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

**NAFTA: A Comparison of Canadian Consumer and Retail Buyer
Product Country Images**

by: Melissa Dowdles, B.Comm

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

Masters of Management Studies

School of Business

**Carleton University
Ottawa, ON
July 11, 1997
© copyright
1997, Melissa Dowdles**

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.

0-612-27035-1

ACCEPTANCE SHEET

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

NAFTA: A Comparison of Canadian Consumer and Retail Buyer Product Country Images

submitted by Melissa Dowdles in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Masters of Management Studies

Thesis Co-Supervisor

Thesis Co-Supervisor

Director, School of Business

Carleton University

August 18, 1997

ABSTRACT

The NAFTA trading bloc is opening up several trade opportunities. However, literature which looks at product and country images suggests that the image a person holds of a country and/ or its products will affect their willingness to buy. Regardless of the attempts to increase trade through the removal of trade barriers, the image that NAFTA holds in the minds of consumers and retail buyers will be a major determinant in product evaluations and willingness to buy.

This research used secondary data from two surveys measuring the attitudes of Canadian consumers and retail buyers toward the current and potential NAFTA countries including Canada, the United States, Mexico, Chile, and Argentina.

The study was divided into three sections: the consumer study, the model validation, and the comparison of Canadian consumers and retail buyers.

In general, the consumer study found significant differences in consumers' views of NAFTA countries and their products. The developed countries received more positive country and product ratings than the less developed countries. Products from Mexico, Chile, and Argentina are viewed as being very similar.

The tested model establishes the existence of a PCI effect among consumers and retail buyers for developed and less developed countries. For consumers, a wider range of country factors are used when making product evaluations while for retail buyers, it is the perceived competence of the country and/ or its people that is the first step to accepting products from that country. Although the strength of various model paths vary across countries and between consumers and retail buyers, there is a core model which appears to describe PCI effects.

The findings also suggest that a halo effect is operant regardless of the level of knowledge of country or products, as opposed to existing only for countries of which respondents have little or no knowledge as Han (1989) had originally stipulated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank Dr. Louise Heslop for taking me under her wing and teaching me to fly. Over the past three years she has given me the experience and confidence I needed to succeed and move forward to new challenges. I also wish to express my thanks to Dr. Deborah Compeau and Dr. Nicolas Papadopoulos for their feedback and support.

I would also like to thank my Mom and Dad for all their support (and for putting up with me during my more stressful moments).

Finally, I would like to thank all my friends for just being there.

I am forever indebted to all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACCEPTANCE SHEET	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF APPENDICES	x
INTRODUCTION	1
1.0 LITERATURE REVIEW	5
1.1 Consumers versus Retail Buyers.....	5
1.2 Information Processing.....	8
1.3 Information Cues and Product Evaluations	10
1.4 Product-Country Images	11
1.5 Product Country Image and the NAFTA Trading Bloc.....	19
1.6 Product Country Image and Retail Buyers.....	21
1.7 Modeling.....	22
2.0 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND MODEL DEVELOPMENT	27
2.1 Primary Objective	27
2.2 Secondary Objectives	34
3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	36
3.1 Consumer Survey.....	36
3.2 Retail Buyer Survey	37
4.0 DATA PREPARATION & DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES	38
4.1 Data Preparation.....	38
4.2 Data Analysis Procedures	39
5.0 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF CONSUMER SURVEY	43
5.1 Descriptive Sample Statistics	43
5.2 General Results of Country Ratings.....	45
5.3 General Results of Product Ratings.....	51
5.4 Analysis of H ₃₇ to H ₄₀ (Demographic Differences).....	56

6.0 ANALYSIS AND RESULTS OF THE PCI MODEL	62
6.1 Measurement Model.....	62
6.2 Structural Model.....	81
7.0 COMPARISON OF CONSUMERS' AND RETAIL BUYERS' MODELS	123
7.1 Canada	123
7.2 United States	125
7.3 Mexico.....	128
7.4 Chile.....	131
7.5 Argentina.....	133
9.0 DISCUSSION	136
9.1 Views of Countries and Attitudes Towards Products.....	136
9.2 Demographic Impacts On Country And Product Ratings.....	137
9.3 Consumer PCI Models	139
9.3 Retail Buyer PCI Models.....	142
9.5 Country Knowledge	144
9.6 Comparison of Consumer and Retail Buyer Models	145
9.0 LIMITATIONS	148
10.0 RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS.....	150
10.1 Implications for Business Practitioners and Marketers.....	150
10.2 Implications for Government and Policy Makers	155
10.3 Implications for Market Researchers.....	156
REFERENCES	158

