business with that country
- H₁₅: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about the profitability of products from a country are positively related to the beliefs about doing business with that country
- H₁₆: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about the business relationships from a country are positively related to the beliefs about doing business with the country

FIGURE 4.2: MEASUREMENT MODEL OF DOING BUSINESS CONSTRUCTS

Explanation of Terms in the Model**Beliefs About Suppliers Service:**

ONTIME	on time delivery
SERVICE	overall level of service
CUSTOM	willingness to customize
CREDIT	ease of obtaining credit
SPEED	speed in resolving problems

COSTRET	cost of returning goods
RETURN	return policies of supplier
EZREORD	ease of re-ordering
MINORD	minimum order size
LEAD	lead times for delivery

Profitability of Products Beliefs:

RETAILP	retail price obtainable
PROFIT	overall profitability
MARKUP	markup that can be obtained
TRANS	transportation costs
DUTY	duty costs
PAYTERM	payment terms available

EXCHANG	foreign exchange costs
PSTABLE	price stability
FREQRET	frequency of customer returns
MARKDN	mark downs required to clear
COSTBUS	overall cost of doing business
TURNOVR	turnover rate

Perceptions of Business Relationships:

EASECOM	ease of communicating
EASEBUS	ease of doing business
WILLBUS	willingness to do business
COSTCOM	cost of communications
BUSTYLES	similarity of business styles

LANGUAG	communication in first language
ORIENT	market orientation of vendors
NEWPROD	receptivity to new products/ideas
MANAGE	their skills as managers
NEGOT	their skills as negotiators

Beliefs About Business with the Country:

COMSUP	overall comparison of suppliers to other countries
--------	--

FIGURE 4.3: MEASUREMENT MODEL OF REMAINING CONSTRUCTS

Explanation of Terms in the Model**Beliefs About Country and People:**

KNOW	knowledge of country/people
LIKE	likeability of country/people
INDUS	industriousness of people
EDUCATE	education level of people
WEALTH	level of wealth of country
FRIEND	friendliness of the people
TRUST	trustworthiness of people
SKILL	skill level of workers
WORK	work ethic
INDIVID	individualism
POLITIC	political stability of country

Familiar With Products:

EASFIND	ease of finding
KNOWP	knowledge of products
BRAND	awareness of brand names

Product Quality Beliefs:

INNOVAT	innovativeness
ATTRACT	attractiveness
DEFECTS	defects in merchandise
SPECS	conformance to specifications
QUALITY	quality

Product Evaluation:

COMPROD	comparison to other countries
SATIS	overall satisfaction
PRIDE	pride in offering to customers

Buyer Intentions:

BUY	willingness to buy
-----	--------------------

RIGHTS	individual rights and freedoms
ENVIRO	environmental/pollution controls
WORLD	role in world politics
Q LIFE	quality of life
AVAILW	availability of skilled workers
LABOUR	labour costs
RESTRIC	restrictions on doing business
ALIGN	alignment with Canada
ECONOMY	stability of economy
TECH	technology level of country

SELLS	sell well to customers
VARIETY	variety

DURABLE	durability
RELIABL	reliability
TEC	technology level
WORKSHIP	workmanship

WHOLE	wholesale price level
VALUE	value

Figure 4.2 includes the measurement model of the business related constructs which are thought to affect the “beliefs about business with a country” construct. Retail buyers must select products which contribute to the overall profitability of their firm through achieving acceptable markups, saleability, and maintaining associated costs low. They must also be concerned about the service they receive from a supplier to ensure timely delivery, resolution of problems, and customization of the order. Third, retail buyers consider business relationship influences, such as, business styles and communication. The measurement scales for the other constructs in the structural equation model are displayed in figure 4.3.

4.3.2 Measures

The measures used in this research were based on a thorough investigation of previous studies to uncover relevant observables. The measurement items are discussed below in association with the constructs they are used to estimate. All items were presented to respondents as five point semantic differential scales. The previous applications of the scales are noted, however, only the items derived from the Bamossy and Papadopoulos (1987b) paper had been involved in reliability tests. The authors tested the reliability of the items using Cronbach’s alpha coefficients and found them to be internally consistent. However, this also means the stability of the measures in a test-retest situation has not been ascertained.

Beliefs About Country and People

This construct represents the perceptions of a country and the people of that country that are held by Canadian retail buyers. The twenty-one measurement items used were semantic differential scales drawn and developed from a variety of different sources. Thirteen items were drawn from a consumer study examining Canadian consumer attitudes toward East European nations (Bennett 1991). These include beliefs about one's knowledge of the country, likeability of the people, level of industriousness, education level, wealth of the nation, friendliness of the people, trustworthiness of the people, their work ethic, their level of individualism, the political stability of the country, the individual rights and freedoms in the country, the country's alignment with Canada, and the stability of its economy. Five items were developed from a study examining investor perceptions of nations (D'Souza 1993). The measures include quality of life in the country, skill level of the workers, availability of skilled labour, the cost of labour, and the restrictions on business practices. Another two scales were taken from a consumer study, including the country's role in world politics and technology level of the nation (Papadopoulos, Heslop, and Bamossy 1990). A single item has been added in this study to measure the buyer's perception of environmental and pollution controls in the country. These items combined should provide strong estimation of the beliefs about a country and its people construct.

Familiarity With Products

This construct represents the level of familiarity the retail buyer has with the products of a given nation. The nature of the measurement items suggest that familiarity is not a sole function of experience with a product, but rather familiarity in a more general sense with

the products from a country. This definition is substantiated through the measurement items, such as, the ability to find the products from the country, knowledge of the country's brand names, and variety of goods offered. Low ranking on these scales may suggest exposure to a higher level of risk associated with the nation. Four of the five measurement scales were derived from the Bamossy and Papadopoulos(1987b) study, including ease of finding products from a country, knowledge of their products, knowledge of the country's brand names, and variety offered by a given country. The fifth measurement item, country's products sell well to customers, was developed from a retail buyer vendor selection study (Wagner, Ettenson, and Parrish 1989).

Beliefs About Business with the Country

The beliefs about business with a country was an overall assessment of the perception of conducting business with a nation. The overall comparison of suppliers, of a given country, to all others has been added in this study to measure this perception.

Beliefs About Supplier Service

Ten measurement items were used to estimate this construct which represents the retail buyer's beliefs about supplier service from a given country. Seven items were taken from an exploratory study of the underlying themes of the retail buying selection process (Wall, Sommers and Wilcock 1994). These include timely delivery of goods, overall level of service, availability of credit, speed of resolving problems, ease of reordering products, minimum order size, and delivery lead time. The other three measurement items were derived from a retail buyer study examining the procurement decision-making process

(Sternquist 1993). These items include willingness of the supplier to customize the order, cost of returning goods, and return policy of the supplier.

Profitability of Products Beliefs

This construct estimated the perceptions held by retail buyers regarding the profitability of products purchased for resale from a nation. The twelve measurement items, presented to respondents as semantic differential scales were drawn from three studies. Two items, possible retail price for the goods and transportation costs, were selected from a retail buyer study analyzing purchasing decisions by general merchandise categories (Wagner, Ettenson, and Parrish 1989). Six measures were derived from the Wall, Sommers and Wilcock (1994) study including, overall profitability of the products, duty costs associated with the country, payment terms, foreign currency exchange costs, product price stability, and overall cost of doing business with the country. Three measures were developed from the Sternquist (1993) study including, the potential markup obtained from the goods, frequency of customer returns, and the mark downs required to clear the product. Additionally, one scale was derived from an exploratory study on retail buying decision criteria (Hirschman 1981). This item measures the rate of turnover of products from a particular country.

Perceptions of Business Relationships

The perceptions of business relationships construct, used ten measurement items, estimated the beliefs of retail buyers toward business relationships with suppliers from a given country. These measurement items are also presented as semantic differential scales.

Seven items were selected from the Wall, Sommers and Wilcock (1994) study, including ease of communication with suppliers, costs associated with communication, degree of similarity of business styles, ability to communicate in the buyer's first language, the market orientation of the supplier, ease of doing business with them and the skills of the vendor in negotiations. One scale, receptivity to new products or ideas, was developed from the Hirschman (1981) paper. Another scale, the suppliers' skills as managers, was developed from D'Souza's (1993) study. Additionally, a tenth scale was added for this project to measure the overall willingness of the respondent to do business with suppliers of a given country.

Product Quality Beliefs

This construct represents the product quality beliefs a retail buyer may hold toward goods from a given nation. It was estimated by nine items presented to the respondent as semantic differential scales. Five items were taken from the Bamossy and Papadopoulos (1987b) article including, product innovativeness, attractiveness, level of quality, reliability of the products, and the level of workmanship. Two other measures, number of defects in the merchandise and ability to conform to specifications, were developed from the Wall, Sommers and Wilcock (1994) study. The final two items were selected from independent sources including, the durability (Roth and Romeo 1992) and the technology level (Bennett 1991) of the products.

Product Evaluations

This construct represents the retail buyer's evaluation of products and was estimated with five semantic differential scales. Two items were directly developed from Bamossy and Papadopoulos (1987b), including the satisfaction level with the product and value of the product. A third item was indirectly developed from their pride in owning measure to assess the level of pride in offering to customers. A fourth scale, wholesale cost, was derived from the Wall, Sommers and Wilcock (1994) study to measure price. Additionally, an overall comparison item was developed from Bennett (1991).

Buyer Intentions

This construct represents the behaviour intention of the retail buyer towards products of a given country. One semantic differential scale, willingness to buy, was taken from Papadopoulos, Heslop, and Bamossy (1990) to estimate the construct.

In summary, the majority of the measures used for this research had not been subjected to reliability tests. The only study to conduct reliability tests on the scale items was the Bamossy and Papadopoulos (1987b) research paper. The authors used Principal Components Factor Analysis to identify patterns of covariance and Cronbach's alpha to test the internal consistency of the measures. Therefore, the stability of the items (their reliability in test-retest situations) has not been determined. Exploratory studies, such as this one, often encounter this dilemma because their nature is to seek understanding of little known phenomena.

4.3.3 Indicators

The measurement model (see Figures 4.2 and 4.3) of the PCI phenomenon presents the variables which are used to estimate the unobservable constructs. The arrows illustrate that the measurement variables are reflective indicators of the theoretical conceptualization. Reflective indicators are most appropriate to apply in this scenario because they “suggest that one or more underlying unobservables ‘cause’ the observables” (Fornell 1984). This is the case in PCI research. For instance, a retail buyer’s perception about a country and its people will lead to a measurable response of quality of life in the country. This PCI model was tested for each of the stimulus countries.

5 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research was designed and conducted as a cross-sectional survey. This study measures the attitudes of Canadian retail buyers towards the people and countries of Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, and Argentina, the products from these countries, and conducting business with suppliers in these countries. This type of research is frequently used to examine relationships among the constructs in a theoretical model and the measurement scales to the constructs.

5.1 The Research Instrument

The questionnaire was designed on the basis of similar research tools and relevant literature (see Appendix A). It was divided into three distinct sections. The five countries were presented for evaluation, in alphabetical order, in the first two sections.

1. The first section of the questionnaire measured the perceptions of respondents toward products from NAFTA countries and conducting business activities in the region:
 - a) There were twenty semantic differential scales to record respondents' opinions on the products from these countries. Fourteen of these scales were derived from Bamossy and Papadopoulos (1987b), two each from Wall, Sommers, and Wilcock (1994) and Bennett (1991), and one each from Wagner, Ettenson, and Parrish (1989) and Roth and Romeo (1992).
 - b) Thirty three scales measured the business dimension of PCI research. These were constructed with the guide of recent literature in retail buyer selection theory and

PCI research. Twenty scales were derived from Wall, Sommers, and Wilcock (1994), six from Sternquist (1993), two from Wagner, Ettenson and Parrish (1989), two from Hirschman (1981), and one from D'Souza (1993). These semantic scales were presented in three subsections, supplier service, profitability of products, and the relationships with suppliers. There were also overall questions regarding willingness to do business and comparability of business added by the researcher.

2. The second portion of the questionnaire was also comprised of semantic differential scales but measured the perception of NAFTA countries and the people of these nations. There were twenty one scales for the respondent to answer regarding the country and its people. Twenty scales were developed from PCI studies, including thirteen scales through Bennett (1991), five from D'Souza (1993), two from Papadopoulos, Heslop, and Bamossy (1990) and one was added. The additional item asked respondents to evaluate the countries on their environmental/pollution controls. This is particularly important because it represented a contentious issue during the negotiations of NAFTA. A subsection was also present to determine the background that a retail buyer may have with suppliers from the stimulus countries.

3. The final section of the questionnaire collected demographic information on the respondent and his/her organization including buying experience, size of the organization, international exposure, product types carried by the organization, and the formal organization of the firm.

An English and a French version of the questionnaire was created because a high proportion of retail buyers conduct business activity from the province of Quebec. Businesses in this province can usually function in both languages. However, offering these buyers the option to complete the questionnaire in either language was expected to increase their comfort level, positive attitudes to the research, thereby the response rate. To ensure the essence of the measuring scales survived the original translation to French, the method of back translation was employed (Brislin 1970). This method required that the translated version of the questionnaire be back-translated to the original language by a second person. The original questionnaire and the back translated version may not be identical. The discrepancies in the meaning of words or with missing elements were resolved by soliciting suggestions from the back translator and then verifying them with the original translator. This process helped to ensure that the questionnaire had functional equivalence across languages. Also, past research has demonstrated that attitudinal differences between English and French Canadians are not directly attributable to the measuring scales used (Crosby 1969). Therefore, differences found between English and French respondents can be interpreted as real and not as a result of the measuring instrument.

TABLE 5.1 LANGUAGE USED BY RESPONDENT

Employee Classification	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondent Firms
English	127	89.4
French	15	10.6

An interesting note, over 10% of responses were through the French version of the questionnaire (Table 5.1). It is encouraging that respondents made use of the option supplied to them. There was no anticipated target rate of usage prior to the implementation of the measurement instrument. There was also no province identifier to help examine the proportion of Quebec respondents who exercised their option to use the French questionnaire. However, since Quebec was the only province to receive the bilingual option, the French responses are known to come from that province.

5.2 The Sample

The *sampling population* was comprised of all buyers who perform durable and semi-durable product purchasing tasks for retail operations within Canada. This sampling pool excluded agricultural and perishable food retail operations because the highly perishable nature of agricultural products makes local sourcing preferable. In addition, sourcing may be skewed toward certain seasonal conditions and geographical locations. Automotive retailers were also excluded due to the franchise nature of the industry and heavy reliance on a single business relationship. The *elements* of the study were persons within retail organizations who perform buying functions for the firm.

5.3 Sampling Design

A list of Canadian retail buyers obtained from the Maclean Hunter Publishing company was the basis for the sampling frame. The list contained over 2000 contact names and required a screening process to avoid sending multiple copies of the questionnaire to a

single firm and ensure the correct person was targeted. The selection of potential respondents was based on decision rules and the judgment of the researcher. A candidate was selected immediately if clearly identified as a buyer in his/her title. When multiple buyers in one organization were present on the list, two candidates were targeted to receive a questionnaire based on descending alphabetical order. In the event that an organization on the list was not clearly represented through a buyer, then the highest ranking manager or executive related to marketing was selected (e.g. president, vice president-marketing, merchandising manager, or purchasing manager). This person may have been qualified to complete the questionnaire or, following the instructions enclosed with the questionnaire, may have rerouted the survey to the appropriate person in the organization. Following this selection procedure resulted in a *sampling frame* which was comprised of 779 potential respondents.

5.4 Sample Size

The response rate of 28% was obtained in this study as 204 responses arrived from 727 buyers contacted. The full sampling frame was not contacted due to company closures or inappropriate direction of the questionnaire. A respondent was deemed acceptable after demonstrating that they perform activities of a buyer through indication of the number of years of experience as a buyer and their position title. For instance, respondents who noted zero years experience as a buyer were dropped from the study. This meant that 52 questionnaires were returned undeliverable (43) or that they were completed by non-buyers (9).

The questionnaires were then subjected to a screening process to extract usable cases for the statistical analysis. The screening for usable questionnaires was based on scale completion. Questionnaires were accepted if the respondent had completed at least 90% of each section for each stimulus country. This process eliminated 62 responses and reduced the usable sample size to 142 questionnaires representing 20% of the buyers contacted.

The number of refusals to complete the questionnaire tallied 29 or 4% of the buyers contacted. Refusals to participate were registered when the response card indicated that the person would not complete the survey or the refusal was communicated verbally through a telephone conversation. Verbal interaction with respondents occurred only when they called for clarification of the measuring instrument. The frequency of such interactions did not exceed ten verbal contacts.

The response rate obtained in this study did not meet the expectations of the researcher which were based on the implementation of the Total Design Method (Dillman 1978). This strict method integrates the design of the measuring instrument with the procedures employed to execute the survey. Dillman (1978) advises that the questionnaire and mailed package be presented in a simplistic and linear fashion. The method also encourages the use of three strategically planned follow-up packages. The persistence and technically crafted nature of these actions, in addition to a token monetary incentive, was expected to result in a superior response rate. The main deterrent to attaining a very high response

rate was probably the length of the questionnaire at 8 pages, double-sided on legal size paper. A larger questionnaire increases the time commitment of the respondent and may have increased their reluctance to participate. Also, the mailing list may have included people no longer with an organization or in the buyer function. In such cases, the survey package may have been discarded without indication to the researcher.

5.5 Data Collection

The respondent data was gathered from participants through a mailed survey. The initial survey package included a questionnaire, response mail-back card, and a monetary incentive. The measuring instrument for this study and was sent in English to Canadian retail buyers. However, the Quebec respondents received an English and French copy of the questionnaire and they had the option to select the one they felt most comfortable completing (see Appendix A). The response mail-back card was a prepared bilingual notice which was intended to be mailed back separate from the questionnaire by the respondent to indicate completion of the questionnaire (see Appendix B). The respondent also had the opportunity to request a summary of the results through this card by checking the appropriate box. Ninety respondents exercised that option representing 44% of the useable sample size. The card was sent back independently of the questionnaire to ensure confidentiality of the response.

A token monetary incentive of two dollars was included in the survey package to increase the response rate. It was introduced to the respondent as an opportunity to take a break,

complete the questionnaire, and “enjoy a coffee on us”. Follow-up/reminder letters were also used to improve the response rate. Three letters were drafted and sent to sample members as suggested by Dillman (1978) (see Appendix C). The first follow-up letter was designed to create a sense of importance for the questionnaire and was mailed out to the entire sampling frame one week after the initial package. The second letter was sent to nonreturning respondents three weeks after the initial questionnaire had been mailed. This letter also included an additional questionnaire to ensure the respondent had a copy to complete. The third letter was sent seven weeks after the first package was sent. The method of delivery was different depending on the location of the potential respondent. Priority Post mail was used for the remaining potential respondents in Ontario which totaled 261. This method was selected to enhance the questionnaire’s image of importance. Regular mail was used to deliver the package to the 314 potential respondents elsewhere in Canada. The discrepancy in delivery methodology for the third follow-up package was driven primarily by the cost perspective. Priority Post delivery to all remaining non-respondent contacts at that time was prohibitively expensive. These procedures were implemented to maximize the response rate from a small population while managing the costs of the project.

The Total Design Method predicted that the majority of the questionnaires would arrive at the start of the data collection process and then trail off towards the cut-off date (Dillman 1978). This forecast was confirmed in the research project. Figure 5.1 illustrates the distribution of responses are represented through a downward sloping trend over the duration of the data collection. The initial questionnaire package was mailed on May 23,

1996 which led to the first responses received on June fourth. This first day of receipts represented the peak of responses gathered from the sample. There are also indications that the follow-up program had a slight effect on the rate of return. The first follow-up was sent out on May 30, the second on June 13, and the third on July 11. It is difficult to clearly ascertain the effects of the first follow-up because the timing is so close to the initial mailout. However, the effects of the second follow-up seem to appear in the week of June 24 as the number of returns crest over the declining trend. The third follow-up is harder to evaluate as the remaining responses trickled in towards the close of the data gathering process. In addition, there appears to be a “weekly effect” in the distribution of responses. More questionnaires were received in the middle of the week than at either end. This may indicate that retail buyers have a preferred day to complete such external tasks, however, it may also be merely related to the postal system.

FIGURE 5.1: DISTRIBUTION OF QUESTIONNAIRES BY DATE OF ARRIVAL

initial mailout - May 23, 1996

first follow-up - May 30, 1996

second follow-up - June 13, 1996

third follow-up - July 11, 1996

6 ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The purpose of this research project was to examine three areas, 1) the PCI effects on country, product, and business perceptions, 2) relationships between buyers and business characteristics and product perceptions, and 3) the testing and application of an expanded PCI theoretical framework. The analysis and findings section is organized initially with a discussion of descriptive demographics, a presentation of the PCI images, an examination of the relationships among retail buyer characteristics, and concludes with the analysis of the PCI model.

6.1 Descriptive Demographics

The questionnaire contained demographic queries to gather data on the characteristics of the sample. These values are often used by researchers to assess the representativeness of the sample against population numbers and present a general snapshot of respondents.

This sample can be described in terms of firm size, business scope, organizational structure and experience. In addition, the response pool demographics were examined to determine if a pattern exists between response rates and direct experience with the stimulus country.

Size

The size of a company is a traditional method to discuss organizations through classifications and provides a basis to compare the sample to the industry. The organizations surveyed for this study may be categorized as medium sized companies. Over 50% of respondents claimed their businesses' grossed less than 10 million dollars

(Table 6.1). In fact, the largest concentration of company sales ranked within the \$1 million to \$4.9 million range. This grouped value of revenues is consistent with industry population which reported the average Canadian retail location achieved sales of \$0.9 million in 1991 (Statistics Canada 1994). Since sixty-four percent of respondent companies operated less than 25 stores at the time of the survey, the sample sales figures are comparable to the overall retail population (Table 6.2). The response for employment level reinforces the observation that the respondent firms were small to medium sized organizations (Table 6.3). The table highlights this finding with the majority of firms employing 0-49 employees in both the full-time and part-time categories. In general, the firm size within this sample appears to be representative of the population.

TABLE 6.1 ANNUAL SALES OF THE RETAIL FIRM

Annual Sales	Number of Respondent Firms	Percent of Respondent Firms
under \$1 M	11	7.7
\$1 M - \$4.9 M	50	35.2
\$5 M - \$9.9 M	16	11.3
\$10 M - \$49.9 M	25	17.6
\$50 M - \$99.9 M	10	7.0
\$100 M - \$199.9 M	11	7.7
over \$200 M	16	11.2
No Response	3	2.1

TABLE 6.2 NUMBER OF RETAIL OUTLETS STATISTICS

Outlets	Number of Respondent Firms	Percent of Respondent Firms
0 - 9	60	52.2
10 - 24	17	11.9
25 - 49	9	6.3
50 - 99	8	5.6
100 - 199	9	6.3
200 +	12	8.5
No Response	27	19.0

TABLE 6.3 NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES BY CLASSIFICATION

Employee Classification	Number of Respondent Firms	Percent of Respondent Firms
Full-time		
0 - 49	74	54.8
50 - 99	11	7.7
100 - 199	13	9.2
200 - 499	18	12.7
500 - 999	11	7.7
1000 +	8	5.6
No Response	7	4.9
Part-time		
0 - 49	73	51.4
50 - 99	6	4.2
100 - 199	8	5.6
200 - 499	10	7.0
500 - 999	4	2.8
1000 +	8	5.6
No Response	33	23.2

Scope

The scope of the business was measured in the demographic section of the questionnaire by registering the international exposure of the firm and the product breadth of its offerings. The business scope of the sample provides insight into respondents' familiarity with the global market and international business. At an operational level the exposure appears low as the majority of the firms hold only a domestic regional presence in the marketplace (Table 6.4). In addition, table 6.5 shows that most Canadian retailing firms source the majority of their product within Canada's national boundaries. Sixty-eight percent of respondents sourced the majority of their goods from Canadian suppliers compared to 17% who used international channels for virtually all their products. Most of these purchases and overall foreign trade was from American suppliers as highlighted in Table 6.6. Asia and Europe round out the top three most used foreign sources for product. Canadian retail buyers have responded that they have little exposure to Mexican, Chilean, and Argentine goods.

TABLE 6.4 PRESENCE OF THE RETAIL FIRM

Presence	Number of Respondent Firms	Percent of Respondent Firms
Regional	75	52.8
National	40	28.2
Multinational	8	5.6
No Response	19	13.4

TABLE 6.5 DOMESTIC VERSUS INTERNATIONALLY SOURCED GOODS

Percentage Sourced	Number of Respondent Firms	Percent of Respondent Firms
Domestically		
0-24	20	14.1
25-49	24	16.9
50-74	54	38.0
75-100	43	30.3
No Response	1	0.7
Internationally		
0-24	38	26.7
25-49	42	29.6
50-74	37	26.7
75-100	24	16.9
No Response	1	0.7

TABLE 6.6 INTERNATIONAL EXPOSURE OF THE RETAIL FIRM

Foreign Source	Mean Percentage of Products from Foreign Sources
USA	48.9
Asia	24.8
Europe	16.1
Mexico	4.2
South America	1.8
Africa	1.1
Chile	0.2
Central America	0.1
Argentina	0.1
other suppliers	0.4

The breadth of product offerings also define the scope of the organization within the domestic market. The majority of the retail firms surveyed operate specialty chain stores in Canada (Table 6.7). This likely has a constraining effect on their interaction with multiple suppliers and countries as specialists tend to focus on core goods which are

manufactured in global clusters. The product types involved with the retail organizations in this study showed that the most involved categories include, clothing, footwear and “other” products (Table 6.8). The “other” product category obtained the highest mean score which may indicate that the measuring instrument omitted some important categories. Speculation on the missing categories may lead to further research including such categories as computers or jewelry.

TABLE 6.7 CLASSIFICATION OF STORE TYPE

Classification	Number of Respondent Firms	Percent of Respondent Firms
Chain Specialty Store	77	54.2
3 or Fewer Specialty Store	28	19.7
3 or Fewer General Merchandise	11	7.7
Chain Discount Store	11	7.7
Other	11	7.7
Chain Department Store	3	2.1
Missing	1	0.7

TABLE 6.8 PRODUCT TYPES SOLD BY THE RETAIL FIRM

Type of Products Purchased	Mean Percentage of Goods Sourced by Respondent firms
Clothing	31.5
Footware	9.9
Bed/Bath/Kitchen	5.4
Furniture	3.9
Sporting Goods	3.3
Home Entertainment	3.0
Lighting	2.5
Hardware	2.2
Food	1.7
Appliances	1.4
Building Supplies	1.1
Carpets	1.1
Fabric	0.6
Other	32.8

Organizational Structure

The organizational structure, measured through the buying process and ownership, can be helpful in understanding and identifying the sample firms. The structure of buying activity in the sample has been centrally oriented with over 90% of respondents claiming to use this method (Figure 6.9). The least utilized procurement option was a contract arrangement, only 3% of retail firms surveyed answered positively. Individual and group buying practices are exercised moderately within the sample. Every respondent had the opportunity to select multiple answers to this questionnaire item because some firms use more than one buying technique. The organizational structure is also determined by the legal formation of the company. The most frequent formation of firm structure in the sample was based on private incorporation (Table 6.10).

TABLE 6.9 TYPE OF BUYING STRUCTURE USED BY THE RETAIL FIRM

Buying Type Used*	Number of Respondent Firms	Percent of Respondent Firms
Central	128	90.1
Individual	20	14.1
Group	12	8.5
Contract	4	2.8

* multiple responses

TABLE 6.10 LEGAL OWNERSHIP OF THE FIRM

Legal Organization	Number of Respondent Firms	Percent of Respondent Firms
Corporation-Private	83	58.5
Sole Proprietorship	24	16.9
Corporation-Public	24	16.9
Partnership	10	7.0
Other	1	0.7

Experience

Experience levels of the buyer provides a picture of the sample in terms of industry related activity. The experience levels of respondents were weighted heavily in the range of 11-20 years of buying involvement and generally follow a normal distribution (Table 6.11). Forty-two percent of respondents claimed their experience in the industry was within this range, characterizing the sample as highly experienced.

TABLE 6.11 YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS A BUYER

Experience in Years	Number of Respondent Firms	Percent of Respondent Firms
0-5	7	4.9
6-10	38	26.8
11-20	59	41.5
21-30	25	17.6
31+	11	7.8
No Response	2	1.4

Experience with a Country and Questionnaire Completion

The demographic information was also used to assess the relatedness of direct business experience with the stimulus country and completion of the stimulus country's scales. The response pool (n=204) was used in this analysis because the useable response sample was reduced to exclude those respondents who did not adequately complete the survey. The respondent's level of business experience with the stimulus country was compared to the retail buyer's response/non-response to the questionnaire scales to determine if a trend existed (Table 6.12). Response to a country was determined through the completion of over 90% of the potential scales. The results show higher response rates to the scales when the respondent had previous business experience with the country. For instance, 97% of respondents who had completed the Canadian related scales had participated in

previous business transactions with Canadian firms while only 20.3% of buyers responded to Argentine scales with prior business experience with Argentina. The incident rate of non-response for Canada, where one buyer had no previous business experience with the country, was zero. However, 21.3% of retail buyers did not respond to the Argentine scales when there were no business transactions with Argentina. Therefore, a trend appears to exist where higher response rates occur when the respondent had previous business experience. Business exposure with a country may improve the respondent's confidence level in communicating beliefs of the stimulus country.

TABLE 6.12 EXPERIENCE WITH THE STIMULUS COUNTRIES

		Done Business with the Country		Has Not Done Business with the Country	
		Observed	Percentage	Observed	Percentage
Canada	Response	196	97.0	1	0.5
	Non-response	5	2.5	0	0
USA	Response	197	97.5	1	0.5
	Non-response	4	2.0	0	0
Mexico	Response	115	58.1	52	26.3
	Non-response	10	5.1	21	10.6
Chile	Response	42	21.4	103	52.6
	Non-response	8	4.1	43	21.9
Argentina	Response	40	20.3	111	56.4
	Non-response	4	2.0	42	21.3

6.2 PCI Effects on the Country, Product, and Business Profiles

The respondents identified their views of the five stimulus countries, the countries' products, and vendors by indicating a rating for each measurement item on the questionnaire. A goal of this research was to determine if Canadian retail buyers view the stimulus countries distinctly on the three dimensions based on the origin cue. Hypotheses 1a, 1b and 1c, which guided the analysis of the countries' mean scores to examine

differences, were tested using doubly-multivariate repeated measures analysis. This analysis identifies significant differences in the means when multiple variables have been measured over more than one case (Thomas 1983). This section is presented in three parts, views of the countries and people, views of the products, and views of doing business. A country based discussion of the means is followed by a thematic analysis of the paired comparisons.

- H_{1a}: Canadian retail buyers will not distinguish between the countries of an expanded NAFTA (Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, Argentina)
- H_{1b}: Canadian retail buyers will not distinguish between the products from an expanded NAFTA (Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, Argentina)
- H_{1c}: Canadian retail buyers will not distinguish between aspects of doing business with an expanded NAFTA (Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, Argentina)

6.2.1 Retail Buyer Views of Countries and their People

Respondents' views of the countries and their people are presented in Table 6.13 through numbers indicating the mean responses to the questionnaire scales. A higher reported value may lead to an interpretation that the country is perceived favourably on the particular measure. The term preference was used in the following discussions to highlight the existence of more favourable views and high scores attained by the measures.

For ease of reference, the highest score has been underlined while the lowest has been bolded.

To determine if Canadian retail buyers distinguish between the country images, the null hypothesis 1a proposed that retail buyers would not differentiate their views of the five countries. Table 6.14 demonstrates respondents perceive clear differences in their images following Doubly Multivariate Analysis of Variance of the scale means (see Appendix D). The overall significance of the country profiles was obtained at $p < .005$. The pairwise comparisons were found significant at $p < .001$ except for the Chile and Argentina comparison which was $p < .005$. The country scales indicated in the table to have statistical significance were found to be significant at $p < .005$. The range of significant differences for each scale item was from nine to three out of a possible ten for each scale.

TABLE 6.13 RETAIL BUYER RATINGS OF COUNTRY AND PEOPLE SCALES (N=142)

Variable	Canada	USA	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Likeability of people	<u>5.45</u>	4.83	4.68	4.46	4.64
Industriousness	4.74	<u>5.15</u>	3.45	3.83	4.04
Education level	<u>5.25</u>	5.20	2.57	2.96	3.18
Wealth	4.87	<u>5.31</u>	2.33	2.87	3.03
Friendliness	<u>5.17</u>	4.77	4.73	4.66	4.74
Trustworthiness	<u>5.27</u>	4.58	3.27	3.84	3.75
Work ethic	4.63	<u>4.88</u>	2.97	3.80	3.73
Individualism	4.99	<u>5.36</u>	3.35	3.60	3.73
Political stability	4.95	<u>5.97</u>	2.73	2.84	2.76
Skill level of workers	5.15	<u>5.33</u>	2.79	3.15	3.15
Technology level of country	5.49	<u>6.19</u>	2.79	2.95	3.04
Economic stability	4.81	<u>5.71</u>	2.43	2.94	2.77
Restrictions on doing business	4.74	<u>4.92</u>	4.15	3.91	3.73
Labour costs	<u>5.60</u>	4.82	2.03	2.50	2.66
Availability of skilled workers	4.87	<u>5.29</u>	2.79	3.11	3.23
Quality of Life	<u>5.96</u>	5.33	2.52	3.00	3.04
Role in World Politics	5.13	<u>6.18</u>	2.72	2.51	2.64
Environmental controls	<u>5.28</u>	4.77	1.99	2.37	2.38
Individual rights and freedoms	<u>6.14</u>	5.99	2.86	2.66	2.63
Alignment with Canada	—	<u>6.13</u>	3.78	3.07	3.04
Knowledge of country	<u>6.32</u>	5.76	3.49	2.44	2.44
Political and economic ties	—	<u>5.44</u>	4.61	4.46	4.55
Immigration from	—	<u>4.94</u>	3.48	3.49	3.82
Exports to	—	<u>6.20</u>	5.30	5.11	5.24
Imports from	—	<u>4.99</u>	4.25	4.23	4.32
Investment in	—	<u>5.14</u>	4.27	4.09	4.17
Investment from	—	<u>5.61</u>	4.69	4.61	4.63

Underline = highest score

Bold = lowest score

Canada

In descriptive terms, retail buyers viewed their own country most favourably in nine out of 20 possible scales (Table 6.13). The results of the statistical analysis reinforced this finding as Canada achieved higher rankings than the U.S. in 7 of the 16 significantly different scales (Table 6.14). These scales included “friendliness”, “trustworthiness”, “likeability”, “labour costs”, “quality of life”, “environmental/pollution controls”, and “knowledge of their country”. These high means present the perception that the Canadian self-image excels in the social/human aspects. The image of Canada is generally strong when compared to the developing countries of Mexico, Chile and Argentina. In these instances, Canada ranked higher across all the country scales reflecting a preference towards the country based on its developed status.

United States

Canadian retail buyers had the most positive perception of the United States demonstrated by obtaining the highest of the descriptive mean scores for 18 of the 27 total country scales (Table 6.13). The paired comparison analysis showed the American image was more favourable than the Canadian image in 9 of the 16 significant differences between the two countries (Table 6.14). These scales are the qualities typically valued by commercial enterprises and include, “industrious”, “wealth”, “individualism”, “political stability”, “skill level of workers”, “available skilled workers”, “technology level”, “economic stability”, and “role in world politics”. The number of high means significantly different from Canada portrays the U.S. image as the highest in the country and people category. The Americans scored well in the economic and skill based measures which is consistent with

the country's commercial orientation. The higher proportion of scales measuring these aspects of country image may have led the economic oriented country to excel.

In addition, the United States was viewed more favourably than Mexico, Chile, and Argentina on 25 of the 27 scales. Retail buyers did not distinguish among these four countries in terms of "likeability" and "friendliness" which makes the favourable distinction of Canada on these social measures more noticeable.

Argentina

Although Argentina did not receive the highest descriptive mean for any of the scales, the country was generally viewed with moderation. The paired comparisons showed that the country was perceived more favourably than Mexico in 14 of the 27 scales. However, there were no significant differences in the views of Argentina and Chile across the country items. The low mean score on the "knowledge of country" scale may indicate that respondents do not have the confidence to differentiate between the two countries.

Chile

The descriptive means present Chile as a country with a poor image through receiving the lowest ratings on nine of the country scales. However, a statistical examination of the means displayed a less negative view. Although Chile scored consistently less favourable than Canada and the United States, the country was viewed as similar to Argentina in all items and more favourable than Mexico in 12 of the scales.

Mexico

Retail buyers perceived Mexico consistently as the least favoured in this study. The country received the lowest average score on 15 of the 27 country scales (Table 6.13). The pairwise comparison confirmed this finding in 14 of the 15 least favoured scales. This poor image is based primarily on the economic qualities where the U.S. image was positive. The relative positioning to the existing NAFTA partners may have been the main factor in the formation of this poor image. The analysis also revealed that 8 of the country scales were found to be similar to the other Latin America countries of Chile and Argentina. These scales tended to measure political aspects of the countries and future desired links with Canada. This may indicate that retail buyers did not perceive Mexico as fully integrated into the NAFTA economy. The paired comparison highlighted items where Mexico obtained higher ratings than Chile and Argentina, including “alignment with Canada” and “knowledge of the country”. In addition, Mexico was viewed as having less “restrictions on doing business” than Argentina. These relatively favourable ratings were likely a result of Mexico’s affiliation with Canada through the NAFTA.

TABLE 6.14 DOUBLY MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF RETAIL BUYER PERCEPTIONS OF COUNTRY DIFFERENCES
Overall Significance $p < .005$

Pairwise Comparisons										
Variable	C/US p<.001	C/M p<.001	C/Ch p<.001	C/A p<.001	US/M p<.001	US/Ch p<.001	US/A p<.001	M/Ch p<.001	M/A p<.001	Ch/A p<.005
Likeability of people	C	C	C	C	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Industriousness	US	C	C	C	US	US	US	Ch	A	ns
Education level	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	Ch	A	ns
Wealth	US	C	C	C	US	US	US	Ch	A	ns
Friendliness	C	C	C	C	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Trustworthiness	C	C	C	C	US	US	US	Ch	A	ns
Work ethic	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	Ch	A	ns
Individualism	US	C	C	C	US	US	US	Ch	A	ns
Political stability	US	C	C	C	US	US	US	Ch	A	ns
Skill level of workers	US	C	C	C	US	US	US	Ch	A	ns
Technology level of country	US	C	C	C	US	US	US	Ch	A	ns
Economic stability	US	C	C	C	US	US	US	Ch	A	ns
Restrictions on doing business	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	Ch	A	ns
Labour costs	C	C	C	C	US	US	US	Ch	A	ns
Availability of skilled workers	US	C	C	C	US	US	US	Ch	A	ns
Quality of Life	C	C	C	C	US	US	US	Ch	A	ns
Role in World Politics	US	C	C	C	US	US	US	Ch	A	ns
Environmental controls	C	C	C	C	US	US	US	Ch	A	ns
Individual rights and freedoms	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	Ch	A	ns
Alignment with Canada	-	-	-	-	US	US	US	M	M	ns
Knowledge of country	C	C	C	C	US	US	US	M	M	ns
Political and economic ties	-	-	-	-	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
Immigration from	-	-	-	-	US	US	US	ns	A	ns
Exports to	-	-	-	-	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
Imports from	-	-	-	-	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
Investment in	-	-	-	-	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
Investment from	-	-	-	-	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
Number of Significant Differences	16	20	20	20	25	25	25	14	17	0

A = Argentina, C = Canada, Ch = Chile, M = Mexico, US = United States

Country letter(s) indicate Significant Differences at $p < .005$

ns = No Significant Difference

Thematic Analysis of the Country Scales

A thematic approach to the analysis is helpful in synthesizing the country based discussion into information which may have strategic implications. Four themes surfaced from the pairwise comparison analysis; a domestic preference, perceived equivalencies, a poor image of Mexico and a developed country bias.

Previous PCI research found the existence of a domestic bias in respondents' views of their own country (Hakansson and Wootz 1975 and Ahmed, d'Astous, and Mendez 1995). However, other research discounted the bias as a fallacy (Heslop and Papadopoulos 1993). This study revealed a minor domestic preference in the country and people views held by Canadian retail buyers. Compared to Mexico, Chile and Argentina, Canada obtained higher ratings across all the country scales. The extent of the domestic presence was not as intense when compared to the country image of the United States. Canada achieved higher ratings than the U.S. on seven of the scales focusing on the social and human aspects of the country. This does not imply that retail buyers have an overwhelming domestic bias. In fact, when compared to Canada, the U.S. obtained nine high ratings in the country scales. These scales portray Americans more favourably in economic terms. Although no overall domestic bias has been found in this study, a minor domestic preference was found predominately clustered around the social aspects of Canada.

Another dominating theme outlined from the pairwise comparison analysis is the presence of perceived equivalencies among the countries. Perceived equivalencies exist when

respondents report that they view two or more nations as similar on a given measurement. These equivalencies are highlighted in Table 6.16 with a “no significant difference” notation. Canadian retail buyers view Argentina and Chile as similar across all of the country measures. Other country comparisons contained non significant findings, however, the Argentine and Chilean comparison was the most pronounced. This may have resulted from the respondents’ low knowledge level of the countries and the confidence in reporting differences.

Of the five countries in this study, country the image of Mexico is perceived most poorly by Canadian retail buyers. This is consistent with a study of American views toward people of Mexican descent (Buriel and Vasquez 1982). Closer examination of the comparison to the other less developed countries reveals that the Mexican image is weak in terms of motivational (e.g. “industriousness” and “work ethic”) and skill (e.g. “education level”, “skill level of workers”, and “availability of skilled workers”) aspects. Mexico’s poor image is likely driven by the respondents’ knowledge level of the country and their confidence in indicating low scores following the implementation of the NAFTA.

The previous three themes tend to support or are derived from the fourth underlying theme. Canadian retail buyers have reported a developed country bias in their perceptions of the five countries and their people. The analysis showed that buyers favoured Canada and the United States consistently over the other countries in the study (Table 6.16). This trend in country image matches previous findings on product images which suggest that the products from developed nations are perceived better than ones originating from less

developed countries (Gaedeke 1973, Forsythe 1993, Brewer 1994, Labrie et al 1994, and Ahmed et al 1995).

Differences in the images were demonstrated through the analysis of the country comparisons and the thematic discussion. The results indicate that the five countries have distinct profiles, which does not support the null hypothesis that retail buyers do not distinguish between the countries. The pairwise comparisons delivered nine different profiles while only one was viewed as not statistically different at the scale level. Also, 75% of these scales were found significantly different. Since the overwhelming trend shows differences in the country profiles, the null hypothesis 1a was rejected.

6.2.2 Retail Buyer Views of Products

Respondents' views of the products from the five stimulus countries are presented in Table 6.15. The numbers indicate the mean responses to the scales in the questionnaire. A higher reported value can be interpreted as the country performing well on the particular product measure. Again for ease of reference, the highest score has been underlined while the lowest has been bolded.

Hypothesis 1b was posited in the null form to determine if differences exist between retail buyers' views of the products from the five countries. It was hypothesized that Canadian retail buyers would not distinguish between the products of the five countries. Overall significant differences of the product profiles were found at $p < .005$ (see Appendix E).

Also, the ten profile comparisons were found significant at $p < .001$. The range of significant differences of the mean product scores was from ten to six (Table 6.16).

TABLE 6.15 RETAIL BUYER RATINGS OF PRODUCT SCALES (N=142)

Variable	Canada	USA	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Quality	<u>5.53</u>	5.16	3.06	3.04	3.11
Value	<u>4.99</u>	4.80	3.50	3.27	3.37
Conformance to specifications	<u>5.63</u>	5.27	3.29	3.27	3.22
Workmanship	<u>5.47</u>	5.02	3.29	3.38	3.44
Defects in merchandise	<u>4.83</u>	4.59	3.58	3.78	4.11
Sell well to customers	<u>5.55</u>	5.18	3.55	3.15	2.80
Attractiveness	<u>5.48</u>	5.39	3.66	3.55	3.47
Variety	4.94	<u>5.84</u>	3.67	3.28	3.27
Innovativeness	4.89	<u>5.80</u>	3.28	3.08	2.92
Brand names	4.54	<u>5.22</u>	2.82	2.48	3.44
Wholesale price level	<u>4.63</u>	4.47	2.92	3.00	2.85
Durability	<u>5.38</u>	4.89	3.18	3.18	3.18
Technology level	5.39	<u>5.78</u>	3.01	2.91	2.79
Reliability	<u>5.52</u>	5.39	3.06	2.99	2.96
Knowledge of country's products	<u>5.91</u>	5.88	3.11	1.93	1.96
Overall satisfaction	<u>5.49</u>	5.32	3.15	3.14	2.99
Ease of finding	<u>4.79</u>	4.70	3.60	2.71	3.44
Willingness to buy	<u>5.74</u>	5.41	3.22	2.98	2.87
Pride in offering to customers	<u>6.00</u>	5.23	2.96	2.77	2.78
Overall comparison	<u>5.73</u>	5.55	3.09	2.93	3.09

Underline = highest score

Bold = lowest score

Canada

Retail buyers viewed the products of Canada as most favourable by scoring them highest in 16 out of the 20 product measures (Table 6.15). Canada ranked higher on all the product scales when compared to Mexico, Chile, and Argentina. Compared to the United States, Canadian products were seen as excelling in "quality", "conformance to specifications", "workmanship", "durability", and "pride in offering to customers". These measures highlight Canada's image as a producer of quality products. This finding appears contradictory to the country image of Canada, especially considering the U.S. obtained higher ratings on the commercial related scales. The responses may have been

based on the “trustworthiness” of Canadians and in the representations of their products. However, the following modeling analysis indicates that such a relationship is unlikely to exist (see section 6.3). American and Canadian products were viewed as equals in eleven comparisons where no significant differences were found. There is no apparent pattern or clustering to these equivalencies.

United States

The second most positively viewed products originate from the United States. American products attained the highest descriptive means in four of the 17 scales. The country’s goods were perceived by respondents as providing the greatest “variety”, high “innovativeness”, “recognizable brand names” and “technological advancement”. The rankings on these measures were found to be significantly different from the Canadian scores indicating that the American product image may be based on research and development strengths. The image of U.S. products attained higher means across all the scales when compared to the developing countries of Mexico, Chile, and Argentina.

Mexico

The products of Mexico were ranked third out of the five countries. Their products obtained none of the highest descriptive mean scores yet ranked the lowest on only three measures. The paired comparisons present an image of Mexican goods which excel on “variety” and “knowledge” when compared to Chile and Argentina. The access to information of Mexican products has likely improved with the NAFTA, leading to a higher valuation on these measures. Compared to Chile’s products, retail buyers indicated that

Mexican goods were “easier to find”. This rating may also have been derived from the improved access to products from countries in the NAFTA bloc. Compared to Argentine goods, Mexican products are perceived to “sell better to customers” and retail buyers report a greater “willingness to buy” them. These two scores are intuitively related to one another. If a product is perceived to sell well, then the buyer will wish to increase purchases in order to satisfy demand.

Chile

Retail buyers selected Chilean products as the second least preferred origin from the pool of countries. The country’s products received eight of the lowest descriptive means out of 17 measures. The statistical analysis showed one scale item where Chilean goods were viewed more positively than Argentine products. Retail buyers perceive Chile’s products to sell better than those from Argentina. Seventeen of the 20 scales deemed Chilean goods not significantly different from those of Argentina and Mexico. The pattern of scale differences were not identical in both comparisons, however, the analysis shows great similarities between the three images of the developing countries.

TABLE 6.16 DOUBLY MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF RETAIL BUYER PERCEPTIONS OF PRODUCT DIFFERENCES

Pairwise Comparisons										
Variable	C/US p<.001	C/M p<.001	C/Ch p<.001	C/A p<.001	US/M p<.001	US/Ch p<.001	US/A p<.001	M/Ch p<.001	M/A p<.001	Ch/A p<.001
Quality	C	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
Value	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
Conformance to specifications	C	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
Workmanship	C	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
Defects in merchandise	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	A	ns
Sell well to customers	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	M	Ch
Attractiveness	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
Variety	US	C	C	C	US	US	US	M	M	ns
Innovativeness	US	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	M	ns
Brand names	US	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	A	A
Wholesale price level	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
Durability	C	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
Technology level	US	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
Reliability	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
Knowledge of country's products	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	M	M	ns
Overall satisfaction	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
Ease of finding	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	M	ns	A
Willingness to buy	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
Pride in offering to customers	C	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	M	ns
Overall comparison	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
Number of Significant Differences	9	20	20	20	20	20	20	3	7	3

A = Argentina, C = Canada, Ch = Chile, M = Mexico, US = United States

Country letter(s) indicate Significant Differences at $p < .005$

ns = No Significant Difference

Argentina

Argentine products were portrayed as the least favoured of the five options through the descriptive means. Argentina's goods scored the lowest mean in eleven of the 17 scales, however, the pairwise comparisons with Mexico and Chile showed a more positive image. Compared to Mexican goods, the products from Argentina scored higher on 2 of the 7 statistically different means, including fewer defects in merchandise and recognizable brand names. This finding is surprising given that respondents reported more knowledge of Mexican products. Compared to Chilean goods, Argentine products had "recognizable brand names" and were "easier to find". This indicates that Argentine suppliers may have communicated their identities and penetrated the distribution channels to Canadian retail buyers better than Chilean suppliers.

Thematic Analysis of the Product Scales

Three key themes were pulled from the statistical analysis of the product scales including the domestic preference, perceived equivalencies, and developed country bias.

The analysis revealed the presence of a minor domestic preference in the Canadian retail buyers' views of products. Previous PCI studies had found the existence of a domestic bias in respondents' selection and rating of products (Hakansson and Wootz 1975 and Ahmed, d'Astous and Mendez 1995). This study did not find a heavy domestic bias in the responses, however, a concentrated preference was discovered for Canadian products. Compared to the countries of Mexico, Chile, and Argentina, Canadian goods were preferred in every measure. This alone does not illustrate a domestic bias because the

products from the United States were also preferred in all instances to those from the developing countries. The domestic product preference was highlighted in the comparison between Canadian and American goods. Respondents showed that they favoured Canadian products for “quality”, “conformance to specifications”, “workmanship”, “sells well to customers”, “durability”, and “pride in offering to customers”. However, retail buyers did not solely prefer Canadian goods over those from the United States. There were four measures where American products were preferred over the domestic offerings; “variety”, “brand names”, “innovativeness”, and “technology level”. This finding is consistent with the American country image of technological advancement. Although a categorical domestic bias does not exist, the presence of a minor domestic preference was found. In addition, the importance of this preference is higher than the one based on country image and is supported in the modeling analysis of this study (see section 6.3). Product beliefs and product evaluation were important to the retail buyer when considering a purchase from a Canadian source. Therefore, the image of the product and the domestic preference for Canadian goods could directly affect the purchase decision.

Perceived equivalencies have been found in Canadian retail buyer views of products from NAFTA countries. Table 6.16 illustrates the similarities across countries by denoting “ns” on the particular scale where a perceived equivalency exists. The images of Canada and the United States were perceived as similar with eleven of the twenty scales having no significant difference. In particular, the “overall comparison” scale was not significantly different. Although the countries have distinct profiles, Mexico, Chile, and Argentina, also have many perceived similarities. In addition, the “overall comparison” measure was not

significantly different for these countries. This finding indicates that Canadian retail buyers view the products of Mexico more similar to Chile and Argentina than the other NAFTA signatory countries. The most distinguishing product related attributes are the “variety of goods available” and “recognizable brand names”.

The pairwise comparison analysis presented a preference for the products originating from developed nations. The comparisons in Table 6.16 show a consistent ranking of the developed countries’ products (Canada and United States) over the less developed countries’ products (Mexico, Chile, and Argentina). The developed country bias was also found by other PCI researchers (Gaedeke 1973, Ahmed and d’Astous 1995, and Ahmed, d’Astous and Mendez 1995). This bias of Canadian retail buyers is also consistent with Latin American perceptions of higher quality products sourced from developed nations (Forsythe 1993, Brewer 1994, Labrie, Propeck and Arellano 1994, Ahmed, d’Astous and Mendez 1995). The developed country bias was found to exist in the Canadian retail buyers’ images of products.

Summary

The analysis of product images uncovered a minor domestic preference, distinct product images, and developed country bias. Every pairwise comparison displayed a product profile distinct from the others and 71% of the product scale comparisons were found to be significantly different. Therefore, the trends and quantity of significant findings indicate that the products from the five origins hold distinct positioning in the minds of Canadian retail buyers and leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis 1b in this research.

6.2.3 Retail Buyer Views of Doing Business

The respondents' views of the five countries as business associates are presented in Table 6.17. The mean analysis is discussed based on the origin country followed by a thematic view of the results.

The third PCI hypothesis was developed to examine differences in the perceptions held by Canadian retail buyers of doing business with NAFTA and potential NAFTA countries. The null hypothesis proposed that retail buyers' views of suppliers would not be differentiated between the five countries. The findings suggest that respondents have distinguished between the countries in a business context (see Appendix F). The overall comparison of the profiles were determined to be significantly different at $p < .005$. Nine of the individual comparisons were found significant at $p < .001$ while the Mexico and Argentina paired comparison was significant at $p < .005$. The scale items which were found significantly different in the comparisons are indicated in Table 6.18. The range of significant differences found for the business profile measures is from zero to eight.

Canada

Canada is perceived by respondents as the most favourable country to conduct business. The country received the largest number of the highest descriptive means, 23 out of 33 possible measures (Table 6.17). The pairwise comparison analysis also supports this

TABLE 6.17 RETAIL BUYER RATINGS OF BUSINESS SCALES (N=142)

Variable	Canada	USA	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
On time delivery	<u>5.13</u>	5.08	3.08	3.03	3.14
Lead times for delivery	4.14	<u>4.18</u>	3.11	3.06	3.25
Minimum order size	<u>4.85</u>	4.01	3.55	3.55	3.95
Ease of reordering	<u>5.25</u>	4.98	3.31	3.04	3.34
Return policies	<u>5.23</u>	4.67	3.34	3.17	3.20
Cost of returning goods	<u>5.07</u>	3.69	2.65	2.47	2.65
Speed of resolving problems	4.72	<u>4.73</u>	2.88	2.90	2.92
Obtaining credit from suppliers	<u>5.04</u>	4.47	3.56	3.29	3.36
Willingness to customize	<u>4.47</u>	4.46	3.55	3.36	3.61
Overall level of service	<u>5.23</u>	5.06	3.33	3.30	3.42
Retail price	5.02	<u>5.22</u>	3.35	3.35	3.49
Markup that can be obtained	4.14	4.25	4.27	4.22	<u>4.31</u>
Overall profitability	4.32	<u>4.43</u>	3.99	3.93	4.07
Transport costs	<u>4.42</u>	3.66	2.88	2.67	2.85
Duty costs	<u>5.98</u>	4.15	3.85	3.11	3.41
Payment terms	<u>4.97</u>	4.53	3.51	3.16	3.30
Foreign exchange costs	<u>5.47</u>	2.68	3.94	3.50	3.91
Price stability	4.61	<u>4.68</u>	2.95	3.24	3.26
Frequency of returns	<u>5.30</u>	4.94	3.79	3.77	3.80
Mark downs required to clear	4.23	<u>4.29</u>	3.63	3.54	3.52
Overall cost of doing business	<u>4.30</u>	4.04	3.66	3.48	3.45
Turnover	<u>4.53</u>	4.49	3.60	3.45	3.47
Cost of communications	<u>5.48</u>	4.82	3.42	2.87	3.15
Ease of communicating	<u>6.11</u>	5.82	3.44	2.75	3.37
Communication in your first language	<u>6.35</u>	6.06	3.82	3.15	3.75
Similarity of business styles	<u>5.80</u>	5.76	3.32	3.06	3.16
Market orientation of vendors	<u>5.56</u>	5.32	3.31	3.03	3.21
Receptivity to new products/ideas	5.23	<u>5.40</u>	3.53	3.27	3.68
Skills as managers	5.13	<u>5.55</u>	3.43	3.50	3.65
Skills as negotiators	4.91	<u>5.61</u>	3.70	3.63	3.93
Ease of doing business	<u>5.50</u>	5.42	3.47	3.20	3.44
Willingness to do business with country	<u>5.80</u>	5.49	3.57	3.06	3.36
Overall comparison	<u>5.81</u>	5.63	3.50	3.08	3.23

Underline = highest score

Bold = lowest score

positive view (Table 6.18). When compared to the developing countries, Canada was perceived more favourably on 31 of the 33 scales. Only two measures, “obtainable markup” and “overall profitability”, were found not significantly different in the country comparisons. This may illustrate that the country-of-origin cue has little effect on retail buyers’ beliefs of “profitability” and its main driver (“markup”). Compared to the business image of the United States, Canada was viewed more favourably on nine of the eleven

significant differences from the paired comparisons. However, the Canadian image is mostly concentrated on the cost perspective and includes “minimum order size”, “return policies”, “cost of returning goods”, “obtaining credit from suppliers”, “transport costs”, “duty costs”, “payment terms”, “foreign exchange costs”, and “cost of communications”. The highest rating on two of the measures was easily attained since “duty costs” and “foreign exchange costs” are infrequently incurred within Canada. The remaining seven measures primarily portray Canada as a low cost source for retailing products. The close geographic proximity of the supplier to the buyer is likely the main reason for the perceived associated expenditures.

United States

The United States was identified as the second most favoured supplier country through the descriptive means. The image attained the highest value on nine of the 33 scales. The statistical analysis showed that the business image of the U.S. was more favourable than the image of Mexico in 30 scales, the image of Chile in 31, and Argentina in 29. The three developing countries rated higher than the United States for their “foreign exchange costs”. This likely occurred because the price differential between the Canadian dollar and U.S. dollar is greater than with the other three currencies. Compared to Mexico, the American suppliers were viewed as equal in terms of “duty costs”. The variation on these costs would be negligible since the implementation of the NAFTA. The business image of the U.S. was also seen as similar to Argentina in the “minimum order size” and “overall profitability”. In fact, no significant difference was found with the perception of

“obtainable markup” on goods from any of the five supplier options. The pairwise analysis displayed a slightly weaker image when compared to Canada. The United States was viewed more favourably than Canadian supplies on 3 scales; “receptivity to new products/ideas”, “skills as managers”, and “skills as negotiators”. These measures identify American suppliers as strong managers of their enterprises, consistent with their commercially oriented country image.

Argentina

Argentine suppliers were viewed by respondents as the third highest rated vendor by ranking one scale with the highest descriptive mean. The paired comparisons highlight the image of business with Argentina as moderate. The image is more favourable than Chile on 6 measures, including “minimum order size”, “duty costs”, “ease of communication”, “communication in the respondent’s first language”, “receptivity to new products/ideas”, and “willingness to do business”. There is no apparent pattern with these measures. However, the trade levels with the sample organizations from Argentina are lower than from Chile, therefore, perhaps the dealings have been with “early adopter” companies or specialty goods. These measures may be important for supplying rare products to the Canadian market. This positive perception is moderated by the equivalency with Mexico where no significant differences were found in the ratings of 32 scales. Another moderating force is the less favoured position in comparison to the developed countries.

Mexico

Respondents perceive Mexican business attributes as the second least preferred out of the five countries. Mexican suppliers have four of the lowest descriptive mean scores out of 33. The pairwise comparisons of Mexico to the developing countries are less condemning. However, compared to the Canadian and American business images, Mexican suppliers are seen as less favourable. The comparison with the U.S. on “foreign exchange costs” was the only instance where Mexico achieved a higher rating. Compared to Chile, Mexico was viewed favourably on nine of the ten significant differences, including “duty costs”, “payment terms”, “foreign exchange costs”, “cost of communication”, “ease of communication”, “communication in the respondent’s first language”, “market orientation of vendors”, respondent’s “willingness to do business”, and the “overall comparison” to global sources. The NAFTA likely affected most of these measures favourably for Mexican suppliers. The “foreign exchange costs” may be perceived lower with Mexico due to the massive peso devaluation experienced prior to the data gathering. Compared to Argentina, Mexico was a near equal except for the perceived lower duty costs derived from implementing the NAFTA.

TABLE 6.18 DOUBLY MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF RETAIL BUYER PERCEPTIONS OF DOING BUSINESS DIFFERENCES

Pairwise Comparison											
Overall Significance $p<.005$	Variable	C/US $p<.001$	C/M $p<.001$	C/Ch $p<.001$	C/A $p<.001$	US/M $p<.001$	US/Ch $p<.001$	US/A $p<.001$	M/Ch $p<.001$	M/A $p<.005$	C/A $p<.001$
	On time delivery	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Lead times for delivery	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Minimum order size	C	C	C	C	US	US	ns	ns	ns	A
	Ease of reordering	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Return policies	C	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Cost of returning goods	C	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Speed of resolving problems	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Obtaining credit from suppliers	C	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Willingness to customize	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Overall level of service	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Retail price	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Markup that can be obtained	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
	Overall profitability	ns	ns	ns	ns	US	US	ns	ns	ns	ns
	Transport costs	C	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Duty costs	C	C	C	C	ns	US	US	M	M	A
	Payment terms	C	C	C	C	US	US	US	M	ns	ns
	Foreign exchange costs	C	C	C	C	M	Ch	A	Ch	ns	ns
	Price stability	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Frequency of returns	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Mark downs required to clear	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Overall cost of doing business	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Turnover	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Cost of communications	C	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Ease of communications	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	M	ns	ns
	Communication in your first language	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	M	ns	A
	Similarity of business styles	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	M	ns	A
	Market orientation of vendors	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Receptivity to new products/ideas	US	C	C	C	US	US	US	M	ns	ns
	Skills as managers	US	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	A
	Skills as negotiators	US	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Ease of doing business	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Willingness to do business with country	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	ns	ns	ns
	Overall comparison	ns	C	C	C	US	US	US	M	ns	A
	Number of Significant Differences	12	31	31	31	31	32	30	10	1	6

A = Argentina, C = Canada, Ch = Chile, M = Mexico, US = United States

Country letter(s) indicate Significant Differences at $p < .005$

ns = No Significant Difference

Chile

Chilean suppliers were identified as the least preferred business partner for Canadian retail buyers. Chileans attained 27 of the lowest descriptive means out of a potential 33 business scales. The paired comparisons to Canada and the United States displayed a less favoured image for Chilean suppliers, with the exception of higher “foreign exchange costs” for American purchases. Compared to Mexico, Chilean suppliers were seen as favourable for their “price stability”. This view was probably derived from Mexico’s currency crisis.

Thematic Analysis of the Business Scales

The analysis of the business dimension led to the discovery of three key themes including a minor domestic bias, perceived equivalencies, and developed country bias.

A minor domestic preference was found in the business scales of the five countries (Table 6.18). Retail buyers viewed their own country more favourably than Mexico, Chile, and Argentina on 31 of the 33 business measures. This unilateral preference does not define the domestic bias. The preference was highlighted when the business profile of Canada was compared to the American supplier image. The Canadian image was most favourable in primarily cost terms as it achieved the highest rating on nine measures. This preference may exist as a function of geographical proximity to the buyer. The Americans were the only country to break the domestic bias in the business perceptions. They were perceived most favourably from the managerial perspective. Although retail buyers ranked the

Americans higher on three scales, there is evidence that a minor domestic preference exists.

Differences in the business profiles have been found from the paired comparison analysis (Table 6.18). However, two instances of perceived equivalencies occurred. First, the business image of Mexico and Argentina are seen as virtual equals. This is supported in the results of the paired comparison and the finding that most scales were not statistically distinguishable. The only measure to report a significant difference was duty costs. This difference may be attributed to Mexico's status as a member of the NAFTA and the lower trade barriers associated with membership. Second, all five countries did not differ on a single measure, the buyer's beliefs of "markup obtained" from products sourced from a country. This finding infers that Canadian retail buyers believe the potential markup does not differ based on the country-of-origin. Further research may be required to determine if the beliefs of markup obtained are independent of PCI.

Canadian retail buyers' images of doing business with the five countries exposed a developed country bias (Table 6.18). Respondents showed a preference for the developed countries, Canada and the United States, when compared to the less developed nations, Argentina, Chile, and Mexico. This finding is consistent with the bias discovered on the country and product scales but also with previous research on product images (Gaedeke 1973 and Ahmed et al 1995). Discrepancies in infrastructure levels may have resulted in a particular example of this bias. Canada and the United States were perceived more positively for "ontime delivery", "lead times for delivery", "cost of communication", and

“ease of communication”. The rankings on these four measures would be strongly influenced by the level of infrastructure which enables a country to score well on the scales. The finding is consistent with previous research which portrays Mexico as having a poor infrastructure (Roussel 1993, Brewer 1994, Fraser 1994, and Richardson 1994). The only failing in the developed country bias resulted from the “foreign exchange costs”. The United States is viewed poorly due to the relatively high valuation of the American dollar. However, the overall trend of this bias is supported. The bias again places the Mexican image with Chile and Argentina rather than with the other two NAFTA countries.

The presence of a developed country bias and a domestic bias in the beliefs of business with NAFTA countries builds an argument for accepting the hypothesis. Also, the ten pairwise comparisons presented distinct profiles with 65% of the scales found to be significantly different. Therefore, the null hypothesis 1c was rejected.

6.3.4 Summary of PCI Effects

The tests on the null Hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 1c have revealed differences in the country, product, and business perceptions of the five countries. The three null hypotheses have been rejected, indicating that Canadian retail buyers view products from the five countries in a distinct manner. The overall trend from the analysis enveloped three key themes which included the existence of a minor domestic preference, perceived equivalencies, and a developed country bias. The perceived equivalencies indicate that a regional image may

have superseded the nation, product and business images of the countries. However, differences did dominate the profiles of the countries.

6.3 Hypotheses of Retail Buyer Characteristics

The purpose of analyzing the relatedness of certain demographics to product quality perceptions was to identify key segments of the respondent group. The product quality variable is a composite measure of eight variables including innovativeness, attractiveness, number of defects, conformance to specifications, durability, reliability, technology level, and workmanship. This collection of variables provides an overall snapshot of the respondents' product quality perceptions. Identifying key segments of respondents may be useful for practitioners by enabling them to improve the targeting of their marketing strategies. This section discusses the results of the correlation tests for hypotheses 2 to 6. The strength of the relationships of the variables have been determined through the Spearman Correlation Coefficient which have been provided in the tables. The statistical significance is also indicated with an asterisk when significance has been attained at the .05 level.

Hypothesis 2

- H₂: Retail buying experience of Canadian buyers will be positively related to their views of product quality from the extended NAFTA countries (Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, Argentina)

TABLE 6.19 CORRELATION OF PRODUCT QUALITY BELIEFS AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

Source Country	Spearman Correlation Coefficient
Canada	-.05
United States	.07
Mexico	-.03
Chile	.08
Argentina	.11

* denotes significance at .05

Hypothesis 2 was designed to test the relationship between years of retail buying experience and the beliefs of product quality. The expectation of this relationship was based on perceived risk. It was anticipated that greater buying experience would reduce the perceived risks associated with product quality. This would lead to higher product quality beliefs because the threats to product integrity have been lowered. The correlations presented in Table 6.19 are all low and not statistically significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis that years of experience is not related to the perceptions of product quality from a nation cannot be rejected. This indicates that future sampling may include those buyers who have not yet attained buying experience since reported beliefs are not related to their level of experience.

Hypothesis 3

H₃: The size of the retailing company of Canadian buyers will be positively related to their views of product quality from the extended NAFTA countries (Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, Argentina)

The rationale for hypothesis 3 was to examine the relationship between the size of a retailing organization and the beliefs about product quality from a country. The size of the

organization is estimated by annual sales, number of employees, and number of retail outlets. It was believed that larger organizations would have access to more information sources reducing perceived risks or the financial resources to absorb an increased level of risk. These positions would lead to more positive views of product quality. However, the results did not support the hypothesis that the relationship exists (Table 6.20). The analysis demonstrates that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected as there were no statistically significant relationships between the size of the retailing firm and the respondents' views of product quality.

TABLE 6.20 CORRELATION OF PRODUCT QUALITY BELIEFS AND RETAILER SIZE

Beliefs of product quality from:	Spearman Correlation Coefficient			
	Annual Sales	Employees (FT)	Employees (PT)	Number of Outlets
Argentina	.01	-.03	.02	.01
Canada	-.07	-.04	-.13	-.01
Chile	.08	.06	.12	.03
Mexico	.03	-.05	.02	.02
United States	.00	-.01	-.05	.03

* denotes significance at .05

Hypothesis 4

H₄: International experience of the Canadian buyers' organizations will be positively related to the views of product quality from the extended NAFTA countries (Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, Argentina)

The purpose of hypothesis 4 was to determine if a relationship exists between the product quality beliefs of a country and the international exposure of the buyer. The basis for this hypothesis was the belief that perceived risk would be lowered through the benefits of international exposure including more sources of information, an experienced

organizational culture and personal international experience. The analysis does show some support for this hypothesis (Table 6.21).

TABLE 6.21 SPEARMAN CORRELATION COEFFICIENT OF PRODUCT QUALITY BELIEFS AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE

Beliefs of product quality from:	Experience Buying From					
	USA	Mexico	Chile	Argentina	Central America	South America
Argentina	.06	.01	.18*	.22*	.11	.14
Canada	-.07	.06	-.06	.12	.01	.05
Chile	.07	-.06	.10	.03	-.04	.19*
Mexico	.06	.21*	.10	.01	-.05	.12
United States	.21*	.08	-.10	.07	-.03	-.05

* denotes significance at .05

Beliefs of product quality from:	Experience Buying From			
	Europe	Asia	Africa	Other Countries
Argentina	-.02	-.10	-.03	-.01
Canada	.00	.08	.06	.16*
Chile	-.09	.03	-.07	-.12
Mexico	-.03	-.08	.01	-.07
United States	-.04	-.03	.06	.08

* denotes significance at .05

Six significant correlations highlight the relationship between a retail buyer's specific experience with a country and their perceptions of the nation's product quality. A retail buyer's dealings with Mexico and their beliefs of Mexican product quality are positively correlated. This infers that increased trade with Mexico may improve the perception of product quality from that nation. Another positive relationship was found between the respondent's experience with the United States and the product quality anticipated from the Americans. Again, Canadian retail buyer perceptions of American product quality may increase as the amount of dealings with American goods increase. Experience with Argentina and the beliefs about Argentine product quality were also found to be positively

related. A significant result was found between experience with other nations and the respondents' views on Canadian product quality. It was anticipated that international exposure would also be positively related to respondents' views on Canadian product quality. The perceived risks associated with domestic products would be minimized as strengths are confirmed or delineated. This analysis suggests that increased trade exposure with nations not explicitly listed on the questionnaire may lead to better Canadian product quality beliefs.

The Halo effect, or the formation of product images from country information or other products from the country, appears to have been applied in a modified manner by respondents to the formation of product images from the South American countries. Buyer perceptions of Argentine product quality are positively related to their experience with Chile. This relationship may be explained through a strong regional image which supplants country related images. This position is also supported by another correlation result. The beliefs of Chilean product quality are positively related to a retail buyer's dealings with South America. The application of the regional South American information to product quality beliefs illustrate that the Halo effect is present.

This analysis does not wholly demonstrate support for the hypothesis that general international experience is related to product quality perceptions. However, the findings show that international buying experience with a country is related to the views of the country's product quality. Also, there is evidence that regional exposure in South America is related positively to the views of South American products. Although, the null

hypothesis 4 cannot be rejected, this analysis shows that the relationship may exist at the specific and regional level but not at the general level.

Hypothesis 5

H₅: Product type purchased by the Canadian buyer will be related to their views of product quality from the extended NAFTA countries (Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, Argentina)

Hypothesis 5 was developed to test the relationship between product quality beliefs and the product types distributed by the retailing organization. The justification for this hypothesis was based on the different environments where various product classes exist. For instance, season dominated classes may have heavier time demands in total turn time to the customer. It was believed that such varying environmental factors would provide different influences on the sourcing decision process. Therefore, relationships may exist for some product types but not others. Also, the relationship may be positive for some product classes and negative with other product groupings.

The responses were aggregated into six new product classes based on similarity of the product type. The six groups were building materials (building supplies, carpets, and hardware), household goods (appliances, bedroom, bath and kitchen, furniture, and light fixtures), clothing & accessories (clothing, fabric, and footwear), entertainment (home entertainment and sporting goods), food, and other products. The results showed little support for this hypothesis (Table 6.22). There were only four significant relationships found. American product quality beliefs were found to be negatively related to the

clothing and accessories grouping while positively related to the entertainment category. Also, the quality beliefs of Mexican products were found to be positively related to the retailer's household offerings. An additional positive correlation was also found between Chilean product quality and food items. There is no apparent trend or pattern to the significant relationships found in this analysis. The inconsistent support in the results led to the conclusion that the null hypothesis 5 could not be rejected.

TABLE 6.22 SPEARMAN CORRELATION COEFFICIENT OF PRODUCT QUALITY BELIEFS AND PRODUCT TYPE SOURCED BY BUYERS

Beliefs of product quality from:	Building Materials	Household Goods	Clothing & Accessories	Entertainment	Food	Other Products
Canada	-.06	-.04	-.11	.05	-.11	.10
United States	.04	.08	-.21*	.18*	-.10	.12
Mexico	.09	.14*	-.06	.11	.05	-.01
Chile	-.01	.08	-.08	.06	.14*	.04
Argentina	.03	.07	.00	.05	.07	-.02

* denotes significance at .05

Hypothesis 6

H₆: The type of formal organization of the firm of the Canadian buyer will be related to their views of product quality from the extended NAFTA countries (Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, Argentina)

The purpose of hypothesis 6 was to examine the relationship between product quality beliefs and the formal retail organization in which the buyer works. It was believed that a less formal organization would encourage entrepreneurial attitudes and lessen the perceived product quality risks. Fewer risks to product quality should result in more favourable views of quality. The findings do not support this perspective (Table 6.23). Only one significant positive correlation was found between contracted buying practices

and the beliefs of Mexican product quality. However, one significant relationship out of twenty five represents the potential for random error. Therefore, the null hypothesis 6 cannot be rejected.

TABLE 6.23 CORRELATION OF PRODUCT QUALITY BELIEFS AND FORMAL ORGANIZATION

Beliefs of product quality from:	Spearman Correlation Coefficient				
	Legal Ownership	Central Buying	Contracted Buying	Group Buying	Store Buying
Argentina	.03	-.22	.10	.14	.14
Canada	-.04	.09	-.04	-.02	-.03
Chile	-.04	-.02	-.07	.05	.10
Mexico	.06	-.03	.17*	.03	.12
United States	.00	-.01	.04	.03	-.02

* denotes significance at .05

6.4 Model Analysis and Discussion

The structural model posited for this research project was designed to test the relationship of latent constructs which exist within the PCI theoretical framework. Partial Least Squares (PLS), a second generation multivariate statistical technique, was used to evaluate the theoretical model. PLS uses an iterative regression process to minimize the variance among the subsamples. The application of the technique for this study delivered two main advantages, selection of directional indicators and relatively high tolerance. PLS allows the researcher to choose the directional flow of the relationship between the measures and latent constructs (Fornell 1984). The reflective nature of the measures in the PCI model is supported by theory as the underlying constructs determine the respondent's valuations. The tolerance to measurement scales and sample sizes is another advantage of PLS (Fornell and Bookstein 1982). This is important for the study because the exploratory nature and relatively small sample.

Prior to testing the relationship of constructs, the measurement variables were examined and the composition of groupings was adjusted to ensure good measures. Adjustments were only made in accordance to PCI theory and were therefore not entirely empirically driven. This section presents a discussion of the measurement model and the quest for good measures. Once good measures were attained, the structural model was tested to identify patterns of relationships. The results of this testing are also presented in this section.

6.4.1 PCI Measurement Model

The purpose of examining the measurement model was to determine if the variables are good measures for the latent constructs. Good measures are ones which obtain high loadings from the PLS analysis. Variable loadings in excess of .7 are considered good measures while those with less than .5 are poor measures. The evaluation of the overall construct was based on the average communality shared among the measures. A construct was considered acceptable for use in the structural testing if the average communality exceeded .5. Any value lower than the .5 level would contribute to instability of the structural model.

The proposed PCI model contained nine constructs, including BELIEFS ABOUT COUNTRY AND PEOPLE, FAMILIARITY WITH PRODUCTS, BELIEFS ABOUT SUPPLIER SERVICE, BELIEFS ABOUT PROFITABILITY OF PRODUCTS, PERCEPTIONS OF BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS, BELIEFS ABOUT BUSINESS WITH THE COUNTRY, PRODUCT QUALITY BELIEFS, PRODUCT EVALUATIONS, and BUYER INTENTIONS (see Appendix G and H for PLS results). The measures of each construct are discussed in turn.

Beliefs About Country and People

The initial loading of the BELIEFS ABOUT COUNTRY AND PEOPLE construct measures are shown in Table 6.24. The variables showed poor loadings following the initial run of the PLS analysis. There was no single measure which delivered strong results across all five countries. However, there were six measures which attained moderate to

strong loadings for the five nations. A value of between .6 and .7 would designate the measure as attaining a moderate loading. These acceptable items include “wealth”, “trustworthiness”, “skill level of the workforce”, “work ethic”, “economic stability”, and the “technology level” of the firm. These acceptable measures only represent 29% of the variable grouping. Also, the average communality for the grouping across all countries is considerably lower than the .5 cutoff.

TABLE 6.24 COUNTRY AND PEOPLE BELIEFS VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Knowledge of Country	.34	.53	.05	.29	.20
Likeability	.62	.52	.50	.29	.40
Industriousness	.68	.53	.67	.52	.44
Education Level	.71	.55	.69	.78	.66
Wealth	.60	.68	.69	.81	.60
Friendliness	.65	.55	.40	.24	.29
Trustworthiness	.70	.55	.73	.55	.59
Skill level of Workforce	.78	.62	.78	.82	.77
Work Ethic	.67	.72	.76	.61	.63
Individualism	.58	.65	.58	.57	.56
Political Stability	.42	.59	.62	.65	.73
Rights/Freedoms	.58	.63	.47	.62	.60
Environmental Controls	.53	.37	.60	.70	.73
Role in World Politics	.53	.42	.63	.66	.72
Quality of Life	.64	.57	.60	.74	.74
Labour Costs	.09	.24	.51	.63	.33
Availability of Skilled Workers	.53	.59	.66	.70	.65
Restrictions on Doing Business	.26	.38	.09	.16	.30
Alignment with Canada	n/a	.51	.46	.63	.58
Economic Stability	.62	.65	.69	.83	.74
Technology Level of Country	.63	.61	.73	.77	.77
Average Communality	.34	.31	.36	.39	.36

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

The BELIEFS ABOUT COUNTRY AND PEOPLE construct required some reorganization to ensure that the PCI theoretical basis continued to be represented during the structural testing. Dropping the poor performing variables would not have led to

successful attainment of this goal. Also, previous research has illustrated that the BELIEFS ABOUT COUNTRY AND PEOPLE may be multidimensional (Szamosi 1995). Therefore, the variables were divided into five homogeneous groupings, COUNTRY DESCRIPTION, PEOPLE DESCRIPTION, COUNTRY COMPETENCE, PEOPLE COMPETENCE, and COUNTRY EVALUATION based on the complete IKON Research Group model. The desired Links construct was also added at this point to improve the conative component of the model.

The COUNTRY DESCRIPTION construct is represented through six perception measures of a country and its ability to function as a distinct entity. These measures include “individual rights/freedoms”, “knowledge of the country”, “quality of life”, “role in world politics”, “environmental/pollution controls”, and “political stability”. The composition of the construct was designed to capture the descriptive values of a country. A follow-up run of PLS was conducted to check the value of this construct (Table 6.25). Only one variable, “knowledge of country”, scored consistently low loadings with the exception of the United States where the variable obtained a strong loading of .72. This variable was probably less a descriptor of a country than the level of confidence that the respondent had when answering the questions. Therefore, the scale was dropped from further analysis with the intention that the average communality of the group would improve.

TABLE 6.25 COUNTRY DESCRIPTION VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Rights/Freedoms	.76	.77	.65	.79	.71
Knowledge of Country	.43	.72	.30	.33	.30
Quality of Life	.77	.67	.75	.75	.79
Role in World Politics	.63	.54	.71	.81	.80
Environmental Controls	.61	.38	.64	.83	.81
Political Stability	.52	.72	.67	.63	.76
Average Commuality	.40	.42	.41	.50	.51

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

The average communality showed that the construct was bordering on acceptability as the values hovered around the .5 acceptance level (Table 6.25). The deletion of the “knowledge of country” variable from the construct had a positive effect on the average communality (Table 6.26). However, only three of the five countries had attained values in excess of the .5 cutoff. The variable loadings gave little consistent indication or guidance for removal of another variable. In fact, the loadings showed relative strength for all five measures. Therefore, five variables were used in the COUNTRY DESCRIPTION construct for further testing involving the structural model.

TABLE 6.26 COUNTRY DESCRIPTION VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Rights/Freedoms	.76	.81	.71	.80	.72
Quality of Life	.79	.68	.74	.75	.79
Role in World Politics	.64	.51	.76	.81	.80
Environmental Controls	.53	.76	.74	.65	.77
Political Stability	.60	.41	.70	.85	.84
Average Commuality	.45	.43	.53	.60	.62

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

The PEOPLE DESCRIPTION grouping of scales represents the views that retail buyers hold of a country's residents from a relationship perspective. This group contains three measures including, "friendliness", "trustworthiness", and "individualism" which loaded well in the PLS analysis (Table 6.27). Variable loadings for "friendliness" and "trustworthiness" are consistently strong for all countries. Also, the individualism measure had obtained moderate to strong variable loadings. The average communality for each country exceeded the .5 cutoff contributing to the opinion that the variables were good measures. Therefore, no changes were made to the group for further analysis.

TABLE 6.27 PEOPLE DESCRIPTION VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Friendliness	.89	.88	.83	.85	.77
Trustworthiness	.89	.78	.73	.77	.73
Individualism	.51	.63	.62	.63	.75
Average Communality	.61	.59	.54	.57	.57

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

The COUNTRY COMPETENCE construct is comprised of measures which determine the perceived ability of the country to deliver product through its infrastructure or other national attributes. The construct includes six measures, the "wealth of the country", "technology level", "economic stability", "restrictions on doing business", "labour costs", and "availability of skilled workers". COUNTRY COMPETENCE showed overall poor results in the initial run of PLS, however, four variables had moderate to high loadings (Table 6.28). Two of the six variables did not obtain adequate loadings scores, "restrictions on doing business" and "labour costs". The restrictions on doing business variable had scored low across all countries. While labour costs scored low except with

Chile (.70) and Mexico (.63). An explanation for their exclusion may be that these measures are not direct competencies of a nation but vehicles to creating a business output. The poor level of average communality indicates that changes were necessary for this construct. Therefore, neither variable was included for further analysis.

TABLE 6.28 COUNTRY COMPETENCE VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Wealth	.72	.72	.80	.87	.66
Technology Level	.72	.74	.81	.84	.85
Economic Stability	.72	.68	.78	.87	.80
Restrictions on Business	.39	.48	.12	.17	.35
Labour Costs	.02	.34	.62	.70	.46
Availability of Skilled Workers	.68	.66	.72	.74	.72
Average Communality	.36	.38	.47	.55	.44

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

The exclusion of two measures improved the COUNTRY COMPETENCE construct (Table 6.29). The variables all attained strong to moderate loadings in all cases and the average communality progressed above the .5 level. Therefore, no additional changes were made to this construct for further analysis.

TABLE 6.29 COUNTRY COMPETENCE VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Wealth	.72	.76	.79	.88	.66
Technology Level	.74	.76	.83	.85	.86
Economic Stability	.72	.69	.78	.88	.80
Availability of Skilled Workers	.71	.67	.74	.74	.74
Average Communality	.52	.52	.62	.71	.59

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

The PEOPLE COMPETENCE construct is the natural complement to COUNTRY COMPETENCE as it reflects the view of the people and their ability to assist in completing a productive task. The construct contains four measures including “education level”, “work ethic”, “skill level of workers”, and “industriousness”. The PLS analysis revealed that the construct was comprised of good measures (Table 6.30). The four variables all scored strong loadings across at least four of the countries while the average communality had exceeded the .5 mark in all cases. Therefore, no further alterations were made to this construct for further analysis.

TABLE 6.30 PEOPLE COMPETENCE VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Education Level	.77	.63	.72	.78	.77
Work Ethic	.81	.84	.85	.77	.78
Skill level of workers	.82	.66	.80	.81	.79
Industriousness	.87	.79	.78	.76	.65
Average Communality	.67	.54	.62	.61	.56

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

The COUNTRY EVALUATION construct represents an overall view of the country through two measures, “likeability” and “alignment with Canada”. These two variables capture the evaluative component of attitude formation towards a nation. The results from PLS analysis revealed that “likeability” achieved strong loadings for all five countries while “alignment with Canada” obtained strong to moderate loadings (Table 6.31). In addition, the average communality of the group consistently scored above the .5 cutoff value. Therefore, the composition of the COUNTRY EVALUATION construct was maintained for further analysis.

TABLE 6.31 COUNTRY EVALUATION VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Likeability	1.0	.90	.89	.85	.86
Alignment with Canada	n/a	.63	.69	.72	.72
Average Communality	1.0	.60	.64	.62	.62

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

Links

The LINKS construct was composed to represent the conative component of attitudes toward the country by measuring the desired links pertaining to “political and economic” matters, “immigration”, “exports to”, “imports from”, “investment in”, and “investment from” the country. The PLS analysis showed four of the six variables obtaining strong loadings consistently across the four countries (Table 6.31). The “investment from” measure loaded moderately well while the “exports to” variable loaded moderate to poorly. Also, the average communality of the construct scored consistently above the .5 cutoff value. Therefore, the variables included in the LINKS construct were maintained for further analysis.

TABLE 6.32 LINKS VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Political and Economic ties	n/a	.77	.87	.84	.77
Immigration	n/a	.76	.71	.75	.83
Exports to	n/a	.57	.63	.66	.65
Import from	n/a	.80	.80	.83	.82
Investment in	n/a	.82	.81	.81	.79
Investment from	n/a	.72	.69	.73	.66
Average Communality	n/a	.56	.57	.60	.57

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

In summary, the BELIEFS OF COUNTRY AND PEOPLE construct was divided into smaller homogeneous units to better represent the multidimensional nature of these beliefs. The result was the introduction of five new variable groups including COUNTRY DESCRIPTION, PEOPLE DESCRIPTION, COUNTRY COMPETENCE, PEOPLE COMPETENCE, and COUNTRY EVALUATION. These changes were made within the PCI theoretical framework and the decisions were guided from the PLS analysis.

Familiarity with Products

The composition of the FAMILIARITY construct was intended to capture the awareness level of Canadian retail buyers with the products of a country. The construct includes “ease of finding products”, “knowledge of products”, “awareness of brand names”, “sells well to customers”, and “variety”. The results of the initial PLS run portrayed a divisive picture of the construct by displaying strong results for only two of the five variables (Table 6.33). “Sells well to customers” and “variety” obtained strong loadings for four countries indicating that the two variables did not belong in the same construct as the other variables. However, the three other variables (“ease of finding products”, “knowledge of products” and “awareness of brand names”) encapsulate the essence of product familiarity. The average communality of the construct was unsatisfactory with values well below the .5 level. Therefore, two measures, “sells well to customers” and “variety”, were moved to other constructs. The “sells well to customers” measure was added to the PRODUCT EVALUATION construct because it represents an evaluation of products in terms of contributing to organizational revenues. The “variety” measure was placed into the PRODUCT BELIEFS construct because of its relatedness with the other

beliefs about products. These two moves ultimately proved beneficial as the scales obtained strong to moderate loadings in their respective new constructs.

TABLE 6.33 FAMILIARITY VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Ease of Finding Products	.38	.29	.38	.24	.11
Knowledge of Products	.68	.59	.57	.18	.41
Awareness of Brand Names	.42	.30	.36	.12	.23
Sells Well to Customers	.81	.84	.84	.36	.72
Variety	.77	.76	.81	.55	.82
Average Communality	.41	.36	.39	.41	.28

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

The withdrawal of two variables from the FAMILIARITY construct had a positive effect on the remaining variables in the PLS analysis (Table 6.34). However, the improved loadings were still not adequate to accept the construct intact. The average communality stayed below the .5 level. From the variable loadings, it was apparent that “awareness of brand names” did not fit with the construct. Also, the “ease of finding” measure only loaded strongly on one country. Therefore, it was necessary to drop a variable to strengthen this portion of the measurement model. The “awareness of brand names” was the primary candidate for exclusion as it attained poor loadings across all countries. Therefore, the variable was dropped from further analysis.

TABLE 6.34 FAMILIARITY VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Awareness of Brand Names	.59	.43	.30	.52	.63
Ease of Finding	.56	.43	.53	.86	.35
Knowledge of Products	.85	.97	.91	.81	.82
Average Communality	.46	.43	.40	.55	.40

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

The omission of the additional variable improved the FAMILIARITY construct's average communality to an acceptable level (Table 6.35). The variable loadings of the "ease of finding" measure did not change dramatically. The measure managed to only register a strong loading in one country. However, the additional information it provided made it advantageous to maintain in the construct for further analysis.

TABLE 6.35 FAMILIARITY VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Knowledge of Products	.94	1.0	.96	.85	1.0
Ease of Finding	.51	.37	.47	.85	.15
Average Communality	.57	.56	.57	.72	.51

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

Beliefs About Doing Business with a Country

The BELIEFS ABOUT DOING BUSINESS WITH A COUNTRY construct contains a single measure, "overall comparison of supplier nations", to capture an overall view of a nation as a supplier. Since the construct is represented with a single measure, communality and loadings information is contained to 1.0. No changes were made to this group prior to further analysis.

Beliefs About Supplier Service

The BELIEFS ABOUT SUPPLIER SERVICE construct contains ten variables to measure the views of retail buyers toward the service levels offered by supplier countries. The variables included "ontime delivery", "lead times for delivery", "minimum order size", "ease of reordering", "return policies", "cost of returning goods", "speed of resolving problems", "ease of obtaining credit from suppliers", "willingness to customize", and the

“overall level of service”. The PLS analysis of the construct revealed that many variables did not obtain strong loadings and the average communality of the measures was very poor (Table 6.36). In fact, the only measure to attain strong variable loadings for all countries was the “overall measure of service”.

TABLE 6.36 SUPPLIER SERVICE VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
On-time Delivery	.57	.71	.74	.69	.63
Overall Level of Service	.79	.70	.86	.75	.79
Willingness to Customize	.59	.48	.65	.55	.61
Ease of Obtaining Credit	.51	.26	.16	.51	.34
Speed in Resolving Problems	.55	.63	.74	.61	.75
Cost of Returning goods	.49	.46	.52	.65	.57
Return Policies	.62	.65	.53	.67	.65
Ease of Reordering	.60	.69	.57	.59	.58
Minimum Order Size	.62	.49	.24	.38	.18
Lead Times for Delivery	.53	.69	.44	.44	.35
Average Communality	.35	.35	.34	.35	.33

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

Principal Component Factor Analysis using varimax rotation was employed to increase the level of understanding of this construct. The analysis highlighted two relatively stable groupings of variables, logistic and service related variables (Tables 6.37 -6.38). The Logistics factor contains “lead times”, “minimum order size”, “ease of reordering”, “return policies”, “cost of returning goods”, and the “ease of obtaining credit”. However, the “ease of obtaining credit” variable did not load well in more than one country and was ultimately dropped from the grouping for further analysis. The Logistics factor explains approximately 37% of the variance in the measures. The Service factor includes “on-time delivery”, “speed of resolving problems”, “willingness to customize”, and “overall level of service”. The service factor explains around 16% of the variance. Each variable grouping

deals with distinct and important aspects of supplier services. The Logistics factor pertains to the infrastructural abilities of a nation and their competencies for distributing goods. Therefore, the group would be most related to the COUNTRY COMPETENCE construct. It also deals with the ability of the nation to deliver service levels through infrastructure. The Service factor is more service oriented and related to the PEOPLE COMPETENCE construct reflecting the level of service from the people of a country and their skills. The Logistics and Service groupings were both used in further analysis as constructs.

TABLE 6.37 LOGISTICS FACTOR - FACTOR LOADINGS AND THE PERCENTAGE OF VARIANCE EXPLAINED FROM THE PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS FACTOR ANALYSIS

	Factor Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Lead Time for Delivery	.61	.68	.68	.82	.47
Minimum Order Size	.78	.61	.76	.71	.06
Ease of Reordering	.70	.62	.72	.79	.52
Return Policies	.65	.75	.67	.67	.73
Cost of Returning Goods	.66	.74	.75	.69	.78
Ease of Obtaining Credit	.28	.17	.50	.60	.68
% of Variance Explained	35.8	35.6	38.2	38.5	36.9

TABLE 6.38 SERVICE FACTOR - FACTOR LOADINGS AND THE PERCENTAGE OF VARIANCE EXPLAINED FROM THE PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS FACTOR ANALYSIS

	Factor Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Ontime Delivery	.76	.69	.76	.79	.64
Speed of Resolving Problems	.71	.78	.72	.69	.64
Willingness to Customize	.36	.67	.66	.18	.78
Overall Level of Service	.72	.83	.90	.57	.88
% of Variance Explained	13.6	15.6	17.1	17.8	19.6

The PLS analysis of the SUPPLIER SERVICE construct illustrated relatively good measures (Table 6.39). The “overall measure of service” had very strong loadings across

all countries while the other three variables had strong to moderate loadings for the countries. Also, the average communality for the construct was well above the .5 level. Therefore, the composition was left unchanged for further testing.

TABLE 6.39 SUPPLIER SERVICE VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
On-time Delivery	.67	.79	.76	.76	.69
Speed of Resolving Problems	.63	.79	.75	.61	.75
Willingness to Customize	.69	.60	.68	.67	.71
Overall Level of Service	.91	.88	.91	.88	.89
Average Communality	.54	.60	.61	.55	.58

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

The PLS analysis also confirmed that the SUPPLIER LOGISTICS construct contained good measures (Table 6.40). Two variables attained strong loadings for all five countries, “ease of reorder” and “return policies”. The “lead times for delivery” and “cost of returning goods” measures received strong to moderate loadings. The only poor measure in the group was identified as the “minimum order size” variable which received only one strong loading and one moderate loading. However, the acceptable average communality of the construct and the additional information contributed from the variable made the option of maintaining “minimum order size” in the construct more attractive. Therefore, the construct was not altered for further analysis.

TABLE 6.40 SUPPLIER LOGISTICS VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Lead Time for Delivery	.63	.76	.72	.74	.61
Minimum Order Size	.82	.63	.58	.59	.33
Ease of Reorder	.78	.79	.86	.82	.88
Return Policies	.72	.76	.72	.81	.87
Cost of Returning Goods	.57	.59	.78	.83	.84
Average Communality	.50	.50	.55	.58	.55

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

Beliefs of Profitability

The PROFITABILITY construct contains twelve measures to assess the contribution of a country's products to the firm's earnings. The construct included "retail price", "wholesale price level", "markup that can be obtained", "transportation costs", "duty costs", "payment terms", "foreign exchange costs", "price stability", "frequency of customer returns", "markdowns required to clear", "overall cost of doing business", "turnover", and "overall profitability". The PLS analysis indicated that the measures and the average communality value were poor (Table 6.41).

TABLE 6.41 PROFITABILITY VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Retail Price Obtainable	.20	-.04	.32	.41	.28
Overall Profitability	.67	.78	.67	.54	.66
Markup that can be Obtaining	.59	.72	.45	.45	.49
Transportation Costs	.45	.38	.48	.54	.24
Duty Costs	.40	.34	.46	.49	.43
Payment Terms Available	.69	.51	.39	.59	.63
Foreign Exchange Costs	.40	.17	.28	.39	.29
Price Stability	.43	.43	.52	.64	.66
Frequency of Customer Returns	.39	.52	.48	.50	.38
Markdowns Required to Clear	.60	.62	.71	.52	.53
Overall Cost of Doing Business	.54	.61	.56	.40	.46
Turnover Rate	.53	.68	.64	.62	.45
Average Communality	.26	.28	.26	.26	.23

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

The addition of a variable to this construct did not improve the poor loadings attained through the PLS analysis. There was also no improvement in pattern clarity of strong loadings. The “wholesale price level” variable was added when poor loadings were discovered with the other measures in PRODUCT EVALUATION. This construct seemed like a possible choice because wholesale prices are related to profitability. However, the “wholesale price level” measure provided little insight into the PROFITABILITY construct (Table 6.42). Therefore, some exploratory Principal Components Analysis was conducted to pull out more homogeneous groupings.

TABLE 6.42 PROFITABILITY VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Retail Price Obtainable	.20	-.07	.34	.44	.29
Wholesale Price Level	.33	.27	-.10	-.02	-.12
Overall Profitability	.59	.73	.44	.43	.47
Markup that can be Obtaining	.45	.39	.48	.54	.25
Transportation Costs	.40	.33	.45	.48	.42
Duty Costs	.69	.50	.38	.60	.64
Payment Terms Available	.40	.17	.27	.38	.28
Foreign Exchange Costs	.43	.42	.53	.64	.67
Price Stability	.39	.51	.48	.50	.39
Frequency of Customer Returns	.60	.62	.71	.52	.54
Markdowns Required to Clear	.54	.60	.55	.39	.45
Overall Cost of Doing Business	.53	.68	.63	.61	.46
Turnover Rate	.67	.78	.66	.53	.63
Average Communality	.25	.26	.24	.24	.21

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

The Principal Components Factor Analysis conducted on PROFITABILITY produced two subgroups (Tables 6.43-6.44). The variables loaded with some regularity on two factors, Business Costs and Profitability. The Business Costs factor contained “transportation costs”, “duty costs”, “foreign exchange costs”, and the “overall cost of

business". "Markup", "turnover", and "overall profitability" loaded on the Profitability factor. Business Costs explained approximately 25% of shared variance and profitability explained around 17%. As an additional note for the US, Profitability is the first factor explaining 25% of the variance, while Business Costs was the second factor explaining 17% of variance. Although both factors appear useful, only the Profitability variable grouping was used in further analysis. This grouping captures the core idea of profitability. The Business Costs grouping is more an indirect determinant of profitability and does not present retail buyer views of profitability but perceptions of costs. Therefore, only the Profitability variable grouping was used as a construct for consistency with the initial intention of the research.

TABLE 6.43 BUSINESS COSTS - FACTOR LOADINGS AND THE PERCENTAGE OF VARIANCE EXPLAINED FROM THE PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS FACTOR ANALYSIS

	Factor Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A. *	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Transportation Costs	.68	.62	.76	.85	.73
Duty Costs	.87	.78	.73	.86	.81
Foreign Exchange Costs	.85	.66	.77	.78	.72
Markdowns Required to Clear	.30	.39	.28	.21	.62
Overall Cost of Business	.67	.68	.71	.77	.77
% of Variance Explained	26.3	14.2	25.4	27.2	25.5

TABLE 6.44 PROFITABILITY - FACTOR LOADINGS AND THE PERCENTAGE OF VARIANCE EXPLAINED FROM THE PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS FACTOR ANALYSIS

	Factor Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A. *	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Markup that can be Obtained	.84	.86	.88	.85	.91
Turnover Rate	.22	.69	.63	.61	.41
Overall Profitability	.81	.85	.87	.90	.90
% of Variance Explained	17.7	27.2	15.0	16.7	18.1

* The factor groupings are switched for the United States, Profitability (Factor 2) explained more variance than Business Costs (Factor 1).

The PLS analysis results on the PROFITABILITY construct show that it is composed of good measures (Table 6.45). The “markup obtainable” and “overall profitability” both display strong loadings for all countries while the “turnover rate” measure displays slightly less strength. In addition, the average communality of the grouping is also strong. PROFITABILITY was maintained for further analysis.

TABLE 6.45 PROFITABILITY VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Markup Obtainable	.85	.85	.78	.77	.91
Turnover Rate	.68	.80	.77	.79	.58
Overall Profitability	.90	.90	.90	.88	.93
Average Communality	.67	.72	.67	.66	.67

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

Supplier Relationships

The SUPPLIER RELATIONSHIPS construct was designed to represent human and social attributes which are important to the business environment. The construct contained eleven measures, including “cost of communication”, “ease of communication”, “communication in the buyer’s first language”, “similarity of business styles”, “market orientation of vendors”, “receptivity to new products”, “skills as managers”, “skills as negotiators”, and “ease of doing business” with them. The PLS analysis highlighted that most measures received strong to moderate loadings (Table 6.46). However, the results also showed that three variables did not belong in the construct; “cost of communication”, “ease of communication”, and the ability to “communicate in the buyer’s first language”. This may indicate that language is not a barrier to conducting business or that there is a separate communication construct. This seems intuitively correct as English

is the de facto standard of languages in international commerce. This language standardization or theoretical separation from the relationship construct infers that the measurement items have little bearing on business relationships. The three communication scales were dropped from further analysis.

TABLE 6.46 SUPPLIER RELATIONSHIPS VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Ease of Communicating	-.28	.54	.57	-.46	.30
Ease of Doing Business	.83	.78	.80	.73	.74
Willingness to do Business	.81	.71	.73	.65	.72
Cost of Communicating	.25	.37	.48	.28	.06
Similarity of Business Styles	.57	.75	.67	.80	.75
Communication in First Language	.36	.42	.52	.52	.35
Market Orientation of Vendors	.67	.70	.74	.78	.63
Receptivity to New Products	.72	.79	.81	.80	.64
Skills as Managers	.75	.79	.82	.76	.74
Skills as Negotiators	.75	.77	.77	.68	.62
Average Communality	.40	.46	.49	.44	.36

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

The remaining SUPPLIER RELATIONSHIP variables were analyzed with PLS and the results were strong (Table 6.47). Two measures, “skills as managers” and “ease of doing business”, attained strong loadings across the five countries while the other variables obtained strong to moderate loadings. Only the “similarity of business styles” measure had a mediocre loading in Canada which may have resulted from a domestic effect. In addition, the average communality of the group is strong.

One measure was removed from SUPPLIER RELATIONS to better represent PCI theory. “Willingness to do business” with a country was moved from SUPPLIER RELATIONS to

BUYING INTENTIONS. “Willingness to do business” is essentially an outcome measure consistent with the orientation of BUYING INTENTIONS. In addition, this adjustment was a improvement to the modeling as BUYING INTENTIONS was no longer based on a single measure.

TABLE 6.47 SUPPLIER RELATIONS VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Similarity of Business Styles	.56	.74	.70	.81	.74
Market Orientation of Vendors	.70	.72	.80	.82	.69
Receptivity to New Products	.79	.81	.84	.82	.69
Skills as Managers	.81	.83	.87	.84	.78
Skills as Negotiators	.79	.79	.83	.74	.68
Ease of Doing Business	.79	.80	.78	.73	.71
Average Communality	.56	.61	.65	.63	.51

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

Product Beliefs

The PRODUCT BELIEFS construct contained nine variables to capture the retail buyer’s perceptions of a country’s product offerings, including “workmanship”, “attractiveness”, “quality”, “technology level”, “innovativeness”, “reliability”, “defects in merchandise”, “variety”, and “durability”. The PLS analysis presented strong loadings (Table 6.48).

Five of the variables in the construct obtained strong loading while another three measures received strong to moderate loadings over the countries. The “defects in merchandise” variable was the only measure to obtain poor loadings. This variable was dropped from further analysis with the expectation that the average communality of the construct would improve.

TABLE 6.48 PRODUCT BELIEFS VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Innovativeness	.71	.66	.75	.74	.77
Attractiveness	.76	.75	.78	.75	.62
Defects in Merchandise	.36	.30	.58	.43	.38
Conformance to Specifications	.72	.83	.77	.82	.78
Quality	.71	.85	.85	.82	.82
Durability	.78	.77	.83	.80	.86
Reliability	.82	.77	.85	.79	.80
Workmanship	.74	.81	.87	.83	.80
Technology Level	.69	.62	.75	.75	.71
Average Communality	.51	.53	.62	.57	.55

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

Although the “conformance to specifications” measure loaded well in the PRODUCT BELIEFS construct, it was moved into PRODUCT EVALUATION. This change was made to reflect the affective nature of the scale and improve the representativeness of the model’s affective component. A final change to PRODUCT BELIEFS was the addition of the “variety” measure. This change was made because the breadth of product offerings did not load with the core FAMILIARITY variables and was expected to load well with other PRODUCT BELIEFS measures. These changes were made for further analysis (Table 6.49).

TABLE 6.49 PRODUCT BELIEFS VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Innovativeness	.75	.71	.80	.79	.79
Attractiveness	.78	.78	.82	.77	.66
Quality	.70	.82	.82	.78	.79
Durability	.77	.77	.83	.81	.86
Reliability	.81	.75	.84	.79	.81
Workmanship	.66	.77	.83	.81	.76
Technology Level	.74	.64	.78	.77	.74
Variety	.71	.59	.75	.76	.61
Average Commuality	.55	.54	.66	.62	.57

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

Product Evaluation

The PRODUCT EVALUATION construct contained six measures to represent the evaluation of goods from a country. The variables include an “overall comparison to the products of other countries”, “overall satisfaction level”, “pride in offering to customers”, “wholesale price level”, and “value”. The “wholesale price level” measure was the only weak variable in the construct while the others obtained strong loadings (Table 6.50).

Therefore, wholesale price level was dropped from the construct.

TABLE 6.50 PRODUCT EVALUATION VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Comparison to Other Countries	.85	.89	.90	.89	.86
Overall Satisfaction	.88	.89	.89	.81	.80
Pride in Offering to Customers	.74	.82	.87	.79	.78
Wholesale Price Level	-.03	.19	-.29	-.26	-.23
Value	.67	.79	.79	.79	.72
Average Commuality	.50	.58	.61	.55	.51

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

Prior to further analysis two additional members joined the construct, “sells well to customers” and “conformance to specifications”. The “sells well to customers” measure

came from the FAMILIARITY construct to better reflect the evaluative aspects of the PCI model. The “conformance to specifications” variable was also made to improve the model’s affective component. The analysis demonstrated relatively strong loadings with the rest of the PRODUCT EVALUATION construct (Table 6.51).