LIST OF TABLES

Description	Page
Table 4.1 - Data Preparation	39
Table 5.1 - Demographic Breakdown of Survey and Overall Population	44
Table 5.2 - Means (Standard Deviation) for Country Items	46
Table 5.3 - Doubly Multivariate Analysis of NAFTA Country Differences - Significant Differences for Country Items	49
Table 5.4 - Means (Standard Deviation) for Product Items	52
Table 5.5 - Doubly Multivariate Analysis of NAFTA Country Differences - Significant Differences for Product Items	54
Table 5.7 - Significant Effects of Gender on Country and Product Ratings	57
Table 5.8 - Significant Effects of Age on Country and Product Ratings	58
Table 5.9 - Significant Effects of Education on Country and Product Ratings	60
Table 5.10 - Significant Effects of Income on Country and Product Ratings	61
Table 6.1 - COUNTRY DESCRIPTION Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings (Consumers)	63
Table 6.2 - PEOPLE DESCRIPTION Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings (Consumers)	64
Table 6.3 - COUNTRY COMPETENCE Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings (Consumers)	64
Table 6.4 - PEOPLE COMPETENCE Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings (Consumers)	65
Table 6.5 - COUNTRY EVALUATION Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings (Consumers)	65
Table 6.6 - RELATIONSHIP Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings (Consumers)	66
Table 6.7 - PRODUCT BELIEFS Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings (Consumers)	67
Table 6.8 - PRODUCT EVALUATION Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings (Consumers)	68
Table 6.9 - FAMILIARITY Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings (Consumers)	68
Table 6.10 - COUNTRY DESCRIPTION Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Consumers)	69
Table 6.11 - PRODUCT BELIEFS Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Consumers)	70
Table 6.12 - RELATIONSHIP Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Consumers)	70
Table 6.13 - FAMILIARITY Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Consumers)	71
Table 6.14 - PEOPLE DESCRIPTION Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Consumers)	71
Table 6.15 - COUNTRY COMPETENCE Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Consumers)	71
Table 6.16 - PEOPLE COMPETENCE Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Consumers)	72
Table 6.17 - COUNTRY EVALUATION Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Consumers)	72
Table 6.18 - PRODUCT EVALUATION Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Consumers)	72
Table 6.19 - COUNTRY DESCRIPTION Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings (Retail Buyer)	73
Table 6.20 - PEOPLE DESCRIPTION Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings (Retail Buyer)	74
Table 6.21 - COUNTRY COMPETENCE Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings (Retail Buyer)	74
Table 6.22 - PEOPLE COMPETENCE Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings (Retail Buyer)	74
Table 6.23 - COUNTRY EVALUATION Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings (Retail Buyer)	75
Table 6.24 - RELATIONSHIP Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings (Retail Buyer)	75
Table 6.25 - PRODUCT EVALUATIONS Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings (Retail Buyer)	75
Table 6.26 - PRODUCT BELIEFS Indicator Loadings - Initial Model (Retail Buyer)	76
Table 6.27 - FAMILIARITY Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Retail Buyer)	77
Table 6.28 - COUNTRY DESCRIPTION Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Retail Buyer)	78
Table 6.29 - PRODUCT BELIEFS Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Retail Buyer)	78
Table 6.30 - FAMILIARITY Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Retail Buyer)	79
Table 6.31 - PEOPLE DESCRIPTION Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Retail Buyer)	79
Table 6.32 - COUNTRY COMPETENCE Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Retail Buyer)	79
Table 6.33 - PEOPLE COMPETENCE Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Retail Buyer)	80
Table 6.34 - COUNTRY EVALUATION Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Retail Buyer)	80
Table 6.35 - RELATIONSHIP Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Retail Buyer)	80
Table 6.36 - PRODUCT EVALUATION Indicator Loadings - Final Model (Retail Buyer)	80
Table 6.37 - Discriminant Validity Coefficients - Canada (Consumers)	82
Table 6.38 - Discriminant Validity Coefficients - United States (Consumers)	82

Table 6.39 - Discriminant Validity Coefficients - Mexico (Consumers)	83
Table 6.40 - Discriminant Validity Coefficients - Chile (Consumers)	83
Table 6.41 - Discriminant Validity Coefficients - Argentina (Consumers)	83
Table 6.42 - Incidence of Significance - Consumers	85
Table 6.43 - Summary of Hypotheses (Path Coefficients) - Consumers	86
Table 6.44 - Discriminant Validity Coefficients - Canada (Retail Buyers)	105
Table 6.45 - Discriminant Validity Coefficients - United States (Retail Buyers)	105
Table 6.46 - Discriminant Validity Coefficients - Mexico (Retail Buyers)	105
Table 6.47 - Discriminant Validity Coefficients - Chile (Retail Buyers)	106
Table 6.48 - Discriminant Validity Coefficients - Argentina (Retail Buyers)	106
Table 6.49 - Incidence of Significance - Retail Buyers	107
Table 6.50 - Summary of Hypotheses (Path Coefficients) - Retail Buyers	108
Table 7.1 - Comparison of Consumers and Retail Buyers - Canada	125
Table 7.2 - Comparison of Consumers and Retail Buyers - United States	127
Table 7.3 - Comparison of Consumers and Retail Buyers - Mexico	130
Table 7.4 - Comparison of Consumers and Retail Buyers - Chile	133
Table 7.5 - Comparison of Consumers and Retail Buyers - Argentina	135