TABLE 6.51 PRODUCT EVALUATION VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVERAGE COMMUNALITY

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Comparison to Other Countries	.82	.87	.88	.85	.85
Overall Satisfaction	.86	.87	.86	.78	.79
Pride in Offering to Customers	.71	.81	.85	.77	.74
Value	.65	.79	.81	.79	.73
Conformance to Specifications	.69	.78	.74	.78	.75
Sells Well to Customers	.70	.82	.80	.64	.61
Average Communality	.55	.68	.68	.59	.56

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

Buyer Intentions

The BUYING INTENTIONS construct contained a single measure, “willingness to buy”. However, the addition of the “willingness to do business” measure was made to broaden the representativeness of the model’s conative component. The analysis of this modification showed strong loadings for both measures across the five countries (Table 6.52). This adjustment was maintained in further analysis.

TABLE 6.52 WILLINGNESS TO BUY VARIABLE LOADINGS AND AVG. VARIANCE EXTRACTED

	Variable Loadings				
	Canada	U.S.A.	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Willingness to Buy	.89	.89	.91	.89	.86
Willingness to Do Business	.90	.90	.93	.90	.87
Avg. Variance Extracted	.80	.80	.85	.79	.75

Bold indicates strong loading of the variable

In summary, the analysis of the measurement model highlighted some deficiencies in the representativeness of the structural model's latent constructs. Therefore, adjustments to the composition of variable groupings were made to better reflect the constructs being measured. These changes were guided by the empirical results and were executed in accordance with the PCI theoretical framework. Figure 6.2 displays the measurement model which was used in further analysis to examine the relationships of constructs in the structural model (see Appendix H).

6.4.2 PCI Structural Model

The structural model is a representation of the latent constructs pertinent to PCI theory. The PLS analysis was conducted on the structural model shown in Figure 6.2. The lines between the constructs are predicted relationships between the unobservables. The previous changes to the measurement model altered the representation of the constructs, however, the structural model was still consistent with PCI theory. This section presents the structural model which was used in the analysis and the results through a country based discussion.

FIGURE 6.2: THE REVISED PCI MEASUREMENT MODEL

The PCI structural model contained fourteen constructs to represent the country-of-origin influence on Canadian retail buyers' purchase intentions. The constructs included COUNTRY DESCRIPTION, PEOPLE DESCRIPTION, COUNTRY COMPETENCE, PEOPLE COMPETENCE, COUNTRY EVALUATION, PRODUCT BELIEFS, PRODUCT EVALUATION, PROFITABILITY, SUPPLIER SERVICE, SUPPLIER RELATIONS, BUSINESS EVALUATION, FAMILIARITY, LINKS, and BUYING INTENTIONS. The model posits that COUNTRY DESCRIPTION, PEOPLE DESCRIPTION, COUNTRY COMPETENCE, and PEOPLE COMPETENCE directly affect COUNTRY EVALUATION. The COUNTRY COMPETENCE and PEOPLE COMPETENCE constructs were modeled as indirectly affecting PRODUCT

EVALUATION through PRODUCT BELIEFS (halo effect). PROFITABILITY, SUPPLIER SERVICE, and SUPPLIER RELATIONS were shown to directly affect BUSINESS EVALUATION. The business dimension was incorporated into the model as directly affecting PRODUCT BELIEFS and BUYING INTENTIONS. FAMILIARITY was modeled as directly affecting PRODUCT BELIEFS, PRODUCT EVALUATION, and BUYING INTENTIONS. COUNTRY EVALUATION was posited to indirectly affect BUYING INTENTIONS through PRODUCT EVALUATION and LINKS. LINKS was also modeled as directly affecting PRODUCT EVALUATION. The LINKS construct was added to the analysis as a representation of the desired association of a country with Canada.

New hypotheses were developed to represent the relationships between the latent constructs in the structural model. The initially proposed hypotheses (H_7 to H_{16}) were replaced with the following hypotheses (H_{17} to H_{36}), designed to test the revised model in Figure 6.2.

- H_{17} : Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about a country's descriptive values are directly related to their evaluation of the nation
- H_{18} : Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about the descriptors of a country's people are directly related to their evaluation of the nation
- H_{19} : Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about the competence of a country are directly related to the their evaluation of the nation
- H_{20} : Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about the competence of a country's people are directly related to their evaluation of the nation

- H₂₁: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about the competence of a country are directly related to their beliefs about the products from the nation
- H₂₂: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about the competence of a country's people are directly related to their beliefs about the products from the nation
- H₂₃: Canadian retail buyers' evaluation of a country are directly related to the desired links with the country
- H₂₄: Canadian retail buyers' evaluation of a country is directly related to the evaluation of products from the country
- H₂₅: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about the products from a nation are directly related to the evaluation of products from the country
- H₂₆: Canadian retail buyers' desired links with a country are directly related to their evaluations of products from the country
- H₂₇: Canadian retail buyers' desired links with a country are directly related their buying intentions
- H₂₈: Canadian retail buyers' evaluations of products from a country are directly related to their buying intentions
- H₂₉: Canadian retail buyers' familiarity with the products of a country is directly related to their beliefs of those products
- H₃₀: Canadian retail buyers' familiarity with the products of a country is directly related to their evaluation of those products
- H₃₁: Canadian retail buyers' familiarity with the products of a country is directly related to buying intentions
- H₃₂: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs of anticipated profitability from the products of a country are directly related to the business evaluation of the country
- H₃₃: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs of supplier service is directly related to the business evaluation of the country
- H₃₄: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs of supplier relations are directly related to the business evaluation of the country

- H₃₅: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs of supplier logistics are directly related to their evaluation of business with the country
- H₃₆: Canadian retail buyers' evaluation of business with a country is directly related to their beliefs of products from the nation
- H₃₇: Canadian retail buyers' evaluation of business with a country is directly related to their buying intentions

TABLE 6.53 PLS RESULTS SUMMARY TABLE

Hypothesis	Path	Path Coefficients				
		Canada	USA	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
H ₁₇	C Descrip $\Rightarrow$ C Eval	0.01	0.21	-0.01*	0.19**	0.29
H ₁₈	P Descrip $\Rightarrow$ C Eval	0.62**	0.53*	0.74**	0.56**	0.51**
H ₁₉	C Comp $\Rightarrow$ C Eval	-0.18	-0.17	-0.01	-0.00	-0.16
H ₂₀	P Comp $\Rightarrow$ C Eval	0.23	0.21	0.04	0.05	0.11
H ₂₁	C Comp $\Rightarrow$ Prod Bel	0.00	0.24	0.09	0.25	0.46*
H ₂₂	P Comp $\Rightarrow$ Prod Bel	0.31	0.08	0.25	0.12	0.05
H ₂₃	C Eval $\Rightarrow$ Links	n/a	0.37*	0.54**	0.56**	0.42**
H ₂₄	C Eval $\Rightarrow$ Prod Eval	0.13	0.10	-0.10	0.07	0.15
H ₂₅	Prod Bel $\Rightarrow$ Prod Eval	0.71**	0.83**	0.77**	0.74**	0.72**
H ₂₆	Links $\Rightarrow$ Prod Eval	n/a	0.03	0.14*	0.06	0.07
H ₂₇	Links $\Rightarrow$ Buy	n/a	0.02	0.07	0.03	0.13
H ₂₈	Prod Eval $\Rightarrow$ Buy	0.24*	0.58**	0.40*	0.55**	0.49
H ₂₉	Familiar $\Rightarrow$ Prod Bel	0.28*	0.09	0.15	0.08	0.07
H ₃₀	Familiar $\Rightarrow$ Prod Eval	0.14	0.03	0.15	0.21*	0.08
H ₃₁	Familiar $\Rightarrow$ Buy	0.22	0.14	0.07	0.04	0.01
H ₃₂	Profit $\Rightarrow$ Bus Eval	0.11	0.21*	0.16	0.13	0.08
H ₃₃	S Service $\Rightarrow$ Bus Eval	0.22	-0.08	0.44*	0.32*	0.12
H ₃₄	S Relat $\Rightarrow$ Bus Eval	0.35*	0.62**	0.24*	0.32*	0.52**
H ₃₅	S Logist $\Rightarrow$ Bus Eval	0.15	0.19	-0.00	0.12	0.19*
H ₃₆	Bus Eval $\Rightarrow$ Prod Bel	0.30*	0.46**	0.45**	0.40*	0.27*
H ₃₇	Bus Eval $\Rightarrow$ Buy	0.44*	0.25	0.44*	0.23	0.32

*=significant at P=.05

**=significant at P=.001

The PLS analysis revealed several significant relationships between the constructs of the structural model (see Appendix I). In total, forty of the paths were found to be significant and were found reasonably spread over the five countries (Table 6.53). However, each country had its own signature of strong relationships. Figures 6.3 to 6.7 present graphical

representations of the statistically significant paths in the PCI model. The significant paths are illustrated with solid arrows while the relationships which are not significant are identified with dotted arrows. The path coefficients are noted when significant to indicate the strength of the relationships.

FIGURE 6.3 PLS RESULTS FOR THE CANADIAN PCI MODEL

Canada

The PLS analysis on the purchase decision making process of Canadian retail buyers for Canadian products found seven significant paths (Figure 6.3). There are two distinct patterns in the PCI model. The first determines the evaluation of the Canadian nation

from retail buyers' beliefs of the citizens' descriptive features. This relationship is isolated from the remaining model. The second pattern of relationships ties together the business dimension with PRODUCT BELIEFS to indirectly lead to BUYING INTENTIONS. The business evaluation of Canada is driven by the relations of the retail buyer with the supplier. The evaluation of business in Canada directly affects the beliefs about Canadian products and the purchase intentions of the retail buyer. There is evidence to suggest that the "halo effect" exists for retail buyers as the relationship is strong between their familiarity with products from Canada and their product beliefs. This finding demonstrates that retail buyers may apply information attained through their familiarity with a country's products to the formation of their product beliefs. In addition, the retail buyer beliefs of Canadian goods will indirectly affect their buying intentions through their evaluation of Canadian products.

United States

The PLS results for the American PCI model are similar to the Canadian perspective. There are seven significant paths in the Canadian retail buyers' purchase decision making process of American goods (Figure 6.4). Of the seven paths, five relationships are similar to the Canadian model. There are also two separate patterns of the model. The first part illustrates the relationship of the American image with the desired level of association with the country. Canadian retail buyers' descriptive beliefs of the United States is directly related to the evaluation of the nation's image and ultimately to the desired links with the nation. The second fraction of significant relationships in the American PCI model incorporates the buying intentions of the Canadian retail buyer. The BUSINESS

EVALUATION of the United States is directly related to two constructs, the anticipated PROFITABILITY of products from the country and beliefs about American SUPPLIER RELATIONS. In addition, the BUSINESS EVALUATION is directly related to Canadian retail buyer views of their products. The PRODUCT BELIEFS are then indirectly related to BUYING INTENTIONS through the evaluation of American goods.

FIGURE 6.4 PLS RESULTS FOR THE AMERICAN PCI MODEL

Mexico

The results from the PLS analysis of the Mexican model present ten significant paths for the decision making process of Canadian retail buyers (Figure 6.5). This model attained

the highest number of significant paths and represents the most complete model of the five stimulus countries. Buyers consider more of the factors in their purchase decision in a Mexican scenario. The three dimensions of country, product, and business images have been found to be directly and indirectly related to BUYING INTENTIONS. Canadian retail buyers' descriptive beliefs of Mexico and its people are directly related to their evaluation of the nation. The COUNTRY EVALUATION is then indirectly related to the evaluation of Mexican products through the desired LINKS with the country. Although the path between LINKS and PRODUCT EVALUATION is weak, it remains significant. The relationship may exist because positive changes in the evaluation of Mexican products may lead to more links desired, increasing the buyer's access to the goods.

FIGURE 6.5 PLS RESULTS FOR THE MEXICAN PCI MODEL

The business dimension is woven into the PCI model through the BUSINESS EVALUATION of Mexico and its direct relationship with retail buyers' beliefs of Mexican products. The retail buyer's beliefs of SUPPLIER SERVICE and SUPPLIER RELATIONS were found to be directly related to the BUSINESS EVALUATION of Mexico. This reinforces previous work which found relationships were an important aspect of business activity (Government of Canada 1992, Williams 1994, and Alessi 1995). SUPPLIER SERVICE is also important to Canadian retail buyers when considering Mexico likely due to the different emphasis on time (Government of Canada 1992 and Alessi 1995). A lower emphasis on time in Mexico can impede delivery time and speed in resolving problems. There is also a direct relationship between the BUSINESS EVALUATION of Mexico and the Canadian retail buyers' intentions of buying Mexican goods. The beliefs of Mexican products are also related to the purchase intentions of the retail buyer through their evaluation of Mexican goods.

Chile

The PLS analysis of the Canadian retail buyers' purchase decision making process, with respect to Chilean goods, presented nine significant relationships (Figure 6.6). The model is segmented into two pieces. The first segment of the model encapsulates the country image. Canadian retail buyers' beliefs of the descriptive features of Chile and its people are directly related to the evaluation of the country. Also, the COUNTRY EVALUATION is directly related to the desired LINKS with Chile. The second segment of the PCI model presents the business dimension as being indirectly related to BUYING

INTENTIONS through product images. Canadian retail buyers' beliefs of SUPPLIER SERVICE and SUPPLIER RELATIONS are directly related to the BUSINESS EVALUATION of Chile. The BUSINESS EVALUATION is directly related to the retail buyers' beliefs of Chilean products. Chilean PRODUCT BELIEFS and the retail buyer's familiarity with the country's products are directly related to the evaluation of Chilean goods. The relationship between FAMILIARITY and PRODUCT EVALUATION indicates that the "halo" effect is present for Canadian retail buyers in their consideration of Chile's products. Also, the evaluation of Chilean products is directly related to the retail buyers' purchase intentions.

FIGURE 6.6 PLS RESULTS FOR THE CHILEAN PCI MODEL

Argentina

The results of the PLS analysis highlighted seven significant relationships in the Argentine model (Figure 6.7). The relationships in this model were separated into two distinct areas. The first area presents Canadian retail buyers' descriptive beliefs of Argentine citizens and their relatedness to the COUNTRY EVALUATION. The Argentine evaluation is also related to the retail buyer's desired LINKS with the country.

FIGURE 6.7 PLS RESULTS FOR THE ARGENTINE PCI MODEL

The second area contains five significant relationships which tie the business dimension to product images. Canadian retail buyer beliefs of SUPPLIER RELATIONS and SUPPLIER LOGISTICS are directly related to the evaluation of doing business with Argentina. This BUSINESS EVALUATION and the buyer's beliefs of the country's competencies are directly related to the PRODUCT BELIEFS. The relationship between the beliefs about Argentine competencies and the evaluation of Argentine products infers that the "halo effect" is present for Canadian retail buyers in their purchase decision process involving Argentina. The last significant relationship in the Argentine PCI model is between the retail buyer's beliefs of the products and their evaluation of them. The Argentine model was the only PCI model to have no relationship with buying intentions. The path between PRODUCT EVALUATIONS and BUYING INTENTIONS is strong but not significant. This is contradictory to previous modeling research (Papadopoulos et al 1988) and the other countries in this study which found a relationship between the two constructs. The path between BUSINESS EVALUATION and the BUYING INTENTIONS construct is also strong, but not significant. This relationship is the strongest of the non significant findings of the American and Chilean models, however, still lower than the significant findings of the Canadian and Mexican models.

The PLS analysis of the country models leads to a common trend of relationships which form the core of the model. The core is identified as the BELIEFS OF A COUNTRY'S PRODUCTS, EVALUATION OF THEIR PRODUCTS, AND BUYING INTENTION, reflecting previous modeling results (Papadopoulos et al 1988). The business dimension was consistently tied into the model, however, different aspects were accentuated.

SUPPLIER RELATIONS was the only construct to be consistently related to the evaluation of business with the country. This reinforces the importance of human interaction in the business environment. The link between BUSINESS EVALUATION and PRODUCT BELIEFS was found to be significant for all five country models. This implies that a halo effect exists, applying the business image to form product beliefs during the decision making process, even in well-known countries. The country image dimension was related to the core of the model in one instance and the description of the country's people repeatedly achieved a significant relationship with the evaluation of the country. The human or social factor may be resonating through these relationships. However, it appears that the business and product images are the main drivers in the purchase decision making process of Canadian retail buyers when considering the five countries.

Table 6.54 presents a summary of the hypotheses relating to the PCI model and their status. Each hypothesis was assigned to one of three status levels at this point, "rejected", "accept" or "further analysis". A null hypothesis was rejected if the path obtained statistical significance in the analysis for one of the stimulus countries. In total, seven of the 21 PCI model hypotheses were accepted. A null hypothesis was accepted (failure to reject) when a path did not obtain statistical significance levels in any of the five countries. This rule led to the acceptance of six null hypotheses. Eight hypotheses were retained for further analysis to examine the interaction of the business dimension with the core of the model.

TABLE 6.54 SUMMARY OF PCI MODEL HYPOTHESES

	Model Linkage Represented	# of Sig.	Country					Action for the Null Hypothesis
H ₁₇	Country Description to Country Evaluation	2		M	Ch			Rejected
H ₁₈	People Description to Country Evaluation	5	C	USA	M	Ch	A	Rejected
H ₁₉	Country Competence to Country Evaluation	0						Not rejected
H ₂₀	People Competence to Country Evaluation	0						Not rejected
H ₂₁	Country Competence to Product Beliefs	1					A	Rejected*
H ₂₂	People Competence to Product Beliefs	0						Not rejected
H ₂₃	Country Evaluation to Links	4		USA	M	Ch	A	Rejected
H ₂₄	Country Evaluation to Product Evaluation	0						Not rejected
H ₂₅	Product Beliefs to Product Evaluation	5	C	USA	M	Ch	A	Further analysis
H ₂₆	Links to Product Evaluation	1			M			Rejected*
H ₂₇	Links to Willingness to Buy	0						Not rejected
H ₂₈	Product Evaluation to Buying Intentions	4	C	USA	M	Ch		Further analysis
H ₂₉	Familiarity to Product Beliefs	1	C					Rejected*
H ₃₀	Familiarity to Product Evaluation	1				Ch		Rejected*
H ₃₁	Familiarity to Buying Intentions	0						Not rejected
H ₃₂	Profitability to Business Evaluation	1		USA				Further analysis
H ₃₃	Supplier Service to Business Evaluation	2			M	Ch		Further analysis
H ₃₄	Supplier Relationships to Business Evaluation	5	C	USA	M	Ch	A	Further analysis
H ₃₅	Supplier Logistics to Business Evaluation	1					A	Further analysis
H ₃₆	Business Evaluation to Product Beliefs	5	C	USA	M	Ch	A	Further analysis
H ₃₇	Business Evaluation to Buying Intentions	2	C		M			Further analysis

* Significance only found in one country

6.4.2 PCI Simplified Model

The PLS analysis was continued on a subset of the previous model to better understand the interaction of the business dimension with the core of the PCI model (Figure 6.8). The results in the previous discussion may not have been an adequate reflection of the relationships of the business dimension with the product images and BUYING INTENTIONS. The BUSINESS EVALUATION of a country may have been poorly represented through the single measure of the “overall comparison as a supplier”. The motivation for analyzing a simpler version of the retail buyer model was to search for direct relationships of the contributory business constructs to the core of the model.

The simplified model posited that the anticipated PROFITABILITY from a country's products, the SUPPLIER SERVICE, and SUPPLIER RELATIONS would be directly related to the buyer's PRODUCT BELIEFS and their BUYING INTENTIONS.

Canadian retail buyers' beliefs of products would be indirectly related to buying intentions through their PRODUCT EVALUATION.

FIGURE 6.8 SIMPLIFIED PCI STRUCTURAL MODEL

Two constructs are noticeably absent from the previous model, BUSINESS EVALUATION and SUPPLIER LOGISTICS. The BUSINESS EVALUATION construct was omitted because it was a single measure construct which was unlikely to have captured the complete essence of the countries' business evaluations. The SUPPLIER LOGISTICS construct was also dropped from the revised model. Although

the findings were significant in the Argentine model, the link was relatively weak. In addition, the nature of the construct was more competency based and focused on the country. These competency measures were not incorporated into the simplified model because they may be heavily influenced by geographic location. This bias is less likely to affect the more supplier based business constructs of PROFITABILITY, SUPPLIER SERVICE, and SUPPLIER RELATIONS.

The following hypotheses represent the paths which were contained in the simplified PCI model for further analysis (Figure 6.8):

- H₃₈ Canadian retail buyer beliefs of anticipated profitability are directly related to their beliefs of the products from a country
- H₃₉ Canadian retail buyer beliefs of the supplier service from a country are directly related to their beliefs of the products from a country
- H₄₀ Canadian retail buyer beliefs of supplier relations with a country are directly related to their beliefs of the products from a country
- H₄₁ Canadian retail buyer beliefs of anticipated profitability are directly related to their buying intentions of products from a country
- H₄₂ Canadian retail buyer beliefs of supplier service from a country are directly related to their buying intentions of products from a country
- H₄₃ Canadian retail buyer beliefs of supplier relations with a country are directly related to their buying intentions of products from a country
- H₄₄ Canadian retail buyer beliefs about a country's products are directly related to the evaluation of products from a country
- H₄₅ Canadian retail buyer's evaluation of a country's products are directly related to their buying intentions of products from a country

The PLS analysis of the simplified model found several significant relationships among the six constructs (see Appendix K and L). Table 6.55 reveals that 23 of 40 paths yielded significant findings. The significant paths were found across the five countries with each country possessing a distinct pattern. The path coefficients are noted when significant to communicate the strength of the relationships.

Table 6.55 PLS Results Summary Table for the Simplified Model

Path	Path Coefficients				
	Canada	USA	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Profit $\Rightarrow$ Prod Bel	0.19	0.27	0.18	0.08	-0.05
S Service $\Rightarrow$ Prod Bel	0.29*	0.34*	0.46**	0.46**	0.37*
S Relat $\Rightarrow$ Prod Bel	0.31*	0.27	0.30*	0.27	0.31*
Profit $\Rightarrow$ Buy	0.05	0.14	0.07**	0.12	0.07
S Service $\Rightarrow$ Buy	0.04	-0.18	0.06**	-0.08	-0.01
S Relat $\Rightarrow$ Buy	0.30*	0.24*	0.07**	0.13	0.20
Prod Bel $\Rightarrow$ Prod Eval	0.83**	0.87**	0.84**	0.82**	0.80**
Prod Eval $\Rightarrow$ Buy	0.44**	0.69**	0.66**	0.65**	0.58**

*=significant at P=.05

**=significant at P=.001

Canada

The PLS analysis of the relationships of the business dimension with Canadian retail buyers' product beliefs and buying intentions yielded five significant paths in the model (Figure 6.9). Two significant relationships were found in the core of the simplified model. This finding depicts the indirect relationship of buyers' PRODUCT BELIEFS with their BUYING INTENTIONS through their PRODUCT EVALUATION. The business perceptions of Canadian suppliers were found to be directly and indirectly related to the sourcing decision. The buyers' SUPPLIER RELATIONS beliefs were found to be related to their PRODUCT BELIEFS and their BUYING INTENTIONS with Canadian

suppliers. Beliefs of SUPPLIER SERVICE was also related to BUYING INTENTIONS indirectly through their beliefs and evaluation of Canadian products.

FIGURE 6.9 PLS RESULTS FOR THE SIMPLIFIED CANADIAN PCI MODEL

United States

The simplified model of the American sourcing decision contained four significant relationships which were revealed through PLS analysis (Figure 6.10). The perceptions of doing business with the United States were found to be directly and indirectly related to the BUYING INTENTIONS of the Canadian retail buyer. The buyer's beliefs of SUPPLIER RELATIONS with Americans was found to have a direct relationship with BUYING INTENTIONS. Canadian retail buyer beliefs of the services provided by

American suppliers was found to be related to BUYING INTENTIONS indirectly through the model core of PRODUCT BELIEFS and PRODUCT EVALUATIONS.

FIGURE 6.10 PLS RESULTS FOR THE SIMPLIFIED AMERICAN PCI MODEL

Mexico

The PLS analysis highlighted seven significant relationships in the model of Canadian retail buyers' sourcing decisions involving Mexican suppliers (Figure 6.11). The three perceptions of doing business with Mexico, anticipated PROFITABILITY of products, SUPPLIER SERVICE, and SUPPLIER RELATIONS, were found to be related directly to BUYING INTENTIONS. However, the path coefficients for these relationships were small indicating that the relationships were weak. Canadian retail buyer views of Mexican supplier services and relations were more strongly related to their PRODUCT BELIEFS

of Mexico. These beliefs were then indirectly related to BUYING INTENTIONS through the buyer's PRODUCT EVALUATION. The findings in the simplified Mexican model represent the most complete model of the five countries.

FIGURE 6.11 PLS RESULTS FOR THE SIMPLIFIED MEXICAN PCI MODEL

Chile

The simplified Chilean model delivered the least number of significant results from the PLS analysis of the five countries by presenting three significant paths (Figure 6.12).

However, the analysis presented a model with connectivity of the business dimension into the sourcing decision. Canadian retail buyer beliefs of SUPPLIER SERVICE were found

to be related indirectly to their **BUYING INTENTIONS** through their **PRODUCT BELIEFS** and **PRODUCT EVALUATION**.

FIGURE 6.12 PLS RESULTS FOR THE SIMPLIFIED CHILEAN PCI MODEL

Argentina

The PLS analysis revealed four significant relationships in the simplified model of the Canadian retail buyers' sourcing decision involving Argentine goods (Figure 6.13). Their perceptions of **SUPPLIER RELATIONS** and **SUPPLIER SERVICES** provided by Argentina are indirectly related to their **BUYING INTENTIONS** through their **PRODUCT BELIEFS** and **PRODUCT EVALUATIONS**. The analysis of the simpler Argentine model highlights a strong and significant relationship between **PRODUCT**

EVALUATION and BUYING INTENTIONS which was not present in the full PCI model. The full model obtained a moderate path coefficient between the two constructs but without statistical significance. The isolation of the business dimension on the core PCI model during the PLS analysis enhanced the visibility of this relationship.

FIGURE 6.13 PLS RESULTS FOR THE SIMPLIFIED ARGENTINE PCI MODEL

The analysis of the five simplified models provided insight into the business aspects of the Canadian retail buyer sourcing decision making process. The results guided the acceptance or rejection of the simplified model hypotheses. In seven of the eight cases, the analysis led to the decision to reject the null hypotheses while only one was not rejected (Table 6.56). An hypothesis outcome of rejection resulted in the instance where a

significant relationship was found in at least one country model. Alternatively, an hypothesis was not rejected when the represented relationship did not obtain statistical significance in any of the five models.

TABLE 6.56 SUMMARY OF THE SIMPLIFIED MODEL HYPOTHESES

	Model Linkage Represented	# of Sig.	Country	Action for the Null Hypothesis
H ₃₈	Profitability Beliefs to Product Beliefs	0		Not rejected
H ₃₉	Supplier Service to Product Beliefs	5	C USA M Ch A	Rejected
H ₄₀	Supplier Relationship to Product Beliefs	3	C M A	Rejected
H ₄₁	Profitability Beliefs to Buying Intentions	1	M	Rejected*
H ₄₂	Supplier Service to Buying Intentions	1	M	Rejected*
H ₄₃	Supplier Relationship to Buying Intentions	3	C USA M	Rejected
H ₂₅	Product Beliefs to Buying Intentions	5	C USA M Ch A	Rejected
H ₂₈	Product Evaluation to Buying Intentions	5	C USA M Ch A	Rejected

* significance only found in one country

The core of the PCI model, which includes PRODUCT BELIEFS, PRODUCT EVALUATION and BUYING INTENTIONS, was found to be significant with consistency in all five models. This finding matches the Papadopoulos et. al. (1988) model which found strong relationships between beliefs of a country's products and the evaluation of the products. The same study also found a strong relationship between the evaluation of a country's products and intentions of buying from that country.

The failure to reject null hypothesis H₃₈ has a possible explanation. The hypothesis represents the relationship between beliefs about anticipated PROFITABILITY of a country's products and the buyers' PRODUCT BELIEFS. There is likely no relationship because profitability is independent of product beliefs such as quality, workmanship, and

reliability. A product with low quality may still deliver high profitability, assuming a large margin and a high rate of turnover. Similarly, products with varying levels of quality, workmanship, and reliability may deliver high profitability.

Overall the PROFITABILITY construct did not relate well to other constructs in the model. However, one significant relationship was found in the Mexican model between PROFITABILITY and BUYING INTENTIONS. Therefore, the null hypothesis H_{41} was rejected. This finding was consistent with other research which determined the relationship of markup to buying was a key consideration in the purchase decision making process (Ettenson et al 1986, Wagner et al 1989, and Sternquist 1995).

The relationship of SUPPLIER SERVICE to the PRODUCT BELIEFS was found significant over the five models consistently. The services offered by a supplier may be considered a tablestake before looking at the products from the country. The beliefs of SUPPLIER SERVICE was also found to be related to BUYING INTENTIONS in the Mexican model. Therefore, the null hypothesis H_{43} was rejected.

The final pair of null hypotheses, H_{40} and H_{43} , were rejected representing the importance of human and social aspects to business transactions. The beliefs about SUPPLIER RELATIONS were found to be related with PRODUCT BELIEFS and BUYING INTENTIONS. However, both construct relationships are not significant for all countries, thus indicating that the importance of social interactions may change depending on the supplier country.

6.4.3 Comparison of the PCI Simplified Models

Further analysis was conducted to compare the similarity of the country models relative to one another. One-way ANOVA and the corresponding Scheffe test were employed to determine if the means of the paths were significantly different across stimulus countries (Appendix M). The results showed that the overall means were significantly different and the majority of the individual comparisons had significant differences. There were no apparent patterns for the non-significant path comparisons. Therefore, these results can lead to the interpretation that the models are independent. Each model is a distinct representation of the Canadian retail buyer's sourcing decision from NAFTA countries and each construct has differing levels of relationships depending on the stimulus country. Therefore, it is impossible to state that a single construct has a consistent level of influence on sourcing across all supplier nations.

7 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a synopsis of the research and highlight the major findings. This study gathered the views of Canadian retail buyers toward NAFTA countries (Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, and Argentina) through a mailed questionnaire. The research examined the PCI effects on the country profiles, analyzed the demographic relationships, and furthered the theoretical modeling base of PCI.

7.1 Sample Discussion

The number of respondents to the questionnaire reached 142, communicating their views of NAFTA countries for this research. The sample was comprised primarily of moderately sized businesses with much buying experience. Although the majority of the respondents' products were sourced from within Canada, most have some level of exposure to international markets. In addition, respondents worked predominately with organizations operating chain specialty stores selling clothing, footwear, and "other" merchandise.

7.2 PCI Effects on the Country Profiles

The purpose of examining the country profiles was to determine if Canadian retail buyers distinguished between the five countries. The dominant trend in the means analysis was differentiation which led to the acceptance of the three hypotheses. The country, product, and business hypotheses were accepted because each country had a distinct profile from the perspective of Canadian retail buyers. The prevalent patterns which surfaced from the

pairwise comparison of the scale means involved three major themes; a minor domestic preference, perceived equivalencies across the countries, and a developed nation bias.

The study found a trend for Canadian retail buyers to exhibit a domestic preference. This finding was another confirmation of previous work which uncovered a domestic bias (Hakansson and Wootz 1975, Ahmed, d'Astouos and Mendez 1995). When compared to Mexico, Chile, and Argentina, the Canadian profile obtained higher ratings on all scales. This illustrates a clear preference for the Canadian image over the other three countries. In comparison to the United States, Canadian retail buyers rated their own nation more favourably on some of the country, product, and supplier scales. Canada was rated higher on social aspects of a nation, product quality attributes, and the supplier logistics and related costs. The preference for Canadian product attributes is particularly important as the modeling analysis showed product beliefs and evaluations were related to buying intentions. Thus, the domestic product preference may influence purchase behaviour. The United States attained higher scores for economic and production aspects of the country, innovative and technical levels of their products, and the managerial skills of American suppliers. Therefore, although a traditional domestic bias was not found, concentrated domestic preferences exist within the responses of Canadian retail buyers.

Another trend in this research was the frequency of perceived equivalencies across countries. The country and supplier profiles both had instances where two nations were seen as statistically similar. Argentina and Chile did not statistically differ on the country

scales while Argentina and Mexico had similar supplier profiles. This suggests that perhaps there is a strong regional image influencing the ratings given by the retail buyer.

The study also found a tendency for Canadian retail buyers towards more favourable responses on the country, products, and business scales of developed countries. Canada and the United States consistently ranked above the less developed countries (Mexico, Chile, and Argentina). This finding confirms previous research which also reported this bias (Gaedeke 1973 and Ahmed, d'Astous and Mendez 1995).

7.3 Analysis of the Buyer and Organizational Characteristics

The analysis of the relations between buyer and organizational characteristics with the perceived product quality of NAFTA countries did not produce many significant relationships. In fact, there was not enough support to accept any of the five hypotheses. Therefore, the analysis suggests that buyer and organizational characteristics are not related to PCI.

7.4 PCI Theoretical Modeling

A key feature to this research was the expansion of the theoretical modeling base for the PCI framework. The testing of the model was conducted with the Partial Least Squares (PLS) analysis technique to identify patterns of relationships among the latent constructs. The results of the model analysis reflected previous research with the existence of a core set of relationships (Papadopoulos et al 1988). This core indirectly relates the beliefs about a country's products to buying intentions through the evaluation of the country's

products. The country image dimension did not relate to the core PCI model very well. The descriptive beliefs of the country were found to be related to the country evaluation. However, the country dimension only linked to the core model once. In the business dimension, the supplier scales tied into the model through the business evaluation of the country. In addition, supplier relationships were important to Canadian retail buyers in the consideration of all five countries. This emphasizes the importance of social contact in the business environment. The product and business beliefs were found to be the most important considerations in the retail buyer's sourcing decision from a country.

The analysis of a simplified PCI model to closely examine the interaction of the business dimension with the core model revealed that supplier service and supplier relations were the most important factors in the sourcing decision. The service offered by a supplier was found to be salient, however, only indirectly to buying intentions through the retail buyer's beliefs of the country's products. Social or human aspects of business were important to retail buyers as illustrated by finding the supplier relations construct to be significantly related to the product beliefs and the buying intentions. The analysis showed that the factors influencing vendor selection decisions may fluctuate across supplier countries.

The analysis of the PCI model and the simplified version identified the supplier relations component to be a key factor in the buyer's decision making process. There was also some support for the influence of supplier services on the decision process. However, there was less support for the relationship of profitability in the purchase decision.

8. RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

This study may generated results which may be valuable to the public, private organizations, and academics. However, there are weaknesses inherent in the methodology employed in this research. The limitations stem from the instrument and the nature of the study.

Research instruments expose studies to risks and limitations through structural pitfalls, this study was no exception. The very nature of the measuring instrument relied on the respondent to self report their attitudes and perceptions. It may be questionable whether respondents have completed the questionnaire accurately. They may have responded erroneously to the queries. However, the likelihood of this was diminished by presenting instructions for the correct method of responding. In addition, respondents may have reported attitudes they wish to be seen as holding (e.g. non-stereotypical) rather than the actual perception on which their behaviour is based. However, the anonymity of the survey should have minimized this effect.

The use of a mail survey represented another weakness of the proposed research through low response rates. Mailed questionnaires typically elicit lower response rates than other methods, such as, personal interviews. However, reasonable efforts were made to encourage completion of the questionnaire. Personal interviews could not have achieved the same level of anonymity as the mail survey, thus further lowering the response rate.

With this consideration, a mailed questionnaire seemed to be the best means of measuring attitudes.

The nature of the study requested that respondents record their own perceptions based on a single cue, country of origin. This can be considered a weakness of this study because single cue studies have been shown to overstate the effects of PCI compared to multi cue studies (Lim, Darley, Summers 1994 and Peterson and Jolibert 1995). Although the PCI effects are overstated in a single cue environment, they are real. Therefore, the isolated condition, associated with single cue studies, may have been an ideal situation to test the proposed PCI model.

9. IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

The results of this study can have far reaching implications for NAFTA related policy makers, practitioners of international marketing, and academics studying marketing concepts.

9.1 Implications for Policy Makers

Policy makers implement procedures and programs which are designed to regulate and monitor international trade flows. Planners are also interested in encouraging a healthy commercial climate within their domestic boundaries while promoting their constituencies' products abroad. This research has different implications for NAFTA country policy makers depending on the country they represent.

9.1.1 *Canadian Planners*

The policy makers of Canada can implement the findings of this study in three ways. First, they should actively assist in leveraging Canada's perceived social strengths by supporting business related interactions among the country's retail buyers and vendors. The PCI model suggests that positive direct and indirect relationships exist between the human interaction and the intention to buy goods from a supplier. Therefore, supporting commercial forums is a key method for Canadian policy makers to promote their domestic vendors. Second, Canada's strong product quality perception can be entrenched through the development of product standards. The Canadian standards may be used as a

promotional tool to encourage the acquisition of Canadian products. Third, policy makers should support research and development activities for Canada's infrastructure to maintain the country's competitive cost position. The efficiency of the infrastructure systems currently deliver a cost advantage to the country's vendors.

9.1.2 American Planners

This research project also has implications for American policy makers. Canadian retail buyers currently hold favourable perceptions of the United States as a country where innovation abounds through its products. Since the results of the PCI model suggest that product image is important to purchase intentions, then a goal of American planners should be to sustain the positive aspects of their image and invest in further developments. The PCI model also suggests that the human dimension is important for American companies to secure deals with Canadian retail buyers. Therefore, American planners should be involved with establishing conventions or conferences where American vendors can increase their exposure to Canadian retail buyers.

9.1.3 Mexican Planners

Mexican policy makers must account for the poor perceptions of their country in the minds of Canadian retail buyers and design policies to improve the country's image. Mexico currently has a comfort zone with Canadian retail buyers, over Chile and Argentina, derived from the perceived "alignment with Canada", the Canadian retail buyers' "knowledge of Mexico", "knowledge of Mexican products", and the retail buyers'

“willingness to buy”. Mexico also holds a perceived cost advantage over Chile and Argentina. These advantages may quickly erode once Chile and Argentina become signatories to the NAFTA. Mexico must act swiftly to improve its overall image with Canadian retail buyers. This can be done by leveraging the comfort zone during trade conferences and conventions to increase commercial relationships. A second focus of Mexican planners should be to improve their infrastructure. They naturally hold an advantage over Chile and Argentina in geographic proximity, therefore, efficiency of moving product to Canada through the Mexican infrastructure should be easier to obtain.

9.1.4 Chilean Planners

The policy makers of Chile must acknowledge the perceived weaknesses of their country in the Canadian retail buyer market. They have two options to remedy their poor image. First, the planners may want to focus on improving their business image and the relative poor standing it received. Since, the country was seen poorly in communication terms, the government should support trade missions, conferences, or other methods of increasing business related contacts with Canadian retail buyers.

Second, Chilean officials may wish to co-operate with Argentine planners to promote both countries to the Canadian retail buyer. Since many of the unfavourable views are similar for Argentina and Chile, planners should strive to portray their countries in a consistent and similar manner. Both nations are viewed more positively than Mexico in terms of economic and production aspects. This image can be promoted in cooperative campaigns

designed around a South American image to increase trade from these countries to Canada. However, this option has the potential drawback of alienating the countries during negotiations for expanding the NAFTA and limits the effectiveness of the countries' proprietary images.

9.1.5 Argentine Planners

Argentine policy makers also have two courses of action similar to those available to Chile. First, the poor product image may be the focus of planning efforts by financially supporting the promotion and export of high quality goods to Canada. This is important as the results of the PCI model demonstrated that the product image is related to purchase intentions. Second, these officials may join a co-operative venture with Chile to promote the strengths of the South American image.

9.2 Implications for Marketers

Practitioners in the marketplace are interested in quantitative results which can help develop strategies to leverage their unique selling propositions. The findings of this research project have different implications depending on the vendor's nationality. The differing perception profiles of the countries and their different performance in the model testing generates a dissimilar impact on marketing.

9.2.1 *Canadian Practitioners*

Canada holds a positive image with Canadian retail buyers involving social characteristics, product quality, and logistical abilities. These advantages can be used by Canadian marketers to position their products. The social image coupled with geographic proximity to Canadian buyers will assist Canadian marketers in the development and maintenance of business relationships. Although American suppliers are perceived as a strong economic and production oriented nation with innovative products, the perceived product quality strengths of Canadian products bode well for a premium product positioning strategy. Canadian goods also made retailers most proud to offer to customers, making it easier to launch in-store or co-operative promotions. In addition, Canadian vendors hold a competitive advantage with the perception that they are the most favourable in terms of logistical capabilities. Marketers can protect this advantage by improving electronic customer ordering and inventory controls, forecasting of demand, and maintaining efficiency in order processes.

9.2.2 American Practitioners

Vendors from the United States are fortunate because Canadian retail buyers hold a favourable view of the country and believe it is a provider of innovative products. This image provides a good basis for American marketers to position their products as premium offerings. This strategy likely places Canadian and American marketers in direct competition. However, the favourable views of managerial and negotiation skills may be a competitive advantage for American vendors closing deals with Canadian retail buyers.

The results of the PCI model analysis demonstrated that human relationships are important to Canadian retail buyers in their consideration of American products. There is a direct and positive relationship with buying intentions. Therefore, meetings with the retail buyers and attending trade shows will both be important activities for American vendors attempting to sell into Canada. The service aspects were also found to have an indirect relationship with the buying motivation. Therefore, American marketers will want to ensure and communicate that they can deliver products in a timely manner, resolve problems quickly, customize products and orders, and maintain high overall service conditions.

9.2.3 Mexican Practitioners

Marketers from Mexico can utilize the findings of the model analysis to form their marketing strategies. The complexity of the Mexican model provides Mexican marketers with multiple options in their strategies. Whatever strategies are adopted, they must be

well coordinated. Canadian retail buyers' purchase intentions of Mexican goods are directly related to profitability, service, and human relations. These model relationships are weak, but are significant. Therefore, it would be most effective to focus on building human relationships which are directly and indirectly related to buying intentions.

Mexican marketers should capitalize on their geographic proximity to Canada and attend trade shows frequently. Their close proximity to Canada will likely be their best defense against competition from Chile and Argentina. Mexican companies can leverage their location by improving their image in terms of supplier services.

9.2.4 Argentine and Chilean Practitioners

The implications for marketers from Argentina and Chile are very similar. To combat an overall poor perception on country, product, and business attributes, Argentine and Chilean marketers can pursue two different strategies. First, the South American vendors can position their products and bundle services through Canadian resellers or private branding houses. This strategy would avoid the negative implication of Chilean and Argentine goods by identifying the product with Canadian firms. The products would then be leveraging the image of Canada. Non-disclosure or limited disclosure of the origin to the retail buyer may circumvent the unfavourable perceptions normally tied to their products.

Alternatively, Argentine and Chilean marketers could position their products in accordance to their individual perceived strengths. However, they may wish to target a

select group of retailers with strong consumer images to act as distributors. Trialability initiatives and warranty programs might also improve the willingness of retail buyers to purchase Argentine and Chilean products by reducing the perceived risks. Rebates to the consumer may also help by providing some market pull for the product, increasing the sourcing requirements and the desire of retail buyers. Although this action may encourage a “cheap” image, increases in marketshare might provide the opportunity to improve overall country images. The maintenance of human contact and interaction will be the key to success for selling to Canadian retail buyers. This can be accomplished with frequent meetings, attendance at trade shows, and visiting the customer’s premises.

9.3 Implications for Future Research

The findings of this research are also important to academics for PCI research, South American images, and the perceptions of trading blocs. Researchers are interested in understanding phenomena and furthering the basis of human knowledge. The accepted PCI model for Canadian retail buyers did not present a strong link between the country beliefs and the buying decision process. Further modeling research should be encouraged in this area with different sampling frames to include retail buyers from other nations to compare results to this study. It is possible that buyers in different countries will show a distinct manifestation of the PCI effects. It may also prove fruitful to examine a PCI model with additional sample groups to include other professional buying groups.

The findings of this project highlighted that Canadian retail buyers perceive the existence of a South American image which encompasses Argentina and Chile. Both countries had consistently similar country, product, and business profiles. Mexico was also perceived as similar, but had more distinguishing attributes which separated it slightly from this group. Further research should be done to understand this regional image and discover differentiating perceptions for Argentina and Chile.

There are other opportunities to study images and trading blocs. Some research may be directed at understanding image groupings within the trading bloc and how those images change as new members join. A longitudinal study could fill this research niche. Another opportunity exists with the examination of the attitudes toward NAFTA countries from countries outside the agreement. This is important knowledge because these attitudes may affect the international trade of a NAFTA country with external countries.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, Sadrudin A. and Alain d'Astous (1995), "Country-of-Origin Effects in the Context of NAFTA: The Case of Chile"
- Ahmed, Sadrudin A. and Alain d'Astous (1993), "Evaluation of Country-of-Design and Country-of-Assemble in a Multi-Cue/Multi-National Context," *European Advances in Consumer Research*, 1, 214-221.
- Ahmed, Sadrudin A., Alain d'Astous, and Mostafa El Adraoui (1994), "Country -of-Origin Effects on Purchasing Managers' Product Perceptions", *Industrial Marketing Management*, 23 (4), 323-332.
- Ahmed, Sadrudin A., Alain d'Astous, and Jose Rojas Mendez (1995), "Country of Origin Effects in the Export Markets: Implications for Mexican Exporters," *Working Paper 95-18*, ISSN 0701-3086.
- Alden, Dana L., Wayne D. Hoyer, and Ayn E. Crowley (1993), "Country-of-Origin, Perceived Risk and Evaluation Strategy," in Leigh McAlister and Michael Rothchild (eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research*, Provo, Utah: Association for Consumer Research, 20, 678-683.
- Alessi, Richard J. (1995), "Doing Business in Mexico: Understanding Key Cultural and Social Customs Will Help You Put Your Best Foot Forward," *Association Management*, 47 (1), 54.
- Atkins, Virginia T. and Martha C. Jenkins (1988), "Imported Versus U.S.-Produced Ladies' Sportswear: Retail Buyers' Attitudes and Practices," *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 6 (3), 65-72.
- Bamossey, Gary J. and Nicolas Papadopoulos (1987a), "Nationality Stereotyping and Shifting Perceptions: Methodological Issues in the Measurement of the Country of Origin Construct," in Peter Leeflang and Marshall Rice (eds.), *Contemporary Research in Marketing*, Proceedings of the XVIth Annual Conference of the European Marketing Academy, Toronto, k59-k70.
- Bamossey, Gary J. and Nicolas Papadopoulos (1987b), "An Assessment of Reliability for Product Evaluation Scales Used in Country of Origin Research," in K.D. Bahn and M.J. Sirgy (eds.), *Proceedings, Third World Marketing Congress*, (Barcelona: Academy of Marketing Science; August) 135-142.

- Becker, Thomas and Robert Lenberg (1990), "Correlates of Competitive Export Performance: How Top U.S. Exporters Adapt to Change in Latin America," *Journal of Global Marketing*, 3 (4), 83-93.
- Bennett, David (1991), "Canadian Consumer Evaluations of European Countries and Their Products", Unpublished M.M.S. Thesis, Carleton University.
- Bilkey, Warren and Erik Nes (1982), "Country-of-Origin Effects on Product Evaluations," *Journal of International Business Studies*, 8(1), Spring/Summer, 89-99.
- Brewer, Geoffrey (1994), "New World Orders," *Sales and Marketing Management*, 146 (1), 59-63.
- Brislin, Richard (1970), "Back Translation For Cross-Cultural Research," *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1 (3), 185-216.
- Brown, Stephen and Steve Burt (1992), "Retail Marketing: International Perspectives - Introduction," *European Journal of Marketing*, 26 (8/9), 5-7.
- Buriel, Raymond and Richard Vasquez (1982), "Stereotypes of Mexican Descent Persons: Attitudes of Three Generations of Mexican Americans and Anglo-American Adolescents," *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 13 (1), 59-70.
- Cravens, David (1981), "An Examination of the Patronage Decision in Organizational Buying," in Robert Lusch and William Darden (eds.), *Retail Patronage Theory*, Workshop Proceedings, Lake Placid, New York, May 14-17, 6-13.
- Crosby, Richard (1969), "Attitude Measurement in a Bilingual Culture," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 6 (November), 421-26.
- Crow, Lowell E., Richard W. Olshavsky, and John O. Summers (1980), "Industrial Buyers Choice Strategies: A Protocol Analysis," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17 (1), 34-44.
- D'Souza, Ritoo (1993), "The Canadian Investment Climate: Foreign Investors' Experiences and Perceptions", Unpublished MMS Thesis, Carleton University.
- Dawar, Niraj and Philip Parker (1994), "Marketing Universals: Consumers' Use of Brand Name, Price, Physical Appearance, and Retailer Reputation as Signals of Product Quality," *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (2), 81-95.
- Dillman, Don (1978), *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method*, Toronto: John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- Economic Intelligence Unit (1995), "Business Outlook - Argentina," *Business Latin America*, July 17, 1995, 4.

Engel, James, Roger Blackwell, and Paul Miniard (1993), *Consumer Behavior*, Seventh Edition, The Dryden Press.

Ettenson, Richard and Janet Wagner (1986), "Retail Buyers' Saleability Judgments: A Comparison of Information Use Across Three Levels of Experience," *Journal of Retailing*, 6 (1), 41-63.

Ettenson, Richard, Janet Wagner, and Gary Gaeth (1988), "Evaluating the Effect of Country of Origin and 'Made in the USA' Campaign: A Conjoint Approach," *Journal of Retailing*, 64 (1), 85-100.

Financial Post (1995), "Columbia, Argentina next up for NAFTA?," August 22, 43.

Fornell, Claes (1984), "A Second Generation of Multivariate Analysis: Classification of Methods and Implications For Marketing Research," *University of Michigan Working Paper*, April, 1-43.

Fornell, Claes and Fred Bookstein (1982), "Two Structural Equation Models: LISREL and PLS Applied to Consumer Exit-Voice Theory," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19 (November), 440-52.

Forsythe, S.M. (1993), "Marketing Alabama Apparel Products in Mexico," *Highlights of Agricultural Research*, 40 (4), 6.

Fraser, Dave (1994), "Opportunities For Doing Business in Mexico," *Draft Article*, Deloitte and Touche Management Consultants, Toronto.

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

Ganitsky, Joseph (1989), "Environmental Assessment and Marketing Plans of Leading Domestic and Foreign Firms Operating in Latin America," *Journal of Global Marketing*, 2 (3), 19-45.

Gilly, Mary (1988), "Sex Roles in Advertising: A Comparison of Television Advertisements in Australia, Mexico, and the United States," *Journal of Marketing*, 52 (April), 75-85.

Government of Canada (1992), "Doing Business With Mexican Firms: Inter-Cultural Issues in Trade Development," *Mexico Market Profile*, Canadian Embassy, Mexico.

Government of Canada (1997), "Pocket Facts," Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

Government of Canada (1997), "Canada-Chile Free Trade Agreement," Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

Grewal, Dhruv and Julie Baker (1994), "Do Retail Store Environmental Factors Affect Consumers' Price Acceptability? An Empirical Examination," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 11 (2), 107-115.

Grosse, Robert and Walter Zinn (1990), "Standardization in International Marketing: The Latin American Case," *Journal of Global Marketing*, 4(1), 53-77.

Hakansson, Hakan and Bjorn Wootz (1975), "Supplier Selection in an International Environment - An Experimental Study," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 12 (1), 46-51.

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

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

Harris, Catherine (1995), "Chile in NAFTA may be a Non-Starter For Now," *The Financial Post*, Saturday, October 7, 1995, 30.

Hart, Stanley, Scott Roberts, and Francisco Valderrey (1994), "A Comparison of Television Advertisements Aimed at the General U.S. Market, the U.S. Hispanic Market, and the Mexican Market in Mexico: An Exploratory Study," in Elizabeth J. Wilson and William C. Black, eds., *Development in Marketing Science*, Academy of Marketing Science, 17, 88-91.

Herbig, Paul and Ken Day (1993), "Managerial Implications of the North American Free Trade Agreement," *International Marketing Review*, 10 (4), 15-35.

Heslop, Louise and Nicolas Papadopoulos (1993), "'But Who Knows Where or When': Reflections on the Images of Countries and Their Products," in Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise Heslop (eds.), Product-Country Images: Impact and Role in International Marketing, Binghamton, NY: International Business Press, 39-75.

Hirschman, Elizabeth (1981), "An Exploratory Comparison of Decision Criteria Used by Retail Buyers," in Robert Lusch and William Darden (eds.), Retail Patronage Theory, Workshop Proceedings, Lake Placid, New York, May 14-17, 1-5.

Howard, John and Jagdish Sheth (1969), *The Theory of Buyer Behavior*, John Wiley and Sons Inc., Toronto, 24-49.

Johansson, Johnny K. And I.D. Nebenzahl (1987), "Country-of-Origin, Social Norms and Behavioral Intentions," in Tamer S. Cavusgil, ed., *Advances in International Marketing*, 2, 65-79.

Johansson, Johnny K., Susan P. Douglas, and Ikujiro Nonaka (1985), "Assessing the Impact of Country of Origin on Product Evaluations: A New Methodological Perspective," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 22 (November), 388-396.

Kiecker, Pamela and Dale F. Duhan (1992), "The Influence of Origin Evaluation and Origin Identification on Retail Sales," *American Marketing Association Educators' Proceedings*, Summer, 27.

Labrie, Marie-Helene, Jan Propeck, and Rolando Arellano (1994), "The Mutual Perceptions of Canadian and Mexican Business People Within the North American Market," in Jean-Claude Cosset ed., *International Business*, Proceedings of the International Business Division, Administrative Sciences Association of Canada, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 48-57.

Leshner Taylor, Ruth A. (1984), "Do Retail Buyers Short-Circuit Profit-Making Items in the Apparel Industry," in Michael R. Solomon (ed.), *The Psychology of Fashion*, Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 143-153.

Liefeld, John, Louise Heslop, and Marjorie Wall (1994), "The Effects of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Cues and Consumer Characteristics on Product Evaluations and Choice: U.S. Consumers," in Brock Smith ed., *Marketing*, Proceedings of the Marketing Division, Administrative Science Association of Canada, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Lim, Jeen-Su, William K. Darley, and John O. Summers (1994), "An Assessment of Country of Origin Effects Under Alternative Presentation Formats," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22 (3), 274-282.

McKenna, Barrie (1996), "Canada, Chile Open Bilateral Trade Talks: U.S. not at Table in NAFTA Overture," *Globe and Mail*, Wednesday, January 24, 1996, B2.

Martinez, Jon, John Quelch, and Joseph Ganitsky (1992), "Don't Forget Latin America," *Sloan Management Review*, 33(2), Winter, 78-92.

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

Nagashima, Akira (1977), "A Comparative 'Made In' Product Image Survey Among Japanese Businessmen," *Journal of Marketing*, 41 (July), 95-100.

Nes, Erik and Warren J. Bilkey (1993), "A Multi-Cue Test of Country-of-Origin Theory", in Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise Heslop (eds.), Product-Country Images: Impact and Role in International Marketing, Binghamton, NY: International Business Press, 179-195.

Niffenegger, Phillip, John White, and Guy Marmet (1982), "How European Retailers View American Imported Products: Results of a Product Image Survey," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 10 (3), 281-299.

Papadopoulos, Nicolas (1993), "What Product and Country Images Are and Are Not", in Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise Heslop (eds.), Product-Country Images: Impact and Role in International Marketing, Binghamton, NY: International Business Press, 3-38.

Papadopoulos, Nicolas and Louise Heslop (1986), "The Effect of Travel on Product and Country Images," In T.E. Muller (ed.), Marketing, Proceedings of the Marketing Division, Administrative Sciences Association of Canada, Whistler, B.C., 7 (3), 191-200.

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

Papadopoulos, Nicolas, Judith Marshall, Louise Heslop, G. Avlonitis, F. Gliemel, and F. Graby (1988), "Strategic Implications of Product and Country Images: A Modelling Approach," *The 41st E.S.O.M.A.R. Marketing Research Congress*, Lisbon, September 4-8, 69-90.

Peris, Salvador Miquel, Karin Newman, Enrique Bigne, and Bal Chansarkar (1993), "Aspects of Anglo-Spanish Perceptions and Product Preferences Arising From 'Country of Origin' Image," *International Journal of Advertising*, 12 (2), 131-142.

Peterson, Robert and Alian Jolibert (1995), "A Meta-Analysis of Country-of-Origin Effects," *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26 (4), 883-900.

Richardson, Helen (1994), "Mexico: Target a Growing Market," *Transportation and Distribution*, 35 (11), 65-70.

Roth, Martin S. and Jean B. Romeo (1992), "Matching Product Category and Country Image Perceptions: A Framework for Managing Country-of-Origin Effects," *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23 (3), 477-497.

Roussel, Philip (1993), "Exporting in Mexico," *Twin Plant News*, 9 (5), 81.

Scott, William A. (1965), "Psychological and Social Correlates of International Images," in H.C. Kelman (ed.), National and International Images, New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 71-103.

- Sheth, Jagdish (1973), "A Model of Industrial Buyer Behavior," *Journal of Marketing*, 37 (4), 50-56.
- Sommers, Montrose, James Barnes, William Stanton, Michael Etzel and Bruce Walker (1992), *Fundamentals of Marketing*, Sixth Edition, McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited.
- Statistics Canada (1994), "Annual Retail Trade - 1992", September 1994, 2-6
- Sternquist, Brenda (1993), "Gatekeepers of Consumer Choice: A Four Country Comparison of Retail Buyers," Paper Completed for Montreal International Symposium of Retailing, 1-24.
- Szamosi, Leslie (1995), "Eastern Europe and Product Country Images: Analysis of Canadian, American and Australian Consumer Preferences," Unpublished M.M.S. Thesis, Carleton University.
- Tansey, Richard, Michael Hyman, and George Zinkhan (1990), "Cultural Themes in Brazilian and U.S. Auto Ads: A Cross-Cultural Comparison," *Journal of Advertising*, 19 (2), 30-39.
- Thomas, D. Roland (1983), "Univariate Repeated Measures Techniques Applied to Multivariate Data", *Psychometrika*, 48 (3), 451-464.
- Thorelli, Hans B., Jeen-Su Lim, Jongsuk Ye (1989), "Relative Importance of Country of Origin, Warranty and Retail Store Image on Product Evaluations," *International Marketing Review*, 6 (1), 35-46.
- Wagner, Janet, Richard Ettenson, and Jean Parrish (1989), "Retail Buyers: An Analysis by Merchandise Division," *Journal of Retailing*, 65 (1), 58-79.
- Wall, Marjorie and Louise Heslop (1986), "Consumer Attitudes Toward Canadian-Made Versus Imported Products," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 14 (2), 27-36.
- Wall, Marjorie, John Liefeld, and Louise Heslop (1989), "Impact of Country-of-Origin Cues and Patriotic Appeals on Consumer Judgements: Covariance Analysis," (Montreal, Que.: Administrative Sciences Association of Canada) 10, 306-315.
- Wall, Marjorie, John Liefeld, and Louise 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*, 19 (2), Spring, 105-113.
- Wall, Marjorie, Louise Heslop, and Greta Hofstra (1990), "Imported vs. Domestic Car Owners: Demographic Characteristics and Attitudes," (Whistler, B.C.: Administrative Sciences Association of Canada).

Wall, Marjorie, Monty Sommers, and Anne Wilcock (1994), "The Retail Buying of Fashion Goods: Underlying Themes of the Sourcing Process," The Retail Buying of Fashion Goods, Routledge, 177-193.

Wind, Yoram, Paul E. Green, and Patrick J. Robinson (1968), "The Determinants of Vendor Selection: The Evaluation Function Approach," *Journal of Purchasing*, 4 (August), 29-41.

Williams, Patricia (1994), "Mexico: Welcome to the Land of Armani and Laptops," *Daily Commercial News*, 67 (217), A1,A7.

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

Appendix A - Questionnaire

The questionnaire has been slightly modified to meet thesis formatting requirements

INTERNATIONAL TRADE: THE QUALITY OF PRODUCTS FROM FOREIGN NATIONS

May 6, 1996

Dear Respondent,

The retail buyer's marketplace has become very complex in recent years. Buying decisions are more difficult because many products are available from sources anywhere in the world. Buyers must make the appropriate purchases to satisfy the needs of consumers and protect the firm's bottom line.

We are presently conducting a study on retail buyers' views of products produced in foreign countries. This study is part of a larger project, funded by the federal government, to examine Canadian Global Competitiveness. Specifically, we are interested in your perceptions of current NAFTA countries (Canada, U.S., Mexico), tentative NAFTA member countries (Chile, Argentina) and the products made in those countries. This information is important to many groups including businesses, marketers, and consumers. The results of this study will be distributed to government and industry policy makers.

This study requires participation of all respondents to ensure a representative sample of your profession. We would appreciate your taking the time to fill in this questionnaire. It should take you approximately 20 minutes to answer all the questions. When you have completed the questionnaire, please seal it in the enclosed envelope (postage pre-paid) and mail it back to us.

We also ask that you fill in the reply card and mail it separately to acknowledge that you have completed and returned the survey. Please indicate whether you would like us to provide you with a summary of our findings once the analysis is complete.

You can be assured that your answers will be completely confidential. Your name does NOT appear on the questionnaire or the envelope you are sending back. We will aggregate answers from all

respondents and all reports will deal with aggregated data only. Individual responses will NOT be identified.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Dr. Louise Heslop
Professor of Marketing

Dr. Nicolas Papadopoulos
Professor of International Business

School of Business, Carleton University
1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6
(613) 788-2600, ext. 2388
fax: (613) 788-2532

P.S. We know your time is valuable and we cannot compensate you fully or directly for it. However, we have enclosed \$2 and invite you to have a "coffee on us" while you complete the questionnaire.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE: THE QUALITY OF PRODUCTS FROM FOREIGN NATIONS

Section I. The Countries' Products

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

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

EXAMPLES:

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

Innovativeness low : X : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : high

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

Innovativeness low : _ : _ : X : _ : _ : _ : high

IMPORTANT NOTES

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

Example:

THIS

Innovativeness low : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : high

NOT THIS

Innovativeness low : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : high

REMEMBER,

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

How would you describe each of the following?

Products made in Argentina:

Quality	Low	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	High
Value	Low	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	High
Conformance to specifications	Low	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	High
Workmanship	Poor	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	Good
Defects in merchandise	Few	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	Many
Sell well to my customers	Never	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	Always
Attractiveness	Low	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	High
Variety	Low	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	High
Innovativeness	Low	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	High
Brand names	Well-known	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	Unknown
Wholesale Cost	Low	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	High
Durability	Low	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _	High

Technology level	Low	_____	High
Reliability	Low	_____	High
Knowledge of Argentine products	Low	_____	High
Overall satisfaction	Low	_____	High
Ease of finding	Easy	_____	Difficult
Willingness to buy	Low	_____	High
Pride in offering to customers	Low	_____	High

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

Poor _____ Good

Argentine Supplier's Service:

On time delivery	Never	_____	Always
Lead times for delivery	Short	_____	Long
Minimum order size	Small	_____	Large
Ease of re-ordering	Easy	_____	Difficult
Return policies	Reasonable	_____	Unreasonable
Cost of returning goods	Low	_____	High
Speed of resolving problems	Slow	_____	Fast
Obtaining credit from suppliers	Easy	_____	Difficult
Willingness to customize	Low	_____	High
Overall level of service	Low	_____	High

Profitability of Products from Argentina:

Retail price	Low	_____	High
Markup that can be obtained	Low	_____	High
Overall profitability	Low	_____	High
Transport costs	Low	_____	High
Duty costs	Low	_____	High
Payment terms	Poor	_____	Good
Foreign exchange costs	Low	_____	High
Price stability	Low	_____	High
Frequency of customer returns	Low	_____	High
Mark downs required to clear	Rarely	_____	Frequently
Overall cost of doing business	Low	_____	High
Turnover	Low	_____	High

Relationships with Argentine Suppliers:

Cost of communications	Low	_____	High
Ease of communicating	Easy	_____	Difficult
Communication in your first language	Rarely	_____	Frequently
Similarity of business styles	Low	_____	High
Market orientation of vendors	Low	_____	High
Receptivity to new products, ideas	Low	_____	High
Their skills as managers	Low	_____	High
Their skills as negotiators	Low	_____	High
Ease of doing business with them	Low	_____	High
Willingness to do business with them	Low	_____	High

Compared to doing business with suppliers in other countries, how would you rate doing business with suppliers in Argentina?

Poor _____ Good

How would you describe each of the following?

Products made in Canada:

Quality	Low		High
Value	Low		High
Conformance to specifications	Low		High
Workmanship	Poor		Good
Defects in merchandise	Few		Many
Sell well to my customers	Never		Always
Attractiveness	Low		High
Variety	Low		High
Innovativeness	Low		High
Brand names	Well-known		Unknown
Wholesale price level	Low		High
Durability	Low		High
Technology level	Low		High
Reliability	Low		High
Knowledge of Canadian products	Low		High
Overall satisfaction	Low		High
Ease of finding	Easy		Difficult
Willingness to buy	Low		High
Pride in offering to customers	Low		High

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

Poor _____ Good

Canadian Supplier's Service:

On time delivery	Never		Always
Lead times for delivery	Short		Long
Minimum order size	Small		Large
Ease of re-ordering	Easy		Difficult
Return policies	Reasonable		Unreasonable
Cost of returning goods	Low		High
Speed of resolving problems	Slow		Fast
Obtaining credit from suppliers	Easy		Difficult
Willingness to customize	Low		High
Overall level of service	Low		High

Profitability of Products from Canada:

Retail price	Low		High
Markup that can be obtained	Low		High
Overall profitability	Low		High
Transport costs	Low		High
Duty costs	Low		High
Payment terms	Poor		Good
Foreign exchange costs	Low		High
Price stability	Low		High
Frequency of customer returns	Low		High
Mark downs required to clear	Rarely		Frequently
Overall cost of doing business	Low		High
Turnover	Low		High

Relationships with Canadian Suppliers:

Cost of communications	Low		High
Ease of communicating	Easy		Difficult

Communication in your first language	Rarely		Frequently
Similarity of business styles	Low		High
Market orientation of vendors	Low		High
Receptivity to new products, ideas	Low		High
Their skills as managers	Low		High
Their skills as negotiators	Low		High
Ease of doing business with them	Low		High
Willingness to do business with them	Low		High
Compared to doing business with suppliers in other countries, how would you rate doing business with suppliers in Canada?	Poor		Good

How would you describe each of the following?

Products made in Chile:

Quality	Low		High
Value	Low		High
Conformance to specifications	Low		High
Workmanship	Poor		Good
Defects in merchandise	Few		Many
Sell well to my customers	Never		Always
Attractiveness	Low		High
Variety	Low		High
Innovativeness	Low		High
Brand names	Well-known		Unknown
Wholesale price level	Low		High
Durability	Low		High
Technology level	Low		High
Reliability	Low		High
Knowledge of Chilean products	Low		High
Overall satisfaction	Low		High
Ease of finding	Easy		Difficult
Willingness to buy	Low		High
Pride in offering to customers	Low		High

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

Poor

Good

Chilean Supplier's Service:

On time delivery	Never		Always
Lead times for delivery	Short		Long
Minimum order size	Small		Large
Ease of re-ordering	Easy		Difficult
Return policies	Reasonable		Unreasonable
Cost of returning goods	Low		High
Speed of resolving problems	Slow		Fast
Obtaining credit from suppliers	Easy		Difficult
Willingness to customize	Low		High
Overall level of service	Low		High

Profitability of Products from Chile:

Retail price	Low		High
Markup that can be obtained	Low		High

Overall profitability	Low	_____	High
Transport costs	Low	_____	High
Duty costs	Low	_____	High
Payment terms	Poor	_____	Good
Foreign exchange costs	Low	_____	High
Price stability	Low	_____	High
Frequency of customer returns	Low	_____	High
Mark downs required to clear	Rarely	_____	Frequently
Overall cost of doing business	Low	_____	High
Turnover	Low	_____	High

Relationships with Chilean Suppliers:

Cost of communications	Low	_____	High
Ease of communicating	Easy	_____	Difficult
Communication in your first language	Rarely	_____	Frequently
Similarity of business styles	Low	_____	High
Market orientation of vendors	Low	_____	High
Receptivity to new products, ideas	Low	_____	High
Their skills as managers	Low	_____	High
Their skills as negotiators	Low	_____	High
Ease of doing business with them	Low	_____	High
Willingness to do business with them	Low	_____	High

Compared to doing business with suppliers in other countries, how would you rate doing business with suppliers in Chile?

Poor	_____	Good
------	-------	------

How would you describe each of the following?

Products made in Mexico:

Quality	Low	_____	High
Value	Low	_____	High
Conformance to specifications	Low	_____	High
Workmanship	Poor	_____	Good
Defects in merchandise	Few	_____	Many
Sell well to my customers	Never	_____	Always
Attractiveness	Low	_____	High
Variety	Low	_____	High
Innovativeness	Low	_____	High
Brand names	Well-known	_____	Unknown
Wholesale price level	Low	_____	High
Durability	Low	_____	High
Technology level	Low	_____	High
Reliability	Low	_____	High
Your knowledge of Mexican products	Low	_____	High
Overall satisfaction	Low	_____	High
Ease of finding	Easy	_____	Difficult
Willingness to buy	Low	_____	High
Pride in offering to customers	Low	_____	High

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

Poor	_____	Good
------	-------	------

Mexican Supplier's Service:

On time delivery	Never		Always
Lead times for delivery	Short		Long
Minimum order size	Small		Large
Ease of re-ordering	Easy		Difficult
Return policies	Reasonable		Unreasonable
Cost of returning goods	Low		High
Speed of resolving problems	Slow		Fast
Obtaining credit from suppliers	Easy		Difficult
Willingness to customize	Low		High
Overall level of service	Low		High

Profitability of Products from Mexico:

Retail price	Low		High
Markup that can be obtained	Low		High
Overall profitability	Low		High
Transport costs	Low		High
Duty costs	Low		High
Payment terms	Poor		Good
Foreign exchange costs	Low		High
Price stability	Low		High
Frequency of customer returns	Low		High
Mark downs required to clear	Rarely		Frequently
Overall cost of doing business	Low		High
Turnover	Low		High

Relationships with Mexican Suppliers:

Cost of communications	Low		High
Ease of communicating	Easy		Difficult
Communication in your first language	Rarely		Frequently
Similarity of business styles	Low		High
Market orientation of suppliers	Low		High
Receptivity to new products, ideas	Low		High
Their skills as managers	Low		High
Their skills as negotiators	Low		High
Ease of doing business with them	Low		High
Willingness to do business with them	Low		High

Compared to doing business with suppliers in other countries, how would you rate doing business with suppliers in Mexico?

Poor

Good

How would you describe each of the following?

Products made in the U.S.A.:

Quality	Low		High
Value	Low		High
Conformance to specifications	Low		High
Workmanship	Poor		Good
Defects in merchandise	Few		Many
Sell well to my customers	Never		Always
Attractiveness	Low		High
Variety	Low		High
Innovativeness	Low		High
Brand names	Well-known		Unknown
Wholesale price level	Low		High

Durability	Low		High
Technology level	Low		High
Reliability	Low		High
Knowledge of American products	Low		High
Overall satisfaction	Low		High
Ease of finding	Easy		Difficult
Willingness to buy	Low		High
Pride in offering to customers	Low		High

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

Poor

Good

American Supplier's Service:

On time delivery	Never		Always
Lead times for delivery	Short		Long
Minimum order size	Small		Large
Ease of re-ordering	Easy		Difficult
Return policies	Reasonable		Unreasonable
Cost of returning goods	Low		High
Speed of resolving problems	Slow		Fast
Obtaining credit from suppliers	Easy		Difficult
Willingness to customize	Low		High
Overall level of service	Low		High

Profitability of Products from the U.S.A.:

Retail price	Low		High
Markup that can be obtained	Low		High
Overall profitability	Low		High
Transport costs	Low		High
Duty costs	Low		High
Payment terms	Poor		Good
Foreign exchange costs	Low		High
Price stability	Low		High
Frequency of customer returns	Low		High
Mark downs required to clear	Rarely		Frequently
Overall cost of doing business	Low		High
Turnover	Low		High

Relationships with American Suppliers:

Cost of communications	Low		High
Ease of communicating	Easy		Difficult
Communication in your first language	Rarely		Frequently
Similarity of business styles	Low		High
Market orientation of vendors	Low		High
Receptivity to new products, ideas	Low		High
Their skills as managers	Low		High
Their skills as negotiators	Low		High
Ease of doing business with them	Low		High
Willingness to do business with them	Low		High

Compared to doing business with suppliers in other countries, how would you rate doing business with suppliers in the U.S.?

Poor

Good

Section II. Countries and Their People

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

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

How would you describe the country and people of Argentina?

Likeability of people	Low	_____	High
Industriousness	Low	_____	High
Education level	Low	_____	High
Wealth	Poor	_____	Rich
Friendliness	Low	_____	High
Trustworthiness	Low	_____	High
Work ethic	Low	_____	High
Individualism	Low	_____	High
Political stability of country	Low	_____	High
Skill level of workers	Low	_____	High
Technology level of country	Low	_____	High
Stability of economy	Low	_____	High
Restrictions on doing business	Few	_____	Many
Labour costs	Low	_____	High
Availability of skilled workers	Low	_____	High
Quality of life	Low	_____	High
Role in World politics	Poor	_____	Good
Environmental/pollution controls	Few	_____	Many
Individual rights and freedoms	Few	_____	Many
Alignment with Canada	Weak	_____	Strong
Your knowledge of Argentina	Low	_____	High

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

Political and economic ties	Less	_____	More
Immigration from Argentina	Less	_____	More
Exports to Argentina	Less	_____	More
Imports from Argentina	Less	_____	More
Investments in Argentina	Less	_____	More
Investments from Argentina	Less	_____	More

How would you describe the country and people of Canada?

[illegible]

How would you describe the country and people of Chile?

[illegible]

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

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

How would you describe the country and people of Mexico?

Likeability of people	Low		High
Industriousness	Low		High
Education level	Low		High
Wealth	Poor		Rich
Friendliness	Low		High
Trustworthiness	Low		High
Work ethic	Low		High
Individualism	Low		High
Political stability of country	Low		High
Skill level of workers	Low		High
Technology level of country	Low		High
Stability of economy	Low		High
Restrictions on doing business	Few		Many
Labour costs	Low		High
Availability of skilled workers	Low		High
Quality of life	Low		High
Role in World politics	Poor		Good
Environmental/pollution controls	Few		Many
Individual rights and freedoms	Few		Many
Alignment with Canada	Weak		Strong
Your knowledge of Mexico	Low		High

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

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

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

Likeability of people	Low		High
Industriousness	Low		High
Education level	Low		High
Wealth	Poor		Rich
Friendliness	Low		High
Trustworthiness	Low		High
Work ethic	Low		High
Individualism	Low		High
Political stability of country	Low		High
Skill level of workers	Low		High

[illegible]

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

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

How would you assess your background with suppliers from:

Argentina:

I have done business with _____ Never Frequently
I plan to do business with _____ Never Frequently

Canada:

[illegible]

Chile:

I have done business with _____ Never _____ Frequently
I plan to do business with _____ Never _____ Frequently

Mexico:

I have done business with	Never	:	:	:	:	:	:	Frequently
I plan to do business with	Never	:	:	:	:	:	:	Frequently

United States:

I have done business with _____ Never _____ Frequently
I plan to do business with _____ Never _____ Frequently

This last section asks for some **background information** which will help us classify your answers. Please be assured that your responses are anonymous and will only be used to analyze the data statistically.

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

A. What is the legal form of ownership of your company?

☐ Sole Proprietorship	☐ Corporation-Private
☐ Partnership	☐ Corporation-Public

B. How would you classify your company?

☐ 3 or fewer specialty store(s)	☐ Chain department store
☐ Chain specialty stores (4 or more)	☐ Chain discount stores
☐ 3 or fewer general merchandise store	☐ Other (Please specify)

How many retail outlets does your company have? _____

C. How does your company organize its buying activities? (Please mark as many as apply)

- ☐ Each store does its own
- ☐ Centralized buying office (operated by your company)
- ☐ Group buying (independent retailers form an alliance to buy together)
- ☐ Contracted service

D. If a chain, are your stores:

- ☐ Regional only
- ☐ National only
- ☐ Multinational

E. What categories of consumer goods does your store sell? (Indicate the approximate percentage of total retail sales revenue derived annually from each category; TOTAL TO 100%)

Food	_____ %	Lamp / Lighting	_____ %
Furniture	_____ %	Appliances	_____ %
Home entertainment	_____ %	Bed / Bath / Kitchen	_____ %
Sporting goods	_____ %	Carpets / Floor coverings	_____ %
Footwear	_____ %	Building supplies	_____ %
Clothing	_____ %	Hardware	_____ %
Fabric / Yam / Upholstery	_____ %	Other (Specify) _____	_____ %

(TOTAL TO 100%)

F. Please indicate the approximate percentage of total retail sales revenue derived annually from goods from:

Domestic Sources	_____ %
Imported Sources	_____ %
TOTAL	100 %

Of the domestically sourced products, what percent is from each of the following?

Manufacturer direct	_____ %
Wholesalers _____ %	Wholesalers _____ %
Agents _____ %	Agents _____ %
Other _____	_____ %
TOTAL	
100 %	

Of the products you import, what percent is from each of the following?

Manufacturer direct	_____ %
_____ %	
_____ %	
Other _____	_____ %
100 %	TOTAL

G. Please indicate your company's approximate annual retail sales.

_____ Under \$1(million)
 _____ Between \$1.0 m and \$4.9 m
 _____ Between \$5.0 m and \$ 9.9 m
 _____ Between \$10.0 m and \$19.9 m
 _____ Between \$20.0 m and \$29.9 m
 _____ Between \$30.0 m and \$39.9 m
 _____ Between \$40.0 m and \$49.9 m
 _____ Between \$50.0 m and \$74.9 m
 _____ Between \$75.0 m and \$99.9 m
 _____ Between \$100.0 m and \$149.9 m
 _____ Between \$150.0 m and \$199.9 m
 _____ Between \$200.0 m and \$500.0 m
 _____ Over \$500 m

H. If you deal with suppliers / agents from outside Canada, please indicate the approximate percentage of purchases from:

USA	_____ %
Chile	_____ %
Mexico	_____ %
Argentina	_____ %
Europe	_____ %
Africa	_____ %
Asia	_____ %
South America (other)	_____ %
Central America (except Mexico)	_____ %
Other (Specify) _____	_____ %

TOTAL 100%

I. What was the estimated number of employees in your company as of January 1, 1995?

Full time employees _____

Contractual

Part-time employees _____

Other (specify) _____

YOUR TITLE _____

YOUR RESPONSIBILITY _____
(if unclear from title)

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS A BUYER _____

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

Your contribution to this effort is greatly appreciated.

THANK YOU!

COMMERCE INTERNATIONAL: LA QUALITÉ DES PRODUITS DES NATIONS ÉTRANGÈRES

Le 6 mai, 1996

Cher répondant,

Le commerce de détail est devenu très complexe au cours des années récentes. Les décisions relatives aux achats sont plus difficiles parce que de nombreux produits sont disponibles de diverses sources à l'échelle mondiale. Les acheteurs doivent faire les achats appropriés pour satisfaire les besoins des consommateurs et protéger les bénéfices de l'entreprise.

Nous faisons en ce moment une étude sur les opinions des acheteurs de détail sur les produits fabriqués dans des pays étrangers. Cette étude fait partie d'un projet plus vaste, financé par le gouvernement fédéral pour examiner la Compétitivité canadienne globale. Nous nous intéressons spécifiquement à vos perceptions des pays actuels de l'ALÉNA (Canada, É.-U., Mexique), aux membres possibles de l'ALÉNA (Chili, Argentine) et aux produits fabriqués dans ces pays. Cette information est importante pour plusieurs groupes, notamment pour les entreprises, les distributeurs et les consommateurs. Les résultats de cette étude seront distribués au gouvernement et aux décideurs de l'industrie.

L'étude exige la participation de tous les répondants pour assurer un échantillon représentatif de votre profession. Nous vous serions reconnaissants de prendre le temps de remplir ce questionnaire. Il faut environ 20 minutes pour répondre à toutes les questions. Une fois que vous aurez complété le questionnaire, veuillez le placer dans l'enveloppe affranchie ci-jointe et nous le retourner par la poste.

Nous vous demandons également de remplir la carte du répondant et de nous l'expédier séparément pour que nous sachions que vous avez complété et retourné le sondage. Veuillez indiquer si vous désirez recevoir un sommaire de nos résultats une fois que l'analyse sera complétée.

Soyez assuré que vos réponses seront entièrement confidentielles. Votre nom N'APPARAÎT PAS sur le questionnaire, ni sur l'enveloppe que vous retournez. Nous compilerons les réponses de tous les

répondants et tous les rapports porteront exclusivement sur des données compilées. Les réponses individuelles NE SERONT PAS identifiées.

Nous vous remercions de votre aide et vous prions d'agréer l'expression de nos sentiments distingués.

Dr. Louise Heslop
Professeur de marketing

Dr. Nicolas Papadopoulos
Professeur de commerce international

École de commerce, Université Carleton
1125, promenade Colonel By, Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6
(613) 788-2600, ext. 2388
télécopieur: (613) 788-2532

P.S. Nous savons que votre temps est précieux et qu'il ne nous est pas possible de vous rémunérer pleinement ou directement. Cependant, vous trouverez ci-joint la somme de \$2 et nous vous invitons à prendre un café à nos frais pendant que vous remplissez le questionnaire.

COMMERCE INTERNATIONAL: LA QUALITÉ DES PRODUITS DES NATIONS ÉTRANGÈRES

Section I. Les produits des pays

Cette section examine ce que vous pensez des produits (marchandises et services) de cinq pays: l'Argentine, le Canada, le Chili, le Mexique et les États-Unis. Ce sont vos opinions et vos sentiments sur ce que vous croyez pouvoir obtenir de ces pays qui nous intéressent. **Il n'est pas nécessaire d'avoir une connaissance approfondie de ces pays ou de leurs produits pour remplir ce questionnaire.**

Chaque page présente une liste d'échelles se rapportant à un pays différent. Pour remplir chaque échelle, il suffit de placer un "X" dans l'espace qui reflète le mieux votre opinion.

EXEMPLES:

Si le pays est le mieux décrit par ce qui apparaît à gauche,

Innovation basse : X : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : élevée

Si le pays n'est que peu associé à ce qui apparaît à gauche,

Innovation basse : _ : _ : X : _ : _ : _ : _ : élevée

NOTES IMPORTANTES

- Veuillez placer vos "X" au milieu des espaces fournis et non sur les lignes qui séparent les espaces.

Exemple:

CECI

Innovation basse : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : élevée

ET NON

Innovation basse : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : élevée

PRIÈRE DE NOTER:

- Il n'y a pas de "bonnes" ou de "mauvaises" réponses pour ces échelles.
- C'est votre première impression ou votre réaction immédiate qu'il faudrait noter.
- Vous devriez considérer chaque échelle comme séparée du reste et juger chaque pays indépendamment des autres.
- Veuillez vous rappeler de remplir chaque échelle pour chaque pays, sans en omettre.
- Il est sans importance que vous ayez eu ou pas une expérience personnelle du pays en question ou de ses produits.

Comment décririez-vous chacun des éléments suivants?

Produits fabriqués aux Argentine:

Qualité	Basse	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Élevée
Valeur	Basse	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Élevée
Conformité aux spécifications	Basse	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Élevée
Fabrication	Mauvaise	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Bonne
Défauts de fabrication	Peu nombreux	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Nombreux
Se vendent bien	Jamais	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Toujours
Esthétique	Basse	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Élevée
Variété	Basse	_ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Élevée

Innovation	Basse	_____	Élevée
Marques	Bien connues	_____	Inconnues
Prix de gros	Bas	_____	Élevé
Durabilité	Basse	_____	Élevée
Niveau de technologie	Bas	_____	Élevé
Fiabilité	Basse	_____	Élevée
Votre connaissance des produits argentines	Basse	_____	Élevée
Satisfaction globale	Basse	_____	Élevée
Facile à trouver	Facile	_____	Difficile
Disposition à acheter	Bas	_____	Élevé
Fierté à offrir aux clients	Basse	_____	Élevée

En comparaison aux produits de tout autre pays (pas seulement ceux qui font partie de ce questionnaire) quelle cote accorderiez-vous aux produits de l'Argentine?

	Faible	_____	Bonne
<u>Service des fournisseurs argentines:</u>			
Livraison à temps	Jamais	_____	Toujours
Temps qu'il faut pour livrer	Court	_____	Long
Commande minimale	Petite	_____	Grande
Facilité de commander de nouveau	Facile	_____	Difficile
Politiques de retour	Raisonnables	_____	Déraisonnables
Coûts de retour	Bas	_____	Élevés
Solution aux problèmes	Lente	_____	Rapide
Obtenir crédit des fournisseurs	Facile	_____	Difficile
Volonté de fabrication sur mesure	Basse	_____	Élevée
Service global	Bas	_____	Élevé

Rentabilité des produits de l'Argentine:

Prix de vente	Bas	_____	Élevé
Majoration possible	Basse	_____	Élevée
Rentabilité globale	Basse	_____	Élevée
Frais de transport	Bas	_____	Élevés
Frais de douane	Bas	_____	Élevés
Conditions de paiement	Mauvaises	_____	Bonnes
Coûts des devises	Bas	_____	Élevés
Stabilité des prix	Basse	_____	Élevée
Fréquence des retours/clients	Basse	_____	Élevée
Rabais nécessaires pour vendre	Rares	_____	Fréquents
Coûts globaux des affaires	Bas	_____	Élevés
Chiffre d'affaires	Bas	_____	Élevé

Rapports avec les fournisseurs argentines:

Frais de communications	Bas	_____	Élevés
Facilité des communications	Facile	_____	Difficile
Communication dans votre langue première	Rarement	_____	Fréquemment
Similarité des styles en affaires	Basse	_____	Élevée
Orientation des fournisseurs au marché	Faible	_____	Élevée
Réceptivité aux nouveaux produits, nouvelles idées	Basse	_____	Élevée
Leurs habiletés de gestionnaires	Basses	_____	Élevées
Leurs habiletés de négociateurs	Basses	_____	Élevées
Facilité de faire des affaires avec eux	Basse	_____	Élevée
Nésir de faire des affaires avec eux	Basse	_____	Élevée

En comparaison à faire des affaires avec des fournisseurs des autres pays, comment jugez-vous les fournisseurs de l'Argentine? Mauvaise : Bonne

Comment décriez-vous chacun des éléments suivants?

Produits fabriqués au Canada:

Qualité	Basse		Élevée
Valeur	Basse		Élevée
Conformité aux spécifications	Basse		Élevée
Fabrication	Mauvaise		Bonne
Défauts de fabrication	Peu nombreux		Nombreux
Se vendent bien	Jamais		Toujours
Esthétique	Basse		Élevée
Variété	Basse		Élevée
Innovation	Basse		Élevée
Marques	Bien connues		Inconnues
Prix de gros	Bas		Élevé
Durabilité	Basse		Élevée
Niveau de technologie	Bas		Élevé
Fiabilité	Basse		Élevée
Votre connaissance des produits canadiens	Basse		Élevée
Satisfaction globale	Basse		Élevée
Facile à trouver	Facile		Difficile
Disposition à acheter	Bas		Élevé
Fierté à offrir aux clients	Basse		Élevée

En comparaison aux produits de tout autre pays (pas seulement ceux qui font partie de ce questionnaire) quelle cote accorderiez-vous aux produits du Canada?

Faible : Bonne

Service des fournisseurs canadiens:

Livraison à temps	Jamais		Toujours
Temps qu'il faut pour livrer	Court		Long
Commande minimale	Petite		Grande
Facilité de commander de nouveau	Facile		Difficile
Politiques de retour	Raisonnables		Déraisonnables
Coûts de retour	Bas		Élevés
Solution aux problèmes	Lente		Rapide
Obtenir crédit des fournisseurs	Facile		Difficile
Volonté de fabrication sur mesure	Basse		Élevée
Service global	Bas		Élevé

Rentabilité des produits du Canada:

Prix de vente	Bas		Élevé
Majoration possible	Basse		Élevée
Rentabilité globale	Basse		Élevée
Frais de transport	Bas		Élevés
Frais de douane	Bas		Élevés
Conditions de paiement	Mauvaises		Bonnes
Coûts des devises	Bas		Élevés
Stabilité des prix	Basse		Élevée
Fréquence des retours/clients	Basse		Élevée
Rabais nécessaires pour vendre	Rares		Fréquents
Coûts globaux des affaires	Bas		Élevés
Chiffre d'affaires	Bas		Élevé

Frais de communications	Bas	_____	Élevés
Facilité des communications	Facile	_____	Difficile
Communication dans votre langue première	Rarement	_____	Fréquemment
Similarité des styles en affaires	Basse	_____	Élevée
Orientation des fournisseurs au marché	Faible	_____	Élevée
Réceptivité aux nouveaux produits, nouvelles idées	Basse	_____	Élevée
Leurs habiletés de gestionnaires	Basses	_____	Élevées
Leurs habiletés de négociateurs	Basses	_____	Élevées
Facilité de faire des affaires avec eux	Basse	_____	Élevée
Nésir de faire des affaires avec eux	Basse	_____	Élevée

En comparaison à faire des affaires avec des fournisseurs des autres pays, comment jugez-vous les fournisseurs du Canada? Mauvaise _____ Bonne

Qualité	Basse	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Valeur	Basse	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Conformité aux spécifications	Basse	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Fabrication	Mauvaise	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Défauts de fabrication	Peu nombreux	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Se vendent bien	Jamais	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Esthétique	Basse	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Variété	Basse	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Innovation	Basse	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Marques	Bien connues	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Prix de gros	Bas	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Durabilité	Basse	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Niveau de technologie	Bas	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Fiabilité	Basse	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Votre connaissance des produits chiliens	Basse	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Satisfaction globale	Basse	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Facile à trouver	Facile	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Disposition à acheter	Bas	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Fierté à offrir aux clients	Basse	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.

Faible : : : : : Bonne

Livraison à temps	Jamais	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Toujours
Temps qu'il faut pour livrer	Court	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Long
Commande minimale	Petite	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Grande
Facilité de commander de nouveau	Facile	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Difficile
Politiques de retour	Raisonnables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Déraisonnables
Coûts de retour	Bas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Élevés
Solution aux problèmes	Lente	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Rapide
Obtenir crédit des fournisseurs	Facile	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Difficile
Volonté de fabrication sur mesure	Basse	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Élevée
Service global	Bas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Élevé

Rentabilité des produits du Chili:

Prix de vente	Bas	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Majoration possible	Basse	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Rentabilité globale	Basse	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Frais de transport	Bas	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Frais de douane	Bas	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Conditions de paiement	Mauvaises	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Coûts des devises	Bas	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Stabilité des prix	Basse	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Fréquence des retours/clients	Basse	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Rabais nécessaires pour vendre	Rares	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Coûts globaux des affaires	Bas	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Chiffre d'affaires	Bas	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.

Rapports avec les fournisseurs chiliens:

Frais de communications	Bas	_____	Élevés
Facilité des communications	Facile	_____	Difficile
Communication dans votre langue première	Rarement	_____	Fréquemment
Similarité des styles en affaires	Basse	_____	Élevée
Orientation des fournisseurs au marché	Faible	_____	Élevée
Réceptivité aux nouveaux produits, nouvelles idées	Basse	_____	Élevée
Leurs habiletés de gestionnaires	Basses	_____	Élevées
Leurs habiletés de négociateurs	Basses	_____	Élevées
Facilité de faire des affaires avec eux	Basse	_____	Élevée
Nésir de faire des affaires avec eux	Basse	_____	Élevée

En comparaison à faire des affaires avec des fournisseurs des autres pays, comment jugez-vous les fournisseurs du Chili?

Comment décririez-vous chacun des éléments suivants?

Produits fabriqués au Mexique:

Qualité	Basse	Élevée
Valeur	Basse	Élevée
Conformité aux spécifications	Basse	Élevée
Fabrication	Mauvaise	Bonne
Défauts de fabrication	Peu nombreux	Nombreux
Se vendent bien	Jamais	Toujours
Esthétique	Basse	Élevée
Variété	Basse	Élevée
Innovation	Basse	Élevée
Marques	Bien connues	Inconnues
Prix de gros	Bas	Élevé
Durabilité	Basse	Élevée
Niveau de technologie	Bas	Élevé
Fiabilité	Basse	Élevée
Votre connaissance des produits mexicains	Basse	Élevée
Satisfaction globale	Basse	Élevée
Facile à trouver	Facile	Difficile
Disposition à acheter	Bas	Élevé
Fierté à offrir aux clients	Basse	Élevée

En comparaison aux produits de tout autre pays (pas seulement ceux qui font partie de ce questionnaire) quelle cote accorderiez-vous aux produits du Mexique?

Faible : _ _ _ _ _ Bonne

Service des fournisseurs mexicains:

Livraison à temps	Jamais	_ _ _ _ _	Toujours
Temps qu'il faut pour livrer	Court	_ _ _ _ _	Long
Commande minimale	Petite	_ _ _ _ _	Grande
Facilité de commander de nouveau	Facile	_ _ _ _ _	Difficile
Politiques de retour	Raisonnables	_ _ _ _ _	Déraisonnables
Coûts de retour	Bas	_ _ _ _ _	Élevés
Solution aux problèmes	Lente	_ _ _ _ _	Rapide
Obtenir crédit des fournisseurs	Facile	_ _ _ _ _	Difficile
Volonté de fabrication sur mesure	Basse	_ _ _ _ _	Élevée
Service global	Bas	_ _ _ _ _	Élevé

Rentabilité des produits du Mexique:

Prix de vente	Bas	_ _ _ _ _	Élevé
Majoration possible	Basse	_ _ _ _ _	Élevée
Rentabilité globale	Basse	_ _ _ _ _	Élevée
Frais de transport	Bas	_ _ _ _ _	Élevés
Frais de douane	Bas	_ _ _ _ _	Élevés
Conditions de paiement	Mauvaises	_ _ _ _ _	Bonnes
Coûts des devises	Bas	_ _ _ _ _	Élevés
Stabilité des prix	Basse	_ _ _ _ _	Élevée
Fréquence des retours/clients	Basse	_ _ _ _ _	Élevée
Rabais nécessaires pour vendre	Rares	_ _ _ _ _	Fréquents
Coûts globaux des affaires	Bas	_ _ _ _ _	Élevés
Chiffre d'affaires	Bas	_ _ _ _ _	Élevé

Rapports avec les fournisseurs mexicains:

Frais de communications	Bas	_ _ _ _ _	Élevés
Facilité des communications	Facile	_ _ _ _ _	Difficile
Communication dans votre langue première	Rarement	_ _ _ _ _	Fréquemment
Similarité des styles en affaires	Basse	_ _ _ _ _	Élevée
Orientation des fournisseurs au marché	Faible	_ _ _ _ _	Élevée
Réceptivité aux nouveaux produits, nouvelles idées	Basse	_ _ _ _ _	Élevée
Leurs habiletés de gestionnaires	Basses	_ _ _ _ _	Élevées
Leurs habiletés de négociateurs	Basses	_ _ _ _ _	Élevées
Facilité de faire des affaires avec eux	Basse	_ _ _ _ _	Élevée
Nésir de faire des affaires avec eux	Basse	_ _ _ _ _	Élevée

En comparaison à faire des affaires avec des fournisseurs des autres pays, comment jugez-vous les fournisseurs du Mexique?

Mauvaise : _ _ _ _ _ Bonne

Comment décriez-vous chacun des éléments suivants?

Produits fabriqués aux États-Unis:

Qualité	Basse	_ _ _ _ _	Élevée
Valeur	Basse	_ _ _ _ _	Élevée
Conformité aux spécifications	Basse	_ _ _ _ _	Élevée
Fabrication	Mauvaise	_ _ _ _ _	Bonne
Défauts de fabrication	Peu nombreux	_ _ _ _ _	Nombreux

Se vendent bien	Jamais		Toujours
Esthétique	Basse		Élevée
Variété	Basse		Élevée
Innovation	Basse		Élevée
Marques	Bien connues		Inconnues
Prix de gros	Bas		Élevé
Durabilité	Basse		Élevée
Niveau de technologie	Bas		Élevé
Fiabilité	Basse		Élevée
Votre connaissance des produits américain	Basse		Élevée
Satisfaction globale	Basse		Élevée
Facile à trouver	Facile		Difficile
Disposition à acheter	Bas		Élevé
Fierté à offrir aux clients	Basse		Élevée

En comparaison aux produits de tout autre pays (pas seulement ceux qui font partie de ce questionnaire) quelle cote accorderiez-vous aux produits des États-Unis?

	Faible		Bonne
<u>Service des fournisseurs américain:</u>			
Livraison à temps	Jamais		Toujours
Temps qu'il faut pour livrer	Court		Long
Commande minimale	Petite		Grande
Facilité de commander de nouveau	Facile		Difficile
Politiques de retour	Raisonnables		Déraisonnables
Coûts de retour	Bas		Élevés
Solution aux problèmes	Lente		Rapide
Obtenir crédit des fournisseurs	Facile		Difficile
Volonté de fabrication sur mesure	Basse		Élevée
Service global	Bas		Élevé

Rentabilité des produits des États-Unis:

Prix de vente	Bas		Élevé
Majoration possible	Basse		Élevée
Rentabilité globale	Basse		Élevée
Frais de transport	Bas		Élevés
Frais de douane	Bas		Élevés
Conditions de paiement	Mauvaises		Bonnes
Coûts des devises	Bas		Élevés
Stabilité des prix	Basse		Élevée
Fréquence des retours/clients	Basse		Élevée
Rabais nécessaires pour vendre	Rares		Fréquents
Coûts globaux des affaires	Bas		Élevés
Chiffre d'affaires	Bas		Élevé

Rapports avec les fournisseurs américain:

Frais de communications	Bas		Élevés
Facilité des communications	Facile		Difficile
Communication dans votre langue première	Rarement		Fréquemment
Similarité des styles en affaires	Basse		Élevée
Orientation des fournisseurs au marché	Faible		Élevée
Réceptivité aux nouveaux produits, nouvelles idées	Basse		Élevée
Leurs habiletés de gestionnaires	Basses		Élevées
Leurs habiletés de négociateurs	Basses		Élevées

Facilité de faire des affaires avec eux	Basse	_____	Élevée
Nésir de faire des affaires avec eux	Basse	_____	Élevée

En comparaison à faire des affaires avec des fournisseurs des autres pays, comment jugez-vous les fournisseurs des États-Unis?	Mauvaise	_____	Bonne
--	----------	-------	-------

Section II. Les pays et leurs peuples

Cette section porte sur ce que vous pensez des pays et de leurs peuples – l'Argentine, le Canada, le Chili, le Mexique et les États-Unis.

- Il est sans importance que vous ayez eu ou pas une expérience personnelle du pays en question.
- Dans chacune des pages qui suivent, vous trouverez différents pays à juger à l'aide d'un ensemble d'échelles, comme avant. De nouveau, il suffit de placer un "X" au milieu de l'espace qui reflète le mieux votre opinion.
- Veuillez vous rappeler de remplir chaque échelle pour chaque pays, sans en omettre.

Comment décrieriez-vous le pays et le peuple de l' Argentine?

Amabilité des gens	Basse	_____	Élevée
Diligence	Basse	_____	Élevée
Niveau d'instruction	Bas	_____	Élevé
Niveau de richesse	Bas	_____	Élevé
Attitude amicale	Basse	_____	Élevée
Fiabilité	Basse	_____	Élevée
Éthique du travail	Basse	_____	Élevée
Individualisme	Bas	_____	Élevé
Stabilité politique du pays	Basse	_____	Élevée
Compétence des travailleurs	Basse	_____	Élevée
Niveau de technologie du pays	Bas	_____	Élevé
Stabilité économique	Basse	_____	Élevée
Restrictions sur les affaires	Peu	_____	Beaucoup
Coût de la main-d'oeuvre	Bas	_____	Élevé
Disponibilité de travailleurs spécialise's habiles	Basse	_____	Élevée
Qualité de vie	Basse	_____	Élevée
Rôle sur la scène politique mondiale	Pauvre	_____	Bon
Contrôles de l'environnement/pollution	Peu	_____	Beaucoup
Droits et libertés de la personne	Peu	_____	Beaucoup
Alignement avec le Canada	Faible	_____	Fort
Vos connaissances de l'Argentine	Basses	_____	Élevées

Que souhaiteriez-vous voir dans les rapports futurs entre le Canada et l'Argentine?

Des liens politiques et économiques	Moins	:	_	:	_	:	_	:	_	:	Plus
L'immigration de l'Argentine	Moins	:	_	:	_	:	_	:	_	:	Plus
Des exportations en Argentine	Moins	:	_	:	_	:	_	:	_	:	Plus
Des importations de l'Argentine	Moins	:	_	:	_	:	_	:	_	:	Plus
Des investissements en Argentine	Moins	:	_	:	_	:	_	:	_	:	Plus
Des investissements de l'Argentine	Moins	:	_	:	_	:	_	:	_	:	Plus

Comment décrivez-vous le pays et le peuple du Canada?

Amabilité des gens	Basse	Élevée
Diligence	Basse	Élevée
Niveau d'instruction	Bas	Élevé
Niveau de richesse	Bas	Élevé
Attitude amicale	Basse	Élevée
Fiabilité	Basse	Élevée
Éthique du travail	Basse	Élevée
Individualisme	Bas	Élevé
Stabilité politique du pays	Basse	Élevée
Compétence des travailleurs	Basse	Élevée
Niveau de technologie du pays	Bas	Élevé
Stabilité économique	Basse	Élevée
Restrictions sur les affaires	Peu	Beaucoup
Coût de la main-d'oeuvre	Bas	Élevé
Disponibilité de travailleurs spécialise's habiles		
	Basse	Élevée
Qualité de vie	Basse	Élevée
Rôle sur la scène politique mondiale	Pauvre	Bon
Contrôles de l'environnement/pollution	Peu	Beaucoup
Droits et libertés de la personne	Peu	Beaucoup
Vos connaissances de l'Argentine	Basses	Élevées

Comment décrivez-vous le pays et le peuple du Chili?

Amabilité des gens	Basse	Élevée
Diligence	Basse	Élevée
Niveau d'instruction	Bas	Élevé
Niveau de richesse	Bas	Élevé
Attitude amicale	Basse	Élevée
Fiabilité	Basse	Élevée
Éthique du travail	Basse	Élevée
Individualisme	Bas	Élevé
Stabilité politique du pays	Basse	Élevée
Compétence des travailleurs	Basse	Élevée
Niveau de technologie du pays	Bas	Élevé
Stabilité économique	Basse	Élevée
Restrictions sur les affaires	Peu	Beaucoup
Coût de la main-d'oeuvre	Bas	Élevé

Disponibilité de travailleurs spécialise's habiles

	Basse	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevée
Qualité de vie	Basse	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevée
Rôle sur la scène politique mondiale	Pauvre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Bon
Contrôles de l'environnement/pollution	Peu	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Beaucoup
Droits et libertés de la personne	Peu	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Beaucoup
Alignement avec le Canada	Faible	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Fort
Vos connaissances du Chili	Basses	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevées

Que souhaiteriez-vous voir dans les rapports futurs entre le Canada et le Chili?

Des liens politiques et économiques	Moins	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Plus
L'immigration du Chili	Moins	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Plus
Des exportations en Chili	Moins	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Plus
Des importations du Chili	Moins	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Plus
Des investissements en Chili	Moins	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Plus
Des investissements du Chili	Moins	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Plus

Comment décririez-vous le pays et le peuple du Mexique?

Amabilité des gens	Basse	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevée
Diligence	Basse	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevée
Niveau d'instruction	Bas	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevé
Niveau de richesse	Bas	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevé
Attitude amicale	Basse	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevée
Fiabilité	Basse	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevée
Éthique du travail	Basse	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevée
Individualisme	Bas	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevé
Stabilité politique du pays	Basse	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevée
Compétence des travailleurs	Basse	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevée
Niveau de technologie du pays	Bas	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevé
Stabilité économique	Basse	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevée
Restrictions sur les affaires	Peu	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Beaucoup
Coût de la main-d'oeuvre	Bas	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevé
Disponibilité de travailleurs spécialise's habiles		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
	Basse	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevée
Qualité de vie	Basse	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevée
Rôle sur la scène politique mondiale	Pauvre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Bon
Contrôles de l'environnement/pollution	Peu	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Beaucoup
Droits et libertés de la personne	Peu	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Beaucoup
Alignement avec le Canada	Faible	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Fort
Vos connaissances du Mexique	Basses	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Élevées

Que souhaiteriez-vous voir dans les rapports futurs entre le Canada et le Mexique?

Des liens politiques et économiques	Moins	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Plus
L'immigration du Mexique	Moins	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Plus
Des exportations en Mexique	Moins	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Plus
Des importations du Mexique	Moins	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Plus
Des investissements en Mexique	Moins	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Plus
Des investissements du Mexique	Moins	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Plus

Comment décririez-vous le pays et le peuple de les États-Unis?

Amabilité des gens	Basse	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Élevée
Diligence	Basse	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Élevée
Niveau d'instruction	Bas	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Élevé
Niveau de richesse	Bas	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Élevé
Attitude amicale	Basse	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Élevée
Fiabilité	Basse	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Élevée
Éthique du travail	Basse	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Élevée
Individualisme	Bas	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Élevé
Stabilité politique du pays	Basse	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Élevée
Compétence des travailleurs	Basse	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Élevée
Niveau de technologie du pays	Bas	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Élevé
Stabilité économique	Basse	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Élevée
Restrictions sur les affaires	Peu	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Beaucoup
Coût de la main-d'oeuvre	Bas	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Élevé
Disponibilité de travailleurs spécialisés habiles	Basse	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Élevée
Qualité de vie	Basse	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Élevée
Rôle sur la scène politique mondiale	Pauvre	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Bon
Contrôles de l'environnement/pollution	Peu	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Beaucoup
Droits et libertés de la personne	Peu	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Beaucoup
Alignement avec le Canada	Faible	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Fort
Vos connaissances des États-Unis	Basses	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Élevées

Que souhaiteriez-vous voir dans les rapports futurs entre le Canada et les États-Unis?