LIST OF FIGURES

Description	Page
Figure 1 - LISREL Model of PCI Effects	24
Figure 2 - Comprehensive Product Country Image Model	27
Figure 3 - Canadian Consumers' Model of PCI Effects for Canada	96
Figure 4 - Canadian Consumers Model of PCI Effects for the United States	98
Figure 5 - Canadian Consumers Model of PCI Effects for Mexico	99
Figure 6 - Canadian Consumers Model of PCI Effects for Chile	102
Figure 7 - Canadian Consumers Model of PCI Effects for Argentina	103
Figure 8 - Canadian Retail Buyers Model of PCI Effects for Canada	115
Figure 9 - Canadian Retail Buyers Model of PCI Effects for the United States	117
Figure 10 - Canadian Retail Buyers Model of PCI Effects for Mexico	119
Figure 11 - Canadian Retail Buyers Model of PCI Effects for Chile	120
Figure 12 - Canadian Retail Buyers Model of PCI Effects for Argentina	121
Figure 13 - A Comparison of Canadian Consumers' and Retail Buyers' Models of PCI Effects for Canada	124
Figure 14 - A Comparison of Canadian Consumers' and Retail Buyers' Models of PCI Effects for the United States	126
Figure 15 - A Comparison of Canadian Consumers' and Retail Buyers' Models of PCI Effects for Mexico	129
Figure 16 - A Comparison of Canadian Consumers' and Retail Buyers' Models of PCI Effects for Chile	132
Figure 17 - A Comparison of Canadian Consumers' and Retail Buyers' Models of PCI Effects for Argentina	134
Figure 18 - Amalgamated Consumer Model - Significant Paths	141
Figure 19 - Amalgamated Retail Buyer Model - Significant Paths	144

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Consumer Survey	164
Appendix B: Retail Buyer Survey	176
Appendix C: Doubly Multivariate Analysis of Variance - Country Profiles	199
Appendix D: Doubly Multivariate Analysis of Variance - Product Profiles	210
Appendix E: Analysis of Gender Differences	221
Appendix F: Analysis of Age Differences	224
Appendix G: Analysis of Education Differences.....	229
Appendix H: Analysis of Income Differences	234
Appendix I - Consumer Measurement Models - Initial Findings	238
Appendix J: Consumer Measurement Models - Final Models	243
Appendix K: Retail Buyer Measurement Models - Initial Findings	253
Appendix L: Retail Buyer Measurement Models - Final Models	258
Appendix M: Adjusted T-Statistics - Consumers.....	269
Appendix N: Comparison of Consumer Models - ANOVA Results	274
Appendix O: Adjusted T-Statistics - Retail Buyers	287
Appendix P: Comparison of Retail Buyer Models - ANOVA Results.....	292
Appendix Q: Comparison of Consumer and Retail Buyers - Paths.....	302
Appendix R: Comparison of Consumers and Retail Buyers - Loadings	307

INTRODUCTION

The introduction of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) has had major impacts for governments, businesses, and consumers throughout North America. The NAFTA aims to fulfill several objectives including the following key objectives. First, the agreement is intended to phase out both tariff and non-tariff barriers on thousands of goods traded among the U.S., Mexico, and Canada. Second, financial services will be provided more freely among the countries. Finally, limitations will be reduced on foreign direct investment and ownership, while strong rules for the protection of investments and intellectual properties will be established (Gooding and Mendez, 1992; Reddy, Buskirk, and Vyas, 1994). With the creation of NAFTA, the world's largest market has been established constituting over 360 million people and over \$6 trillion in annual output (Reddy, Buskirk, and Vyas, 1994).

Trading blocs, such as the one covered by the NAFTA, are becoming increasingly common in global markets. As more companies expand internationally, there is a heightened need to know people's perceptions of exporting countries and their products. Many studies have attempted to provide answers for business and government regarding the question of whether or not consumers would be willing to buy products from given countries or regions. Researchers (e.g. Papadopoulos et. al, 1988; Han, 1989; Papadopoulos and Heslop, 1993) have found a relationship between the image of a country and the

image of the products from that country. This relationship (between a country image and a product image) is explained by Papadopoulos (1993) as, "The image of countries, in their role as origins of products, is one of the extrinsic cues that may become part of a product's total image" (p. 8). Product-Country Image (PCI) research looks at the relationship of the images of countries and the images of products from those countries, and the effects of these images on buyer behaviour. Though research has progressed in this area over the last thirty years, the evolution of trading blocs and their role in PCI effects has received little attention.

Even before the introduction of the NAFTA, the trade practices of Mexico and other Latin American countries have been changing and barriers to trade have been lowered. NAFTA was welcomed with open arms by Mexico. Now, other Latin American countries are anticipating the opportunity to become partners (Reddy, Buskirk, and Vyas, 1994). Increased trade in goods and services is likely. However, regardless of barriers being lowered and free trade being phased in, the image of a country held by consumers will likely be a major determinant in their evaluations and purchases of products from that country.

The purpose of this research was to determine the relationships between attitudes toward countries within a trading bloc and the willingness to buy their products. The study looked at both Canadian consumers' and retail buyers' views of the countries and products of current and potential NAFTA members,

specifically Canada, the United States, Mexico, Chile, and Argentina. There were three objectives for this research. The main objective was the validation of a theoretical PCI model which encompasses several facets of PCI research. The purpose of the model was to compare views of consumers and retail buyers in a comprehensive manner. Since an in-depth study of Canadian retail buyers was completed by Nadeau (forthcoming), a second objective involved an in-depth look at Canadian consumers' views of the countries and products from current and potential partners in NAFTA. The final objective was to determine the relationship between consumer demographics and the product and country images that are held regarding NAFTA and potential NAFTA countries. For ease of presentation, all of these countries, Canada, U.S., Mexico, Chile, and Argentina, will be referred to as NAFTA countries throughout this paper.

The remainder of this document is divided into nine chapters detailing this research study. The first chapter reviews the literature which has guided this research endeavour. The second chapter looks at the research objectives and hypotheses, including an in-depth discussion of the model that was tested. The third chapter explains the research methodologies for both portions of the study (consumer and retail buyers), while the fourth chapter outlines the data analysis and techniques that were employed. The fifth chapter discusses the findings from the consumer survey while the sixth chapter looks at the results from the consumer and retail buyer PCI model testing and comparisons. Chapter seven compares the consumer and retail buyer models. A discussion of the results is

provided in chapter eight. In the ninth chapter, the study limitations are reviewed. The final chapter considers the implications of the study for researchers, marketers, business people, and government.

1.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

This research amalgamates several areas of study. This literature review is organized into seven sections. The first section looks at the limited research that compares consumers' and retail buyers' decision criteria and information sources. The second section expands on the information learned in the previous one and introduces an information processing theory of consumer choice. The research discussed is primarily drawn from the consumer behaviour literature. The third section looks at the use of information cues in product evaluations and quality perceptions. This research is drawn from both consumer behaviour and applied psychology literature. The fourth section looks at consumer PCI research and the mechanisms of effect. PCI with respect to NAFTA is detailed in section five. The sixth section looks at PCI and retail buyers. The final section introduces the concept of modeling in product and country image research.

1.1 Consumers versus Retail Buyers

Since this research is aimed at comparing the information sources and decision criteria used by consumers and retail buyers, it seems fitting to begin with a look at research in this area. Several studies exist that look at retail buyers.

However, this section concentrates on the literature that looks at both retail buyers and consumers. Given their close interdependence, it is surprising how little research was found that compares the product selection processes or criteria of retail buyers or retailers and consumers. An exploratory study

conducted by Taylor (1984) observed the differences between the buyer selection processes of consumers and retailers in the apparel industry. The apparel preferences of six retail buyers and sixty consumers were studied. The retail buyers viewed sample lines and subsequently placed orders. Preferences were measured based on the amount of merchandise purchased. Consumers viewed the same sample line and recorded their preferences on Likert-type scales indicating the strength of their preference for each style, colour, and fabric presented. Overall, significant differences were found between the preferences of each group (consumers and retail buyers). Based on these differences, the study was able to predict stock-outs and markdowns for the stores and concluded that retail buyers are not adequately meeting the needs of their customers (Taylor, 1984).

Even though little research has looked at both consumers and retail buyers, studies have acknowledged that the customer is an important external information source for retail buyers making product selections. One's own knowledge was the most frequently cited information source used by retailers, while customer requests were the most frequently used external source (Kline and Wagner, 1994). Other studies suggest that the retail buyer does not look to the external environment at all when making a buying decision, possibly indicating a supply rather than demand orientation among buyers (Hirschman, 1981).

Although several models of industrial buyer behaviour and choice strategies have been developed (Sheth, 1973; Crow, Olshavsky, and Summers, 1980), none is applicable to or fit the retail buyer situation. Several differences have been identified between industrial and retail buyers (Hirschman, 1981; Wagner, Ettenson, and Parrish, 1989). Some of the differences identified include that industrial buyers often purchase as a committee, while retail buyers make individual decisions, and that industrial buyers purchase staple or complex products and are not concerned with resale of the product, whereas retail buyer purchases are concerned with the “ultimate” consumer (Hirschman, 1981).

In Hirschman’s (1981) study of decision criteria used by retail buyers in selecting merchandise and vendors, it was found that both store type and department type influenced buyers’ criteria. Her findings suggest that price and terms of delivery were the most commonly used criteria in selecting merchandise.

These findings are cause for concern as they represent the limitations of research in this area. The lack of research acknowledging the relationship between consumers and retail buyers brings with it a lack of understanding. If retail buyers are making decisions with little knowledge of consumers’ perceptions or beliefs, at some point both the consumer and retail buyer lose. Retail buyers may be making decisions on a trial and error basis or on the basis of expectations about consumer response. As trade between NAFTA countries

increases, a greater understanding of consumers' views is required for retail buyers to make effective buying decisions.

1.2 Information Processing

The previous section has looked at some comparisons of the decision criteria and information sources used by retail buyers. Viewing choice behaviour from an information processing perspective will enhance the knowledge obtained from the comparison of consumers and retail buyers. Both consumers and retail buyers are constantly exposed to product information. How these groups react to, interpret, combine, and/or integrate this information will impact on their choice behaviour (Bettman, 1979).

A general model of information processing can be represented as a five stage process: exposure, attention, comprehension, acceptance, and retention (Engel, Blackwell, and Miniard, 1993) The process begins with an appropriate stimulus and is completed once the stimulus has been processed and stored in memory. Assael (1995) discusses two models of information processing, one for low and one for high involvement decisions. In low involvement situations, information is acquired ,often passively, and stored in short-term memory. Relevant information is passed on to long-term memory for use in brand evaluation while other information is discarded. When making a brand evaluation, information is retrieved from long-term memory (unless it has been forgotten). The evaluation

subsequently leads to purchase and consumption. The positive or negative consumption experience will transfer to long-term memory for more effective information search in the future. High involvement decisions are similar to low involvement except that the information is not acquired passively, and perceived risk encourages additional information search at the brand evaluation stage. Additional external information is collected until perceived risk is low and a purchase decision can be made. The differences can be explained by the elaboration-likelihood model. In high-involvement cases, consumers are motivated to obtain and process information that may meet their needs, while in low-involvement cases there is little motivation (Assael, 1995).