Des liens politiques et économiques	Moins	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Plus
L'immigration des États-Unis	Moins	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Plus
Des exportations en États-Unis	Moins	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Plus
Des importations des États-Unis	Moins	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Plus
Des investissements en États-Unis	Moins	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Plus
Des investissements des États-Unis	Moins	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Plus

Comment évaluez-vous vos expériences avec les fournisseurs:

de l'Argentine:

J'ai fait des affaires	Jamais	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Fréquemment
J'ai l'intention de faire des affaires	Jamais	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Fréquemment

du Canada:

J'ai fait des affaires	Jamais	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Fréquemment
J'ai l'intention de faire des affaires	Jamais	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Fréquemment

du Chili:

J'ai fait des affaires	Jamais	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Fréquemment
J'ai l'intention de faire des affaires	Jamais	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Fréquemment

du Mexique:

J'ai fait des affaires	Jamais	: _ _ _ _ _	Fréquemment
J'ai l'intention de faire des affaires	Jamais	: _ _ _ _ _	Fréquemment

des États-Unis:

J'ai fait des affaires	Jamais	: _ _ _ _ _	Fréquemment
J'ai l'intention de faire des affaires	Jamais	: _ _ _ _ _	Fréquemment

Cette dernière section pose des **questions d'ordre général** qui nous aideront à classer vos réponses. Soyez assuré que vos réponses sont anonymes et ne serviront qu'à l'analyse statistique des données.

Veuillez répondre à cette section en plaçant un "X" dans l'espace approprié.

A. Comment la propriété de votre compagnie est-elle légalement définie?

☐ Propriété personnelle	☐ Société-Privée
☐ Partenariat	☐ Société-Publique

B. Comment classez-vous votre compagnie?

☐ 3 magasins spécialisés ou moins
☐ Chaîne de grands magasins
☐ Chaîne de magasins spécialisés (4 ou plus)
☐ Chaîne de magasins de vente au rabais
☐ Magasins de marchandises générales (3 ou moins)
☐ Autre (Veuillez préciser)

Combien de magasins de détail votre compagnie a-t-elle? _____

C. Comment votre compagnie organise-t-elle ses achats? (Veuillez noter tout ce qui s'applique)

☐ Chaque magasin fait ses propres achats
☐ Bureau centralisé pour les achats (géré par votre compagnie)
☐ Achats en groupe (des détaillants indépendants forment une alliance pour acheter ensemble)
☐ Service à contrat

D. S'il s'agit d'une chaîne, vos magasins sont-ils:

☐ Régionaux seulement
☐ Nationaux seulement
☐ Multinationaux

E. Quelles catégories de biens de consommation sont vendues dans votre magasin? (Veuillez indiquer quel pourcentage approximatif du **revenu total des ventes au détail provient annuellement de chaque catégorie; TOTAL DE 100%)**

Nourriture	_____ %	Lampes / Éclairage	_____ %
Meubles	_____ %	Appareils ménagers	_____ %
Appareils audio-vidéo	_____ %	Lit/ Bain / Cuisine	_____ %

Articles de sport	_____ %	Tapis / Carrelage	_____ %
Chaussures	_____ %	Matériaux de construction	_____ %
Vêtements	_____ %	Quincaillerie	_____ %
Tissu / Fil / Rembourrage	_____ %	Autre (Précisez)	_____ %

(TOTAL DE 100%)

F. Veuillez indiquer quel pourcentage approximatif du **revenu total des ventes au détail** provient annuellement des biens de:

Sources nationales	_____ %
Sources importées	_____ %
TOTAL	100 %

Des produits de source nationale, quel pourcentage provient?

Directement de la manufacture	_____ %
Marchands en gros	_____ %
Agents	_____ %
Autre	_____ %
TOTAL	100 %

Des produits que vous importez, quel pourcentage provient?

Directement de la manufacture	_____ %
Marchands en gros	_____ %
Agent	_____ %
Autre	_____ %
TOTAL	100 %

G. Veuillez indiquer le total approximatif des ventes annuelles au détail de votre compagnie.

_____ Moins d' \$1 (million)
 _____ Entre \$1.0 m et \$4.9 m
 _____ Entre \$5.0 m et \$9.9 m
 _____ Entre \$10.0 m et \$19.9 m
 _____ Entre \$20.0 m et \$29.9 m
 _____ Entre \$30.0 m et \$39.9 m
 _____ Entre \$40.0 m et \$49.9 m
 _____ Entre \$50.0 m et \$74.9 m
 _____ Entre \$75.0 m et \$99.9 m
 _____ Entre \$100.0 m et \$149.9 m
 _____ Entre \$150.0 m et \$199.9 m
 _____ Entre \$200.0 m et \$500.0 m
 _____ Plus de \$500 m

H. Si vous faites des affaires avec des fournisseurs / agents à l'extérieur du Canada, veuillez indiquer le pourcentage approximatif d'achats de:

É.-U.	_____ %
Chili	_____ %
Mexique	_____ %
Argentine	_____ %
Europe	_____ %
Afrique	_____ %
Asie	_____ %
Amérique du Sud (autre)	_____ %
Amérique Centrale (sauf Mexique)	_____ %
Autre (Précisez) _____	_____ %

TOTAL 100%

I. Approximativement combien d'employés travaillaient dans votre compagnie au 1er janvier, 1995?

Employés à temps plein _____ À contrat _____

Employés à temps partiel _____ Autres (précisez) _____

VOTRE TITRE _____

VOS RESPONSABILITÉS

(si le titre n'est pas clair)

ANNÉES D'EXPÉRIENCE COMME ACHETEUR _____

Souhaitez-vous faire des commentaires supplémentaires? Votre opinion a de l'importance et tout ce que vous désirez ajouter à ce sondage sera très utile. Vous pouvez commenter sur les pays qui font partie de ce sondage, sur leurs produits, ou sur les pays et les produits qui vous intéressent. Veuillez utiliser cet espace et ajouter des feuilles supplémentaires au besoin.

Votre participation est très sincèrement appréciée.

MERCI!

Appendix B - Reply Card

Dr. Louise Heslop and/et
Dr. Nicolas Papadopoulos
Université Carleton University
School of Business/
École de Commerce
1125, promenade Colonel By Drive
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1S 5B6

I have completed the retail buyers' survey and mailed it to you /
J'ai complété le sondage auprès des acheteurs au détail et je vous l'ai retourné.

Name/Nom:

Company/Compagnie:

We Thank You! Nous vous remercions!

Your Assistance is greatly appreciated /
Votre collaboration est grandement appréciée

____ Please check here if you would like us to send you a summary of the project
findings / Veuillez cocher ici si vous souhaitez recevoir un sommaire des résultats du
projet.

Appendix C - Follow-up Material

May 13, 1996

Last week a questionnaire seeking your opinion of products from different nations was mailed to you. You were chosen, among other professionals, through a scientific selection process.

If you have already completed and returned it to us please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. This questionnaire has been sent to a small, but representative sample. It is extremely important that yours be included in the study if the results are to accurately represent your profession.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please fax us right now, collect (613) 520-4427 and we will get another one in the mail to you today.

Sincerely,

Dr. Louise Heslop
Professor of Marketing

Dr. Nicolas Papadopoulos
Professor of International Business

Le 13 mai, 1996

La semaine dernière, nous vous avons expédié un questionnaire pour obtenir vos opinions sur les produits de diverses nations. Vous avez été choisi, comme d'autres professionnels, par un processus scientifique de sélection.

Si vous l'avez déjà complété et retourné, veuillez accepter nos sincères remerciements. Dans le cas contraire, veuillez le faire dès aujourd'hui. Ce questionnaire a été expédié à un échantillon peu nombreux mais représentatif. Il est extrêmement important que vos réponses soient comprises dans l'étude pour que les résultats reflètent fidèlement les opinions de votre profession.

Si, par hasard, vous n'avez pas reçu le questionnaire ou qu'il a été égaré, veuillez télécopier immédiatement, à frais virés, au (613) 520-4427 et nous vous enverrons un autre questionnaire par la poste aujourd'hui.

Veuillez agréer l'expression de nos sentiments distingués.

Dr. Louise Heslop
Professeur de marketing

Dr. Nicolas Papadopoulos
Professeur de commerce international

May 27, 1996

Dear Respondent,

About three weeks ago we sent you a survey concerning your opinion on NAFTA countries and their products. As of today, we have not received notification that you have completed and returned the questionnaire.

This study is being conducted as part of a larger project, supported by a federal government research funding agency, to examine Canadian Global Competitiveness. The results will be distributed to government, industry policy makers, and to the business community.

We are writing to you again because of the significance each questionnaire has to the usefulness of the project. You have been chosen to represent your profession through a scientific selection process. It is extremely important that we receive your completed questionnaire to ensure the results of the study are truly representative of your industry. If you do not perform buying activities for your firm would you kindly forward the questionnaire to someone in your company who is involved in these activities.

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Cordially.

Dr. Louise Heslop
Professor of Marketing

Dr. Nicolas Papadopoulos
Professor of International Business

P.S. Some people who have already responded have noted that they know little about some of the countries. Even if you feel you know very little about one or two of the countries, your reactions concerning what you would expect to find from these countries are important and useful.

Le 27 mai, 1996

Cher répondant,

Il y a environ trois semaines, nous vous avons expédié un sondage sollicitant vos opinions sur les pays de l'ALÉNA et leurs produits. Nous n'avons pas encore reçu d'avis que vous avez complété et retourné le questionnaire.

Cette étude fait partie d'un projet plus vaste financé par une agence de recherche du gouvernement fédéral pour examiner la compétitivité canadienne globale. Les résultats seront distribués au gouvernement, aux décideurs de l'industrie et à la communauté des gens d'affaires.

Nous nous permettons de vous écrire de nouveau à cause de l'importance de chaque questionnaire pour l'utilité du projet. Vous avez été choisi pour représenter votre profession par un processus scientifique de sélection. Il est extrêmement important que nous recevions vos réponses au questionnaire pour nous assurer que les résultats de l'étude soient représentatifs de votre profession. Si vous n'effectuez pas d'achats pour votre entreprise, veuillez remettre le questionnaire à un membre de votre compagnie qui participe à ces activités.

Vous trouverez ci-joint un questionnaire de remplacement au cas où votre questionnaire aurait été égaré.

Votre coopération est grandement appréciée.

Veuillez agréer l'expression de nos salutations cordiales.

Dr. Louise Heslop
Professeur de marketing

Dr. Nicolas Papadopoulos
Professeur de commerce international

P.S. Certaines des personnes qui ont déjà répondu ont signalé qu'elles connaissaient peu certains des pays. Même si vous croyez connaître très peu l'un ou l'autre des pays, vos réactions sur ce que vous pensez pouvoir obtenir de ces pays sont importantes et utiles.

June 24, 1996

Dear Respondent,

We are writing to you about our study of NAFTA countries and the products originating from these nations. We have not yet received notification that you have completed and returned the questionnaire.

The large number of questionnaires returned is very encouraging. However, whether we will be able to describe accurately the perceptions and opinions of retail buyers depends on you and others who have not yet responded. This is because our past experience suggest that those of you who have not yet sent in your questionnaire may hold quite different views than those that have.

This study is only part of a much larger project designed to examine Canadian Global Competitiveness. Therefore, the results are of particular importance to government and industry policy makers, businesses, and consumers. The usefulness of our results depends on how accurately we are able to describe the opinions of retail buyers.

It is for these reasons that we are sending this by certified mail to ensure delivery. In case our other correspondence did not reach the person in your organization whose response is needed, a replacement questionnaire is enclosed. May we urge you to complete and return it as quickly as possible. If you do not perform buying activities for your firm would you kindly forward the questionnaire to someone in your company who is involved in these activities.

We will be happy to send you a copy of the results if you would like one. Simply mark your indication on the return card in the appropriate space. We expect to have the results ready within a few months.

Your contribution to the success of this study will be appreciated greatly.

Most sincerely,

Dr. Louise Heslop
Professor of Marketing

Dr. Nicolas Papadopoulos
Professor of International Business

Le 24 juin, 1996

Cher répondant,

Nous vous écrivons au sujet de notre étude sur les pays de l'ALÉNA et des produits provenant de ces pays. Nous n'avons pas encore reçu d'avis que vous avez complété et retourné le questionnaire.

Le grand nombre de questionnaires retournés est très encourageant. Cependant, notre capacité de décrire avec précision les perceptions et les opinions des acheteurs au détail dépend de vous et de d'autres qui n'ont pas encore répondu. Il en est ainsi parce que notre expérience suggère que ceux qui n'ont pas encore retourné leur questionnaire peuvent avoir des opinions très différentes de celles des personnes qui l'ont retourné.

Cette étude n'est qu'une partie d'un projet beaucoup plus vaste pour examiner la compétitivité canadienne globale. Les résultats sont par conséquent particulièrement importants pour le gouvernement et les décideurs, les entreprises et les consommateurs. L'utilité de nos résultats dépend de la précision avec laquelle nous arrivons à décrire les opinions des acheteurs au détail.

C'est pour ces raisons que cette lettre est recommandée pour en assurer la livraison. Vous trouverez ci-joint un questionnaire de remplacement au cas où notre correspondance n'aurait pas rejoint la personne de votre organisme qui devrait répondre au questionnaire. Nous vous prions de le compléter et de le retourner le plus tôt possible. Si vous n'effectuez pas d'achats pour votre entreprise, veuillez remettre le questionnaire à un membre de votre compagnie qui participe à ces activités.

Nous serions heureux de vous expédier une copie des résultats si vous le désirez. Il suffit de l'indiquer dans l'espace approprié de la carte de renvoi. Nous croyons que les résultats seront disponibles dans quelques mois.

Votre contribution au succès de cette étude sera grandement appréciée.

Veuillez agréer l'expression de nos sentiments distingués.

Dr. Louise Heslop
Professeur de marketing

Dr. Nicolas Papadopoulos
Professeur de commerce international

Appendix D - Doubly Multivariate Analysis of Variance

Country Profiles

Overall

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- d e s i g n 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

AVERAGED Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 4, M = 7 1/2, N = 269 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	1.79933	22.23950	80.00	2176.00	.000
Hotellings	10.54263	71.09686	80.00	2158.00	.000
Wilks	.03070	37.87692	80.00	2136.60	.000
Roys	.89903				

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (4,560) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	94.72908	555.67092	23.68227	.99227	23.86677	.000
INDUS	343.68227	623.11773	85.92057	1.11271	77.21738	.000
EDUCATE	997.90922	456.49078	249.47730	.81516	306.04625	.000
WEALTH	1031.84965	479.75035	257.96241	.85670	301.11275	.000
FRIEND	46.61844	494.58156	11.65461	.88318	13.19617	.000
TRUST	359.76738	503.03262	89.94184	.89827	100.12757	.000
WORK	356.24965	523.35035	89.06241	.93455	95.29935	.000
INDIV	486.52482	639.47518	121.63121	1.14192	106.51465	.000
POLIT	1420.33191	639.26809	355.08298	1.14155	311.05333	.000
TECHC	1622.83121	455.16879	405.70780	.81280	499.14751	.000
ECONCM	1333.00142	572.99858	333.25035	1.02321	325.69051	.000
QLIFE	1429.82411	457.77589	357.45603	.81746	437.27811	.000
WORLD	1763.52624	633.67376	440.88156	1.13156	389.62269	.000
ENVIRO	1437.38156	578.21844	359.34539	1.03253	348.02318	.000
RIGHTS	2025.20567	489.99433	506.30142	.87499	578.63689	.000
AVAILW	790.24113	667.35887	197.56028	1.19171	165.77851	.000
SKILL	955.83546	419.36454	238.95887	.74887	319.09461	.000
RESTRICT	182.59007	1130.60993	45.64752	2.01895	22.60957	.000
LABOUR	1495.22837	581.97163	373.80709	1.03924	359.69446	.000
KNOW	2005.33901	488.66099	501.33475	.87261	574.52399	.000

Canada vs USA

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 9, N = 74)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.78887	28.02321	20.00	150.00	.000
Hotellings	3.73643	28.02321	20.00	150.00	.000
Wilks	.21113	28.02321	20.00	150.00	.000
Roys	.78887				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,169) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	28.24706	130.75294	28.24706	.77369	36.50972	.000
INDUS	20.26176	149.23824	20.26176	.88307	22.94478	.000
EDUCATE	.14412	87.35588	.14412	.51690	.27891	.598
WEALTH	14.41176	83.58824	14.41176	.49460	29.13793	.000
FRIEND	13.20294	166.29706	13.20294	.98401	13.41754	.000
TRUST	48.18824	134.81176	48.18824	.79770	60.40876	.000
WORK	6.22353	142.77647	6.22353	.84483	7.36660	.007
INDIV	18.82353	208.17647	18.82353	1.23181	15.28115	.000
POLIT	103.95294	221.04706	103.95294	1.30797	79.47650	.000
TECHC	38.22353	77.77647	38.22353	.46022	83.05566	.000
ECONOM	71.57647	143.42353	71.57647	.84866	84.34058	.000
QLIFE	40.26176	106.23824	40.26176	.62863	64.04698	.000
WORLD	95.29412	249.70588	95.29412	1.47755	64.49470	.000
ENVIRO	28.24706	171.75294	28.24706	1.01629	27.79430	.000
RIGHTS	1.17647	89.82353	1.17647	.53150	2.21349	.139
AVAILW	16.54412	171.95588	16.54412	1.01749	16.25973	.000
SKILL	4.70588	77.29412	4.70588	.45736	10.28919	.002
RESTRIC	3.40000	274.60000	3.40000	1.62485	2.09250	.150
LABOUR	70.66176	163.83824	70.66176	.96946	72.88798	.000
KNOW	24.35588	72.14412	24.35588	.42689	57.05447	.000

Canada vs Mexico

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 9 , N = 67)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DFE	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.94250	111.46361	20.00	136.00	.000
Hotellings	16.39171	111.46361	20.00	136.00	.000
Wilks	.05750	111.46361	20.00	136.00	.000
Rois	.94250				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,155) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	50.88462	190.11538	50.88462	1.22655	41.48594	.000
INDUS	165.15705	284.34295	165.15705	1.83447	90.02981	.000
EDUCATE	600.92628	156.57372	600.92628	1.01015	594.88639	.000
WEALTH	512.82051	158.17949	512.82051	1.02051	502.51256	.000
FRIEND	25.96154	160.03846	25.96154	1.03251	25.14420	.000
TRUST	336.46154	219.53846	336.46154	1.41638	237.55081	.000
WORK	228.49038	245.00962	228.49038	1.58071	144.54947	.000
INDIV	201.92628	252.57372	201.92628	1.62951	123.91857	.000
POLIT	401.65385	235.34615	401.65385	1.51836	264.53097	.000
TECHC	612.08013	181.41987	612.08013	1.17045	522.94393	.000
ECONOM	502.61538	213.38462	502.61538	1.37667	365.09373	.000
QLIFE	980.15705	147.34295	980.15705	.95060	1031.09341	.000
WORLD	517.96154	231.03846	517.96154	1.49057	347.49209	.000
ENVIRO	876.69551	180.80449	876.69551	1.16648	751.57319	.000
RIGHTS	903.72115	142.77885	903.72115	.92115	981.07516	.000
AVAILW	355.41346	230.08654	355.41346	1.48443	239.42768	.000
SKILL	485.00321	174.49679	485.00321	1.12579	430.81305	.000
RESTRICT	28.32051	379.67949	28.32051	2.44955	11.56154	.001
LABCUR	1056.01282	168.98718	1056.01282	1.09024	968.60595	.000
KNOW	640.41346	158.08654	640.41346	1.01991	627.90980	.000

Canada vs Chile

* * * * * Analysis of Variance -- design 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 9, N = 66)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.92788	86.20566	20.00	134.00	.000
Hotellings	12.86652	86.20566	20.00	134.00	.000
Wilks	.07212	86.20566	20.00	134.00	.000
Roys	.92788				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,153) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	79.01299	161.98701	79.01299	1.05874	74.62936	.000
INDUS	76.00325	194.49675	76.00325	1.27122	59.78761	.000
EDUCATE	409.17208	136.32792	409.17208	.89103	459.21134	.000
WEALTH	336.63636	172.36364	336.63636	1.12656	298.31804	.000
FRIEND	31.18182	149.81818	31.18182	.97920	31.84405	.000
TRUST	164.36688	131.13312	164.36688	.85708	191.77561	.000
WORK	56.57143	203.42857	56.57143	1.32960	42.54775	.000
INDIV	141.82143	216.67857	141.82143	1.41620	100.14224	.000
POLIT	373.12013	276.37987	373.12013	1.80640	206.55404	.000
TECHC	529.92208	171.07792	529.92208	1.11816	473.92485	.000
ECONOM	318.08117	200.41883	318.08117	1.30993	242.82358	.000
QLIFE	690.00325	166.49675	690.00325	1.08821	634.06940	.000
WORLD	551.11688	227.98312	551.11688	1.48943	370.01812	.000
ENVIRO	669.20779	208.79221	669.20779	1.36465	490.38608	.000
RIGHTS	964.36688	164.13312	964.36688	1.07277	898.95407	.000
AVAILW	233.19481	240.80519	233.19481	1.57389	148.16460	.000
SKILL	328.32468	150.67532	328.32468	.98481	333.39019	.000
RESTRICT	56.57143	383.42857	56.57143	2.50607	22.57377	.000
LABOUR	779.54545	201.45455	779.54545	1.31670	592.04648	.000
KNOW	1157.17208	164.32792	1157.17208	1.07404	1077.40258	.000

Canada vs Argentina

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance S = 1, M = 9 , N = 66 1/2

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.93086	90.87096	20.00	135.00	.000
Hotellings	13.46237	90.87096	20.00	135.00	.000
Wilks	.06914	90.87096	20.00	135.00	.000
Rois	.93086				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont..)

Univariate F-tests with 1,154: D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	55.35806	202.14194	55.35806	1.31261	42.17404	.000
INDUS	58.79032	206.70968	58.79032	1.34227	43.79916	.000
EDUCATE	351.29032	145.70968	351.29032	.94617	371.27740	.000
WEALTH	288.39032	156.10968	288.39032	1.01370	284.49299	.000
FRIEND	22.76129	176.23871	22.76129	1.14441	19.88915	.000
TRUST	188.91613	160.08387	188.91613	1.03951	181.73651	.000
WORK	73.55161	193.94839	73.55161	1.19447	61.57677	.000
INDIV	118.91613	229.08387	118.91613	1.48756	79.94052	.000
POLIT	425.06129	259.43871	425.06129	1.68467	252.31176	.000
TECHC	529.11290	174.38710	529.11290	1.13238	467.25583	.000
ECONOM	388.41613	203.08387	388.41613	1.31873	294.53882	.000
QLIFE	694.50323	153.49677	694.50323	.99673	696.78009	.000
WORLD	534.35161	211.14839	534.35161	1.37109	389.72663	.000
ENVIRO	682.58065	197.41935	682.58065	1.28194	532.45752	.000
RIGHTS	1004.40000	154.60000	1004.40000	1.00390	1000.50194	.000
AVAILW	218.06452	218.93548	218.06452	1.42166	153.38736	.000
SKILL	338.63226	153.36774	338.63226	.99589	340.02827	.000
RESTRICT	103.35806	393.14194	103.35806	2.55287	40.48701	.000
LABOUR	746.32581	215.17419	746.32581	1.39724	534.14479	.000
KNOW	1208.20645	164.79355	1208.20645	1.07009	1129.07207	.000

USA vs Mexico

* * * * * Analysis of Variance -- design 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 12 1/2, N = 67)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.93468	72.07818	27.00	136.00	.000
Hotellings	14.30964	72.07818	27.00	136.00	.000
Wilks	.06532	72.07818	27.00	136.00	.000
Roys	.93468				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,162) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	.30675	223.69325	.30675	1.38082	.22215	.638
INDUS	252.66564	247.83436	252.66564	1.52984	165.15803	.000
EDUCATE	577.77914	174.22086	577.77914	1.07544	537.25037	.000
WEALTH	697.94172	146.55828	697.94172	.90468	771.47846	.000
FRIEND	.24847	168.25153	.24847	1.03859	.23923	.625
TRUST	144.44479	175.05521	144.44479	1.08059	133.67243	.000
WORK	312.15031	151.34969	312.15031	.93426	334.11597	.000
INDIV	340.15031	206.34969	340.15031	1.27376	267.04353	.000
POLIT	864.91104	168.58896	864.91104	1.04067	831.10775	.000
TECHC	989.64417	135.35583	989.64417	.83553	1184.45107	.000
ECONOM	924.54294	213.95706	924.54294	1.32072	700.02813	.000
QLIFE	643.44785	156.55215	643.44785	.96637	665.83917	.000
WORLD	1064.17485	199.32515	1064.17485	1.23040	864.90000	.000
ENVIRO	654.73620	187.26380	654.73620	1.15595	566.40558	.000
RIGHTS	884.56748	159.93252	884.56748	.98724	896.00249	.000
AVAILW	559.29141	204.20859	559.29141	1.26055	443.68951	.000
SKILL	585.79448	149.70552	585.79448	.92411	633.90251	.000
RESTRICT	44.17178	427.82822	44.17178	2.64091	16.72594	.000
LABOUR	612.91104	164.58896	612.91104	1.01598	603.27005	.000
KNOW	417.67178	122.82822	417.67178	.75820	550.87363	.000
ALIGN	454.67791	149.82209	454.67791	.92483	491.63527	.000
POLECO	56.73620	259.26380	56.73620	1.60039	35.45140	.000
IMMIG	179.64417	268.35583	179.64417	1.65652	108.44689	.000
EXPORT	66.28528	121.21472	66.28528	.74824	88.58837	.000
IMPORT	38.47853	256.52147	38.47853	1.58347	24.30019	.000
INVIN	61.85276	225.14724	61.85276	1.38980	44.50486	.000
INVFROM	61.85276	223.14724	61.85276	1.37745	44.90375	.000

USA vs Chile

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- d e s i g n 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 12 1/2, N = 67 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.92384	61.54703	27.00	137.00	.000
Hotellings	12.12971	61.54703	27.00	137.00	.000
Wilks	.07616	61.54703	27.00	137.00	.000
Roys	.92384				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,163) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	10.25610	214.74390	10.25610	1.31745	7.78483	.006
INDUS	161.28049	195.71951	161.28049	1.20073	134.31834	.000
EDUCATE	442.56402	180.93598	442.56402	1.11004	398.69316	.000
WEALTH	515.00305	157.49695	515.00305	.96624	532.99760	.000
FRIEND	2.22256	198.27744	2.22256	1.21643	1.82712	.178
TRUST	46.87805	144.12195	46.87805	.88418	53.01845	.000
WORK	112.39024	150.60976	112.39024	.92399	121.63628	.000
INDIV	268.92988	215.57012	268.92988	1.32252	203.34715	.000
POLIT	843.52439	177.47561	843.52439	1.08881	774.72322	.000
TECHC	925.61280	158.88720	925.61280	.97477	949.57235	.000
ECONOM	702.43902	181.56098	702.43902	1.11387	630.62869	.000
QLIFE	449.56098	167.43902	449.56098	1.02723	437.64253	.000
WORLD	1127.02439	210.97561	1127.02439	1.29433	870.74035	.000
ENVIRO	512.50000	223.50000	512.50000	1.37117	373.76957	.000
RIGHTS	966.36890	180.13110	966.36890	1.10510	874.46384	.000
AVAILW	428.73476	213.76524	428.73476	1.31144	326.91828	.000
SKILL	440.24390	122.75610	440.24390	.75310	584.57183	.000
RESTRICT	76.10976	391.89024	76.10976	2.40423	31.65654	.000
LABOUR	447.22256	203.27744	447.22256	1.24710	358.60978	.000
KNOW	932.34451	168.15549	932.34451	1.03163	903.75971	.000
ALIGN	802.34451	162.15549	802.34451	.99482	806.52315	.000
POLECO	90.19512	255.80488	90.19512	1.56936	57.47273	.000
IMMIG	189.02744	289.47256	189.02744	1.76977	106.80902	.000
EXPORT	118.32012	141.17988	118.32012	.86613	136.60714	.000
IMPORT	53.92988	266.57012	53.92988	1.63540	32.97658	.000
INVIN	107.75610	257.24390	107.75610	1.57818	68.27856	.000
INVFROM	96.59756	257.40244	96.59756	1.57916	61.17037	.000

USA vs Argentina

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 12 1/2, N = 64 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.93995	75.94843	27.00	131.00	.000
Hotellings	15.65349	75.94843	27.00	131.00	.000
Wilks	.06005	75.94843	27.00	131.00	.000
Rois	.93995				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,157) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	2.66139	245.83861	2.66139	1.56585	1.69965	.194
INDUS	125.31962	209.18038	125.31962	1.33236	94.05844	.000
EDUCATE	355.14241	152.35759	355.14241	.97043	365.96376	.000
WEALTH	428.55696	138.44304	428.55696	.88180	486.00091	.000
FRIEND	.62025	222.37975	.62025	1.41643	.43790	.509
TRUST	51.04114	163.45886	51.04114	1.04114	49.02432	.000
WORK	114.24051	144.75949	114.24051	.92203	123.90040	.000
INDIV	210.64557	238.35443	210.64557	1.51818	138.74865	.000
POLIT	858.99051	136.50949	858.99051	.86949	987.92770	.000
TECHC	868.91139	141.08861	868.91139	.89865	966.90364	.000
ECONOM	738.25633	197.24367	738.25633	1.25633	587.62972	.000
QLIFE	419.29114	161.70886	419.29114	1.02999	407.08164	.000
WORLD	1064.55696	198.44304	1064.55696	1.26397	842.23385	.000
ENVIRO	491.25316	225.74684	491.25316	1.43788	341.65151	.000
RIGHTS	929.63291	177.36709	929.63291	1.12973	822.88303	.000
AVAILW	370.13924	234.86076	370.13924	1.49593	247.43112	.000
SKILL	419.29114	123.70886	419.29114	.78795	532.12606	.000
RESTRICT	115.44620	397.05380	115.44620	2.52901	45.64886	.000
LABOUR	387.65823	216.34177	387.65823	1.37797	281.32497	.000
KNOW	922.78481	152.21519	922.78481	.96952	951.79210	.000
ALIGN	797.48101	144.51899	797.48101	.92050	866.35342	.000
POLECO	75.05063	259.94937	75.05063	1.65573	45.32786	.000
IMMIG	120.33228	319.16772	120.33228	2.03292	59.19197	.000
EXPORT	78.00316	124.49684	78.00316	.79297	98.36794	.000
IMPORT	38.99051	239.50949	38.99051	1.52554	25.55853	.000
INVIN	84.07911	247.42089	84.07911	1.57593	53.35209	.000
INFROM	83.05063	200.94937	83.05063	1.27993	64.88674	.000

Mexico vs Chile

* * * * * Analysis of Variance -- design 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 12 1/2, N = 65)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.66371	9.64895	27.00	132.00	.000
Hotellings	1.97365	9.64895	27.00	132.00	.000
Wilks	.33629	9.64895	27.00	132.00	.000
Roys	.66371				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,158) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	3.22013	102.77987	3.22013	.65051	4.95019	.028
INDUS	12.08805	142.91195	12.08805	.90451	13.36426	.000
EDUCATE	12.08805	115.91195	12.08805	.73362	16.47727	.000
WEALTH	16.30189	127.69811	16.30189	.80822	20.17021	.000
FRIEND	.25472	91.24528	.25472	.57750	.44107	.508
TRUST	24.35220	135.64780	24.35220	.85853	28.36499	.000
WORK	49.13522	129.36478	49.13522	.81876	60.01142	.000
INDIV	5.28616	101.21384	5.28616	.64059	8.25197	.005
POLIT	.45283	148.54717	.45283	.94017	.48165	.489
TECHC	2.64465	112.85535	2.64465	.71427	3.70257	.056
ECONOM	22.18868	123.81132	22.18868	.78362	28.31576	.000
QLIFE	16.75786	94.74214	16.75786	.59963	27.94683	.000
WORLD	1.38679	84.11321	1.38679	.53236	2.60498	.109
ENVIRO	9.86164	66.13836	9.86164	.41860	23.55877	.000
RIGHTS	1.66352	95.83648	1.66352	.60656	2.74255	.100
AVAILW	6.65409	115.34591	6.65409	.73004	9.11472	.003
SKILL	11.32075	99.67925	11.32075	.63088	17.94435	.000
RESTRICT	3.02201	179.47799	3.02201	1.13594	2.66037	.105
LABOUR	17.68868	90.81132	17.68868	.57476	30.77602	.000
KNOW	87.70126	153.79874	87.70126	.97341	90.09696	.000
ALIGN	38.05031	165.94969	38.05031	1.05031	36.22754	.000
POLECC	.80503	110.19497	.80503	.69744	1.15427	.284
IMMIG	.25472	94.24528	.25472	.59649	.42703	.514
EXPORT	3.22013	106.77987	3.22013	.67582	4.76475	.031
IMPORT	.25472	121.24528	.25472	.76738	.33193	.565
INVIN	2.29245	131.20755	2.29245	.83043	2.76057	.1099
INVFROM	1.38679	108.11321	1.38679	.68426	2.02670	.157

Mexico vs Argentina

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 12 1/2, N = 62)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.69398	10.58312	27.00	126.00	.000
Hotellings	2.26781	10.58312	27.00	126.00	.000
Wilks	.30602	10.58312	27.00	126.00	.000
Rois	.69398				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,152) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	.39542	114.10458	.39542	.75069	.52675	.469
INDUS	23.05882	135.94118	23.05882	.89435	25.78278	.000
EDUCATE	34.00000	99.00000	34.00000	.65132	52.20202	.000
WEALTH	34.66993	110.83007	34.66993	.72915	47.54874	.000
FRIEND	.01307	114.98693	.01307	.75649	.01728	.896
TRUST	16.47386	95.02614	16.47386	.62517	26.35092	.000
WORK	40.26471	116.23529	40.26471	.76471	52.65385	.000
INDIV	16.47386	120.02614	16.47386	.78965	20.86234	.000
POLIT	.01307	128.98693	.01307	.84860	.01540	.901
TECHC	6.32680	88.67320	6.32680	.58338	10.84514	.001
ECONCM	11.76471	95.23529	11.76471	.62655	18.77702	.000
QLIFE	19.88235	90.11765	19.88235	.59288	33.53525	.000
WORLD	.00000	103.00000	.00000	.67763	.00000	1.000
ENVIRO	8.83660	92.16340	8.83660	.60634	14.57372	.000
RIGHTS	1.58170	121.41830	1.58170	.79880	1.98008	.161
AVAILW	15.11111	132.88889	15.11111	.87427	17.28428	.000
SKILL	10.61765	97.88235	10.61765	.64396	16.48798	.000
RESTRICT	16.47386	204.02614	16.47386	1.34228	12.27307	.001
LABOUR	28.87582	114.12418	28.87582	.75082	38.45919	.000
KNOW	90.05229	117.94771	90.05229	.77597	116.05098	.000
ALIGN	43.97386	145.02614	43.97386	.95412	46.08842	.000
POLECC	.02941	102.47059	.02941	.67415	.04363	.835
IMMIG	8.50000	155.00000	8.50000	1.01974	8.33548	.004
EXPORT	.08170	93.41830	.08170	.61459	.13293	.716
IMPORT	.20915	159.79085	.20915	1.05126	.19895	.656
INVIN	1.44118	125.05882	1.44118	.82276	1.75165	.188
INVFROM	.47059	117.52941	.47059	.77322	.60861	.437

Chile vs Argentina

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 12 1/2, N = 66 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.28685	2.01110	27.00	135.00	.005
Hotellings	.40222	2.01110	27.00	135.00	.005
Wilks	.71315	2.01110	27.00	135.00	.005
Roys	.28685				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,161) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	1.23457	88.76543	1.23457	.55134	2.23922	.137
INDUS	1.36111	104.13889	1.36111	.64683	2.10429	.149
EDUCATE	3.16049	77.93951	3.16049	.48348	6.53703	.011
WEALTH	1.92901	106.57099	1.92901	.66193	2.91422	.090
FRIEND	.37346	89.12654	.37346	.54737	.68228	.410
TRUST	1.00000	93.00000	1.00000	.57764	1.73118	.190
WORK	.60494	82.39506	.60494	.51177	1.18205	.279
INDIV	1.00000	94.00000	1.00000	.58385	1.71277	.192
POLIT	1.11420	96.38580	1.11420	.59867	1.86112	.174
TECHC	.25000	82.25000	.25000	.51087	.48936	.485
ECONOM	2.41975	84.58025	2.41975	.52534	4.60604	.033
QLIFE	.00000	76.00000	.00000	.47205	.00000	1.000
WORLD	.30864	72.69136	.30864	.45150	.68359	.410
ENVIRC	.00309	68.49691	.00309	.42545	.00725	.932
RIGHTS	.19753	81.80247	.19753	.50809	.38877	.534
AVAILW	.44444	106.55556	.44444	.66184	.67153	.414
SKILL	.02778	71.47222	.02778	.44393	.06257	.803
RESTRICT	4.69444	185.80556	4.69444	1.15407	4.06772	.045
LABOUR	1.11420	87.38580	1.11420	.54277	2.05290	.154
KNOW	.37346	107.12654	.37346	.66538	.56127	.455
ALIGN	.69444	93.80556	.69444	.58264	1.19189	.277
POLECC	.02778	91.47222	.02778	.56815	.04889	.825
IMMIG	5.44444	114.55556	5.44444	.71153	7.65179	.006
EXPORT	2.59568	95.90432	2.59568	.59568	4.35751	.038
IMPORT	.25000	116.25000	.25000	.72205	.34624	.557
INVIN	.00000	124.00000	.00000	.77019	.00000	1.000
INVFROM	.11111	83.88889	.11111	.52105	.21325	.645

Appendix E - Doubly Multivariate Analysis of Variance

Product Profiles

Overall

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

AVERAGED Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 4, M = 7 1/2, N = 201 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	1.48372	12.02885	80.00	1632.00	.000
Hotellings	6.76761	34.13414	80.00	1614.00	.000
Wilks	.06978	19.27772	80.00	1600.10	.000
Roys	.85528				

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (4,424) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	755.74953	449.45047	188.93738	1.06002	178.23866	.000
VALUE	344.82243	595.97757	86.20561	1.40561	61.32979	.000
WRKSHR	506.19439	452.60561	126.54960	1.06747	118.55047	.000
ATTRACT	469.38318	454.61682	117.34579	1.07221	109.44297	.000
INNOVAT	775.52523	472.87477	193.88131	1.11527	173.84238	.000
VARIETY	622.47850	495.92150	155.61963	1.16963	133.05074	.000
DURABL	562.25421	442.94579	140.56355	1.04468	134.55133	.000
TEC	1012.99813	426.20187	253.24953	1.00519	251.94118	.000
RELIABL	826.12336	391.47664	206.53084	.92329	223.68915	.000
KNOWP	1793.69346	493.10654	448.42336	1.16299	385.57896	.000
SATIS	744.10093	412.69907	186.02523	.97335	191.11916	.000
EASFIND	424.45981	1316.74019	106.11495	3.10552	34.16979	.000
BUY	966.31028	736.88972	241.57757	1.73795	139.00165	.000
PRIDE	1049.33458	623.06542	262.33364	1.46949	178.51972	.000
SPECS	668.88972	398.71028	167.22243	.94035	177.82915	.000
SELLS	720.64673	617.35327	180.16168	1.45602	123.73556	.000
COMPROD	919.17009	402.02991	229.79252	.94818	242.35020	.000
DEFECTS	148.75514	732.04486	37.18879	1.72652	21.53972	.000
BRAND	829.81308	1507.38692	207.45327	3.55516	58.35276	.000
WHOLE	337.24112	499.55888	84.31028	1.17820	71.55825	.000

Canada vs USA

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 9 , N = 73)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.61346	11.74396	20.00	148.00	.000
Hotellings	1.58702	11.74396	20.00	148.00	.000
Wilks	.38654	11.74396	20.00	148.00	.000
Roys	.61346				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,167) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	11.81250	131.68750	11.81250	.78855	14.98007	.000
VALUE	.96429	169.03571	.96429	1.01219	.95267	.330
WRKSHP	14.58333	140.41667	14.58333	.84082	17.34421	.000
ATTRACT	.07440	130.42560	.07440	.78099	.09527	.758
INNOVAT	102.96429	187.03571	102.96429	1.11997	91.93450	.000
VARIETY	96.42857	233.57143	96.42857	1.39863	68.94495	.000
DURABL	9.33333	146.66667	9.33333	.87824	10.62727	.001
TEC	21.00000	124.00000	21.00000	.74251	28.28226	.000
RELIABL	.96429	116.03571	.96429	.69482	1.38781	.240
KNOWP	.02679	147.47321	.02679	.88307	.03033	.862
SATIS	.50298	104.99702	.50298	.62872	.79999	.372
EASFIND	.01190	393.98810	.01190	2.35921	.00505	.943
BUY	5.50298	207.99702	5.50298	1.24549	4.41832	.037
PRIDE	44.29762	206.70238	44.29762	1.23774	35.78915	.000
SPECS	8.36012	122.13988	8.36012	.73138	11.43066	.001
SELLS	5.76190	149.23810	5.76190	.89364	6.44767	.012
COMPROD	2.33333	114.66667	2.33333	.68663	3.39826	.067
DEFECTS	2.86012	219.63988	2.86012	1.31521	2.17465	.142
BRAND	28.00298	452.49702	28.00298	2.70956	10.33487	.002
WHOLE	6.02679	162.47321	6.02679	.97289	6.19470	.014

Canada vs Mexico

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 9 , N = 67)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.87399	47.16475	20.00	136.00	.000
Hotellings	6.93599	47.16475	20.00	136.00	.000
Wilks	.12601	47.16475	20.00	136.00	.000
Rois	.87399				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,155) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	505.15705	215.34295	505.15705	1.38931	363.60300	.000
VALUE	159.38782	345.11218	159.38782	2.22653	71.58574	.000
WRKSH	408.49038	220.00962	408.49038	1.41942	287.78747	.000
ATTRACT	237.12821	197.87179	237.12821	1.27659	185.75094	.000
INNOVAT	203.53846	251.46154	203.53846	1.62233	125.46039	.000
VARIETY	115.70513	269.29487	115.70513	1.73739	66.59724	.000
DURABL	390.38782	206.11218	390.38782	1.32976	293.57854	.000
TEC	487.50000	198.50000	487.50000	1.28065	380.66751	.000
RELIABL	528.32051	172.67949	528.32051	1.11406	474.22934	.000
KNOWP	626.16667	231.83333	626.16667	1.49570	418.64486	.000
SATIS	441.15705	192.34295	441.15705	1.24092	355.50741	.000
EASFIND	94.82051	520.17949	94.82051	3.35600	28.25405	.000
BUY	457.96154	329.03846	457.96154	2.12283	215.73174	.000
PRIDE	684.11538	273.88462	684.11538	1.76700	387.16262	.000
SPECS	482.51282	185.48718	482.51282	1.19669	403.20570	.000
SELLS	296.20513	266.79487	296.20513	1.72126	172.08650	.000
COMPROD	554.66667	192.33333	554.66667	1.24086	447.00173	.000
DEFECTS	152.32051	347.67949	152.32051	2.24309	67.90645	.000
BRAND	262.16667	610.83333	262.16667	3.94086	66.52524	.000
WHOLE	231.92628	197.57372	231.92628	1.27467	181.95018	.000

Canada vs Chile

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

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

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.92104	64.15948	20.00	110.00	.000
Hotellings	11.66536	64.15948	20.00	110.00	.000
Wilks	.07896	64.15948	20.00	110.00	.000
Roys	.92104				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,129) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	408.75385	144.24615	408.75385	1.11819	365.55045	.000
VALUE	201.69615	231.80385	201.69615	1.79693	112.24492	.000
WRKSHF	286.65000	135.85000	286.65000	1.05310	272.19617	.000
ATTRACT	228.98462	127.01538	228.98462	.98462	232.56250	.000
INNOVAT	216.03462	180.46538	216.03462	1.39896	154.42555	.000
VARIETY	177.78846	184.71154	177.78846	1.43187	124.16502	.000
DURABL	319.01538	137.98462	319.01538	1.06965	298.24328	.000
TEC	421.38846	131.11154	421.38846	1.01637	414.60204	.000
RELIABL	421.38846	108.11154	421.38846	.83807	502.80583	.000
KNOWP	1040.00000	151.00000	1040.00000	1.17054	888.47682	.000
SATIS	372.00385	135.49615	372.00385	1.05036	354.16870	.000
EASFIND	262.00385	566.49615	262.00385	4.39144	59.66236	.000
BUY	518.03462	236.46538	518.03462	1.83306	282.60570	.000
PRIDE	675.23462	194.26538	675.23462	1.50593	448.38284	.000
SPECS	357.78846	103.71154	357.78846	.80397	445.02967	.000
SELLS	357.78846	223.71154	357.78846	1.73420	206.31350	.000
COMPROD	518.03462	119.46538	518.03462	.92609	559.37932	.000
DEFECTS	76.46538	233.03462	76.46538	1.80647	42.32862	.000
BRAND	341.55385	498.44615	341.55385	3.86392	88.39560	.000
WHOLE	166.40000	181.60000	166.40000	1.40775	118.20264	.000

Canada vs Argentina

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 9 , N = 55 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.93650	83.33314	20.00	113.00	.000
Hotellings	14.74923	83.33314	20.00	113.00	.000
Wilks	.06350	83.33314	20.00	113.00	.000
Rois	.93650				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,132) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	419.38346	106.61654	419.38346	.80770	519.23103	.000
VALUE	181.95489	190.04511	181.95489	1.43974	126.38076	.000
WRKSHP	305.35714	122.14286	305.35714	.92532	330.00000	.000
ATTRACT	286.37594	129.62406	286.37594	.98200	291.62506	.000
INNOVAT	280.18421	164.31579	280.18421	1.24482	225.08072	.000
VARIETY	204.09398	196.40602	204.09398	1.48792	137.16691	.000
DURABL	377.77820	146.72180	377.77820	1.11153	339.67260	.000
TEC	528.66541	139.83459	528.66541	1.05935	499.04560	.000
RELIABL	509.11278	114.88722	509.11278	.87036	584.94660	.000
KNOWP	1088.13534	159.86466	1088.13534	1.21110	898.47164	.000
SATIS	444.87218	133.12782	444.87218	1.00854	441.10335	.000
EASFIND	137.14662	524.35338	137.14662	3.97237	34.52510	.000
BUY	622.74060	231.75940	622.74060	1.75575	354.68576	.000
PRIDE	717.92857	228.57143	717.92857	1.73160	414.60375	.000
SPECS	409.39850	113.60150	409.39850	.96062	475.70322	.000
SELLS	528.66541	196.83459	528.66541	1.50632	350.96427	.000
COMPROD	517.44737	113.05263	517.44737	.85646	604.17039	.000
DEFECTS	48.00376	264.49624	48.00376	2.00376	23.95685	.000
BRAND	131.46241	630.03759	131.46241	4.77301	27.54286	.000
WHOLE	236.84586	159.65414	236.84586	1.20950	195.82114	.000

USA vs Mexico

***** Analysis of Variance -- design 1 *****
 Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 9, N = 65 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.86323	41.97023	20.00	133.00	.000
Hotellings	6.31131	41.97023	20.00	133.00	.000
Wilks	.13677	41.97023	20.00	133.00	.000
Rois	.86323				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

 EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,152) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	360.20915	200.79085	360.20915	1.32099	272.68071	.000
VALUE	126.82680	273.67320	126.82680	1.80048	70.44049	.000
WRKSHP	259.88235	200.11765	259.88235	1.31656	197.39447	.000
ATTRACT	224.32680	222.67320	224.32680	1.46496	153.12877	.000
INNOVAT	554.71895	224.28105	554.71895	1.47553	375.94475	.000
VARIETY	393.49346	212.00654	393.49346	1.39478	292.11869	.000
DURABL	261.72876	214.77124	261.72876	1.41297	185.23323	.000
TEC	667.66013	215.33987	667.66013	1.41671	471.27520	.000
RELIABL	471.89542	211.10458	471.89542	1.38885	339.77523	.000
KNOWP	593.05882	205.94118	593.05882	1.35488	437.72179	.000
SATIS	391.22876	176.77124	391.22876	1.16297	336.40524	.000
EASFIND	96.67974	526.32026	96.67974	3.46263	27.92087	.000
BUY	351.58170	329.41830	351.58170	2.16723	162.22662	.000
PRIDE	393.49346	211.00654	393.49346	1.38820	283.45571	.000
SPECS	332.55229	215.94771	332.55229	1.42071	234.07494	.000
SELLS	222.61765	240.88235	222.61765	1.58475	140.47473	.000
COMPROD	484.39542	178.10458	484.39542	1.17174	413.39817	.000
DEFECTS	110.64052	328.35948	110.64052	2.16026	51.21631	.000
BRAND	502.16993	702.83007	502.16993	4.62388	106.60354	.000
WHOLE	182.01307	222.98693	182.01307	1.46702	124.06999	.000

USA vs Chile

* * * * * Analysis of Variance -- design 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

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	.92927	72.91597	20.00	111.00	.000
Hotellings	13.13801	72.91597	20.00	111.00	.000
Wilks	.07073	72.91597	20.00	111.00	.000
Rois	.92927				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,130) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	299.23664	163.76336	299.23664	1.25972	237.54253	.000
VALUE	168.32061	197.67939	168.32061	1.52061	110.69277	.000
WRKSHP	173.16412	150.33588	173.16412	1.15643	149.74028	.000
ATTRACT	214.38550	156.11450	214.38550	1.20088	178.52354	.000
INNOVAT	491.91221	169.58779	491.91221	1.30452	377.08251	.000
VARIETY	438.62977	151.87023	438.62977	1.16823	375.46444	.000
DURABL	193.22519	166.27481	193.22519	1.27904	151.07084	.000
TEC	533.87786	164.12214	533.87786	1.26248	422.88093	.000
RELIABL	357.38931	134.61069	357.38931	1.03547	345.14801	.000
KNOWP	1032.06107	131.93893	1032.06107	1.01491	1016.89424	.000
SATIS	312.19847	148.80153	312.19847	1.14463	272.75124	.000
EASFIND	244.30916	569.19084	244.30916	4.37839	55.79884	.000
BUY	415.64885	288.35115	415.64885	2.21809	187.39080	.000
PRIDE	383.54580	220.95420	383.54580	1.69965	225.66195	.000
SPECS	256.03435	134.46565	256.03435	1.03435	247.53137	.000
SELLS	270.06107	241.93893	270.06107	1.86107	145.11075	.000
COMPROD	443.82061	139.67939	443.82061	1.07446	413.06509	.000
DEFECTS	49.60305	209.39695	49.60305	1.61075	30.79509	.000
BRAND	565.74427	568.75573	565.74427	4.37504	129.31168	.000
WHOLE	126.42748	205.57252	126.42748	1.58133	79.95024	.000

USA vs Argentina

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * * *
* *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

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	.93888	85.24768	20.00	111.00	.000
Hotellings	15.35994	85.24768	20.00	111.00	.000
Wilks	.06112	85.24768	20.00	111.00	.000
Roys	.93888				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,130) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	297.10305	164.39695	297.10305	1.26459	234.93987	.000
VALUE	134.90076	200.09924	134.90076	1.53922	87.64201	.000
WRKSHP	191.51145	148.48855	191.51145	1.14222	167.66605	.000
ATTRACT	256.03435	167.46565	256.03435	1.28820	198.75399	.000
INNOVAT	613.74427	147.75573	613.74427	1.13658	539.99096	.000
VARIETY	475.60687	153.89313	475.60687	1.18379	401.76513	.000
DURABL	236.64504	197.85496	236.64504	1.52196	155.48690	.000
TEC	651.02672	166.47328	651.02672	1.29056	508.39073	.000
RELIABL	433.46947	147.03053	433.46947	1.13100	393.26073	.000
KNOWP	1108.85878	147.64122	1108.85878	1.13570	976.36446	.000
SATIS	395.74046	144.25954	395.74046	1.10969	356.62292	.000
EASFIND	130.62977	576.87023	130.62977	4.43746	29.43794	.000
BUY	481.01145	279.48855	481.01145	2.14991	223.73542	.000
PRIDE	398.20229	234.29771	398.20229	1.80229	220.94240	.000
SPECS	301.37786	124.12214	301.37786	.95479	315.64975	.000
SELLS	415.64885	229.35115	415.64885	1.76424	235.59661	.000
COMPROD	430.90076	150.09924	430.90076	1.15461	373.20043	.000
DEFECTS	34.44656	233.05344	34.44656	1.79272	19.21471	.000
BRAND	276.18702	698.31298	276.18702	5.37164	51.41579	.000
WHOLE	174.79389	168.20611	174.79389	1.29369	135.09145	.000