Bettman (1979) has taken a different approach to describing information processing and information application. His model is comprised of seven basic components: (1) processing capacity, (2) motivation, (3) attention, (4) information acquisition and evaluation, (5) decision processes, (6) consumption and learning, and (7) memory. The model also includes scanner and interrupt mechanisms. These mechanisms emulate the “real world” by scanning and dealing with environmental factors such as conflict or unexpected events.

Understanding how consumers and retail buyers process available information is important to the study of PCI. Bettman's approach encourages the use of conceptual modeling to visualize the link between distinct components of consumer behaviour. In doing so, he promotes a comprehensive view of the

processes involved in making choices. Conceptual modeling of integral aspects of PCI can enhance future studies in the area of PCI research.

Information processing involves acquiring and processing information for future use. Information on the country in which a product is made is one such piece of information that may be acquired and used in decision-making. The following section introduces the use of specific information cues in product evaluations.

1.3 Information Cues and Product Evaluations

The information obtained during the information acquisition stage of Bettman's (1979) choice model can be viewed as an array of cues (Jacoby, Olson, and Haddock, 1971). A cue is a single piece of information which carries or implies certain performance outcomes of purchase or use of a product. Two types of cues exist, intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic cues are those which involve the physical composition of the product (taste, design, performance, etc.), and extrinsic cues are those which are product related but not part of the tangible product itself (price, brand name, warranty, etc.) (Zeithaml, 1988). Cues are often used when making product evaluations. Several authors have researched or discussed the relationship between the use of certain cues and product evaluations or product quality beliefs (Jacoby, Olson, and Haddock, 1971; Olson, 1973; Bilkey and Nes, 1982; Wall, Heslop, and Liefeld, 1991; Ahmed and D'Astous, 1993).

Jacoby, Olson, and Haddock (1971) looked at price, brand name, and composition characteristics as determinants of perceived quality. Five key findings were cited. First, price did not affect perception of product quality when it was the only cue permitted to vary, and second, price was not an indicator of product quality when embedded in a multi-cue setting. Third, brands with strong brand image affect product quality perceptions. The fourth finding suggests when there are differences in product composition, differences in quality can be detected. Finally, the authors found that consumers will use cues systematically regardless of their predictive power. Olson (1973) presented an overview of the effect of price and other cues on product evaluations. Based on the findings of twenty years of price research, he concluded that single cue price studies are not generalizable and that price should be studied in multi-cue settings.

Country-of-origin (COO) is another cue that plays a role in product evaluations. A large body of research exists that looks at the COO cue. The following section looks at country-of-origin or product-country image effects.

1.4 Product-Country Images

Since the 1960's, studies on country images and their effects on perceptions of products made in different countries have been found in the marketing literature (Roth and Romeo, 1992; Ahmed and D'Astous, 1993; Wall and Heslop, 1989; Han, 1988, 1989; Johansson and Nebenzahl, 1987; Mahasweran, 1994; Witt and Rao, 1992; Papadopoulos and Heslop, 1993).

With the 1980's came an evolutionary change in the approach to PCI research. Researchers acknowledged the limitations pointed out by Bilkey and Nes (1982) in their overview of the PCI field of research. Bilkey and Nes (1982) stated that inferring the magnitude of the relationship between country-of-origin and product evaluations was not warranted due to these limitations. Similar to Olson (1973), who suggested that price was not reliable as a single cue, Bilkey and Nes (1982) concluded that the use of single cue studies presents barriers to PCI research. They suggested that single cue studies and the use of only verbal references to products (rather than tangible products), present general validity and reliability problems in research. Some other issues which surfaced in their overview include how much influence the country-of-origin cue has on buyer perceptions; whether and to what extent other cues compensate for a negative country-of-origin cue; what the determinants are of country-of-origin bias (source country, consuming country, or other considerations); and, possible correlations between the country-of-origin cue and other cues.

With these limitations and issues in mind, researchers have taken new approaches to the study of PCI. Johansson, Douglas, and Nonaka (1985) introduced a new methodological perspective encouraging the use of multiple cues. They believed that the country-of-origin cue works best in the presence of other cues and incorporated this by looking at thirteen attributes of ten automobile models from 3 countries (Japan, U.S. and Germany). They found that all attributes had a significant impact on overall ratings. Their findings

suggested that the impact of PCI may be more complex than previous research suggested.

In his review and meta-analysis of PCI research, Liefeld (1993) looked at the effect of single and multi-cue studies in PCI research. Contrary to the limitations identified by Bilkey and Nes (1982), Liefeld concluded that the number of information cues did not significantly affect the size of effect estimates. Thus, he concluded that, the number of cues does not affect the measure of PCI effects in studies of product evaluations or choices (Liefeld, 1993). However, Liefeld did note the small number of studies available for the analysis.

PCI contributes to the assessment of several product evaluation outcomes (Wall and Heslop, 1989) and perceived risk (Wall and Heslop, 1989; Witt and Rao, 1992). Wall and Heslop (1989) studied the effect of patriotic appeals on consumer judgements. The study focused on products from Canada, a high reputation country, and a less developed country. They looked at three products from three countries (Polo shirt - Canada, U.S. and South Korea; Wallet - Canada, Italy, and Taiwan; and, Telephone - Canada, U.S. and Hong Kong) with respect to quality, perceived risk, perceived price, and likelihood of purchasing a certain product. PCI was found to significantly affect quality perception for all three products, where the high reputation country and Canada were rated higher than the developing country. The significance of perceived risk for the telephone was lower for Canada than for the U.S. or the developing country. The

perceived price was significantly higher for Canada and the other developed country than the developing country for both the polo shirt and telephone.