Mexico vs Chile

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

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	.49128	5.35970	20.00	111.00	.000
Hotellings	.96571	5.35970	20.00	111.00	.000
Wilks	.50872	5.35970	20.00	111.00	.000
Rois	.49128				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,130) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	.54962	113.45038	.54962	.87270	.62979	.429
VALUE	1.23664	100.76336	1.23664	.77510	1.59545	.209
WRKSHP	3.43511	103.56489	3.43511	.79665	4.31193	.040
ATTRACT	.13740	114.86260	.13740	.88356	.15551	.694
INNOVAT	.85878	98.64122	.85878	.75878	1.13179	.289
VARIETY	8.07634	122.92366	8.07634	.94557	8.54127	.004
DURABL	.64504	89.85496	.64504	.69119	.93323	.336
TEC	.00382	84.49618	.00382	.64997	.00587	.939
RELIABL	.18702	103.31298	.18702	.79472	.23533	.628
KNOWP	75.88168	163.61832	75.88168	1.25860	60.29043	.000
SATIS	.54962	122.45038	.54962	.94193	.58350	.446
EASFIND	42.88550	207.11450	42.88550	1.59319	26.91803	.000
BUY	3.20992	211.29008	3.20992	1.62531	1.97496	.162
PRIDE	1.37786	113.12214	1.37786	.87017	1.58344	.211
SPECS	.74809	90.25191	.74809	.69425	1.07756	.301
SELLS	5.51145	143.48855	5.51145	1.10376	4.99335	.027
COMPROD	.30916	104.19084	.30916	.80147	.38574	.536
DEFECTS	5.51145	174.48855	5.51145	1.34222	4.10622	.045
BRAND	6.73282	222.26718	6.73282	1.70975	3.93791	.049
WHOLE	1.23664	93.76336	1.23664	.72126	1.71456	.193

Mexico vs Argentina

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- d e s i g n 1 * * *
 Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 9, N = 56)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.55087	6.99133	20.00	114.00	.000
Hotellings	1.22655	6.99133	20.00	114.00	.000
Wilks	.44913	6.99133	20.00	114.00	.000
Rois	.55087				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,133) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	.73134	102.26866	.73134	.76894	.95111	.331
VALUE	.18284	146.31716	.18284	1.10013	.16619	.684
WRKSHP	2.72015	105.77985	2.72015	.79534	3.42012	.067
ATTRACT	1.80597	99.19403	1.80597	.74582	2.42146	.122
INNOVAT	8.95896	86.54104	8.95896	.65068	13.76851	.000
VARIETY	12.98881	110.51119	12.98881	.83091	15.63200	.000
DURABL	.03358	107.46642	.03358	.80802	.04156	.839
TEC	3.35821	93.64179	3.35821	.70407	4.76968	.031
RELIABL	.13433	82.86567	.13433	.62305	.21560	.643
KNOWP	91.97388	179.52612	91.97388	1.34982	68.13786	.000
SATIS	.83955	109.66045	.83955	.82451	1.01824	.315
EASFIND	.63060	310.86940	.63060	2.33736	.26979	.604
BUY	11.28731	182.21269	11.28731	1.37002	8.23879	.005
PRIDE	.95522	156.04478	.95522	1.17327	.81416	.369
SPECS	.03358	106.46642	.03358	.80050	.04195	.838
SELLS	30.22388	133.77612	30.22388	1.00584	30.04853	.000
COMPROD	.01493	96.98507	.01493	.72921	.02047	.886
DEFECTS	25.70522	171.79478	25.70522	1.29169	19.90046	.000
BRAND	37.31343	490.68657	37.31343	3.68937	10.11376	.002
WHOLE	1.34701	117.15299	1.34701	.88085	1.52922	.218

Chile vs Argentina

***** Analysis of Variance -- design 1 *****
 Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 9, N = 51)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.40209	3.49703	20.00	104.00	.000
Hotellings	.67251	3.49703	20.00	104.00	.000
Wilks	.59791	3.49703	20.00	104.00	.000
Roy's	.40209				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,123) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	.06452	65.93548	.06452	.53606	.12035	.729
VALUE	.32661	68.17339	.32661	.55426	.58928	.444
WRKSHP	.10081	68.39919	.10081	.55609	.18128	.671
ATTRACT	.32661	72.17339	.32661	.58678	.55662	.457
INNOVAT	2.52016	64.97984	2.52016	.52829	4.77040	.031
VARIETY	.01613	59.98387	.01613	.48767	.03307	.856
DURABL	1.03226	53.96774	1.03226	.43876	2.35266	.128
TEC	2.13306	68.36694	2.13306	.55593	3.83763	.052
RELIABL	.90726	58.59274	.90726	.47636	1.90455	.170
KNOWP	.03629	85.46371	.03629	.69483	.05223	.820
SATIS	1.30645	65.69355	1.30645	.53409	2.44611	.120
EASFIND	37.16129	249.83871	37.16129	2.03121	18.29516	.000
BUY	.25806	92.74194	.25806	.75400	.34226	.560
PRIDE	.25806	99.74194	.25806	.81091	.31824	.574
SPECS	1.16532	68.33468	1.16532	.55557	2.09754	.150
SELLS	5.82258	89.17742	5.82258	.72502	8.03093	.005
COMPROD	.58065	64.41935	.58065	.52373	1.10866	.294
DEFECTS	4.93952	132.56048	4.93952	1.07773	4.58327	.034
BRAND	65.03629	365.46371	65.03629	2.97125	21.88853	.000
WHOLE	3.87500	85.62500	3.87500	.69614	5.56642	.020

Appendix F - Doubly Multivariate Analysis of Variance

Doing Business Profiles

Overall

***** Analysis of Variance -- design 1 *****
 Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.
 EFFECT .. COUNTRY
 AVERAGED Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 4, M = 14, N = 227)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	1.58709	9.14871	132.00	1836.00	.000
Hotellings	6.56376	22.60023	132.00	1818.00	.000
Wilks	.06043	14.10100	132.00	1817.30	.000
Roys	.83905				

 EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)
 Univariate F-tests with (4,488) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
MARKUP	1.42439	562.17561	.35610	1.15200	.30911	.872
TURNOVER	158.14634	522.65366	39.53659	1.07101	36.91518	.000
PROFIT	25.36585	484.23415	6.34146	.99228	6.39078	.000
ONTIME	630.50407	462.29593	157.62602	.94733	166.39016	.000
SPEED	480.34146	804.05854	120.08537	1.64766	72.88233	.000
CUSTOM	141.03415	789.76585	35.25854	1.61837	21.78641	.000
SERVICE	520.34797	410.45203	130.08699	.84109	154.66473	.000
LEAD	202.61138	901.38862	50.65285	1.84711	27.42279	.000
MINORD	175.74959	859.85041	43.93740	1.76199	24.93626	.000
EZREORD	639.04715	869.35285	159.76179	1.78146	89.68022	.000
RETURN	514.48130	803.11870	128.62033	1.64574	78.15373	.000
COSTRET	671.74959	701.05041	167.93740	1.43658	116.90094	.000
BUSTYLE	1041.34309	511.45691	260.33577	1.04807	248.39601	.000
ORIENT	812.02276	574.37724	203.00569	1.17700	172.47685	.000
NEWPROD	539.91220	578.88780	134.97805	1.18625	113.78593	.000
MANAGER	509.71382	393.48618	127.42846	.80632	158.03627	.000
NEGOT	371.04065	476.55935	92.76016	.97656	94.98703	.000
EASEBUS	709.84390	496.55610	177.46098	1.01753	174.40317	.000
COMSUP	995.72358	453.87642	248.93089	.93007	267.64615	.000
WILLBUS	935.11545	638.08455	233.77886	1.30755	178.79148	.000
CREDIT	330.88780	905.91220	82.72195	1.85638	44.56095	.000
RETAILP	479.20976	607.59024	119.80244	1.24506	96.22207	.000
TRANS	342.81301	665.58699	85.70325	1.36391	62.83655	.000
DUTY	752.56260	800.23740	188.14065	1.63983	114.73175	.000
PAYTERM	340.83577	619.96423	85.20894	1.27042	67.07155	.000
EXCHANGE	572.06504	953.93496	143.01626	1.95478	73.16215	.000
PSTABLE	388.00976	703.99024	97.00244	1.44260	67.24126	.000
FREQRET	302.41626	739.98374	75.60407	1.51636	49.95891	.000
MARKDN	96.66016	590.13984	24.16504	1.20930	19.98262	.000
COSTBUS	86.39024	594.40976	21.59756	1.21805	17.73122	.000
COSTCOM	707.51870	881.28130	176.97967	1.80590	97.94521	.000
EASECOM	1189.33984	829.96016	297.33496	1.70053	174.84808	.000
LANGUAGE	1155.84715	709.75285	288.96179	1.45441	198.67952	.000

Canada vs USA

***** Analysis of Variance -- design 1 *****
 Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 15 1/2, N = 68)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.79759	16.47859	33.00	138.00	.000
Hotellings	3.94053	16.47859	33.00	138.00	.000
Wilks	.20241	16.47859	33.00	138.00	.000
Roys	.79759				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

 EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,170) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
MARKUP	1.82749	163.67251	1.82749	.96278	1.89813	.170
TURNOVER	.10526	157.89474	.10526	.92879	.11333	.737
PROFIT	2.13158	148.36842	2.13158	.87276	2.44236	.120
ONTIME	.10526	125.89474	.10526	.74056	.14214	.707
SPEED	.00292	253.49708	.00292	1.49116	.00196	.965
CUSTOM	1.68421	276.31579	1.68421	1.62539	1.03619	.310
SERVICE	1.28947	127.21053	1.28947	.74830	1.72321	.191
LEAD	.00292	238.49708	.00292	1.40292	.00208	.964
MINORD	54.08187	246.91813	54.08187	1.45246	37.23468	.000
EZREORD	9.50000	217.00000	9.50000	1.27647	7.44240	.007
RETURN	32.85380	205.14620	32.85380	1.20674	27.22520	.000
COSTRET	193.12573	300.37427	193.12573	1.76691	109.30155	.000
BUSTYLE	.02632	128.47368	.02632	.75573	.03462	.852
ORIENT	.65789	173.84211	.65789	1.02260	.64335	.424
NEWPROD	9.50000	178.00000	9.50000	1.04706	9.07303	.003
MANAGER	22.13158	85.36842	22.13158	.50217	44.07213	.000
NEGOT	45.68713	117.81287	45.68713	.69302	65.92500	.000
EASEBUS	.35380	121.14620	.35380	.71262	.49648	.482
COMSUP	1.05556	138.44444	1.05556	.81438	1.29615	.257
WILLBUS	3.78947	205.21053	3.78947	1.20712	3.13927	.078
CREDIT	29.23977	290.76023	29.23977	1.71035	17.09574	.000
RETAILP	.94737	146.05263	.94737	.85913	1.10270	.295
TRANS	65.78947	254.21053	65.78947	1.49536	43.99586	.000
DUTY	291.97661	355.02339	291.97661	2.08837	139.81057	.000
PAYTERM	12.35380	232.14620	12.35380	1.36557	9.04665	.003
EXCHANGE	725.15789	434.84211	725.15789	2.55789	283.49794	.000
PSTABLE	2.29240	204.70760	2.29240	1.20416	1.90373	.169
FREQRET	4.91520	203.58480	4.91520	1.19756	4.10436	.044
MARKDN	.07310	139.42690	.07310	.82016	.08913	.766
COSTBUS	7.30994	196.69006	7.30994	1.15700	6.31801	.013
COSTCOM	58.95906	319.04094	58.95906	1.87671	31.41616	.000
EASECOM	9.16959	230.83041	9.16959	1.35783	6.75314	.010
LANGUAGE	7.30994	221.69006	7.30994	1.30406	5.60553	.019

Canada vs Mexico

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * * *
 Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 15 1/2, N = 59)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.87935	26.50376	33.00	120.00	.000
Hotellings	7.28853	26.50376	33.00	120.00	.000
Wilks	.12065	26.50376	33.00	120.00	.000
Rois	.87935				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

 EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,152) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
MARKUP	1.44118	210.05882	1.44118	1.38197	1.04285	.309
TURNOVER	62.23529	219.76471	62.23529	1.44582	43.04497	.000
PROFIT	5.22876	202.77124	5.22876	1.33402	3.91955	.050
ONTIME	322.20915	167.79085	322.20915	1.10389	291.88595	.000
SPEED	259.88235	367.11765	259.88235	2.41525	107.60071	.000
CUSTOM	94.44444	269.55556	94.44444	1.77339	53.25639	.000
SERVICE	298.05229	186.94771	298.05229	1.22992	242.33486	.000
LEAD	97.80719	256.69281	97.80719	1.68877	57.91629	.000
MINORD	145.49346	256.00654	145.49346	1.68425	86.38454	.000
EZREORD	316.08170	335.41830	316.08170	2.20670	143.23732	.000
RETURN	304.00327	292.49673	304.00327	1.92432	157.97953	.000
COSTRET	504.73529	255.76471	504.73529	1.68266	299.96228	.000
BUSTYLE	502.16993	191.83007	502.16993	1.26204	397.90337	.000
ORIENT	421.17974	209.32026	421.17974	1.37711	305.84388	.000
NEWPROD	232.97059	212.52941	232.97059	1.39822	166.61943	.000
MANAGER	240.00327	176.49673	240.00327	1.16116	206.69219	.000
NEGOT	113.05882	193.94118	113.05882	1.27593	88.60904	.000
EASEBUS	343.05882	154.94118	343.05882	1.01935	336.54670	.000
COMSUP	418.83660	234.16340	418.83660	1.54055	271.87495	.000
WILLBUS	368.94118	303.05882	368.94118	1.99381	185.04348	.000
CREDIT	180.47386	351.02614	180.47386	2.30938	78.14810	.000
RETAILP	241.77778	231.22222	241.77778	1.52120	158.93897	.000
TRANS	185.11111	322.88889	185.11111	2.12427	57.14109	.000
DUTY	386.71895	334.28105	386.71895	2.19922	175.84389	.000
PAYTERM	161.05882	242.94118	161.05882	1.59830	100.76901	.000
EXCHANGE	209.17974	471.32026	209.17974	3.10079	67.46012	.000
PSTABLE	212.50000	302.00000	212.50000	1.98664	106.95364	.000
FREQRET	175.89542	284.10458	175.89542	1.86911	94.10656	.000
MARKDN	30.74837	207.75163	30.74837	1.36679	22.49682	.000
COSTBUS	30.11765	271.88235	30.11765	1.78870	16.83773	.000
COSTCOM	355.88235	316.11765	355.88235	2.07972	171.12021	.000
EASECOM	515.06209	353.43791	515.06209	2.32525	221.50832	.000
LANGUAGE	484.39542	311.10458	484.39542	2.04674	236.66674	.000

Canada vs Chile

***** Analysis of Variance -- design 1 * * *
 Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

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

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.90453	29.57251	33.00	103.00	.000
Hotellings	9.47469	29.57251	33.00	103.00	.000
Wilks	.09547	29.57251	33.00	103.00	.000
Rois	.90453				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

 EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with 1,135; D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
MARKUP	.18015	224.31985	.18015	1.66163	.10842	.742
TURNOVER	79.44485	172.05515	79.44485	1.27448	62.33499	.000
PROFIT	10.72059	197.27941	10.72059	1.46133	7.33619	.008
ONTIME	307.06250	145.43750	307.06250	1.07731	285.02578	.000
SPEED	220.68015	274.81985	220.68015	2.03570	108.40490	.000
CUSTOM	76.23529	263.76471	76.23529	1.95381	39.01873	.000
SERVICE	240.94118	118.05882	240.94118	.87451	275.51570	.000
LEAD	90.62132	307.87868	90.62132	2.28058	39.73604	.000
MINORD	131.32721	258.17279	131.32721	1.91239	68.67173	.000
EZREORD	355.59191	294.90809	355.59191	2.18450	162.77922	.000
RETURN	309.19118	250.80882	309.19118	1.85784	166.42480	.000
COSTRET	481.77941	250.22059	481.77941	1.85349	259.93153	.000
BUSTYLE	522.53309	168.96691	522.53309	1.25161	417.48983	.000
ORIENT	455.52941	189.47059	455.52941	1.40349	324.57001	.000
NEWPROD	256.23529	179.76471	256.23529	1.33159	192.42801	.000
MANAGER	171.52941	150.47059	171.52941	1.11460	153.89367	.000
NEGOT	102.53309	170.96691	102.53309	1.26642	80.96284	.000
EASEBUS	376.47059	148.52941	376.47059	1.10022	342.17622	.000
COMSUP	514.25000	145.75000	514.25000	1.07963	476.32075	.000
WILLBUS	519.76471	219.23529	519.76471	1.62397	320.05903	.000
CREDIT	203.03309	280.46691	203.03309	2.07753	97.72799	.000
RETAILP	194.48529	178.51471	194.48529	1.32233	147.07760	.000
TRANS	233.47059	284.52941	233.47059	2.10763	110.77424	.000
DUTY	600.05882	290.94118	600.05882	2.15512	278.43409	.000
PAYTERM	217.09191	220.40809	217.09191	1.63265	132.96884	.000
EXCHANGE	324.29779	375.20221	324.29779	2.77928	116.68429	.000
PSTABLE	131.32721	235.17279	131.32721	1.74202	75.38786	.000
FREQRET	177.94118	217.05882	177.94118	1.60784	110.67073	.000
MARKDN	33.18015	201.31985	33.18015	1.49126	22.24977	.000
COSTBUS	52.06250	198.43750	52.06250	1.46991	35.41890	.000
COSTCOM	455.52941	338.47059	455.52941	2.50719	181.68926	.000
EASECOM	728.03309	263.46691	728.03309	1.95161	373.04292	.000
LANGUAGE	734.59191	242.90809	734.59191	1.79932	408.26104	.000

Canada vs Argentina

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- d e s i g n 1 * * *
 Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 15 1/2, N = 52)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.92321	38.61584	33.00	106.00	.000
Hotellings	12.02191	38.61584	33.00	106.00	.000
Wilks	.07679	38.61584	33.00	106.00	.000
Rois	.92321				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

 EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,138) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
MARKUP	1.43885	206.56115	1.43885	1.49682	.96127	.329
TURNOVER	83.10791	189.89209	83.10791	1.37603	60.39689	.000
PROFIT	5.47122	195.02878	5.47122	1.41325	3.87137	.051
ONTIME	300.43525	161.06475	300.43525	1.16714	257.41241	.000
SPEED	219.45683	275.04317	219.45683	1.99307	110.11015	.000
CUSTOM	78.79137	261.20863	78.79137	1.89282	41.62653	.000
SERVICE	268.08993	138.41007	268.08993	1.00297	267.29565	.000
LEAD	67.51439	342.98561	67.51439	2.48540	27.16436	.000
MINORD	61.73022	301.76978	61.73022	2.18674	28.22937	.000
EZREORD	319.43885	330.56115	319.43885	2.39537	133.35675	.000
RETURN	321.58633	297.91367	321.58633	2.15879	148.96568	.000
COSTRET	420.73381	298.26619	420.73381	2.16135	194.66258	.000
BUSTYLE	522.16187	158.33813	522.16187	1.14738	455.09151	.000
ORIENT	406.10072	182.89928	406.10072	1.32536	306.40853	.000
NEWPROD	196.96403	175.03597	196.96403	1.26838	155.28829	.000
MANAGER	174.10072	116.89928	174.10072	.84710	205.52649	.000
NEGOT	78.79137	162.20863	78.79137	1.17542	67.03224	.000
EASEBUS	352.40647	135.09353	352.40647	.97894	359.98834	.000
COMSUP	530.41727	119.58273	530.41727	.86654	612.10829	.000
WILLBUS	497.78417	182.21583	497.78417	1.32040	376.99368	.000
CREDIT	214.15827	309.84173	214.15827	2.24523	95.38367	.000
RETAILP	195.28417	198.21583	195.28417	1.43635	135.95895	.000
TRANS	195.28417	295.21583	195.28417	2.13925	91.28649	.000
DUTY	530.41727	260.58273	530.41727	1.88828	280.89959	.000
PAYTERM	224.82014	225.17986	224.82014	1.63174	137.77955	.000
EXCHANGE	208.92446	408.57554	208.92446	2.96069	70.56608	.000
PSTABLE	142.44964	228.05036	142.44964	1.65254	86.20048	.000
FREQRET	149.69784	275.30216	149.69784	1.99494	75.03865	.000
MARKDN	56.20504	238.29496	56.20504	1.72678	32.54914	.000
COSTBUS	55.30935	239.69065	55.30935	1.73689	31.84392	.000
COSTCOM	401.28058	351.71942	401.28058	2.54869	157.44572	.000
EASECOM	511.25540	279.24460	511.25540	2.02351	252.65750	.000
LANGUAGE	549.93165	191.56835	549.93165	1.38818	396.15401	.000

USA vs Mexico

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- d e s i g n 1 * * *
 Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 15 1/2, N = 63)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.86828	25.56920	33.00	128.00	.000
Hotellings	6.59206	25.56920	33.00	128.00	.000
Wilks	.13172	25.56920	33.00	128.00	.000
Rois	.86828				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

 EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,160) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
MARKUP	.00311	223.49689	.00311	1.39686	.00222	.962
TURNOVER	68.94720	174.55280	68.94720	1.09095	63.19895	.000
PROFIT	15.65528	206.84472	15.65528	1.29278	12.10978	.001
ONTIME	330.04969	147.95031	330.04969	.92469	356.93031	.000
SPEED	296.52484	308.97516	296.52484	1.93109	153.55272	.000
CUSTOM	76.54969	330.95031	76.54969	2.06844	37.00843	.000
SERVICE	270.26398	176.23602	270.26398	1.10148	245.36548	.000
LEAD	97.29503	328.20497	97.29503	2.05128	47.43135	.000
MINORD	24.59938	362.90062	24.59938	2.26813	10.84567	.001
EZREORD	238.28882	331.21118	238.28882	2.07007	115.11149	.000
RETURN	161.44099	354.55901	161.44099	2.21599	72.85264	.000
COSTRET	95.10870	220.39130	95.10870	1.37745	69.04715	.000
BUSTSYLE	524.59938	179.90062	524.59938	1.12438	466.56815	.000
ORIENT	359.00621	220.99379	359.00621	1.38121	259.92130	.000
NEWPROD	324.00311	232.49689	324.00311	1.45311	222.97286	.000
MANAGER	398.02484	171.97516	398.02484	1.07484	370.30916	.000
NEGOT	292.69876	170.80124	292.69876	1.06751	274.18888	.000
EASEBUS	338.19876	191.80124	338.19876	1.19876	282.12435	.000
COMSUP	411.47826	161.52174	411.47826	1.00951	407.60162	.000
WILLBUS	326.01242	256.98758	326.01242	1.60617	202.97474	.000
CREDIT	75.57764	374.42236	75.57764	2.34014	32.29621	.000
RETAILP	300.37578	234.12422	300.37578	1.46328	205.27617	.000
TRANS	38.26398	199.23602	38.26398	1.24523	30.72856	.000
DUTY	6.57143	244.42857	6.57143	1.52768	4.30158	.040
PAYTERM	86.61180	223.88820	86.61180	1.39930	61.89647	.000
EXCHANGE	116.88199	289.11801	116.88199	1.80699	64.68334	.000
PSTABLE	255.80435	278.69565	255.80435	1.74195	146.85803	.000
FREQRET	125.46894	298.03106	125.46894	1.86269	67.35886	.000
MARKDN	45.46894	207.03106	45.46894	1.29394	35.13981	.000
COSTBUS	11.55590	189.94410	11.55590	1.18715	9.73415	.002
COSTCOM	155.82609	245.17391	155.82609	1.53234	101.69179	.000
EASECOM	413.74224	345.75776	413.74224	2.16099	191.45993	.000
LANGUAGE	380.43478	307.56522	380.43478	1.92228	197.90763	.000

USA vs Chile

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- d e s i g n 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 15 1/2, N = 53)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.86799	21.51918	33.00	108.00	.000
Hotellings	6.57531	21.51918	33.00	108.00	.000
Wilks	.13201	21.51918	33.00	108.00	.000
Rois	.86799				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,140) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
MARKUP	.01418	209.98582	.01418	1.49990	.00946	.923
TURNOVER	81.92908	173.07092	81.92908	1.23622	66.27382	.000
PROFIT	17.37589	168.62411	17.37589	1.20446	14.42631	.000
ONTIME	296.17376	141.32624	296.17376	1.00947	293.39439	.000
SPEED	216.34397	283.15603	216.34397	2.02254	106.96631	.000
CUSTOM	74.55674	308.94326	74.55674	2.20674	33.78596	.000
SERVICE	214.59574	133.40426	214.59574	.95289	225.20574	.000
LEAD	90.78014	327.21986	90.78014	2.33728	38.84000	.000
MINORD	19.94681	289.55319	19.94681	2.06824	9.64435	.002
EZREORD	276.03191	297.46809	276.03191	2.12477	129.91131	.000
RETURN	143.26596	292.23404	143.26596	2.08739	68.63415	.000
COSTRET	102.48227	242.51773	102.48227	1.73227	59.16070	.000
BUSTYLE	520.17376	199.32624	520.17376	1.42376	365.35243	.000
ORIENT	372.25532	239.74468	372.25532	1.71246	217.38019	.000
NEWPROD	312.79787	194.70213	312.79787	1.39073	224.91640	.000
MANAGER	284.00355	139.49645	284.00355	.99640	295.02873	.000
NEGOT	264.28723	152.21277	264.28723	1.08723	243.08219	.000
EASEBUS	345.19149	197.80851	345.19149	1.41292	244.31107	.000
COMSUP	462.13121	139.36879	462.13121	.99549	464.22421	.000
WILLBUS	422.07447	237.42553	422.07447	1.69590	248.87983	.000
CREDIT	103.69149	309.80851	103.69149	2.21292	46.85736	.000
RETAILP	245.28014	203.21986	245.28014	1.45157	168.97571	.000
TRANS	73.53191	224.46809	73.53191	1.60334	45.86161	.000
DUTY	86.29787	295.70213	86.29787	2.11216	40.85768	.000
PAYTERM	124.00355	211.49645	124.00355	1.51069	82.08410	.000
EXCHANGE	36.89362	245.10638	36.89362	1.75076	21.07292	.000
PSTABLE	150.48227	239.51773	150.48227	1.71084	87.95807	.000
FREQRET	104.90780	234.09220	104.90780	1.67209	62.74063	.000
MARKDN	46.08511	210.91489	46.08511	1.50653	30.59013	.000
COSTBUS	22.69504	192.30496	22.69504	1.37361	16.52222	.000
COSTCOM	268.17376	323.32624	268.17376	2.30947	116.11902	.000
EASECOM	652.62766	299.87234	652.62766	2.14195	304.68923	.000
LANGUAGE	601.92908	285.07092	601.92908	2.03622	295.61090	.000

USA vs Argentina

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * * *
 Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 15 1/2, N = 56 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.88668	27.26835	33.00	115.00	.000
Hotellings	7.82483	27.26835	33.00	115.00	.000
Wilks	.11332	27.26835	33.00	115.00	.000
Rois	.89668				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

 EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,147) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
MARKUP	.12162	210.87838	.12162	1.43455	.08478	.771
TURNOVER	82.21622	174.78378	82.21622	1.18901	69.14705	.000
PROFIT	9.85135	183.14865	9.85135	1.24591	7.90696	.006
ONTIME	300.01351	171.98649	300.01351	1.16998	256.42704	.000
SPEED	233.67905	308.82095	233.67905	2.10082	111.23216	.000
CUSTOM	70.05405	296.94595	70.05405	2.02004	34.67953	.000
SERVICE	224.87838	172.12162	224.87838	1.17090	192.05676	.000
LEAD	71.03041	330.46959	71.03041	2.24809	31.59586	.000
MINORD	.76014	365.73986	.76014	2.48803	.30552	.581
EZREORD	253.63514	366.36486	253.63514	2.49228	101.76840	.000
RETURN	184.98649	385.01351	184.98649	2.61914	70.62872	.000
COSTRET	81.16554	274.33446	81.16554	1.86622	43.49193	.000
BUSTYLE	505.97635	194.52365	505.97635	1.32329	382.36237	.000
ORIENT	341.63514	190.36486	341.63514	1.29500	263.81110	.000
NEWPROD	257.35135	227.64865	257.35135	1.54863	166.17998	.000
MANAGER	280.21622	128.78378	280.21622	.87608	319.85226	.000
NEGOT	214.54054	153.45946	214.54054	1.04394	205.51004	.000
EASEBUS	306.08446	201.41554	306.08446	1.37017	223.39098	.000
COMSUP	462.50000	134.50000	462.50000	.91497	505.48327	.000
WILLBUS	379.13851	233.36149	379.13851	1.58749	238.82845	.000
CREDIT	93.09459	378.90541	93.09459	2.57759	36.11694	.000
RETAILP	239.04054	205.95946	239.04054	1.40108	170.61105	.000
TRANS	51.11149	217.38851	51.11149	1.47883	34.56203	.000
DUTY	45.45946	306.54054	45.45946	2.08531	21.79986	.000
PAYTERM	109.45946	243.54054	109.45946	1.65674	66.06925	.000
EXCHANGE	108.24662	235.25338	108.24662	1.60036	67.63879	.000
PSTABLE	162.03041	260.46959	162.03041	1.77190	91.44434	.000
FREQRET	104.64865	282.35135	104.64865	1.92076	54.48301	.000
MARKDN	67.16554	234.33446	67.16554	1.59411	42.13351	.000
COSTBUS	25.57095	220.92905	25.57095	1.50292	17.01419	.000
COSTCOM	196.21959	369.28041	196.21959	2.51211	78.10943	.000
EASECOM	435.40878	350.09122	435.40878	2.38157	182.82404	.000
LANGUAGE	445.16554	244.33446	445.16554	1.66214	267.82687	.000

Mexico vs Chile

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- d e s i g n 1 * * *
 Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 15 1/2, N = 53)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.46130	2.80253	33.00	108.00	.000
Hotellings	.85633	2.80253	33.00	108.00	.000
Wilks	.53870	2.80253	33.00	108.00	.000
Rois	.46130				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

 EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,140) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
MARKUP	.05674	92.94326	.05674	.66388	.08546	.770
TURNOVER	1.87589	96.62411	1.87589	.69017	2.71800	.101
PROFIT	.28723	89.21277	.28723	.63723	.45075	.503
ONTIME	.17376	94.32624	.17376	.67376	.25789	.612
SPEED	.12766	163.87234	.12766	1.17052	.10906	.742
CUSTOM	.90780	142.09220	.90780	1.01494	.89443	.346
SERVICE	.03191	95.46809	.03191	.68191	.04680	.829
LEAD	.12766	158.87234	.12766	1.13480	.11249	.738
MINORD	.00000	131.00000	.00000	.93571	.00000	1.000
EZREORD	4.09929	139.90071	4.09929	.99929	4.10220	.045
RETURN	1.71631	105.28369	1.71631	.75203	2.28225	.133
COSTRET	1.14894	86.85106	1.14894	.62036	1.85203	.176
BUSTYLE	5.12057	120.87943	5.12057	.86342	5.93053	.016
ORIENT	5.67376	111.32624	5.67376	.79519	7.13512	.008
NEWPROD	4.34397	124.15603	4.34397	.88683	4.89832	.029
MANAGER	.59929	90.90071	.59929	.64929	.92299	.338
NEGOT	.08865	97.41135	.08865	.69590	.12741	.722
EASEBUS	4.85461	109.64539	4.85461	.78318	6.19858	.014
COMSUP	13.19504	121.30496	13.19504	.86646	15.22860	.000
WILLBUS	17.87589	144.62411	17.87589	1.03303	17.30434	.000
CREDIT	5.67376	130.32624	5.67376	.93090	6.09491	.015
RETAILP	.28723	145.21277	.28723	1.03723	.27692	.600
TRANS	2.78014	93.21986	2.78014	.66586	4.17529	.043
DUTY	32.68085	158.31915	32.68085	1.13085	28.89934	.000
PAYTERM	7.18085	103.31915	7.18085	.73799	9.73023	.002
EXCHANGE	10.72695	113.77305	10.72695	.81266	13.19973	.000
PSTABLE	6.25532	105.74468	6.25532	.75532	8.28169	.005
FREQRET	.00355	146.49645	.00355	1.04640	.00339	.954
MARKDN	.35461	97.64539	.35461	.69747	.50843	.477
COSTBUS	2.78014	99.21986	2.78014	.70871	3.92280	.050
COSTCOM	16.39716	159.60284	16.39716	1.14002	14.38322	.000
EASECOM	32.68085	132.31915	32.68085	.94514	34.57791	.000
LANGUAGE	31.33333	177.66667	31.33333	1.26905	24.69043	.000

Mexico vs Argentina

* * * * * A n a l y s i s o f V a r i a n c e -- design 1 * * *

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

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

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.38766	1.97599	33.00	103.00	.005
Hotellings	.63308	1.97599	33.00	103.00	.005
Wilks	.61234	1.97599	33.00	103.00	.005
Rois	.38766				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,135) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
MARKUP	.36765	80.63235	.36765	.59728	.61554	.434
TURNOVER	.62132	112.87868	.62132	.83614	.74309	.390
PROFIT	.62132	72.87868	.62132	.53984	1.15094	.285
ONTIME	.05882	95.94118	.05882	.71068	.08277	.774
SPEED	.94118	138.05882	.94118	1.02266	.92032	.339
CUSTOM	.03309	112.46691	.03309	.83309	.03972	.842
SERVICE	.94118	79.05882	.94118	.58562	1.60714	.207
LEAD	.62132	190.87868	.62132	1.41392	.43943	.509
MINORD	.00368	122.49632	.00368	.90738	.00405	.949
EZREORD	.03309	138.46691	.03309	1.02568	.03226	.858
RETURN	.62132	144.87868	.62132	1.07318	.57896	.448
COSTRET	.03309	106.46691	.03309	.78864	.04196	.838
BUSTYLE	.94118	124.05882	.94118	.91895	1.02418	.313
ORIENT	.52941	110.47059	.52941	.81830	.64696	.423
NEWPROD	1.62132	111.87868	1.62132	.82873	1.95639	.164
MANAGER	3.30882	72.69118	3.30882	.53845	6.14505	.014
NEGOT	4.00368	95.49632	4.00368	.70738	5.65987	.019
EASEBUS	.01471	119.98529	.01471	.88878	.01655	.898
COMSUP	4.25000	119.75000	4.25000	.88704	4.79123	.030
WILLBUS	1.94485	105.55515	1.94485	.78189	2.48737	.117
CREDIT	3.09191	167.40809	3.09191	1.24006	2.49336	.117
RETAILP	2.88235	186.11765	2.88235	1.37865	2.09071	.151
TRANS	.09191	100.40809	.09191	.74376	.12358	.726
DUTY	11.12132	178.37868	11.12132	1.32132	8.41681	.004
PAYTERM	3.09191	115.40809	3.09191	.85487	3.61680	.059
EXCHANGE	.13235	137.86765	.13235	1.02124	.12960	.719
PSTABLE	7.44485	129.05515	7.44485	.95596	7.78780	.006
FREQRET	.36765	138.63235	.36765	1.02691	.35801	.551
MARKDN	.62132	119.87868	.62132	.88799	.69970	.404
COSTCOM	3.30882	105.69118	3.30882	.78290	4.22638	.042
EASECOM	5.03309	158.46691	5.03309	1.17383	4.28775	.040
EASECOM	.23529	144.76471	.23529	1.07233	.21942	.640
LANGUAGE	.82721	139.67279	.82721	1.03461	.79953	.373

Chile vs Argentina

***** Analysis of Variance -- design 1 *****
 Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

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

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.46587	2.69594	33.00	102.00	.000
Hotellings	.87222	2.69594	33.00	102.00	.000
Wilks	.53413	2.69594	33.00	102.00	.000
Roys	.46587				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

 EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

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

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
MARKUP	.44815	92.05185	.44815	.68695	.65237	.421
TURNOVER	.09259	80.40741	.09259	.60006	.15431	.695
PROFIT	1.48148	65.51852	1.48148	.48894	3.02996	.084
ONTIME	.05926	71.94074	.05926	.53687	.11038	.740
SPEED	.09259	129.40741	.09259	.96573	.09588	.757
CUSTOM	.53333	133.46667	.53333	.99602	.53546	.466
SERVICE	.30000	46.20000	.30000	.34478	.87013	.353
LEAD	1.20000	143.80000	1.20000	1.07313	1.11822	.292
MINORD	12.89259	149.60741	12.89259	1.11647	11.54761	.001
EZREORD	2.90370	122.09630	2.90370	.91117	3.18680	.076
RETURN	.03333	129.46667	.03333	.96617	.03450	.853
COSTRET	1.33704	119.16296	1.33704	.88928	1.50351	.222
BUSTYLE	1.33704	92.16296	1.33704	.68778	1.94398	.166
ORIENT	2.50370	79.49630	2.50370	.59326	4.22028	.042
NEWPROD	9.18148	97.31852	9.18148	.72626	11.26526	.001
MANAGER	1.07037	60.42963	1.07037	.45097	2.37350	.126
NEGOT	4.53704	79.96296	4.53704	.59674	7.60306	.007
EASEBUS	2.70000	96.80000	2.70000	.72239	3.73760	.055
COMSUP	1.33704	90.16296	1.33704	.67286	1.98710	.161
WILLBUS	6.84815	109.65185	6.84815	.81830	8.36878	.004
CREDIT	.09259	142.40741	.09259	1.06274	.08713	.768
RETAILP	1.33704	149.16296	1.33704	1.11316	1.20112	.275
TRANS	1.33704	58.16296	1.33704	.43405	3.08036	.082
DUTY	5.07037	70.42963	5.07037	.52559	9.64693	.002
PAYTERM	.94815	90.05185	.94815	.67203	1.41087	.237
EXCHANGE	7.17037	120.82963	7.17037	.90171	7.95194	.006
PSTABLE	.01481	78.98519	.01481	.58944	.02513	.874
FREQRET	.05926	117.94074	.05926	.88015	.06733	.796
MARKDN	.05926	63.94074	.05926	.47717	.12419	.725
COSTBUS	.01481	76.98519	.01481	.57452	.02579	.873
COSTCOM	4.80000	116.20000	4.80000	.86716	5.53528	.020
EASECOM	25.51481	100.98519	25.51481	.75362	33.85630	.000
LANGUAGE	19.73704	158.76296	19.73704	1.18480	16.65956	.000

Appendix G - Measurement Model

Initial Findings

Profitab	outward					
CRETAILP	0.0722	0.2033	0.0000	0.9587	0.0413	0.0000
CPROFIT	0.2264	0.6706	0.0000	0.5503	0.4497	0.0000
CMARKUP	0.1554	0.5885	0.0000	0.6537	0.3463	0.0000
CTRANS	0.0644	0.4445	0.0000	0.8024	0.1976	0.0000
CDUTY	0.0782	0.3956	0.0000	0.8435	0.1565	0.0000
CPAYTERM	0.3214	0.6918	0.0000	0.5214	0.4786	0.0000
CEXCHANG	0.1200	0.4003	0.0000	0.8397	0.1603	0.0000
CPSTABLE	0.1283	0.4304	0.0000	0.8147	0.1853	0.0000
CFREQRET	0.1292	0.3850	0.0000	0.8517	0.1483	0.0000
CMARKDN	0.2201	0.5970	0.0000	0.6436	0.3564	0.0000
CCOSTBUS	0.1471	0.5378	0.0000	0.7108	0.2892	0.0000
CTURNOVR	0.1824	0.5297	0.0000	0.7195	0.2805	0.0000

S Relati	outward					
CEASECOM	-0.0680	-0.2810	0.0000	0.9210	0.0790	0.0000
CEASEBUS	0.2441	0.8268	0.0000	0.3164	0.6836	0.0000
CWILLBUS	0.2619	0.8095	0.0000	0.3447	0.6553	0.0000
CCOSTCOM	0.0396	0.2453	0.0000	0.9398	0.0602	0.0000
CBUSTYLE	0.1056	0.5674	0.0000	0.6780	0.3220	0.0000
CLANGUAG	0.0945	0.3550	0.0000	0.8739	0.1261	0.0000
CORIENT	0.1402	0.6697	0.0000	0.5514	0.4486	0.0000
CNEWPROD	0.1665	0.7146	0.0000	0.4894	0.5106	0.0000
CMANAGE	0.1650	0.7506	0.0000	0.4366	0.5634	0.0000
CNEGOT	0.1703	0.7467	0.0000	0.4424	0.5576	0.0000

P Qualit	outward					
CINNOVAT	0.1649	0.7114	0.0000	0.4940	0.5060	0.2985
CATTRACT	0.1865	0.7636	0.0000	0.4169	0.5831	0.3440
CDEFECTS	0.0542	0.3586	0.0000	0.8714	0.1286	0.0759
CSPECS	0.1476	0.7241	0.0000	0.4757	0.5243	0.3093
CQUAL	0.1733	0.7098	0.0000	0.4961	0.5039	0.2972
CDURABLE	0.1598	0.7833	0.0000	0.3865	0.6135	0.3619
CRELIABL	0.1873	0.8196	0.0000	0.3282	0.6718	0.3963
CTEC	0.1564	0.7388	0.0000	0.4541	0.5459	0.3220
CWORKSHP	0.1398	0.6927	0.0000	0.5202	0.4798	0.2830

P Evalua	outward					
CCOMPROD	0.3369	0.8510	0.0000	0.2757	0.7243	0.4373
CSATIS	0.3771	0.8825	0.0000	0.2212	0.7788	0.4702
CPRIDE	0.3197	0.7415	0.0000	0.4501	0.5499	0.3320
CWHOLE	-0.0421	-0.0335	0.0000	0.9989	0.0011	0.0007
CVALUE	0.2137	0.6647	0.0000	0.5582	0.4418	0.2667

Buyer In	outward					
CBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.4094
=====						

USA

Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan
Country outward						
UKNOW	0.0874	0.5270	0.0000	0.7222	0.2778	0.0942
ULIKE	0.0852	0.5167	0.0000	0.7330	0.2670	0.0905
UINDUS	0.0752	0.5272	0.0000	0.7221	0.2779	0.0942
UEDUCATE	0.0697	0.5485	0.0000	0.6992	0.3008	0.1020
UWEALTH	0.1028	0.6796	0.0000	0.5381	0.4619	0.1566
UFRIEND	0.0913	0.5503	0.0000	0.6972	0.3028	0.1027
UTRUST	0.0808	0.5518	0.0000	0.6955	0.3045	0.1033
USKILL	0.0929	0.6239	0.0000	0.6108	0.3892	0.1320
UWORK	0.1194	0.7160	0.0000	0.4873	0.5127	0.1738
UINDIVID	0.1415	0.6516	0.0000	0.5754	0.4246	0.1440
UPOLITIC	0.0654	0.5926	0.0000	0.6488	0.3512	0.1191
URIGHTS	0.0866	0.6301	0.0000	0.6030	0.3970	0.1346
UENVIRO	0.0463	0.3728	0.0000	0.8610	0.1390	0.0471
UWORLD	0.0440	0.4194	0.0000	0.8241	0.1759	0.0596
UQLIFE	0.0782	0.5735	0.0000	0.6711	0.3289	0.1115
ULABOUR	0.0493	0.2395	0.0000	0.9426	0.0574	0.0195
UAVAILW	0.0923	0.5890	0.0000	0.6530	0.3470	0.1176
URESTRIC	0.0906	0.3770	0.0000	0.8579	0.1421	0.0482
UALIGN	0.0742	0.5093	0.0000	0.7406	0.2594	0.0879
UECONOM	0.0936	0.6488	0.0000	0.5790	0.4210	0.1428
UTECH	0.0969	0.6085	0.0000	0.6297	0.3703	0.1256
Familiar outward						
UEASFIND	0.0955	0.2860	0.0000	0.9182	0.0818	0.0000
UKNOWP	0.2907	0.5912	0.0000	0.6505	0.3495	0.0000
UBRAND	0.1145	0.3023	0.0000	0.9086	0.0914	0.0000
USELLS	0.5495	0.8428	0.0000	0.2896	0.7104	0.0000
UVARIETY	0.3987	0.7601	0.0000	0.4222	0.5778	0.0000
Business outward						
UCOMSUP	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5931
S Servic outward						
UONTIME	0.1960	0.7142	0.0000	0.4899	0.5101	0.0000
USERVICE	0.2413	0.7018	0.0000	0.5075	0.4925	0.0000
UCUSTOM	0.1390	0.4752	0.0000	0.7742	0.2258	0.0000
UCREDIT	0.1267	0.2614	0.0000	0.9317	0.0683	0.0000
USPEED	0.1552	0.6334	0.0000	0.5988	0.4012	0.0000
UCOSTRET	0.1112	0.4626	0.0000	0.7860	0.2140	0.0000
URETURN	0.2021	0.6505	0.0000	0.5769	0.4231	0.0000
UEZREORD	0.2115	0.6884	0.0000	0.5261	0.4739	0.0000
UMINORD	0.1114	0.4875	0.0000	0.7623	0.2377	0.0000
ULEAD	0.1591	0.6938	0.0000	0.5187	0.4813	0.0000

Profitability outward						
URETAILP	0.0345	-0.0437	0.0000	0.9981	0.0019	0.0000
UPROFIT	0.2469	0.7774	0.0000	0.3956	0.6044	0.0000
UMARKUP	0.1812	0.7178	0.0000	0.4848	0.5152	0.0000
UTRANS	0.0899	0.3748	0.0000	0.8595	0.1405	0.0000
UDUTY	0.0752	0.3358	0.0000	0.8872	0.1128	0.0000
UPAYTERM	0.2050	0.5062	0.0000	0.7437	0.2563	0.0000
UEXCHANG	-0.0175	0.1696	0.0000	0.9712	0.0288	0.0000
UPSTABLE	0.1063	0.4315	0.0000	0.8138	0.1862	0.0000
UFREQRET	0.1816	0.5197	0.0000	0.7299	0.2701	0.0000
UMARKDN	0.1736	0.6204	0.0000	0.6151	0.3849	0.0000
UCOSTBUS	0.1590	0.6076	0.0000	0.6308	0.3692	0.0000
UTURNOVR	0.2575	0.6797	0.0000	0.5380	0.4620	0.0000

S Relati outward						
UEASCOM	0.1027	0.5375	0.0000	0.7111	0.2889	0.0000
UEASEBUS	0.1839	0.7842	0.0000	0.3851	0.6149	0.0000
UWILLBUS	0.2003	0.7093	0.0000	0.4968	0.5032	0.0000
UCOSTCOM	0.0710	0.3726	0.0000	0.8611	0.1389	0.0000
UBUSTYLE	0.1504	0.7452	0.0000	0.4447	0.5553	0.0000
ULANGUAG	0.0661	0.4149	0.0000	0.8279	0.1721	0.0000
UORIENT	0.1465	0.7040	0.0000	0.5044	0.4956	0.0000
UNEWPROD	0.1483	0.7909	0.0000	0.3744	0.6256	0.0000
UMANAGE	0.1870	0.7870	0.0000	0.3807	0.6193	0.0000
UNEGOT	0.1627	0.7684	0.0000	0.4095	0.5905	0.0000

P Qualit outward						
UINNOVAT	0.1519	0.6593	0.0000	0.5653	0.4347	0.2449
UATTRACT	0.1918	0.7485	0.0000	0.4397	0.5603	0.3157
UDEFECTS	0.0471	0.2952	0.0000	0.9128	0.0872	0.0491
USPECS	0.1697	0.8319	0.0000	0.3079	0.6921	0.3900
UQUAL	0.1842	0.8542	0.0000	0.2703	0.7297	0.4111
UDURABLE	0.1605	0.7706	0.0000	0.4062	0.5938	0.3346
URELIABL	0.1529	0.7723	0.0000	0.4036	0.5964	0.3360
UWORKSHP	0.1610	0.8116	0.0000	0.3413	0.6587	0.3711
UTEC	0.1159	0.6160	0.0000	0.6206	0.3794	0.2138

P Evalua outward						
UCOMPROD	0.3096	0.8897	0.0000	0.2084	0.7916	0.5760
USATIS	0.3117	0.8867	0.0000	0.2137	0.7863	0.5721
UPRIDE	0.2746	0.8159	0.0000	0.3343	0.6657	0.4843
UWHOLE	0.0451	0.1925	0.0000	0.9630	0.0370	0.0269
UVALUE	0.2723	0.7913	0.0000	0.3738	0.6262	0.4556

Buyer In outward						
UBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5694
=====						

Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan
Country	outward					
MKNOW	0.0017	0.0525	0.0000	0.9972	0.0028	0.0008
MLIKE	0.0756	0.4996	0.0000	0.7504	0.2496	0.0719
MINDUS	0.1101	0.6734	0.0000	0.5466	0.4534	0.1306
MEDUCATE	0.0868	0.6942	0.0000	0.5181	0.4819	0.1388
MWEALTH	0.0816	0.6897	0.0000	0.5243	0.4757	0.1370
MFRIEND	0.0702	0.3959	0.0000	0.8432	0.1568	0.0452
MTRUST	0.1276	0.7264	0.0000	0.4724	0.5276	0.1520
MSKILL	0.1088	0.7821	0.0000	0.3883	0.6117	0.1762
MWORK	0.1393	0.7595	0.0000	0.4231	0.5769	0.1662
MINDIVID	0.0689	0.5834	0.0000	0.6596	0.3404	0.0980
MPOLITIC	0.0438	0.6222	0.0000	0.6129	0.3871	0.1115
MRIGHTS	0.0254	0.4695	0.0000	0.7796	0.2204	0.0635
MENVIRO	0.0736	0.6029	0.0000	0.6365	0.3635	0.1047
MWORLD	0.0794	0.6321	0.0000	0.6005	0.3995	0.1151
MQLIFE	0.0524	0.5974	0.0000	0.6431	0.3569	0.1028
MLABOUR	0.0502	0.5126	0.0000	0.7372	0.2628	0.0757
MAVAILW	0.0830	0.6565	0.0000	0.5691	0.4309	0.1241
MRESTRIC	0.0391	0.0944	0.0000	0.9911	0.0089	0.0026
MALIGN	0.0794	0.4583	0.0000	0.7899	0.2101	0.0605
MECONOM	0.0683	0.6888	0.0000	0.5255	0.4745	0.1367
MTECH	0.1197	0.7303	0.0000	0.4666	0.5334	0.1537
Familiar	outward					
MEASFIND	0.1471	0.3827	0.0000	0.8536	0.1464	0.0000
MKNOWP	0.2236	0.5744	0.0000	0.6700	0.3300	0.0000
MBRAND	0.1529	0.3552	0.0000	0.8738	0.1262	0.0000
MSELLS	0.4559	0.8374	0.0000	0.2988	0.7012	0.0000
MVARIETY	0.4701	0.8066	0.0000	0.3494	0.6506	0.0000
Business	outward					
MCOMSUP	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5343
S Servic	outward					
MONTIME	0.2181	0.7396	0.0000	0.4530	0.5470	0.0000
MSERVICE	0.3664	0.8567	0.0000	0.2661	0.7339	0.0000
MCUSTOM	0.2254	0.6445	0.0000	0.5846	0.4154	0.0000
MCRECIT	-0.0429	0.1637	0.0000	0.9732	0.0268	0.0000
MSPEED	0.2421	0.7426	0.0000	0.4485	0.5515	0.0000
MCOSTRET	0.0742	0.5153	0.0000	0.7345	0.2655	0.0000
MRETURN	0.0797	0.5262	0.0000	0.7231	0.2769	0.0000
MEZREORD	0.1400	0.5648	0.0000	0.6810	0.3190	0.0000
MMINORD	0.0160	0.2445	0.0000	0.9402	0.0598	0.0000
MLEAD	0.0982	0.4434	0.0000	0.8034	0.1966	0.0000

Profitab	outward					
MRETAILP	0.0889	0.3221	0.0000	0.8962	0.1038	0.0000
MPROFIT	0.2614	0.6662	0.0000	0.5561	0.4439	0.0000
MMARKUP	0.1329	0.4532	0.0000	0.7946	0.2054	0.0000
MTRANS	0.1122	0.4821	0.0000	0.7676	0.2324	0.0000
MDUTY	0.1190	0.4555	0.0000	0.7926	0.2074	0.0000
MPAYTERM	0.0867	0.3881	0.0000	0.8494	0.1506	0.0000
MEXCHANG	-0.0066	0.2804	0.0000	0.9214	0.0786	0.0000
MPSTABLE	0.2491	0.5177	0.0000	0.7320	0.2680	0.0000
MFREQRET	0.1756	0.4767	0.0000	0.7727	0.2273	0.0000
MMARKDN	0.2292	0.7117	0.0000	0.4935	0.5065	0.0000
MCOSTBUS	0.1415	0.5560	0.0000	0.6909	0.3091	0.0000
MTURNOVR	0.2244	0.6347	0.0000	0.5972	0.4028	0.0000

S Relati	outward					
MEASECOM	0.0801	0.5711	0.0000	0.6738	0.3262	0.0000
MEASEBUS	0.1625	0.7963	0.0000	0.3660	0.6340	0.0000
MWILLBUS	0.2639	0.7300	0.0000	0.4671	0.5329	0.0000
MCOSTCOM	0.0880	0.4840	0.0000	0.7658	0.2342	0.0000
MBUSTYLE	0.1155	0.6688	0.0000	0.5528	0.4472	0.0000
MLANGUAG	0.0746	0.5231	0.0000	0.7264	0.2736	0.0000
MORIENT	0.1380	0.7367	0.0000	0.4573	0.5427	0.0000
MNEWPROD	0.1596	0.8134	0.0000	0.3384	0.6616	0.0000
MMANAGE	0.1650	0.8219	0.0000	0.3245	0.6755	0.0000
MNEGOT	0.1377	0.7716	0.0000	0.4046	0.5954	0.0000