Witt and Rao (1992) studied global sourcing from a consumer behaviour point of view concentrating on the PCI effects on perceived risk. They looked at the differences in perceived risk between U.S.-made products (jeans and microwaves) and the same products from newly industrialized countries (Taiwan and Mexico). They concluded that there is a difference in perceived risk and that a PCI bias for both the jeans and the microwave existed.

Past literature presents mixed results with respect to the effect of demographic variables on country and product ratings. In their study of Canadian-made versus imported products, Wall and Heslop (1986) found that younger consumers generally rated foreign products higher than older consumers. Earlier, Schooler (1971) had similar findings. On the other hand, Bennett (1991) did not find a significant difference between age groups in his study of Canadian consumers views of Eastern Europe. Bennett (1991) also looked at the effect of gender, income, and education. The only significant difference found was between respondents with high school education or less and those with a university degree. The higher educated group gave more positive ratings to foreign products. Schooler (1971) also found that higher education led to higher ratings on foreign products. Gender has also been found to have an effect in some cases. Schooler found that females generally rated foreign products

higher than males, however, when he looked at Chilean products, males rated significantly higher than females. Wall and Heslop (1986) support higher ratings from females than males.

PCI research has been conducted from several perspectives. Hong and Wyer (1989) looked at the effect of PCI from an information processing perspective. Findings suggest that country-of-origin stimulates extensive thought about the other product attributes. This is termed the cognitive elaborative approach to information processing. Other approaches have viewed PCI through investigating the following mechanisms: stereotyping, patriotism, and the halo and summary construct.

Stereotyping is important to acknowledge when discussing PCI. Stereotypes are the informal rules one makes about a person, place, or product that influence one's behaviour. They are generalizations abstracted from limited observations (Papadopoulos, 1993). Several studies have concentrated on country and product stereotypes (Mahaswaran, 1994; Bennett, 1991; Papadopoulos and Bamossy, 1987). Novice consumers have been found to use stereotypes when making product evaluations. Experienced consumers will only use country of origin stereotypes when the available product information is ambiguous (Mahaswaran, 1994). Papadopoulos, Heslop, and Bennett (1992) found that respondents reported limited knowledge of certain countries while proceeding to evaluate the countries and products as being significantly different. This

suggests that a stereotype is being used in place of detailed knowledge.

Johansson and Nebenzahl (1987) extended the linkage between PCI and product evaluations through the introduction of the impact of country stereotyping on social norms and behavioural intentions. It was found that there is a country of origin effect upon social norms which in turn has an impact on behavioural intentions.

A number of studies suggest that consumers frequently hold a bias in favour of domestically produced products over foreign products (Han, 1988; Bennett, 1991; Wall, Liefeld, and Heslop, 1989). This behaviour has been attributed to “patriotism” or “ethnocentrism”. Furthermore, the implementation of “made-in” campaigns has also been studied for their effect on domestic product evaluations.

In a model proposed by Han (1988), the role of consumer patriotism was examined. The model hypothesized the relationships between country image, patriotism, serviceability, and purchase intentions. The model was tested using televisions and automobiles as the products to be evaluated. Patriotism was found to play a significant role in choice whereas the country image played a limited role. It was also concluded that patriotic appeal campaigns or advertisements would be effective as long as they did not arouse consumers' guilt.

This, however, is not always the case. In a study by Johansson, Douglas, and Nonaka (1985), nationality did affect the product ratings (automobiles) but not necessarily in favour of one's home country. For example, American respondents rated Japanese products more positively than did Japanese respondents.

Han (1989) suggested that COO information can affect consumers' evaluations through two mechanisms: a halo effect or a summary construct effect. Two models were developed to test these effects. The first, termed the "halo hypothesis", suggests the structural relationship: country image → product beliefs → brand attitude. The halo effect operates under conditions where there is little or no specific product knowledge but involves some beliefs regarding ability to produce products. Therefore, inferences about the quality of a product are drawn from country image which is measured simply as a country's ability to produce that kind of product. In other words, the views of a country's ability to produce a certain product will dictate views about all products. The second model, termed the "summary construct hypothesis", suggests the structural relationship: product beliefs → country image → brand attitude. This relationship implies a consumer has specific knowledge about products from a country. The knowledge of the products transposes itself to a belief about a country's ability to produce products. Country image summarizes consumer beliefs about a product and can affect the attitude toward a brand. For example, if one knows a lot about Japanese products but little about Japan, positive views of the products

may lead to a positive view of Japan and thus lead to positive attitudes toward other Japanese brands. Although both models are intuitively appealing, the measures used by Han (1989) were not necessarily valid or reliable. Country image was measured by respondents' beliefs about a country's ability to produce a certain product while knowledge of a country's products was merely an assumption made by the researchers, not based on information supplied by the respondents. Even with its apparent faults, the intuitive appeal of Han's (1989) suggestions has led several researchers to look for and report on findings supportive of halo and summary effects within their own research.