P Qualit	outward					
MINNOVAT	0.1267	0.7478	0.0000	0.4409	0.5591	0.3839
MATTRACT	0.1520	0.7827	0.0000	0.3873	0.6127	0.4207
MDEFECTS	0.1028	0.5756	0.0000	0.6686	0.3314	0.2275
MSPECS	0.1314	0.7723	0.0000	0.4035	0.5965	0.4096
MQUAL	0.1549	0.8454	0.0000	0.2853	0.7147	0.4907
MDURABLE	0.1569	0.8327	0.0000	0.3066	0.6934	0.4761
MRELIABL	0.1545	0.8486	0.0000	0.2800	0.7200	0.4944
MWORKSHP	0.1539	0.8669	0.0000	0.2485	0.7515	0.5160
MTEC	0.1325	0.7507	0.0000	0.4364	0.5636	0.3870

P Evalua	outward					
MCOMPROD	0.2989	0.8998	0.0000	0.1904	0.8096	0.5606
MSATIS	0.2770	0.8852	0.0000	0.2163	0.7837	0.5426
MPRIDE	0.2861	0.8715	0.0000	0.2404	0.7596	0.5259
MWHOLE	-0.0860	-0.2893	0.0000	0.9163	0.0837	0.0580
MVALUE	0.2680	0.7896	0.0000	0.3766	0.6234	0.4316

Buyer In	outward					
MBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5690
=====						

Chile

Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan
Country outward						
CHKNOW	0.0476	0.2873	0.0000	0.9174	0.0826	0.0212
CHLIKE	0.0457	0.2928	0.0000	0.9142	0.0858	0.0220
CHINDUS	0.0768	0.5165	0.0000	0.7332	0.2668	0.0685
CHEDUCAT	0.0965	0.7791	0.0000	0.3930	0.6070	0.1559
CHWEALTH	0.0929	0.8083	0.0000	0.3466	0.6534	0.1678
CHFRIEND	0.0380	0.2423	0.0000	0.9413	0.0587	0.0151
CHTRUST	0.0521	0.5449	0.0000	0.7031	0.2969	0.0762
CHSKILL	0.0958	0.8153	0.0000	0.3352	0.6648	0.1707
CHWORK	0.0983	0.6095	0.0000	0.6285	0.3715	0.0954
CHINDIV	0.0425	0.5691	0.0000	0.6761	0.3239	0.0832
CHPOLIT	0.0656	0.6544	0.0000	0.5718	0.4282	0.1100
CHRIGHTS	0.0806	0.6159	0.0000	0.6206	0.3794	0.0974
CHENVIRO	0.1008	0.6945	0.0000	0.5176	0.4824	0.1239
CHWORLD	0.0970	0.6545	0.0000	0.5716	0.4284	0.1100
CHQLIFE	0.0650	0.7350	0.0000	0.4597	0.5403	0.1387
CHLABOUR	0.0630	0.6274	0.0000	0.6064	0.3936	0.1011
CHAVAILW	0.0909	0.6997	0.0000	0.5104	0.4896	0.1257
CHRESTRI	0.0164	0.1613	0.0000	0.9740	0.0260	0.0067
CHALIGN	0.0797	0.6289	0.0000	0.6045	0.3955	0.1016
CHECONOM	0.0911	0.8298	0.0000	0.3114	0.6886	0.1768
CHTECH	0.1013	0.7688	0.0000	0.4089	0.5911	0.1518
Familiar outward						
CHEZFIND	0.2395	0.6344	0.0000	0.5976	0.4024	0.0000
CHKNOWP	0.1772	0.5080	0.0000	0.7420	0.2580	0.0000
CHBRAND	0.1237	0.3811	0.0000	0.8548	0.1452	0.0000
CHSELLS	0.3556	0.7352	0.0000	0.4595	0.5405	0.0000
CHVARIET	0.5511	0.8156	0.0000	0.3347	0.6653	0.0000
Business outward						
CHCOMSUP	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5045
S Servic outward						
CHONTIME	0.2209	0.6933	0.0000	0.5194	0.4806	0.0000
CHSERVIC	0.3459	0.7526	0.0000	0.4336	0.5664	0.0000
CHCUSTOM	0.2072	0.5455	0.0000	0.7024	0.2976	0.0000
CHCREDIT	0.0682	0.5103	0.0000	0.7396	0.2604	0.0000
CHSPEED	0.1603	0.6089	0.0000	0.6292	0.3708	0.0000
CHCOSTRE	0.1559	0.6465	0.0000	0.5821	0.4179	0.0000
CHRETURN	0.1315	0.6701	0.0000	0.5510	0.4490	0.0000
CHEZREOR	0.1389	0.5859	0.0000	0.6568	0.3432	0.0000
CHMINORD	0.0820	0.3828	0.0000	0.8535	0.1465	0.0000
CHLEAD	0.0905	0.4363	0.0000	0.8097	0.1903	0.0000

Profitab outward						
CHRETAIL	0.1952	0.4127	0.0000	0.8297	0.1703	0.0000
CHPROFIT	0.2299	0.5440	0.0000	0.7041	0.2959	0.0000
CHMARKUP	0.1231	0.4463	0.0000	0.8008	0.1992	0.0000
CHTRANS	0.1580	0.5372	0.0000	0.7114	0.2886	0.0000
CHDUTY	0.1098	0.4880	0.0000	0.7619	0.2381	0.0000
CHPAYTER	0.1867	0.5904	0.0000	0.6514	0.3486	0.0000
CHXCHANG	0.0353	0.3939	0.0000	0.8448	0.1552	0.0000
CHPSTABL	0.2410	0.6400	0.0000	0.5904	0.4096	0.0000
CHFREQRE	0.1355	0.4960	0.0000	0.7540	0.2460	0.0000
CHMARKDN	0.1485	0.5217	0.0000	0.7279	0.2721	0.0000
CHCOSTBU	0.0946	0.4005	0.0000	0.8396	0.1604	0.0000
CHTRNOVR	0.2257	0.6205	0.0000	0.6149	0.3851	0.0000

S Relati outward						
CHEZCOM	-0.0921	-0.4457	0.0000	0.8013	0.1987	0.0000
CHEZBUS	0.1687	0.7253	0.0000	0.4739	0.5261	0.0000
CHWILBUS	0.2223	0.6520	0.0000	0.5750	0.4250	0.0000
CHCOSTCO	0.0744	0.2793	0.0000	0.9220	0.0780	0.0000
CHBUSTYL	0.1801	0.7963	0.0000	0.3658	0.6342	0.0000
CHLANGUA	0.0897	0.5213	0.0000	0.7283	0.2717	0.0000
CHORIENT	0.1546	0.7787	0.0000	0.3936	0.6064	0.0000
CHNEWPRO	0.1645	0.7983	0.0000	0.3628	0.6372	0.0000
CHMANAGE	0.1808	0.7758	0.0000	0.3982	0.6018	0.0000
CHNEGOT	0.1313	0.6765	0.0000	0.5424	0.4576	0.0000

P Qualit outward						
CHINOVAT	0.1333	0.7422	0.0000	0.4492	0.5508	0.3486
CHATRACT	0.1565	0.7484	0.0000	0.4398	0.5602	0.3546
CHDEFCTS	0.0820	0.4250	0.0000	0.8194	0.1806	0.1143
CHSPECS	0.1627	0.8151	0.0000	0.3357	0.6643	0.4205
CHQUAL	0.1751	0.8147	0.0000	0.3362	0.6638	0.4201
CHDURABL	0.1579	0.8034	0.0000	0.3546	0.6454	0.4085
CHRELIAB	0.1526	0.7881	0.0000	0.3789	0.6211	0.3931
CHWRKSHP	0.1469	0.8311	0.0000	0.3092	0.6908	0.4372
CHTEC	0.1393	0.7507	0.0000	0.4364	0.5636	0.3567

P Evalua outward						
CHCOMPRO	0.3227	0.8865	0.0000	0.2142	0.7858	0.4966
CHSATIS	0.3002	0.8093	0.0000	0.3451	0.6549	0.4138
CHPRIDE	0.2852	0.7876	0.0000	0.3797	0.6203	0.3920
CHWHOLE	-0.0679	-0.2586	0.0000	0.9331	0.0669	0.0423
CHVALUE	0.2911	0.7861	0.0000	0.3821	0.6179	0.3905

Buyer In outward						
CHBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.4858
=====						

Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan
Country	outward					
AKNOW	0.0372	0.2023	0.0000	0.9591	0.0409	0.0142
ALIKE	0.0446	0.3951	0.0000	0.8439	0.1561	0.0540
AINDUS	0.0488	0.4436	0.0000	0.8032	0.1968	0.0681
AEDUCATE	0.0725	0.6566	0.0000	0.5689	0.4311	0.1492
AWEALTH	0.0715	0.5944	0.0000	0.6467	0.3533	0.1222
AFRIEND	0.0339	0.2892	0.0000	0.9164	0.0836	0.0289
ATRUST	0.0830	0.5889	0.0000	0.6532	0.3468	0.1200
ASKILL	0.1103	0.7672	0.0000	0.4114	0.5886	0.2037
AWORK	0.0888	0.6314	0.0000	0.6013	0.3987	0.1380
AINDIVID	0.0814	0.5618	0.0000	0.6844	0.3156	0.1092
APOLITIC	0.0935	0.7282	0.0000	0.4698	0.5302	0.1835
ARIGHTS	0.0875	0.6027	0.0000	0.6368	0.3632	0.1257
AENVIRO	0.1010	0.7248	0.0000	0.4747	0.5253	0.1818
AWORLD	0.1009	0.7189	0.0000	0.4832	0.5168	0.1788
AQLIFE	0.0765	0.7362	0.0000	0.4579	0.5421	0.1876
ALABOUR	0.0251	0.3249	0.0000	0.8944	0.1056	0.0365
AAVAILW	0.0925	0.6495	0.0000	0.5781	0.4219	0.1460
ARESTRIC	0.0327	0.2948	0.0000	0.9131	0.0869	0.0301
AALIGN	0.0889	0.5844	0.0000	0.6584	0.3416	0.1182
AECONOMY	0.0988	0.7435	0.0000	0.4472	0.5528	0.1913
ATECH	0.1186	0.7741	0.0000	0.4007	0.5993	0.2074
Familiar	outward					
AEASFIND	0.0179	0.1102	0.0000	0.9879	0.0121	0.0000
AKNOWP	0.1351	0.4084	0.0000	0.8332	0.1668	0.0000
ABRAND	0.2457	0.2286	0.0000	0.9478	0.0522	0.0000
ASELLS	0.4944	0.7151	0.0000	0.4886	0.5114	0.0000
AVARIETY	0.6488	0.8217	0.0000	0.3249	0.6751	0.0000
Business	outward					
ACOMSUPP	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5461
S Servic	outward					
AONTIME	0.1854	0.6247	0.0000	0.6098	0.3902	0.0000
ASERVICE	0.3143	0.7910	0.0000	0.3744	0.6256	0.0000
ACUSTOM	0.2398	0.6103	0.0000	0.6276	0.3724	0.0000
ACREDIT	0.0644	0.3423	0.0000	0.8828	0.1172	0.0000
ASPEED	0.2491	0.7465	0.0000	0.4428	0.5572	0.0000
ACOSTRET	0.1004	0.5682	0.0000	0.6772	0.3228	0.0000
ARETURN	0.1626	0.6536	0.0000	0.5728	0.4272	0.0000
AEZREORD	0.1927	0.5788	0.0000	0.6649	0.3351	0.0000
AMINORD	-0.0198	0.1836	0.0000	0.9663	0.0337	0.0000
ALEAD	0.0291	0.3464	0.0000	0.8800	0.1200	0.0000

Profitab	outward					
ARETAILP	0.1458	0.2761	0.0000	0.9238	0.0762	0.0000
APROFIT	0.2696	0.6548	0.0000	0.5712	0.4288	0.0000
AMARKUP	0.2275	0.4921	0.0000	0.7578	0.2422	0.0000
ATRANS	0.0328	0.2414	0.0000	0.9417	0.0583	0.0000
ADUTY	0.0823	0.4273	0.0000	0.8174	0.1826	0.0000
APAYTERM	0.1986	0.6261	0.0000	0.6080	0.3920	0.0000
AEXCHANG	0.1244	0.2936	0.0000	0.9138	0.0862	0.0000
APSTABLE	0.3008	0.6626	0.0000	0.5610	0.4390	0.0000
AFREQRET	0.1085	0.3812	0.0000	0.8547	0.1453	0.0000
AMARKDN	0.2168	0.5341	0.0000	0.7147	0.2853	0.0000
ACOSTBUS	0.0975	0.4606	0.0000	0.7879	0.2121	0.0000
ATURNVR	0.1473	0.4471	0.0000	0.8001	0.1999	0.0000

S Relati	outward					
AEASECOM	0.0886	0.3008	0.0000	0.9095	0.0905	0.0000
AEASEBUS	0.1872	0.7345	0.0000	0.4606	0.5394	0.0000
AWILLBUS	0.2552	0.7221	0.0000	0.4786	0.5214	0.0000
ACOSTCOM	0.0488	0.0575	0.0000	0.9967	0.0033	0.0000
ABUSTYLE	0.2125	0.7485	0.0000	0.4397	0.5603	0.0000
ALANGUAG	0.0541	0.3445	0.0000	0.8813	0.1187	0.0000
AORIENT	0.1746	0.6256	0.0000	0.6086	0.3914	0.0000
ANEWPROD	0.1674	0.6412	0.0000	0.5888	0.4112	0.0000
AMANAGER	0.2250	0.7355	0.0000	0.4591	0.5409	0.0000
ANEGOT	0.1446	0.6152	0.0000	0.6215	0.3785	0.0000

P Qualit	outward					
AINNOVAT	0.1476	0.7716	0.0000	0.4047	0.5953	0.3395
AATTRACT	0.1508	0.6169	0.0000	0.6194	0.3806	0.2170
ADEFECTS	0.0703	0.3786	0.0000	0.8567	0.1433	0.0817
ASPECS	0.1539	0.7799	0.0000	0.3918	0.6082	0.3468
AQUAL	0.1592	0.8151	0.0000	0.3356	0.6644	0.3788
ADURABLE	0.1787	0.8628	0.0000	0.2557	0.7443	0.4244
ARELIABL	0.1650	0.8039	0.0000	0.3537	0.6463	0.3685
AWORKSHP	0.1597	0.7955	0.0000	0.3672	0.6328	0.3608
ATEC	0.1450	0.7085	0.0000	0.4981	0.5019	0.2862

P Evalua	outward					
ACOMPROD	0.3282	0.8596	0.0000	0.2611	0.7389	0.4763
ASATIS	0.2949	0.8035	0.0000	0.3544	0.6456	0.4161
APRIDE	0.3221	0.7816	0.0000	0.3891	0.6109	0.3938
AWHOLE	-0.1086	-0.2285	0.0000	0.9478	0.0522	0.0337
AVALUE	0.2836	0.7209	0.0000	0.4804	0.5196	0.3350

Buyer In	outward					
ABUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.4635
=====						

Appendix H - Measurement Model

Final Results

Canada

OB .. Path coefficients

	C Descri	P Descri	C Compet	P Compet	C Evalua	Prod Bel	Profitab
C Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Evalua	0.011	0.622	-0.175	0.231	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Bel	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.305	0.000	0.000	0.000
Profitab	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Servic	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Relati	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Business	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.107
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Eva	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.130	0.707	0.000
Buy	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S logist	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

OB .. Path coefficients

	S Servic	S Relati	Business	Familiar	Prod Eva	Buy	S logist
C Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Evalua	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Bel	0.000	0.000	0.297	0.278	0.000	0.000	0.000
Profitab	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Servic	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Relati	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Business	0.220	0.349	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.152
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Eva	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.141	0.000	0.000	0.000
Buy	0.000	0.000	0.439	0.221	0.244	0.000	0.000
S logist	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

	C Descri	P Descri	C Compet	P Compet	C Evalua	Prod Bel	Profitab
C Descri	1.000						
P Descri	0.536	1.000					
C Compet	0.677	0.527	1.000				
P Compet	0.556	0.642	0.702	1.000			
C Evalua	0.354	0.684	0.322	0.513	1.000		
Prod Bel	0.333	0.410	0.355	0.475	0.416	1.000	
Profitab	0.243	0.372	0.203	0.297	0.257	0.438	1.000
S Servic	0.419	0.456	0.439	0.407	0.333	0.569	0.435
S Relati	0.412	0.412	0.375	0.391	0.378	0.568	0.410
Business	0.448	0.413	0.282	0.352	0.360	0.523	0.365
Familiar	0.295	0.221	0.205	0.233	0.217	0.476	0.246
Prod Eva	0.429	0.491	0.354	0.429	0.455	0.828	0.432
Buy	0.396	0.433	0.305	0.325	0.360	0.509	0.378
S logist	0.286	0.273	0.318	0.164	0.178	0.274	0.123

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

	S Servic	S Relati	Business	Familiar	Prod Eva	Buy	S logist
S Servic	1.000						
S Relati	0.670	1.000					
Business	0.564	0.605	1.000				
Familiar	0.407	0.432	0.424	1.000			
Prod Eva	0.606	0.579	0.707	0.505	1.000		
Buy	0.542	0.610	0.705	0.531	0.666	1.000	
S logist	0.421	0.430	0.408	0.381	0.327	0.280	1.000

0Inner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
C Descri	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.5513	0.4487	0.0000
P Descri	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3876	0.6124	0.0000
C Compet	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4798	0.5202	0.0000
P Compet	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3338	0.6662	0.0000
C Evalua	0.0000	0.0000	0.4917	0.0000	1.0000	0.4917
Prod Bel	0.0000	0.0000	0.4327	0.4465	0.5535	0.2395
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3307	0.6693	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4653	0.5347	0.0000
S Relati	0.3000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4454	0.5546	0.0000
Business	0.0000	0.0000	0.4363	0.0000	1.0000	0.4363
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4314	0.5686	0.0000
Prod Eva	0.0000	0.0000	0.7160	0.4518	0.5482	0.3925
Buy	0.0000	0.0000	0.5897	0.2016	0.7984	0.4708
S logist	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.5011	0.4989	0.0000
Average			0.1905	0.4214	0.5786	0.1137

0Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan
C Descri outward						
CRIGHTS	0.2847	0.7562	0.0000	0.4282	0.5718	0.0000
CQLIFE	0.4965	0.7857	0.0000	0.3826	0.6174	0.0000
CWORLD	0.2785	0.6428	0.0000	0.5868	0.4132	0.0000
CPOLITIC	0.1343	0.5309	0.0000	0.7181	0.2819	0.0000
CENVIRO	0.2406	0.5995	0.0000	0.6406	0.3594	0.0000
P Descri outward						
CTRUST	0.5096	0.8907	0.0000	0.2066	0.7934	0.0000
CINDIVID	0.2418	0.5090	0.0000	0.7409	0.2591	0.0000
CFRIEND	0.4775	0.8858	0.0000	0.2154	0.7846	0.0000
C Compet outward						
CWEALTH	0.3376	0.7206	0.0000	0.4807	0.5193	0.0000
CTECH	0.3712	0.7401	0.0000	0.4523	0.5477	0.0000
CECONOM	0.3693	0.7155	0.0000	0.4880	0.5120	0.0000
CAVAILW	0.3074	0.7085	0.0000	0.4980	0.5020	0.0000
P Compet outward						
CEDUcate	0.2632	0.7706	0.0000	0.4062	0.5938	0.0000
CWORK	0.2923	0.8067	0.0000	0.3493	0.6507	0.0000
CSKILL	0.3040	0.8198	0.0000	0.3280	0.6720	0.0000
CINDUS	0.3609	0.8651	0.0000	0.2516	0.7484	0.0000
C Evalua outward						
CLIKE	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.4917
Prod Bel outward						
CWORKSH	0.1510	0.6627	0.0000	0.5608	0.4392	0.1900
CATTRACT	0.1847	0.7836	0.0000	0.3860	0.6140	0.2657
CQUAL	0.1754	0.7033	0.0000	0.5053	0.4947	0.2141
CTEC	0.1611	0.7402	0.0000	0.4521	0.5479	0.2371
CINNOVAT	0.1584	0.7539	0.0000	0.4316	0.5684	0.2460
CRELIABL	0.1945	0.8121	0.0000	0.3405	0.6595	0.2854
CVARIETY	0.1462	0.7135	0.0000	0.4910	0.5090	0.2203
CDURABLE	0.1696	0.7716	0.0000	0.4046	0.5954	0.2576
Profitab outward						
CMARKUP	0.3369	0.8544	0.0000	0.2700	0.7300	0.0000
CTURNOVR	0.3954	0.6844	0.0000	0.5315	0.4685	0.0000
CPROFIT	0.4908	0.8997	0.0000	0.1906	0.8094	0.0000
S Servic outward						
CONTIME	0.2879	0.6737	0.0000	0.5461	0.4539	0.0000
CSPEED	0.1989	0.6253	0.0000	0.6090	0.3910	0.0000
CCUSTOM	0.2950	0.6889	0.0000	0.5254	0.4746	0.0000
CSERVICE	0.5286	0.9050	0.0000	0.1809	0.8191	0.0000

S Relati	outward					
CBUSTYLE	0.1410	0.5598	0.0000	0.6866	0.3134	0.0000
CORIENT	0.1871	0.7036	0.0000	0.5049	0.4951	0.0000
CNEWPROD	0.2223	0.7858	0.0000	0.3825	0.6175	0.0000
CMANAGE	0.2203	0.8100	0.0000	0.3438	0.6562	0.0000
CNEGOT	0.2273	0.7907	0.0000	0.3747	0.6253	0.0000
CEASEBUS	0.3258	0.7873	0.0000	0.3801	0.6199	0.0000

Business	outward					
CCOMSUP	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.4363

Familiar	outward					
CKNOWP	0.8725	0.9355	0.0000	0.1249	0.8751	0.0000
CEASFIND	0.3590	0.5120	0.0000	0.7379	0.2621	0.0000

Prod Eva	outward					
CVALUE	0.1674	0.6460	0.0000	0.5827	0.4173	0.2988
CSATIS	0.2694	0.8584	0.0000	0.2631	0.7369	0.5276
CCOMPROE	0.2480	0.8153	0.0000	0.3353	0.6647	0.4759
CPRIDE	0.2352	0.7110	0.0000	0.4945	0.5055	0.3619
CSPCS	0.2036	0.6939	0.0000	0.5184	0.4816	0.3448
CSELLS	0.2156	0.6950	0.0000	0.5170	0.4830	0.3458

Buy	outward					
CBUY	0.5553	0.8918	0.0000	0.2047	0.7953	0.4690
CWILLBUS	0.5639	0.8952	0.0000	0.1985	0.8015	0.4726

S logist	outward					
CLEAD	0.2123	0.6274	0.0000	0.6063	0.3937	0.0000
CMINORD	0.3865	0.8155	0.0000	0.3349	0.6651	0.0000
CEZREORD	0.3411	0.7705	0.0000	0.4064	0.5936	0.0000
CRETURN	0.3223	0.7183	0.0000	0.4841	0.5159	0.0000
CCOSTRET	0.1004	0.5713	0.0000	0.6736	0.3264	0.0000

USA

OB .. Path coefficients

	C Descri	P Descri	C Compet	P Compet	C Evalua	Prod Bel	Profitab
C Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Evalua	0.208	0.532	-0.168	0.211	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Bel	0.000	0.000	0.241	0.078	0.000	0.000	0.000
Profitab	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Servic	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Relati	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Business	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.211
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Eva	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.101	0.833	0.000
Buy	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Links	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.366	0.000	0.000
S Logist	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

OB .. Path coefficients

	S Servic	S Relati	Business	Familiar	Prod Eva	Buy	Links
C Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Evalua	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Bel	0.000	0.000	0.457	0.085	0.000	0.000	0.000
Profitab	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Servic	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Relati	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Business	-0.076	0.622	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Eva	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.032	0.000	0.000	0.032
Buy	0.000	0.000	-0.254	-0.142	-0.576	0.000	-0.016
Links	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Logist	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

OB .. Path coefficients

	S Logist
C Descri	0.000
P Descri	0.000
C Compet	0.000
P Compet	0.000
C Evalua	0.000
Prod Bel	0.000
Profitab	0.000
S Servic	0.000
S Relati	0.000
Business	0.186
Familiar	0.000
Prod Eva	0.000
Buy	0.000
Links	0.000
S Logist	0.000

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

	C Descri	P Descri	C Compet	P Compet	C Evalua	Prod Bel	Profitab
C Descri	1.000						
P Descri	0.490	1.000					
C Compet	0.708	0.514	1.000				
P Compet	0.485	0.560	0.651	1.000			
C Evalua	0.452	0.666	0.390	0.500	1.000		
Prod Bel	0.373	0.500	0.502	0.443	0.332	1.000	
Profitab	0.221	0.414	0.306	0.212	0.278	0.495	1.000
S Servic	0.270	0.465	0.323	0.344	0.275	0.592	0.423
S Relati	0.320	0.317	0.429	0.400	0.310	0.539	0.320
Business	0.249	0.294	0.404	0.396	0.249	0.610	0.416
Familiar	0.226	0.167	0.299	0.317	0.201	0.316	0.195
Prod Eva	0.330	0.512	0.427	0.361	0.396	0.883	0.588
Buy	-0.267	-0.405	-0.360	-0.243	-0.324	-0.660	-0.548
Links	0.377	0.344	0.310	0.247	0.366	0.192	0.230
S Logist	0.224	0.248	0.268	0.234	0.181	0.365	0.204

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

	S Servic	S Relati	Business	Familiar	Prod Eva	Buy	Links
S Servic	1.000						
S Relati	0.571	1.000					
Business	0.450	0.717	1.000				
Familiar	0.336	0.432	0.294	1.000			
Prod Eva	0.593	0.484	0.606	0.323	1.000		
Buy	-0.428	-0.522	-0.647	-0.407	-0.780	1.000	
Links	0.304	0.256	0.152	0.257	0.237	-0.228	1.000
S Logist	0.435	0.379	0.433	0.314	0.404	-0.342	0.085

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

	S Logist
S Logist	1.000

OInner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
C Descri	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.5754	0.4246	0.0000
P Descri	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4115	0.5885	0.0000
C Compet	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4799	0.5201	0.0000
P Compet	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4611	0.5389	0.0000
C Evalua	0.0000	0.0000	0.4878	0.3988	0.6012	0.2933
Prod Bel	0.0000	0.0000	0.4612	0.4629	0.5371	0.2477
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.2814	0.7186	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4041	0.5959	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3858	0.6142	0.0000
Business	0.0000	0.0000	0.5810	0.0000	1.0000	0.5810
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4356	0.5644	0.0000
Prod Eva	0.0000	0.0000	0.7939	0.3239	0.6761	0.5368
Buy	0.0000	0.0000	0.6751	0.2022	0.7978	0.5386
Links	0.0000	0.0000	0.1341	0.4455	0.5545	0.0744
S Logist	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4957	0.5043	0.0000
Average			0.2089	0.4184	0.5816	0.1294

Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan
C Descri outward						
URIGHTS	0.4632	0.8078	0.0000	0.3475	0.6525	0.0000
UQLIFE	0.2742	0.6793	0.0000	0.5386	0.4614	0.0000
UWORLD	0.1398	0.5108	0.0000	0.7391	0.2609	0.0000
UPOLITIC	0.3913	0.7602	0.0000	0.4221	0.5779	0.0000
UENVIRO	0.1712	0.4129	0.0000	0.8295	0.1705	0.0000
P Descri outward						
UFRIEND	0.5759	0.8764	0.0000	0.2319	0.7681	0.0000
UTRUST	0.3442	0.7754	0.0000	0.3988	0.6012	0.0000
UINDIVID	0.3628	0.6294	0.0000	0.6039	0.3961	0.0000
C Compet outward						
UWEALTH	0.3990	0.7630	0.0000	0.4178	0.5822	0.0000
UTECH	0.3148	0.7575	0.0000	0.4262	0.5738	0.0000
UECONOM	0.3639	0.6943	0.0000	0.5179	0.4821	0.0000
UAVAILW	0.3073	0.6652	0.0000	0.5576	0.4424	0.0000
P Compet outward						
UEDUCATE	0.1865	0.6307	0.0000	0.6022	0.3978	0.0000
UWORK	0.4724	0.8366	0.0000	0.3002	0.6998	0.0000
USKILL	0.2582	0.6558	0.0000	0.5699	0.4301	0.0000
UINDUS	0.4011	0.7924	0.0000	0.3721	0.6279	0.0000
C Evalua outward						
ULIKE	0.7953	0.8964	0.0000	0.1964	0.8036	0.3920
UALIGN	0.4546	0.6315	0.0000	0.6012	0.3988	0.1945
Prod Sel outward						
UWORKSH	0.1780	0.7735	0.0000	0.4016	0.5984	0.2760
UATTRACT	0.1970	0.7786	0.0000	0.3938	0.6062	0.2796
UQUAL	0.2030	0.8178	0.0000	0.3312	0.6688	0.3084
UTEC	0.1344	0.6438	0.0000	0.5855	0.4145	0.1912
UINNOVAT	0.1566	0.7094	0.0000	0.4968	0.5032	0.2321
URELIABL	0.1675	0.7539	0.0000	0.4317	0.5683	0.2621
UVARIETY	0.1450	0.5926	0.0000	0.6489	0.3511	0.1619
UDURABLE	0.1738	0.7659	0.0000	0.4134	0.5866	0.2705
Profitab outward						
UMARKUP	0.3125	0.8448	0.0000	0.2864	0.7136	0.0000
UTURNOVR	0.4440	0.7948	0.0000	0.3682	0.6318	0.0000
UPROFIT	0.4256	0.9002	0.0000	0.1897	0.8103	0.0000
S Servic outward						
UONTIME	0.3418	0.7904	0.0000	0.3752	0.6248	0.0000
USPEED	0.2707	0.7861	0.0000	0.3821	0.6179	0.0000
UCUSTOM	0.2423	0.6025	0.0000	0.6369	0.3631	0.0000
USERVICE	0.4207	0.8920	0.0000	0.2221	0.7779	0.0000
S Relati outward						
UBUSTYLE	0.1956	0.7382	0.0000	0.4551	0.5449	0.0000
UORIENT	0.1905	0.7200	0.0000	0.4816	0.5184	0.0000
UNEWPROD	0.1929	0.8130	0.0000	0.3391	0.6609	0.0000
UMANAGE	0.2432	0.8304	0.0000	0.3104	0.6836	0.0000
UNEGOT	0.2116	0.7919	0.0000	0.3729	0.6271	0.0000
UEASEBUS	0.2393	0.8027	0.0000	0.3557	0.6443	0.0000
Business outward						
UCOMSUP	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5810
Familiar outward						
UKNOWP	0.9713	0.9965	0.0000	0.0069	0.9931	0.0000
UEASFIND	0.0871	0.3686	0.0000	0.8642	0.1358	0.0000
Prod Eva outward						
UVALUE	0.1868	0.7857	0.0000	0.3827	0.6173	0.4900
USATIS	0.2160	0.8672	0.0000	0.2479	0.7521	0.5970
UCOMPROD	0.2169	0.8693	0.0000	0.2443	0.7557	0.5999
UPRIDE	0.2018	0.8068	0.0000	0.3490	0.6510	0.5168
USPECS	0.1868	0.7904	0.0000	0.3910	0.6090	0.4835
USELLS	0.2060	0.8196	0.0000	0.3282	0.6718	0.5333

Buy	outward					
UBUY	-0.5525	-0.8902	0.0000	0.2075	0.7925	0.5350
UWILLBUS	-0.5671	-0.8961	0.0000	0.1969	0.8031	0.5421
Links	outward					
UPOLIECO	0.2403	0.7732	0.0000	0.4021	0.5979	0.0802
UIMMIG	0.3109	0.7636	0.0000	0.4170	0.5830	0.0782
UEXPORTS	0.1924	0.5732	0.0000	0.6715	0.3285	0.0441
UIMPORTS	0.2506	0.7995	0.0000	0.3608	0.6392	0.0857
UINVIN	0.2488	0.8151	0.0000	0.3356	0.6644	0.0891
UINVEROM	0.0884	0.7171	0.0000	0.4858	0.5142	0.0689
S Logist	outward					
ULEAD	0.2757	0.7632	0.0000	0.4176	0.5824	0.0000
UIMINORD	0.1929	0.6254	0.0000	0.6089	0.3911	0.0000
UEZREORD	0.3665	0.7882	0.0000	0.3788	0.6212	0.0000
URETURN	0.3501	0.7619	0.0000	0.4195	0.5805	0.0000
UCOSTRET	0.1927	0.5883	0.0000	0.6538	0.3462	0.0000

Mexico

OB .. Path coefficients

	C Descri	P Descri	C Compet	P Compet	C Evalua	Prod Bel	Profitab
C Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Evalua	-0.009	0.744	-0.007	0.037	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Bel	0.000	0.000	0.088	0.248	0.000	0.000	0.000
Profitab	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Servic	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Relati	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Business	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.157
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Eva	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.095	0.774	0.000
Buy	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Links	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.543	0.000	0.000
S Logist	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

OB .. Path coefficients

	S Servic	S Relati	Business	Familiar	Prod Eva	Buy	Links
C Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Evalua	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Bel	0.000	0.000	0.449	0.150	0.000	0.000	0.000
Profitab	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Servic	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Relati	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Business	0.443	0.240	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Eva	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.147	0.000	0.000	0.135
Buy	0.000	0.000	-0.442	-0.071	-0.395	0.000	-0.067
Links	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Logist	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

OB .. Path coefficients

	S Logist
C Descri	0.000
P Descri	0.000
C Compet	0.000
P Compet	0.000
C Evalua	0.000
Prod Bel	0.000
Profitab	0.000
S Servic	0.000
S Relati	0.000
Business	-0.001
Familiar	0.000
Prod Eva	0.000
Buy	0.000
Links	0.000
S Logist	0.000

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

	C Descri	P Descri	C Compet	P Compet	C Evalua	Prod Bel	Profitab
C Descri	1.000						
P Descri	0.454	1.000					
C Compet	0.707	0.428	1.000				
P Compet	0.594	0.643	0.767	1.000			
C Evalua	0.346	0.761	0.334	0.504	1.000		
Prod Bel	0.282	0.467	0.483	0.581	0.376	1.000	
Profitab	0.090	0.340	0.141	0.303	0.240	0.497	1.000
S Servic	0.236	0.351	0.388	0.469	0.212	0.710	0.424
S Relati	0.279	0.458	0.363	0.462	0.369	0.651	0.404
Business	0.277	0.437	0.405	0.532	0.365	0.672	0.442
Familiar	0.002	0.227	0.152	0.177	0.213	0.374	0.198
Prod Eva	0.249	0.406	0.380	0.514	0.300	0.843	0.549
Buy	-0.141	-0.434	-0.216	-0.444	-0.365	-0.636	-0.494
Links	0.340	0.594	0.279	0.426	0.543	0.370	0.225
S Logist	0.158	0.082	0.259	0.244	0.026	0.159	0.018

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

	S Servic	S Relati	Business	Familiar	Prod Eva	Buy	Links
S Servic	1.000						
S Relati	0.617	1.000					
Business	0.658	0.577	1.000				
Familiar	0.285	0.324	0.371	1.000			
Prod Eva	0.693	0.548	0.741	0.434	1.000		
Buy	-0.604	-0.506	-0.788	-0.416	-0.779	1.000	
Links	0.244	0.331	0.399	0.139	0.390	-0.407	1.000
S Logist	0.422	0.236	0.246	0.184	0.211	-0.230	-0.001

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

S Logist	
S Logist	1.000

OInner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
C Descri	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4663	0.5337	0.0000
P Descri	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4643	0.5357	0.0000
C Compet	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3850	0.6150	0.0000
P Compet	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3822	0.6178	0.0000
C Evalua	0.0000	0.0000	0.5789	0.3613	0.6387	0.3697
Prod Bel	0.0000	0.0000	0.5442	0.3455	0.6545	0.3562
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3269	0.6731	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3944	0.6056	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3520	0.6480	0.0000
Business	0.0000	0.0000	0.4991	0.0000	1.0000	0.4991
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4310	0.5690	0.0000
Prod Eva	0.0000	0.0000	0.7396	0.3222	0.6778	0.5014
Buy	0.0000	0.0000	0.7127	0.1476	0.8524	0.6075
Links	0.0000	0.0000	0.2946	0.4288	0.5712	0.1683
S Logist	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4527	0.5473	0.0000
Average			0.2246	0.3750	0.6250	0.1528

Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan
C Descri outward						
MRIGHTS	0.3531	0.7111	0.0000	0.4944	0.5056	0.0000
MQLIFE	0.3122	0.7400	0.0000	0.4524	0.5476	0.0000
MWORLD	0.2872	0.7572	0.0000	0.4267	0.5733	0.0000
MPOLITIC	0.2585	0.7396	0.0000	0.4530	0.5470	0.0000
MENVIRO	0.1553	0.7034	0.0000	0.5052	0.4948	0.0000
P Descri outward						
MFRIEND	0.6147	0.8338	0.0000	0.3047	0.6953	0.0000
MTRUST	0.4039	0.7301	0.0000	0.4670	0.5330	0.0000
MINDIVID	0.3129	0.6154	0.0000	0.6213	0.3787	0.0000
C Compet outward						
MWEALTH	0.2729	0.7877	0.0000	0.3795	0.6205	0.0000
MTECH	0.4378	0.8317	0.0000	0.3083	0.6917	0.0000
MECONOM	0.2450	0.7773	0.0000	0.3957	0.6043	0.0000
MAVAILW	0.3126	0.7373	0.0000	0.4563	0.5437	0.0000
P Compet outward						
MEDUCATE	0.2509	0.7153	0.0000	0.4884	0.5116	0.0000
MWORK	0.3583	0.8518	0.0000	0.2745	0.7255	0.0000
MSKILL	0.2774	0.7947	0.0000	0.3685	0.6315	0.0000
MINDUS	0.3799	0.7764	0.0000	0.3973	0.6027	0.0000
C Evalua outward						
MLIKE	0.7563	0.8943	0.0000	0.2002	0.7998	0.4630
MALIGN	0.4683	0.6911	0.0000	0.5223	0.4777	0.2765
Prod Bel outward						
MWORKSHP	0.1733	0.8289	0.0000	0.3130	0.6870	0.3739
MATTRACT	0.1538	0.8202	0.0000	0.3272	0.6728	0.3661
MQUAL	0.1742	0.8178	0.0000	0.3312	0.6688	0.3640
MTEC	0.1372	0.7832	0.0000	0.3866	0.6134	0.3338
MINNOVAT	0.1272	0.7970	0.0000	0.3648	0.6352	0.3457
MRELIABL	0.1705	0.8426	0.0000	0.2900	0.7100	0.3864
MVARIETY	0.1260	0.7461	0.0000	0.4434	0.5566	0.3029
MDURABLE	0.1697	0.8319	0.0000	0.3079	0.6921	0.3767
Profitab outward						
MMARKUP	0.2592	0.7814	0.0000	0.3894	0.6106	0.0000
MTURNVR	0.4377	0.7703	0.0000	0.4067	0.5933	0.0000
MPROFIT	0.5098	0.9029	0.0000	0.1847	0.8153	0.0000
S Servic outward						
MONTIME	0.2619	0.7557	0.0000	0.4289	0.5711	0.0000
MSPEED	0.2908	0.7474	0.0000	0.4413	0.5587	0.0000
MCUSTOM	0.2707	0.6834	0.0000	0.5329	0.4671	0.0000
MSERVICE	0.4400	0.9085	0.0000	0.1746	0.8254	0.0000
S Relati outward						
MBUSTYLE	0.1627	0.7029	0.0000	0.5060	0.4940	0.0000
MORIENT	0.1945	0.7966	0.0000	0.3655	0.6345	0.0000
MNEWPROD	0.2249	0.8362	0.0000	0.3008	0.6992	0.0000
MMANAGE	0.2326	0.8716	0.0000	0.2403	0.7597	0.0000
MNEGOT	0.1941	0.8333	0.0000	0.3056	0.6944	0.0000
MEASEBUS	0.2289	0.7784	0.0000	0.3940	0.6060	0.0000
Business outward						
MCOMSUP	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.4991
Familiar outward						
MKNOWP	0.9027	0.9596	0.0000	0.0791	0.9209	0.0000
MEASFIND	0.2870	0.4660	0.0000	0.7828	0.2172	0.0000
Prod Eva outward						
MVALUE	0.1870	0.8053	0.0000	0.3514	0.6486	0.4797
MSATIS	0.2139	0.8595	0.0000	0.2613	0.7387	0.5464
MCOMPROD	0.2247	0.8806	0.0000	0.2245	0.7755	0.5736
MPRIDE	0.2124	0.8485	0.0000	0.2801	0.7199	0.5325
MSPECS	0.1788	0.7417	0.0000	0.4499	0.5501	0.4069
MSSELLS	0.1944	0.7964	0.0000	0.3658	0.6342	0.4691

Buy	outward					
MBUY	-0.5084	-0.9135	0.0000	0.1655	0.8345	0.5948
MWILLBUS	-0.5741	-0.9328	0.0000	0.1298	0.8702	0.6202
Links	outward					
MPOLIECO	0.2773	0.8691	0.0000	0.2447	0.7553	0.2225
MIMMIG	0.2133	0.7112	0.0000	0.4942	0.5058	0.1490
MEXPORTS	0.1474	0.6300	0.0000	0.6030	0.3970	0.1170
MIMPORTS	0.2970	0.8012	0.0000	0.3582	0.6418	0.1891
MINVIN	0.1925	0.8053	0.0000	0.3514	0.6486	0.1911
MINVEROM	0.1756	0.6917	0.0000	0.5216	0.4784	0.1409
S Logist	outward					
MLEAD	0.3103	0.7219	0.0000	0.4788	0.5212	0.0000
MMINORD	0.0507	0.5837	0.0000	0.6593	0.3407	0.0000
MEZREORD	0.4424	0.8633	0.0000	0.2546	0.7454	0.0000
MRETURN	0.2517	0.7203	0.0000	0.4812	0.5188	0.0000
MCOSTRET	0.2344	0.7814	0.0000	0.3895	0.6105	0.0000

Chile

OB .. Path coefficients

	C Descri	P Descri	C Compet	P Compet	C Evalua	Prod Bel	Profitab
C Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Evalua	-0.187	0.564	0.001	0.049	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Bel	0.000	0.000	0.250	0.123	0.000	0.000	0.000
Profitab	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Servic	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Relati	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Business	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.132
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Eva	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.072	0.739	0.000
Buy	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Links	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.564	0.000	0.000
S Logist	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

OB .. Path coefficients

	S Servic	S Relati	Business	Familiar	Prod Eva	Buy	Links
C Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Evalua	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Bel	0.000	0.000	0.399	-0.080	0.000	0.000	0.000
Profitab	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Servic	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Relati	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Business	0.328	0.324	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Eva	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.207	0.000	0.000	0.058
Buy	0.000	0.000	-0.228	0.044	-0.553	0.000	-0.028
Links	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Logist	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

OB .. Path coefficients

	S Logist
C Descri	0.000
P Descri	0.000
C Compet	0.000
P Compet	0.000
C Evalua	0.000
Prod Bel	0.000
Profitab	0.000
S Servic	0.000
S Relati	0.000
Business	0.127
Familiar	0.000
Prod Eva	0.000
Buy	0.000
Links	0.000
S Logist	0.000

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

	C Descri	P Descri	C Compet	P Compet	C Evalua	Prod Bel	Profitab
C Descri	1.000						
P Descri	-0.307	1.000					
C Compet	-0.756	0.358	1.000				
P Compet	-0.578	0.585	0.769	1.000			
C Evalua	-0.389	0.651	0.382	0.488	1.000		
Prod Bel	-0.470	0.238	0.524	0.518	0.281	1.000	
Profitab	-0.112	0.155	0.024	0.079	0.118	0.358	1.000
S Servic	-0.441	0.390	0.460	0.511	0.434	0.649	0.400
S Relati	-0.443	0.386	0.487	0.525	0.400	0.578	0.345
Business	-0.396	0.257	0.407	0.475	0.393	0.581	0.382
Familiar	0.254	0.028	-0.211	-0.155	-0.072	-0.257	-0.100
Prod Eva	-0.439	0.206	0.406	0.430	0.327	0.818	0.488
Buy	0.322	-0.203	-0.248	-0.238	-0.312	-0.535	-0.446
Links	-0.200	0.525	0.240	0.375	0.564	0.103	-0.044
S Logist	-0.278	0.136	0.274	0.268	0.059	0.293	0.051

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

	S Servic	S Relati	Business	Familiar	Prod Eva	Buy	Links
S Servic	1.000						
S Relati	0.615	1.000					
Business	0.621	0.597	1.000				
Familiar	-0.229	-0.189	-0.264	1.000			
Prod Eva	0.628	0.577	0.685	-0.402	1.000		
Buy	-0.461	-0.493	-0.622	0.327	-0.732	1.000	
Links	0.185	0.269	0.148	0.008	0.173	-0.157	1.000
S Logist	0.323	0.195	0.303	-0.319	0.291	-0.174	0.075

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

	S Logist
S Logist	1.000

OInner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
C Descri	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3998	0.6002	0.0000
P Descri	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4311	0.5689	0.0000
C Compet	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.2937	0.7063	0.0000
P Compet	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3887	0.6113	0.0000
C Evalua	0.0000	0.0000	0.4641	0.3818	0.6182	0.2869
Prod Bel	0.0000	0.0000	0.4472	0.3830	0.6170	0.2759
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3368	0.6632	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4549	0.5451	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3717	0.6283	0.0000
Business	0.0000	0.0000	0.4862	0.0000	1.0000	0.4862
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.2786	0.7214	0.0000
Prod Eva	0.0000	0.0000	0.7216	0.4061	0.5939	0.4285
Buy	0.0000	0.0000	0.5653	0.2057	0.7943	0.4490
Links	0.0000	0.0000	0.3185	0.4019	0.5981	0.1905
S Logist	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4158	0.5842	0.0000
Average			0.2002	0.3739	0.6261	0.1292

OOuter Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan
----------	--------	---------	----------	----------	----------	----------

C Descri	outward					
CHRIGHTS	-0.3123	-0.8014	0.0000	0.3577	0.6423	0.0000
CHQLIFE	-0.2918	-0.7522	0.0000	0.4343	0.5657	0.0000
CHWORLD	-0.2350	-0.8059	0.0000	0.3505	0.6495	0.0000
CHPOLIT	-0.2118	-0.6500	0.0000	0.5775	0.4225	0.0000
CHENVIRO	-0.2394	-0.8492	0.0000	0.2788	0.7212	0.0000
P Descri	outward					
CHERIEND	0.5824	0.8450	0.0000	0.2860	0.7140	0.0000
CHTRUST	0.3687	0.7711	0.0000	0.4054	0.5946	0.0000
CHINDIV	0.3543	0.6310	0.0000	0.6018	0.3982	0.0000
C Compet	outward					
CHWEALTH	0.2918	0.8813	0.0000	0.2232	0.7768	0.0000
CHTECH	0.3214	0.8529	0.0000	0.2726	0.7274	0.0000
CHECONOM	0.3185	0.8765	0.0000	0.2317	0.7683	0.0000
CHAVAILW	0.2549	0.7434	0.0000	0.4474	0.5526	0.0000
P Compet	outward					
CHEDUCAT	0.2904	0.7806	0.0000	0.3906	0.6094	0.0000
CHWORK	0.3359	0.7737	0.0000	0.4014	0.5986	0.0000
CHSKILL	0.3189	0.8119	0.0000	0.3408	0.6592	0.0000
CHINDUS	0.3347	0.7604	0.0000	0.4219	0.5781	0.0000
C Evalua	outward					
CHLIKE	0.7137	0.8462	0.0000	0.2839	0.7161	0.3324
CHALIGN	0.5491	0.7213	0.0000	0.4797	0.5203	0.2415
Prod Bel	outward					
CHWRKSH	0.1703	0.8061	0.0000	0.3502	0.6498	0.2906
CHATRACT	0.1538	0.7736	0.0000	0.4015	0.5985	0.2677
CHQUAL	0.1938	0.7831	0.0000	0.3867	0.6133	0.2743
CHTEC	0.1455	0.7677	0.0000	0.4106	0.5894	0.2636
CHINOVAT	0.1345	0.7882	0.0000	0.3787	0.6213	0.2778
CHRELIAB	0.1651	0.7927	0.0000	0.3716	0.6284	0.2810
CHVARIET	0.1422	0.7645	0.0000	0.4155	0.5845	0.2614
CHDURABL	0.1669	0.8066	0.0000	0.3495	0.6505	0.2909
Profitab	outward					
CHMARKUP	0.2588	0.7656	0.0000	0.4139	0.5861	0.0000
CHTRNOVR	0.4746	0.7885	0.0000	0.3783	0.6217	0.0000
CHPROFIT	0.4836	0.8842	0.0000	0.2181	0.7819	0.0000
S Servic	outward					
CHONTIME	0.3111	0.7568	0.0000	0.4273	0.5727	0.0000
CHSPEED	0.2257	0.6117	0.0000	0.6258	0.3742	0.0000
CHCUSTOM	0.2917	0.6739	0.0000	0.5458	0.4542	0.0000
CHSERVIC	0.4870	0.8828	0.0000	0.2207	0.7793	0.0000
S Relati	outward					
CHBUSTYL	0.2316	0.8045	0.0000	0.3529	0.6471	0.0000
CHORIENT	0.1988	0.8170	0.0000	0.3325	0.6675	0.0000
CHNEWPRO	0.2115	0.8229	0.0000	0.3228	0.6772	0.0000
CHMANAGE	0.2324	0.8361	0.0000	0.3009	0.6991	0.0000
CHNEGOT	0.1688	0.7425	0.0000	0.4487	0.5513	0.0000
CHEZBUS	0.2169	0.7264	0.0000	0.4723	0.5277	0.0000
Business	outward					
CHCOMSUP	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.4862
Familiar	outward					
CHKNOWP	-0.5918	-0.8511	0.0000	0.2756	0.7244	0.0000
CHEZFIND	-0.5855	-0.8476	0.0000	0.2816	0.7184	0.0000
Prod Eva	outward					
CHVALUE	0.2134	0.7875	0.0000	0.3798	0.6202	0.4475
CHSATIS	0.2255	0.7807	0.0000	0.3904	0.6096	0.4399
CHCOMPRO	0.2393	0.8539	0.0000	0.2709	0.7291	0.5261
CHPRIDE	0.2320	0.7743	0.0000	0.4004	0.5996	0.4326
CHSPECs	0.2132	0.7747	0.0000	0.3998	0.6002	0.4331
CHSELLS	0.1678	0.6360	0.0000	0.5955	0.4045	0.2919

Buy	outward					
CHBUY	-0.5485	-0.8861	0.0000	0.2149	0.7851	0.4438
CHWILBUS	-0.5734	-0.8963	0.0000	0.1966	0.8034	0.4541
<hr/>						
Links	outward					
CHPOLECO	0.2355	0.8362	0.0000	0.3008	0.6992	0.2227
CHIMMIG	0.2420	0.7517	0.0000	0.4349	0.5651	0.1800
CHEXPOR	0.1581	0.6614	0.0000	0.5626	0.4374	0.1393
CHIMPORT	0.2610	0.8334	0.0000	0.3055	0.6945	0.2212
CHINVIN	0.2019	0.8139	0.0000	0.3376	0.6624	0.2110
CHINFROM	0.1853	0.7278	0.0000	0.4703	0.5297	0.1687
<hr/>						
S Logist	outward					
CHLEAD	0.1942	0.7399	0.0000	0.4525	0.5475	0.0000
CHMINORD	0.1761	0.5924	0.0000	0.6490	0.3510	0.0000
CHEZREOR	0.2981	0.8233	0.0000	0.3221	0.6779	0.0000
CHRETURN	0.2822	0.8063	0.0000	0.3499	0.6501	0.0000
CHCOSTRE	0.3347	0.8333	0.0000	0.3055	0.6945	0.0000

Argentina

OB .. Path coefficients

	C Descri	P Descri	C Compet	P Compet	C Evalua	Prod Bel	Profitab
C Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Evalua	0.294	0.514	-0.160	0.113	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Bel	0.000	0.000	0.464	0.045	0.000	0.000	0.000
Profitab	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Servic	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Relati	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Business	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.079
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Eva	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.148	0.723	0.000
Buy	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Links	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.420	0.000	0.000
S Logist	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

OB .. Path coefficients

	S Servic	S Relati	Business	Familiar	Prod Eva	Buy	Links
C Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descri	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Compet	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Evalua	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Bel	0.000	0.000	0.268	0.073	0.000	0.000	0.000
Profitab	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Servic	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Relati	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Business	0.116	0.522	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Eva	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.079	0.000	0.000	0.071
Buy	0.000	0.000	-0.322	-0.014	-0.488	0.000	-0.129
Links	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Logist	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

OB .. Path coefficients

S Logist	
C Descri	0.000
P Descri	0.000
C Compet	0.000
P Compet	0.000
C Evalua	0.000
Prod Bel	0.000
Profitab	0.000
S Servic	0.000
S Relati	0.000
Business	0.193
Familiar	0.000
Prod Eva	0.000
Buy	0.000
Links	0.000
S Logist	0.000