In an attempt to improve the understanding of the country and product evaluation link, Bamossy and Papadopoulos (1987) suggest a positive halo effect when looking at how the Dutch evaluate Sweden and its products. It was proposed that the Dutch share a similar philosophy to Sweden toward several social and political issues that promote a positive country image. In terms of Swedish products, strong brand images for innovative and quality products also may lead to a favorable image of the country. In a sense, the product and country images are working together as are the halo and summary effects.

In summary, the research on PCI has introduced several areas and aspects for further study. There is an apparent need to link these concepts in a comprehensive manner.

1.5 Product Country Image and the NAFTA Trading Bloc

In this section, both current and potential NAFTA countries will be discussed in the context of PCI research. The countries in Central and South America are considered less developed than the North American NAFTA partners. Many studies have focused on consumers' generally more negative attitudes toward developing countries and their products (Gaedeke, 1973; Heslop, Liefeld, and Wall, 1987; Ahmed and d'Astous, 1993a). Others have looked specifically at Central and South American countries (Alden, Hoyer, and Crowley, 1993; Ahmed and d'Astous, 1995; Ahmed, d'Astous, and Mendez, 1995; Labrie, Propeck, and Arellano, 1994).

Perceived risk is found to be higher for products from developing countries. Witt and Rao (1992) looked at the perceived risk of products made in the United States and the same products made in Mexico in order to identify some of the implications involved in outsourcing to a developing country. A significant difference was found between the perceived risk of products made in Mexico and the same products made in the United States, indicating a negative PCI bias toward Mexican-made products. The authors conclude that business decision-makers must consider the types of products being sourced and the source country (Witt and Rao, 1992).

A study of Canadian and Mexican business people's perceptions of fellow North American countries, people, enterprises and products was conducted by Labrie, Propeck, and Arellano (1994). Few differences were found between the two samples of top managers from exporting companies in their global perspective of the three countries (Labrie, Propeck, and Arellano, 1994). From the Canadians' point of view, Mexico is generally perceived as the least politically stable country in North America, and its social development level is perceived as being low. Mexican business people are thought of as being comparable to Canadian business people. There is a negative image of Mexican companies which are perceived as having a poorly qualified work force, offering unsatisfactory after-sales service and commercial promotion. Mexican products and services have a low level of development and innovation in the eyes of Canadians, as well as offering a poor selection.

Gaedeke (1973) looked at consumers' attitudes toward products made in developing countries. Mexico, Argentina, and Brazil represented South American countries in the study while Asian countries were also included. Findings suggested that consumers rate products from developing nations lower in quality than products from developed nations.

The issue of country-of-design versus country-of-manufacture is sometimes studied in relation to developing countries (Ahmed and d'Astous, 1993b; Ahmed, d'Astous, and Mendez, 1995). Chileans have a poor image of Mexico as a

country of manufacture or country-of-design. The authors suggested that, rather than using Mexico as the country-of-manufacture for products to be sent to other Latin American countries, the importing country itself should be the manufacturing country if they too are a developing country. In a comparison of Chileans' and Belgians' evaluations of products from LDCs, strategies for marketers were proposed. In Europe, the emphasis on brand name may be sufficient to overcome negative country-of-manufacture images. The strategy in Latin American countries should include the emphasis on country-of-design, warranty, and the brand information in order to overcome negative country-of-manufacture images (Ahmed, d'Astous, and Mendez, 1995).

Although several PCI studies have been cited that look at NAFTA and potential NAFTA countries, research which looks at the PCI effects for all of these countries together has not been published.

1.6 Product Country Image and Retail Buyers

Very few studies have directly studied the PCI phenomenon and retail buyers. However, a study of purchasing managers' product perceptions found that the country-of-design was more important in evaluating, as it was seen as a better indicator of quality than the country-of-assembly (Ahmed, d'Astous, El Adraoui, 1994). Purchasing managers are involved in the purchase of products for one's own company use, while retail buyers are concerned with the resale of the

products to consumers. Although not directly comparable, both must assess extrinsic cues in order to make product judgements.

Another study dealing with purchasers indicated that if there is high need uncertainty, the purchaser is more sensitive to the location of the supplier (Hakansson and Wootz, 1975). Still other research suggests that country-of-origin shows few effects in vendor selection, and that the primary job of the buyer is to choose vendors who offer consumers the best possible selection at the lowest price regardless of country-of-origin (Wagner, Ettenson, Parish, 1989).

In summary, research regarding retail buyers in the context of PCI has been limited. There is a need for better understanding of retail buyers PCI. There is also a need for research which looks at the retail buyers' views of NAFTA countries and their products.

1.7 Modeling

Modeling allows the integration of several components or areas of research and multiple constructs in order to gain insight into complex relationships. From Bettman (1979), one gains knowledge of choice behaviour by extensively linking components of consumer behaviour. Several areas of study including, motivation, attention, information acquisition and evaluation are used to explain complex interrelationships in information processing. The real world experiences

of consumers and retail buyers are not easily studied. The approach taken by Bettman (1979) can be implemented to gain a comprehensive view of the Product Country Image (PCI) phenomenon. Linking different aspects of countries and their products will lead to a better understanding of the complex relationships between country and product variables.

1.7.1 The Development of Modeling in PCI Research

In modeling, the relationships among variables are highly specified and structured. Thus, tests of a model can be viewed as tests of direction of effect or causality. Modeling of PCI can afford the opportunity to take a comprehensive view of the relationship between views of a country, views of its products, and the willingness to buy these products.