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

	C Descri	P Descri	C Compet	P Compet	C Evalua	Prod Bel	Profitab
C Descri	1.000						
P Descri	0.386	1.000					
C Compet	0.788	0.436	1.000				
P Compet	0.618	0.626	0.717	1.000			
C Evalua	0.436	0.628	0.377	0.502	1.000		
Prod Bel	0.577	0.374	0.630	0.509	0.301	1.000	
Profitab	0.169	0.247	0.156	0.171	0.290	0.272	1.000
S Servic	0.468	0.373	0.419	0.386	0.415	0.530	0.469
S Relati	0.470	0.404	0.516	0.482	0.352	0.508	0.495
Business	0.456	0.408	0.474	0.484	0.402	0.516	0.381
Familiar	0.045	0.060	0.104	0.032	0.055	0.147	0.082
Prod Eva	0.490	0.391	0.483	0.355	0.400	0.793	0.421
Buy	-0.450	-0.359	-0.399	-0.317	-0.459	-0.542	-0.412
Links	0.187	0.501	0.284	0.372	0.420	0.200	0.162
S Logist	0.217	0.133	0.207	0.222	0.189	0.151	-0.058

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

	S Servic	S Relati	Business	Familiar	Prod Eva	Buy	Links
S Servic	1.000						
S Relati	0.627	1.000					
Business	0.545	0.662	1.000				
Familiar	0.193	0.126	0.091	1.000			
Prod Eva	0.592	0.511	0.571	0.190	1.000		
Buy	-0.504	-0.526	-0.633	-0.130	-0.710	1.000	
Links	0.167	0.241	0.243	-0.045	0.275	-0.340	1.000
S Logist	0.337	0.146	0.303	0.260	0.190	-0.187	0.044

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

S Logist	
S Logist	1.000

OInner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
C Descri	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3834	0.6166	0.0000
P Descri	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4332	0.5668	0.0000
C Compet	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4088	0.5912	0.0000
P Compet	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4418	0.5582	0.0000
C Evalua	0.0000	0.0000	0.4473	0.3774	0.6226	0.2785
Prod Bel	0.0000	0.0000	0.4641	0.4278	0.5722	0.2656
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3287	0.6713	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4168	0.5832	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4899	0.5101	0.0000
Business	0.0000	0.0000	0.4970	0.0000	1.0000	0.4970
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4884	0.5116	0.0000
Prod Eva	0.0000	0.0000	0.6669	0.4383	0.5617	0.3746
Buy	0.0000	0.0000	0.5966	0.2462	0.7538	0.4497
Links	0.0000	0.0000	0.1764	0.4259	0.5741	0.1013
S Logist	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4548	0.5452	0.0000
Average			0.1899	0.4151	0.5849	0.1137

Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan
C Descri outward						
ARIGHTS	0.2580	0.7237	0.0000	0.4762	0.5238	0.0000
AQLIFE	0.2524	0.7894	0.0000	0.3769	0.6231	0.0000
AWORLD	0.2969	0.8029	0.0000	0.3554	0.6446	0.0000
APOLITIC	0.2427	0.7701	0.0000	0.4069	0.5931	0.0000
AENVIRO	0.2259	0.8357	0.0000	0.3016	0.6984	0.0000
P Descri outward						
AERIEND	0.4506	0.7730	0.0000	0.4025	0.5975	0.0000
ATRUST	0.4292	0.7327	0.0000	0.4632	0.5368	0.0000
AINDIVID	0.4483	0.7523	0.0000	0.4340	0.5660	0.0000
C Compet outward						
AWEALTH	0.2422	0.6629	0.0000	0.5606	0.4394	0.0000
ATECH	0.4162	0.8613	0.0000	0.2581	0.7419	0.0000
AECONOMY	0.3268	0.7997	0.0000	0.3605	0.6395	0.0000
AAVAILW	0.2978	0.7375	0.0000	0.4562	0.5438	0.0000
P Compet outward						
AEDUCATE	0.3152	0.7653	0.0000	0.4142	0.5858	0.0000
AWORK	0.3469	0.7782	0.0000	0.3944	0.6056	0.0000
ASKILL	0.4002	0.7876	0.0000	0.3798	0.6202	0.0000
AINDUS	0.2675	0.6491	0.0000	0.5786	0.4214	0.0000
C Evalua outward						
ALIKE	0.7197	0.8546	0.0000	0.2696	0.7304	0.3267
AALIGN	0.5364	0.7174	0.0000	0.4853	0.5147	0.2303
Prod Bel outward						
AWORKSH	0.1885	0.7559	0.0000	0.4286	0.5714	0.2652
AATTRACT	0.1401	0.6629	0.0000	0.5605	0.4395	0.2040
AQUAL	0.1821	0.7892	0.0000	0.3772	0.6228	0.2891
ATEC	0.1575	0.7370	0.0000	0.4569	0.5431	0.2521
AINNOVAT	0.1573	0.7923	0.0000	0.3722	0.6278	0.2914
ARELIABL	0.1766	0.8133	0.0000	0.3386	0.6614	0.3070
AVARIETY	0.1140	0.6077	0.0000	0.6307	0.3693	0.1714
ADURABLE	0.1942	0.8614	0.0000	0.2580	0.7420	0.3444
Profitab outward						
AMARKUP	0.4204	0.9075	0.0000	0.1764	0.8236	0.0000
ATURNNOVR	0.2722	0.5751	0.0000	0.6693	0.3307	0.0000
APROFIT	0.4982	0.9272	0.0000	0.1403	0.8597	0.0000
S Servic outward						
AONTIME	0.2425	0.6861	0.0000	0.5293	0.4707	0.0000
ASPEED	0.3258	0.7542	0.0000	0.4311	0.5689	0.0000
ACUSTOM	0.3137	0.7097	0.0000	0.4963	0.5037	0.0000
ASERVICE	0.4111	0.8885	0.0000	0.2106	0.7894	0.0000
S Relati outward						
ABUSTYLE	0.2663	0.7349	0.0000	0.4600	0.5400	0.0000
AORIENT	0.2188	0.6868	0.0000	0.5283	0.4717	0.0000
ANEWPROD	0.2098	0.6862	0.0000	0.5292	0.4708	0.0000
AMANAGER	0.2820	0.7797	0.0000	0.3920	0.6080	0.0000
ANEGOT	0.1812	0.6833	0.0000	0.5331	0.4669	0.0000
AEASEBUS	0.2346	0.7092	0.0000	0.4970	0.5030	0.0000
Business outward						
ACOMSUPP	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.4970
Familiar outward						
AKNOWP	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.0000
AEASFIND	-0.0001	0.1522	0.0000	0.9768	0.0232	0.0000
Prod Eva outward						
AVALUE	0.1988	0.7270	0.0000	0.4715	0.5285	0.3525
ASATIS	0.2356	0.7922	0.0000	0.3725	0.6275	0.4185
ACOMPROD	0.2534	0.8540	0.0000	0.2707	0.7293	0.4864
APRIDE	0.2439	0.7436	0.0000	0.4471	0.5529	0.3688
ASPECS	0.2233	0.7480	0.0000	0.4406	0.5594	0.3731
ASELLS	0.1705	0.6102	0.0000	0.6276	0.3724	0.2484

Buy	outward					
ABUY	-0.5640	-0.8624	0.0000	0.2563	0.7437	0.4436
AWILLBUS	-0.5877	-0.8740	0.0000	0.2361	0.7639	0.4557
Links	outward					
AIMMIG	0.2532	0.7687	0.0000	0.4091	0.5909	0.1042
APOLIECO	0.2480	0.8325	0.0000	0.3069	0.6931	0.1222
AEXPORTS	0.1380	0.6516	0.0000	0.5754	0.4246	0.0749
AIMPORTS	0.2914	0.8236	0.0000	0.3217	0.6783	0.1196
AINVIN	0.2273	0.7927	0.0000	0.3716	0.6284	0.1108
AINVFROM	0.1356	0.6552	0.0000	0.5707	0.4293	0.0757
S Logist	outward					
ALEAD	0.0715	0.6116	0.0000	0.6260	0.3740	0.0000
AMINORD	-0.0487	0.3317	0.0000	0.8900	0.1100	0.0000
AZREORD	0.4735	0.8792	0.0000	0.2270	0.7730	0.0000
ARETURN	0.3995	0.8729	0.0000	0.2380	0.7620	0.0000
ACOSTRET	0.2466	0.8408	0.0000	0.2931	0.7069	0.0000

Appendix I - Adjusted T-Statistics

Final Results

Canada

Number of cases in full model: 142
Jackknife deletion number: 4
Number of samples generated: 35
Number of good samples: 35

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimate)†

C Descr1	P Descr1	C Cmpat	P Cmpat	C Evalua	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Business	Familiar	Prod Rva	Buy	S Logist
C Descr1	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Descr1	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Cmpat	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Cmpat	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Evalua	0.0120	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Value	0.4230	-0.1710	0.2310	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Prod Bel	0.0000	0.0000	0.3960	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.2980	0.2780	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Business	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.1070	0.2200	0.3490	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.1520
Prod Rva	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Buy	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.1300	0.7070	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.1400	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Logist	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4390	0.2210	0.2440	0.0000	0.0000

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted)

[illegible]

Number of cases in full model: 142
Jackknife deletion number: 4
Number of samples generated: 35
Number of good samples: 35

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimate)

[illegible]

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted)

[illegible]

Mexico

Number of cases in full model: 142

Justifying deletion number: 4

Number of variables generated: 35

Number of good samples: 35

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimated):

C Descri	P Descri	C Compet	P Compet	C Evalua	Prod Bal	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Business	Familia	Prod Eva	Buy	Linka	S Logist
C Descri	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Descri	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Compet	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Compet	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Evalua	-0.0100	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Prod Bal	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Business	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Familia	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Prod Eva	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Buy	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Linka	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.0010	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Logist	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.0010	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted):

C Descri	P Descri	C Compet	P Compet	C Evalua	Prod Bal	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Business	Familia	Prod Eva	Buy	Linka	S Logist
C Descri	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Descri	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Compet	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Compet	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Evalua	-2.1924	7.1921	-0.0234	0.3230	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Prod Bal	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Business	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Familia	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Prod Eva	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Buy	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Linka	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-3.4716	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Logist	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-3.4716	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Number of cases in full model: 142
Jackknife deletion number: 4
Number of samples generated: 35
Number of good samples: 35

C Descri	C Descri	P Descri	C Compet	P Compet	C Compet
C Descri	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Descri	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Compet	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Compet	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Evalua	-0.1870	0.3440	-0.0010	0.0500	0.0000
Pred Bel	0.0000	0.0000	0.2500	0.1230	0.0000
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Serva	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Business	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Financier	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Pred Eva	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Buy	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Like	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Logist	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

	C Descr1	P Descr1	C Compst	F Compst	C Compst	F Compst	C Descr1
	C Descr1	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	C Descr1
	F Descr1	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	F Descr1
	C Compst	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	C Compst
	F Compst	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	F Compst
	C Evalua	-3.1989	4.1147	-0.2600	0.0000	0.0000	C Evalua
	Prod Bel	0.0000	0.0000	1.2348	0.0000	0.0000	Prod Bel
	Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	Profitab
	S Servio	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	S Servio
	S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	S Relati
	Business	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	Business
	Familyr	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	Familyr
	Prod Eve	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	Prod Eve
	Buy	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	Buy
	Likeli	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	Likeli
	Logist	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	Logist

Argentina

Number of cases in full model: 142
Jackknife deletion number: 4
Number of samples generated: 35
Number of good samples: 35

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimate):

[illegible]

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted)

[illegible]

Appendix J - Comparison of the PCI Model

ANOVA Results

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable BUS@BUY
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of D.F.	Mean Squares	F	F	Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	15.9451	3.9863	379.8190	.0000	
Within Groups	170	1.7842	.0105			
Total	174	17.7293				

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable BUS@BUY
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .0724 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

	G G G G G
	r r r r r
	p p p p p
	4 5 1 3 2
Mean	COUNTRY
-.4434	Grp 4
-.2545	Grp 5 *
-.2307	Grp 1 *
-.2286	Grp 3 *
.4383	Grp 2 * * * *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 4

Mean -.4434

Subset 2

Group	Grp 5	Grp 1	Grp 3
Mean	-.2545	-.2307	-.2286

Subset 3

Group	Grp 2
Mean	.4383

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable BUS@PBE
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	1.0450	.2613	1143.7335	.0000	
Within Groups	170	.0388	.0002			
Total	174	1.0839				

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable BUS@PBE
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0107 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

	G	G	G	G	G
	r	r	r	r	r
	p	p	p	p	p
	1	2	3	4	5
Mean	COUNTRY				
.2678	Grp 1				

.2985	Grp 2	*
.3990	Grp 3	**
.4475	Grp 4	***
.4568	Grp 5	***

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group	Grp 1
-------	-------

Mean	.2678
------	-------

Subset 2

Group	Grp 2
-------	-------

Mean	.2985
------	-------

Subset 3

Group	Grp 3
-------	-------

Mean	.3990
------	-------

Subset 4

Group	Grp 4	Grp 5
-------	-------	-------

Mean	.4475	.4568
------	-------	-------

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable CCOM@CEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of D.F.	Squares	Mean Squares	F	F	Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	1.1512	.2878	617.1101	.0000		
Within Groups	170	.0793	.0005				
Total	174	1.2305					

----- ONE WAY -----

Variable CCOM@CEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .0153 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) - 1/N(J))$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G G G
		r r r r r
		P P P P P
	2 5 1 4 3	
Mean	COUNTRY	
-.1774	Grp 2	
-.1671	Grp 5	
-.1597	Grp 1	*
-.0064	Grp 4	* * *
.0005	Grp 3	* * *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group	Grp 2	Grp 5
Mean	- .1774	- .1671

Subset 2

Group	Grp 5	Grp 1
Mean	- .1671	- .1597

Subset 3

Group	Grp 4	Grp 3
Mean	-.0064	.0005

----- ONE WAY -----

Variable CCOM@PBE
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	4.3558	1.0889	2916.3567	.0000	
Within Groups	169	.0631	.0004			
Total	173	4.4189				

----- ONE WAY -----

Variable CCOM@PBE
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0137 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G G G
		r r r r r
		p p p p p
	2 4 5 3 1	
Mean	COUNTRY	
-.0001	Grp 2	
.0871	Grp 4	*
.2413	Grp 5	**
.2508	Grp 3	**
.4627	Grp 1	****

----- ONE WAY -----

Variable CDES@CEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	2.2210	.5553	60.1180	.0000	
Within Groups	170	1.5701	.0092			
Total	174	3.7911				

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable CDES@CEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0680 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G G G
		r r r r r
		p p p p p
	4 2 3 5 1	
Mean	COUNTRY	
.0016	Grp 4	
.0136	Grp 2	
.0395	Grp 3	
.2077	Grp 5	* * *
.2771	Grp 1	* * *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group	Grp 4	Grp 2	Grp 3
Mean	.0016	.0136	.0395

Subset 2

Group	Grp 5	Grp 1
Mean	.2077	.2771

----- ONE WAY -----

Variable CEV@LINK
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of D.F.	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	3	.9594	.3198	1628.0984	.0000
Within Groups	136	.0267	.0002		
Total	139	.9861			

----- ONE WAY -----

Variable CEV@LINK
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .0099 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.00

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

G G G G
r r r r
p p p p

5 1 4 3
Mean COUNTRY

.3668 Grp 5
.4200 Grp 1 *
.5433 Grp 4 * *
.5646 Grp 3 * * *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 5

Mean .3668

Subset 2

Group Grp 1

Mean .4200

Subset 3

Group Grp 4

Mean .5433

Subset 4

Group Grp 3

Mean .5646

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable CEV@PEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of D.F.	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	1.3341	.3335	3232.4200	.0000
Within Groups	170	.0175	.0001		
Total	174	1.3516			

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable CEV@PEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0072 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

G G G G G
r r r r r
p p p p p

Mean .1483

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable FAM@BUY
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of D.F.	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	2.6622	.6655	4002.0978	.0000
Within Groups	170	.0283	.0002		
Total	174	2.6904			

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable FAM@BUY
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .0091 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

	G G G G G
	r r r r r
	p p p p p
	5 4 1 3 2
Mean	COUNTRY
- .1427	Grp 5
-.0706	Grp 4 *
-.0138	Grp 1 **
.0437	Grp 3 ***
.2211	Grp 2 ****

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 5

Mean -.1427

Subset 2

Group Grp 4

Mean -.0706

Subset 3

Group Grp 1

Mean -.0138

Subset 4

Group Grp 3

Mean .0437

Subset 5

Group Grp 2

Mean .2211

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable FAM@PBE
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	2.3785	.5946	3539.2337	.0000	
Within Groups	170	.0286	.0002			
Total	174	2.4070				

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable FAM@PBE
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .0092 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

```

          G G G G G
          r r r r r
          p p p p p

          3 1 5 4 2
Mean    COUNTRY

```

```

-.0800  Grp 3
.0719   Grp 1  *
.0853   Grp 5  * *
.1505   Grp 4  * * *
.2789   Grp 2  * * * *

```

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 3

Mean -.0800

Subset 2

Group Grp 1

Mean .0719

Subset 3

Group Grp 5

Mean .0853

Subset 4

Group Grp 4

Mean .1505

Subset 5

Group Grp 2

Mean -.2073

Subset 2

Group Grp 5

Mean .0318

Subset 3

Group Grp 1

Mean .0785

Subset 4

Group Grp 2 Grp 4

Mean .1407 .1467

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable LINK@BUY
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of D.F.	Mean Squares	F	F	Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	.1992	0498	28.6553	0000	
Within Groups	170	.2955	0017			
Total	174	.4948				

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable LINK@BUY
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if

$$MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0295 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$$

with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

```

          G G G G G
          r r r r r
          p p p p p

          1 4 3 5 2
Mean    COUNTRY

-.0919   Grp 1
-.0666   Grp 4
-.0284   Grp 3   * *
-.0164   Grp 5   * *
.0000    Grp 2   * *

```

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

```

Group    Grp 1    Grp 4
Mean     -.0919   -.0666
-----

```

Subset 2

```

Group    Grp 3    Grp 5    Grp 2
Mean     -.0284   -.0164   .0000
-----

```

----- ONEWAY -----

Variable LINK@PEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	3	.1976	.0659	906.7646		.0000
Within Groups	136	.0099	.0001			
Total	139	.2075				

----- ONEWAY -----

Variable LINK@PEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .0060 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/\text{N}(I) + 1/\text{N}(J))$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.00

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

	G G G G
	r r r r
	p p p p
	5 3 1 4
Mean	COUNTRY

.0322	Grp 5	
.0582	Grp 3	*
.0707	Grp 1	* *
.1343	Grp 4	* * *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 5

Mean .0322

— — — — —

Subset 2

Group Grp 3

Mean 0582

.....

Subset 3

Group Grp 1

Mean .0707

.....

Subset 4

Group Grp +

Mean .1343

.....

----- ONE WAY -----

Variable PBE@PEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	.3506	.0877	1524.3647		.0000
Within Groups	170	.0098	.0001			
Total	174	.3604				

----- ONE WAY -----

Variable PBE@PEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0054 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G G G
		r r r r r
		p p p p p
	2 1 3 4 5	
Mean	COUNTRY	
.7072	Grp 2	
.7231	Grp 1	*
.7388	Grp 3	**
.7738	Grp 4	***
.8331	Grp 5	****

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 2

Mean .7072

Subset 2

Group Grp 1

Mean .7231

Subset 3

Group Grp 3

Mean .7388

Subset 4

Group Grp 4

Mean .7738

Subset 5

Group Grp 5

Mean .8331

----- ONEWAY -----

Variable PCOM@CEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of D.F.	Squares	Mean Squares	F	F	Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	1.1340	.2835	694.6548	.0000		
Within Groups	170	.0694	.0004				
Total	174	1.2034					

----- ONEWAY -----

Variable PCOM@CEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .0143 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G	G	G	G	G
		r	r	r	r	r
		p	p	p	p	p
		4	3	1	5	2
Mean		COUNTRY				
.0366	Grp 4					
.0488	Grp 3					
.1129	Grp 1			*	*	
.2112	Grp 5			*	*	*
.2311	Grp 2			*	*	*

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group	Grp 4	Grp 3
Mean	.0366	.0488

Subset 2

Group	Grp 1
Mean	.1129

Subset 3

Group	Grp 5
Mean	.2112

Subset 4

Group	Grp 2
Mean	.2311

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable PCOM@PBE
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of D.F.	Squares	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	1.7525	.4381	1163.9104	.0000	
Within Groups	170	.0640	.0004			
Total	174	1.8165				

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable PCOM@PBE
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .0137 * \text{RANGE} * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G	G	G	G
		r	r	r	r
		p	p	p	p
		1	5	3	4
Mean	COUNTRY				
0459	Grp 1				
0780	Grp 5	*			
1226	Grp 3	*	*		
2492	Grp 4	*	*	*	
3048	Grp 2	*	*	*	*

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 1

Mean .0459

Subset 2

Group Grp 5

Mean .0780

Subset 3

Group Grp 3

Mean .1226

Subset 4

Group Grp 4

Mean .2492

Subset 5

Group Grp 2

Mean .3048

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable PDES@CEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	1.2109	.3027	1085.6390	.0000	
Within Groups	170	.0474	.0003			
Total	174	1.2583				

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable PDES@CEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq 0.118 * \text{RANGE} * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G	G	G	G	G
		r	r	r	r	r
		p	p	p	p	p
		1	5	3	2	4
Mean	COUNTRY					
.5136	Grp 1					
.5309	Grp 5	*				
.5646	Grp 3	*	*			
.6222	Grp 2	*	*	*		
.7440	Grp 4	*	*	*	*	

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group	Grp 1
Mean	.5136

Subset 2

Group	Grp 5
Mean	.5309

Subset 3

Group	Grp 3
Mean	.5646

Subset 4

Group	Grp 2
Mean	.6222

Subset 5

Group	Grp 4
-------	-------

Mean -.5751 -.5526

Subset 2

Group Grp 4 Grp 1

Mean -.3940 -.3471

Subset 3

Group Grp 2

Mean .2449

----- ONEWAY -----

Variable PROF@BUS
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	.3561	.0890	511.3543	.0000	
Within Groups	170	.0296	.0002			
Total	174	.3857				

----- ONEWAY -----

Variable PROF@BUS
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .0093 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

G G G G G
r r r r r
p p p p p

		1	2	3	4	5
Mean	COUNTRY					
.0792	Grp 1					
.1069	Grp 2	*				
.1323	Grp 3	*	*			
.1575	Grp 4	*	*	*		
.2110	Grp 5	*	*	*	*	*

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 1

Mean .0792

Subset 2

Group Grp 2

Mean .1069

Subset 3

Group Grp 3

Mean .1323

Subset 4

Group Grp 4

Mean .1575

Subset 5

Group Grp 5

Mean .2110

----- ONEWAY -----

Variable SLOG@BUS
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of D.F.	Squares	Mean Squares	F	F	Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	.8643	.2161	1576.1630	.0000		
Within Groups	170	.0233	.0001				
Total	174	.8876					

----- ONE WAY -----

Variable SLOG@BUS
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if

$MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0083 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G G G
		r r r r r
		p p p p p
	4 3 2 5 1	
Mean	COUNTRY	
.0003	Grp 4	
.1272	Grp 3	*
.1518	Grp 2	**
.1882	Grp 5	***
.1935	Grp 1	***

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 4

Mean .0003

Subset 2

Group Grp 3

Mean .1272

Subset 3

Group Grp 2

Mean .1518

Subset 4

Group Grp 5 Grp 1

Mean .1882 .1935

----- ONEWAY -----

Variable SREL@BUS
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of D.F.	Mean Squares	F	F	Ratio	Prob
Between Groups	4	3.4224	.8556	4202.7605	.0000	
Within Groups	170	.0346	.0002			
Total	174	3.4570				

----- ONEWAY -----

Variable SREL@BUS
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .0101 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

G G G G G

r r r r r

p p p p p

4 3 2 1 5

Mean COUNTRY

.2375	Grp 4	
.3243	Grp 3	*
.3493	Grp 2	**
.5222	Grp 1	***
.6208	Grp 5	****

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 4

Mean .2375

Subset 2

Group Grp 3

Mean .3243

Subset 3

Group Grp 2

Mean .3493

Subset 4

Group Grp 1

Mean .5222

Subset 5

Group Grp 5

Mean .6208

----- ONEWAY -----

Variable SSER@BUS
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	5.5612	1.3903	4451.4621	.0000	
Within Groups	170	.0531	.0003			
Total	174	5.6143				

----- ONEWAY -----

Variable SSER@BUS
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .0125 * \text{RANGE} * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE. 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G G G
		r r r r r
		p p p p p
		5 1 2 3 4
Mean	COUNTRY	
-.0754	Grp 5	
.1157	Grp 1	*
.2209	Grp 2	**
.3273	Grp 3	***
.4440	Grp 4	****

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 5

Mean -0754

Subset 2

Group	Grp 1
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9
10	10
11	11
12	12
13	13
14	14
15	15
16	16
17	17
18	18
19	19
20	20
21	21
22	22
23	23
24	24
25	25
26	26
27	27
28	28
29	29
30	30
31	31
32	32
33	33
34	34
35	35
36	36
37	37
38	38
39	39
40	40
41	41
42	42
43	43
44	44
45	45
46	46
47	47
48	48
49	49
50	50
51	51
52	52
53	53
54	54
55	55
56	56
57	57
58	58
59	59
60	60
61	61
62	62
63	63
64	64
65	65
66	66
67	67
68	68
69	69
70	70
71	71
72	72
73	73
74	74
75	75
76	76
77	77
78	78
79	79
80	80
81	81
82	82
83	83
84	84
85	85
86	86
87	87
88	88
89	89
90	90
91	91
92	92
93	93
94	94
95	95
96	96
97	97
98	98
99	99
100	100

Mean .1157

Subset 3

Group Grp 2

Mean .2209

Subset 4

Group Grp 3

Mean .3273

Subset 5

Group Grp 4

Mean .4440

Appendix K - Measurement Model

Simplified PCI Model

Canada

OB .. Path coefficients

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	0.000	0.187	0.290	0.310	0.000	0.000
Profitab	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Servic	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Relati	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Eva	0.828	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Buy	0.000	-0.048	-0.043	-0.296	-0.444	0.000

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	1.000					
Profitab	0.438	1.000				
S Servic	0.579	0.436	1.000			
S Relati	0.579	0.401	0.671	1.000		
Prod Eva	0.828	0.432	0.603	0.579	1.000	
Buy	-0.507	-0.378	-0.530	-0.601	-0.662	1.000

OInner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
Prod Bel	0.0000	0.0000	0.4295	0.4460	0.5540	0.2379
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3281	0.6719	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4630	0.5370	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4422	0.5578	0.0000
Prod Eva	0.0000	0.0000	0.6863	0.4516	0.5484	0.3763
Buy	0.0000	0.0000	0.5126	0.2020	0.7980	0.4091
Average			0.2714	0.4197	0.5803	0.1717

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan
Prod Bel	outward					
CWORKSHP	0.1508	0.6625	0.0000	0.5611	0.4389	0.1885
CATTRACT	0.1737	0.7798	0.0000	0.3919	0.6081	0.2611
CQUAL	0.1801	0.7056	0.0000	0.5021	0.4979	0.2138
CTEC	0.1586	0.7416	0.0000	0.4500	0.5500	0.2362
CINNOVAT	0.1658	0.7577	0.0000	0.4259	0.5741	0.2466
CRELIABL	0.1933	0.8104	0.0000	0.3432	0.6568	0.2821
CVARIETY	0.1529	0.7180	0.0000	0.4845	0.5155	0.2214
CDURABLE	0.1665	0.7685	0.0000	0.4095	0.5905	0.2536
Profitab	outward					
CMARKUP	0.3641	0.8696	0.0000	0.2439	0.7561	0.0000
CTURNOVR	0.3627	0.6602	0.0000	0.5642	0.4358	0.0000
CPROFIT	0.4891	0.9076	0.0000	0.1762	0.8238	0.0000
S Servic	outward					
CONTIME	0.3569	0.7213	0.0000	0.4797	0.5203	0.0000
CSPEED	0.2320	0.6470	0.0000	0.5814	0.4186	0.0000
CCUSTOM	0.2547	0.6517	0.0000	0.5753	0.4247	0.0000
CSERVICE	0.4816	0.8856	0.0000	0.2156	0.7844	0.0000
S Relati	outward					
CBUSTYLE	0.1866	0.5982	0.0000	0.6421	0.3579	0.0000
CORIENT	0.1985	0.7279	0.0000	0.4702	0.5298	0.0000
CNEWPROD	0.2421	0.7948	0.0000	0.3684	0.6316	0.0000
CMANAGE	0.2198	0.8019	0.0000	0.3570	0.6430	0.0000
CNEGOT	0.2255	0.7864	0.0000	0.3816	0.6184	0.0000
CEASEBUS	0.2629	0.7524	0.0000	0.4338	0.5662	0.0000
Prod Eva	outward					
CVALUE	0.1722	0.6501	0.0000	0.5774	0.4226	0.2900
CSATIS	0.2659	0.8571	0.0000	0.2654	0.7346	0.5041
CCOMPROD	0.2493	0.8160	0.0000	0.3342	0.6658	0.4569
CPRIDE	0.2256	0.7046	0.0000	0.5035	0.4965	0.3407
CSPECS	0.2087	0.6967	0.0000	0.5146	0.4854	0.3331
CSELLS	0.2187	0.6967	0.0000	0.5146	0.4854	0.3331
Buy	outward					
CBUY	-0.5340	-0.8830	0.0000	0.2203	0.7797	0.3996
CWILLBUS	-0.5849	-0.9036	0.0000	0.1836	0.8164	0.4185

USA

OB .. Path coefficients

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	0.000	0.265	0.338	0.266	0.000	0.000
Profitab	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Servic	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Relati	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Eva	0.886	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Buy	0.000	-0.141	0.178	-0.242	-0.687	0.000

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	1.000					
Profitab	0.497	1.000				
S Servic	0.606	0.433	1.000			
S Relati	0.545	0.320	0.574	1.000		
Prod Eva	0.886	0.585	0.609	0.490	1.000	
Buy	-0.662	-0.544	-0.441	-0.522	-0.780	1.000

OInner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
Prod Bel	0.0000	0.0000	0.4816	0.4632	0.5368	0.2585
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.2781	0.7219	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4082	0.5918	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3861	0.6139	0.0000
Prod Eva	0.0000	0.0000	0.7844	0.3240	0.6760	0.5303
Buy	0.0000	0.0000	0.6611	0.2022	0.7978	0.5274
Average			0.3212	0.3737	0.6263	0.2174

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

Prod Bel	outward					
UWORKSHP	0.1775	0.7736	0.0000	0.4016	0.5984	0.2882
UATTRACT	0.2052	0.7832	0.0000	0.3865	0.6135	0.2954
UQUAL	0.2029	0.8181	0.0000	0.3307	0.6693	0.3223
UTECH	0.1186	0.6348	0.0000	0.5971	0.4029	0.1940
UINNOVAT	0.1566	0.7081	0.0000	0.4986	0.5014	0.2415
URELIABL	0.1777	0.7567	0.0000	0.4274	0.5726	0.2757
UVARIETY	0.1448	0.5919	0.0000	0.6497	0.3503	0.1687
UDURABLE	0.1694	0.7653	0.0000	0.4143	0.5857	0.2821

Profitab	outward					
UMARKUP	0.3564	0.8632	0.0000	0.2548	0.7452	0.0000
UTURNOVR	0.4145	0.7763	0.0000	0.3974	0.6026	0.0000
UPROFIT	0.4098	0.9045	0.0000	0.1820	0.8180	0.0000

S Servic	outward					
UONTIME	0.3977	0.8220	0.0000	0.3242	0.6758	0.0000
USPEED	0.2426	0.7740	0.0000	0.4009	0.5991	0.0000
UCUSTOM	0.1835	0.5556	0.0000	0.6914	0.3086	0.0000
USERVICE	0.4329	0.8853	0.0000	0.2162	0.7838	0.0000

S Relati	outward					
UBUSTYLE	0.2022	0.7360	0.0000	0.4583	0.5417	0.0000
UORIENT	0.1770	0.7114	0.0000	0.4939	0.5061	0.0000
UNEWPROD	0.2028	0.8145	0.0000	0.3366	0.6634	0.0000
UMANAGE	0.2338	0.8354	0.0000	0.3022	0.6978	0.0000
UNEGOT	0.2564	0.8123	0.0000	0.3401	0.6599	0.0000
UEASEBUS	0.1997	0.7838	0.0000	0.3857	0.6143	0.0000

Prod Eva	outward					
UVALUE	0.1882	0.7870	0.0000	0.3807	0.6193	0.4858
USATIS	0.2170	0.8678	0.0000	0.2469	0.7531	0.5907
UCOMPROD	0.2188	0.8690	0.0000	0.2448	0.7552	0.5923
UPRIDE	0.1990	0.8055	0.0000	0.3512	0.6488	0.5089
USPECS	0.1869	0.7806	0.0000	0.3906	0.6094	0.4780
USELLS	0.2043	0.8187	0.0000	0.3297	0.6703	0.5258

Buy	outward					
UBUY	-0.5630	-0.8945	0.0000	0.1999	0.8001	0.5290
UWILLBUS	-0.5565	-0.8919	0.0000	0.2045	0.7955	0.5259
=====						

Mexico**OB .. Path coefficients**

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	0.000	0.181	0.456	0.304	0.000	0.000
Profitab	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Servic	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Relati	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Eva	0.837	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Buy	0.000	-0.074	-0.058	-0.067	-0.664	0.000

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	1.000					
Profitab	0.492	1.000				
S Servic	0.720	0.417	1.000			
S Relati	0.659	0.398	0.619	1.000		
Prod Eva	0.837	0.545	0.697	0.547	1.000	
Buy	-0.632	-0.486	-0.593	-0.495	-0.781	1.000

0Inner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
Prod Bel	0.0000	0.0000	0.6180	0.3446	0.6554	0.4050
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3242	0.6758	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3933	0.6067	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3514	0.6486	0.0000
Prod Eva	0.0000	0.0000	0.7006	0.3221	0.6779	0.4749
Buy	0.0000	0.0000	0.6221	0.1472	0.8528	0.5305
Average			0.3235	0.3324	0.6676	0.2466

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

Prod Bel	outward					
MWORKSHP	0.1697	0.8218	0.0000	0.3247	0.6753	0.4174
MATTRACT	0.1553	0.8223	0.0000	0.3239	0.6761	0.4179
MQUAL	0.1608	0.8090	0.0000	0.3455	0.6545	0.4045
MTEC	0.1423	0.7906	0.0000	0.3750	0.6250	0.3862
MINNOVAT	0.1381	0.8062	0.0000	0.3501	0.6499	0.4017
MRELIABL	0.1692	0.8410	0.0000	0.2927	0.7073	0.4371
MVARIETY	0.1379	0.7569	0.0000	0.4270	0.5730	0.3541
MDURABLE	0.1602	0.8257	0.0000	0.3182	0.6818	0.4214

Profitab	outward					
MMARKUP	0.2998	0.7964	0.0000	0.3657	0.6343	0.0000
MTURNOVR	0.4369	0.7674	0.0000	0.4111	0.5889	0.0000
MPROFIT	0.4750	0.8968	0.0000	0.1958	0.8042	0.0000

S Servic	outward					
MONTIME	0.3146	0.7874	0.0000	0.3801	0.6199	0.0000
MSPEED	0.3130	0.7671	0.0000	0.4116	0.5884	0.0000
MCUSTOM	0.2254	0.6447	0.0000	0.5843	0.4157	0.0000
MSERVICE	0.4094	0.8961	0.0000	0.1970	0.8030	0.0000

S Relati	outward					
MBUSTYLE	0.1712	0.7108	0.0000	0.4948	0.5052	0.0000
MORIENT	0.2059	0.8046	0.0000	0.3526	0.6474	0.0000
MNEWPROD	0.2242	0.8349	0.0000	0.3029	0.6971	0.0000
MMANAGE	0.2340	0.8715	0.0000	0.2404	0.7596	0.0000
MNEGOT	0.1995	0.8349	0.0000	0.3029	0.6971	0.0000
MEASEBUS	0.2026	0.7648	0.0000	0.4150	0.5850	0.0000

Prod Eva	outward					
MVALUE	0.1903	0.8068	0.0000	0.3490	0.6510	0.4561
MSATIS	0.2124	0.8586	0.0000	0.2628	0.7372	0.5165
MCOMPROD	0.2242	0.8805	0.0000	0.2247	0.7753	0.5432
MPRIDE	0.2116	0.8477	0.0000	0.2813	0.7187	0.5035
MSPECS	0.1812	0.7434	0.0000	0.4473	0.5527	0.3872
MSELLS	0.1919	0.7952	0.0000	0.3676	0.6324	0.4431

Buy	outward					
MBUY	-0.5465	-0.9250	0.0000	0.1445	0.8555	0.5322
MWILLBUS	-0.5364	-0.9220	0.0000	0.1499	0.8501	0.5288
=====						

Chile

OB .. Path coefficients

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	0.000	0.082	0.456	0.274	0.000	0.000
Profitab	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Servic	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Relati	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Eva	0.817	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Buy	0.000	0.118	-0.084	0.126	0.653	0.000

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	1.000					
Profitab	0.355	1.000				
S Servic	0.656	0.390	1.000			
S Relati	0.581	0.343	0.611	1.000		
Prod Eva	0.817	0.487	0.631	0.578	1.000	
Buy	0.532	0.446	0.452	0.493	0.730	1.000

OInner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
Prod Bel	0.0000	0.0000	0.4882	0.3824	0.6176	0.3015
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3364	0.6636	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4528	0.5472	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3718	0.6282	0.0000
Prod Eva	0.0000	0.0000	0.6668	0.4061	0.5939	0.3960
Buy	0.0000	0.0000	0.5536	0.2058	0.7942	0.4397
Average			0.2848	0.3779	0.6221	0.1954

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

Prod Bel	outward					
CHWRKSHP	0.1703	0.8026	0.0000	0.3559	0.6441	0.3145
CHATRACT	0.1610	0.7770	0.0000	0.3962	0.6038	0.2948
CHQUAL	0.1763	0.7744	0.0000	0.4003	0.5997	0.2928
CHTEC	0.1514	0.7722	0.0000	0.4037	0.5963	0.2911
CHINOVAT	0.1379	0.7930	0.0000	0.3712	0.6288	0.3070
CHRELIAB	0.1661	0.7929	0.0000	0.3713	0.6287	0.3069
CHVARIET	0.1451	0.7689	0.0000	0.4088	0.5912	0.2886
CHDURABL	0.1641	0.8050	0.0000	0.3520	0.6480	0.3164

Profitab	outward					
CHMARKUP	0.2880	0.7720	0.0000	0.4039	0.5961	0.0000
CHTRNOVR	0.4913	0.7967	0.0000	0.3653	0.6347	0.0000
CHPROFIT	0.4430	0.8718	0.0000	0.2399	0.7601	0.0000

S Servic	outward					
CHONTIME	0.3526	0.7872	0.0000	0.3804	0.6196	0.0000
CHSPEED	0.2624	0.6463	0.0000	0.5823	0.4177	0.0000
CHCUSTOM	0.2421	0.6313	0.0000	0.6014	0.3986	0.0000
CHSERVIC	0.4610	0.8677	0.0000	0.2470	0.7530	0.0000

S Relati	outward					
CHBUSTYL	0.2133	0.7987	0.0000	0.3621	0.6379	0.0000
CHORIENT	0.2187	0.8274	0.0000	0.3154	0.6846	0.0000
CHNEWPRO	0.2394	0.8365	0.0000	0.3002	0.6998	0.0000
CHMANAGE	0.2257	0.8337	0.0000	0.3050	0.6950	0.0000
CHNEGOT	0.1532	0.7322	0.0000	0.4639	0.5361	0.0000
CHEZBUS	0.2063	0.7183	0.0000	0.4840	0.5160	0.0000

Prod Eva	outward					
CHVALUE	0.2195	0.7914	0.0000	0.3736	0.6264	0.4177
CHSATIS	0.2281	0.7818	0.0000	0.3888	0.6112	0.4076
CHCOMPRO	0.2401	0.8538	0.0000	0.2710	0.7290	0.4861
CHPRIDE	0.2207	0.7681	0.0000	0.4100	0.5900	0.3934
CHSPECS	0.2161	0.7772	0.0000	0.3960	0.6040	0.4028
CHSELLS	0.1663	0.6345	0.0000	0.5975	0.4025	0.2684

Buy	outward					
CHBUY	0.5678	0.8940	0.0000	0.2008	0.7992	0.4424
CHWILBUS	0.5543	0.8884	0.0000	0.2107	0.7893	0.4370
=====						

Argentina

OB .. Path coefficients

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	0.000	-0.046	0.367	0.307	0.000	0.000
Profitab	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Servic	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S Relati	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prod Eva	0.798	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Buy	0.000	0.066	-0.006	0.204	0.579	0.000

OR .. Correlations of latent variables

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	1.000					
Profitab	0.289	1.000				
S Servic	0.539	0.484	1.000			
S Relati	0.515	0.509	0.630	1.000		
Prod Eva	0.798	0.436	0.594	0.522	1.000	
Buy	0.549	0.420	0.499	0.537	0.711	1.000

OInner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
Prod Bel	0.0000	0.0000	0.3431	0.4283	0.5717	0.1962
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3332	0.6668	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4162	0.5838	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4912	0.5088	0.0000
Prod Eva	0.0000	0.0000	0.6370	0.4379	0.5621	0.3580
Buy	0.0000	0.0000	0.5466	0.2464	0.7536	0.4119
Average			0.2545	0.4193	0.5807	0.1566

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

Prod Bel	outward					
AWORKSHP	0.1965	0.7614	0.0000	0.4202	0.5798	0.1989
AATTRACT	0.1633	0.6810	0.0000	0.5363	0.4637	0.1591
AQUAL	0.1806	0.7908	0.0000	0.3747	0.6253	0.2146
ATEC	0.1336	0.7197	0.0000	0.4821	0.5179	0.1777
AINNOVAT	0.1527	0.7903	0.0000	0.3755	0.6245	0.2143
ARELIABL	0.1767	0.8067	0.0000	0.3492	0.6508	0.2233
AVARIETY	0.1192	0.6154	0.0000	0.6212	0.3788	0.1300
ADURABLE	0.1911	0.8561	0.0000	0.2670	0.7330	0.2515

Profitab	outward					
AMARKUP	0.3785	0.8684	0.0000	0.2460	0.7540	0.0000
ATURNOVR	0.4024	0.6755	0.0000	0.5438	0.4562	0.0000
APROFIT	0.4495	0.8888	0.0000	0.2100	0.7900	0.0000

S Servic	outward					
AONTIME	0.2603	0.7011	0.0000	0.5084	0.4916	0.0000
ASPEED	0.3167	0.7556	0.0000	0.4290	0.5710	0.0000
ACUSTOM	0.2811	0.6905	0.0000	0.5232	0.4768	0.0000
ASERVICE	0.4305	0.8920	0.0000	0.2043	0.7957	0.0000

S Relati	outward					
ABUSTYLE	0.2842	0.7371	0.0000	0.4567	0.5433	0.0000
AORIENT	0.1545	0.6449	0.0000	0.5841	0.4159	0.0000
ANEWPROD	0.2546	0.7171	0.0000	0.4857	0.5143	0.0000
AMANAGER	0.2466	0.7659	0.0000	0.4133	0.5867	0.0000
ANEGOT	0.2001	0.6881	0.0000	0.5265	0.4735	0.0000
AEASEBUS	0.2523	0.7203	0.0000	0.4811	0.5189	0.0000

Prod Eva	outward					
AVALUE	0.2066	0.7335	0.0000	0.4620	0.5380	0.3427
ASATIS	0.2302	0.7889	0.0000	0.3777	0.6223	0.3964
ACOMPROD	0.2525	0.8553	0.0000	0.2684	0.7316	0.4660
APRIDE	0.2379	0.7381	0.0000	0.4553	0.5447	0.3470
ASPECS	0.2306	0.7540	0.0000	0.4315	0.5685	0.3621
ASELLS	0.1673	0.6061	0.0000	0.6326	0.3674	0.2340

Buy	outward					
ABUY	0.5919	0.8760	0.0000	0.2327	0.7673	0.4195
AWILLBUS	0.5598	0.8601	0.0000	0.2602	0.7398	0.4044
=====						

Appendix L - Adjusted T-Statistic

Simplified PCI Model

Canada

Number of cases in full model: 142
 Jackknife deletion number: 4
 Number of samples generated: 35
 Number of good samples: 35

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimate):

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	0.0000	0.1870	0.2900	0.3100	0.0000	0.0000
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Prod Eva	0.8280	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Buy	0.0000	-0.0480	-0.0430	-0.2960	-0.4440	0.0000

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted)

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	0.0000	1.8201	2.1639	2.2086	0.0000	0.0000
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Prod Eva	16.3834	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Buy	0.0000	-0.3807	-0.1003	-2.1260	-3.3041	0.0000

USA

Number of cases in full model: 142
 Jackknife deletion number: 4
 Number of samples generated: 35
 Number of good samples: 35

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimate):

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	0.0000	0.2650	0.3380	0.2660	0.0000	0.0000
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Prod Eva	0.8860	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Buy	0.0000	-0.1410	0.1780	-0.2420	-0.6870	0.0000

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted)

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	0.0000	1.7077	2.3426	1.7563	0.0000	0.0000
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Prod Eva	39.3030	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Buy	0.0000	-1.9130	1.7255	-2.5120	-6.4348	0.0000

Mexico

Number of cases in full model: 142

Jackknife deletion number: 4

Number of samples generated: 35

Number of good samples: 35

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimate):

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	0.0000	0.1810	0.4560	0.3040	0.0000	0.0000
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Prod Eva	0.8370	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Buy	0.0000	-0.0740	-0.0580	-0.0670	-0.6640	0.0000

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted)

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	0.0000	1.8418	4.4471	2.8086	0.0000	0.0000
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Prod Eva	24.8343	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Buy	0.0000	-3.2759	-3.2151	-3.2429	-3.2970	0.0000

Chile

Number of cases in full model: 142

Jackknife deletion number: 4

Number of samples generated: 35

Number of good samples: 35

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimate):

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	0.0000	0.0820	0.4560	0.2740	0.0000	0.0000
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Prod Eva	0.8170	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Buy	0.0000	0.1180	-0.0840	0.1260	0.6530	0.0000

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted)

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	0.0000	0.6274	4.3045	1.8497	0.0000	0.0000
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Prod Eva	18.7525	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Buy	0.0000	1.0057	-0.6520	1.0954	5.7780	0.0000

Argentina

Number of cases in full model: 142

Jackknife deletion number: 4

Number of samples generated: 35

Number of good samples: 35

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimate):

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	0.0000	-0.0460	0.3670	0.3070	0.0000	0.0000
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Prod Eva	0.7980	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Buy	0.0000	0.0660	-0.0060	0.2040	0.5790	0.0000

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted)

	Prod Bel	Profitab	S Servic	S Relati	Prod Eva	Buy
Prod Bel	0.0000	-0.6003	2.9070	2.3351	0.0000	0.0000
Profitab	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Servic	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
S Relati	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Prod Eva	16.7832	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Buy	0.0000	0.4797	-0.0633	1.8843	6.2215	0.0000

Appendix M - Comparison of the Simplified Model

ANOVA Results

----- ONE WAY -----

Variable PBEL@PEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	.1493	.0373	1639.9238		.0000
Within Groups	170	.0039	.0000			
Total	174	.1532				

----- ONE WAY -----

Variable PBEL@PEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .0034 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

G G G G G
 r r r r r
 p p p p p
 1 3 2 4 5
 Mean COUNTRY

.7984 Grp 1
 .8169 Grp 3 *
 .8290 Grp 2 * *
 .8370 Grp 4 * * *
 .8857 Grp 5 * * * *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 1

Mean .7984

Subset 2

Group Grp 3

Mean .8169

Subset 3

Group Grp 2

Mean .8290

Subset 4

Group Grp 4

Mean .8370

Subset 5

Group Grp 5

Mean .8857

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable PEV@BUY
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of D.F.	Squares	Mean Squares	F	F	Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	51.1183	12.7796	150.6885	.0000		
Within Groups	170	14.4173	.0848				
Total	174	65.5356					

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable PEV@BUY
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if

$$MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .2059 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$$

with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

G G G G G
r r r r r
p p p p p

5 2 4 1 3
Mean COUNTRY

-.6874	Grp 5	
-.4439	Grp 2	*
-.1708	Grp 4	**
.5799	Grp 1	***
.6530	Grp 3	***

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 5

Mean -.6874

Subset 2

Group Grp 2

Mean -.4439

Subset 3

Group Grp 4

Mean -.1708

Subset 4

Group Grp 1 Grp 3

Mean .5799 .6530

----- ONEWAY -----

Variable PRO@BUY
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of D.F.	Squares	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	1.4276	.3569	292.7695	.0000	
Within Groups	170	.2072	.0012			
Total	174	1.6348				

----- ONE WAY -----

Variable PRO@BUY
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .0247 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G G G
		r r r r r
		p p p p p
	5 2 4 1 3	
Mean	COUNTRY	
-.1409	Grp 5	
-.0485	Grp 2	*
-.0180	Grp 4	**
.0664	Grp 1	***
.1181	Grp 3	****

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 5

Mean -.1409

Subset 2

Group Grp 2

Mean -.0485

Subset 3

Group Grp 4

Mean -.0180

Subset 4

Group Grp 1

Mean .0664

Subset 5

Group Grp 3

Mean 1181

----- ONEWAY -----

Variable PRO@PBEL
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob
Between Groups	4	1.9913	.4978	2434.6174	.0000	
Within Groups	170	.0348	.0002			
Total	174	2.0260				

----- ONEWAY -----

Variable PRO@PBEL
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .0101 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

					G G G G G
					r r r r r
					p p p p p
					1 3 4 2 5
Mean					COUNTRY
-.0450					Grp 1
.0826					Grp 3 *
.1810					Grp 4 **
.1875					Grp 2 **
.2649					Grp 5 ***

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 1

Mean -.0450

Subset 2

Group Grp 3

Mean .0826

Subset 3

Group Grp 4 Grp 2

Mean .1810 .1875

Subset 4

Group Grp 5

Mean .2649

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable REL@BUY
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of D.F.	Squares	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	6.7615	1.6904	1584.8951	.0000	
Within Groups	170	.1813	.0011			
Total	174	6.9428				

----- ONE WAY -----

Variable REL@BUY
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .0231 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G G
		r r r r
		p p p p
	2 5 4 3 1	
Mean	COUNTRY	
-.2954	Grp 2	
-.2420	Grp 5	*
-.0181	Grp 4	**
.1251	Grp 3	***
.2041	Grp 1	****

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 2

Mean -.2954

Subset 2

Group Grp 5

Mean -.2420

Subset 3

Group Grp 4

Mean -.0181

Subset 4

Group Grp 3

Mean .1251

Subset 5

Group Grp 1

Mean .2041

----- ONEWAY -----

Variable REL@PBEL
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of D.F	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	.0571	.0143	60.2670	.0000
Within Groups	170	.0402	.0002		
Total	174	.0973			

----- ONEWAY -----

Variable REL@PBEL
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if

MEAN(J)-MEAN(I) >= .0109 * RANGE * SQRT(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

```

          G G G G G
          r r r r r
          P P P P P

          5 3 4 1 2
Mean    COUNTRY

.2664   Grp 5
.2757   Grp 3
.3041   Grp 4   * *
.3066   Grp 1   * *
.3108   Grp 2   * *

```

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group	Grp 5	Grp 3
Mean	.2664	.2757

Subset 2

Group	Grp 4	Grp 1	Grp 2
Mean	.3041	.3066	.3108

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable SER:@BUY
 By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of D.F.	Squares	Mean Squares	F	F	Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	1.4190	.3547	379.3019	.0000		
Within Groups	170	.1590	.0009				
Total	174	1.5780					

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable SER@BUY
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .0216 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

```

          G G G G G
          r r r r r
          p p p p p

          3 2 4 1 5
Mean  COUNTRY

-.0834  Grp 3
-.0438  Grp 2  *
-.0141  Grp 4  **
-.0063  Grp 1  **
.1778   Grp 5  ****

```

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 3

Mean - .0834

Subset 2

Group Grp 2

Mean - .0438

Subset 3

Group Grp 4 Grp 1

Mean - .0141 -.0063

Subset 4

Group Grp 5

Mean .1778

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable SER@PBEL
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	F Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	4	7529	1882	815.6146	0000	
Within Groups	170	0392	0002			
Total	174	7922				

----- O N E W A Y -----

Variable SER@PBEL
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0107 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.40

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G G G
		r r r r r
		p p p p p
	2 5 1 3 4	
Mean	COUNTRY	
.2899	Grp 2	
.3382	Grp 5	*
.3676	Grp 1	**
.4550	Grp 3	***
.4566	Grp 4	***

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 2

Mean .2899

Subset 2

Group Grp 5

Mean .3382

Subset 3

Group Grp 1

Mean .3676

Subset 4

Group Grp 3 Grp 4

Mean .4550 .4566

IMAGE EVALUATION TEST TARGET (QA-3)

APPLIED IMAGE, Inc.
1653 East Main Street
Rochester, NY 14609 USA
Phone: 716/482-0300
Fax: 716/288-5989

© 1993, Applied Image, Inc., All Rights Reserved