Modeling in PCI research is a relatively underused approach. Several aspects of PCI have been modeled individually (Han, 1988; Han, 1989; Nagashima, 1988; Klein and Morris, 1996). Conceptual models have been developed but not tested (Johansson, Douglas, and Nonaka, 1985).

As mentioned earlier, Han (1989) developed models to represent the halo and summary constructs using a LISREL technique. He also is credited with developing a model for measuring the effect of consumer patriotism in choice of domestic versus foreign products (Han, 1988). Han (1988) hypothesized that consumer patriotism would either directly lead to the purchase intention of

domestic products, or go through one of two paths: country image or serviceability. Overall, the models' goodness-of-fit was quite good, and it was concluded that patriotism does directly affect the choice of domestic over foreign products.

Papadopoulos et. al (1988) are credited with the development of a full PCI model that measures the effect of product and country images on beliefs about products, product evaluations, and subsequent intentions to buy. The model developed by Papadopoulos et al. is depicted in Figure 1.

Figure 1: LISREL Model of PCI Effects

Source: Papadopoulos et. al. (1988)

The constructs were measured using a limited number of variables. Familiarity with products was measured using three variables: knowledge of products, ease of finding, and recognizeability of brands. Beliefs about the country and its people included three measurement variables: success of the economy, technological capability, and the industriousness of people. Product quality beliefs were measured with four variables: reliability, workmanship, technical advancement, and overall quality. Product evaluations were measured by satisfaction and pride in ownership. Lastly, buyer behaviour was measured on a single semantic differential scale: normally buy few versus buy a lot.

When tested using LISREL, it was found that the overall model was of moderate fit. In the measurement model, the individual portions were examined and all loadings were found to be positive and statistically significant. Although the structural model indicates a need for further development, it was concluded that it can serve as a good base for the modeling of PCI.

1.7.2 Statistical Modeling Technique

Second generation multivariate statistics are gaining popularity in research. Hughes et. al. (1986) and Fornell (1983) recognized several advantages of the second generation over the first generation techniques. One of the main advantages is the ability to explicitly integrate theory and data. These techniques incorporate both theoretical and empirical variables in the analysis. They have the ability to simultaneously analyze multiple criterion and predictor

constructs. Another advantage cited by Fornell (1983) is the application of techniques in a confirmatory mode. Second generation techniques also allow for multiple indicators.

Partial Least Squares (PLS) is a second generation method used to estimate predictive-causal relationships. One must be able to illustrate the theory, using an arrow scheme, in order to effectively use PLS (Fornell, 1984). Relative to other second generation techniques, PLS is forgiving of weak theory and small sample sizes. PLS accounts for variance at both the observed and abstract levels (Fornell and Bookstein, 1982; Fornell, 1984). In general, the nature of PLS is such that there is very little concern for meeting or checking for assumptions. However, one of the limitations faced by PLS is the occurrence of multicollinearity. These effects are often minimized by the structure of the model. The goal of PLS is to minimize residual variance. Once the residual variance is minimized for all iterations and a minimum joint residual variance has been obtained, the model has converged (Fornell, 1984).

2.0 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND MODEL DEVELOPMENT

2.1 Primary Objective

To date, a comprehensive model of Product Country Image (PCI) research has not been developed and tested for the comparison of consumers and retail buyers. The main objective of this research involved the validation of a PCI Effects Model for both Canadian consumers and retail buyers concerning NAFTA and potential NAFTA countries. This model was developed in 1997 as part of the ongoing work of the IKON Research Group.¹ Figure 2 illustrates the model.

Figure 2 - Comprehensive Product Country Image Model

¹ The IKON Research Group focuses on international images. It is led by a group of researchers at Carleton University and includes research associates from several countries worldwide.

The core of the model, PRODUCT BELIEFS, PRODUCT EVALUATION, FAMILIARITY, and WILLINGNESS TO BUY, is taken directly from the PCI model tested by Papadopoulos *et. al.* (1988). A more extensive measurement instrument allowed additional measurement variables to be added to the constructs in order to be more representative of the PCI relationship. Three components of the model's core, PRODUCT BELIEFS, PRODUCT EVALUATION, AND WILLINGNESS TO BUY can be likened to the three components of attitude: cognitive, affective, and conative (Engel, Blackwell, and Miniard, 1993). Similarly, the country related constructs maintain a similar pattern. In the model by Papadopoulos *et. al.* (1988) FAMILIARITY affected PRODUCT BELIEFS. In the model tested here, FAMILIARITY, measured by *knowledge of brand names, ease of finding, and knowledge of products*, is proposed to work by affecting all three product constructs: BELIEFS, EVALUATION, and WILLINGNESS TO BUY. The WILLINGNESS TO BUY construct is measured by one variable, *buy*. There are direct links to it from the RELATIONSHIP, PRODUCT EVALUATION, and FAMILIARITY constructs.

Based on single or multiple cues, inferential beliefs are often used by respondents to infer knowledge of other cues which have not been provided (Olson, 1978). In this model, based on previous knowledge and/or stereotypes, beliefs about a country and its people are used to make inferences about its products. The cognitive components (beliefs) of the country and people include the COUNTRY COMPETENCE, PEOPLE COMPETENCE, COUNTRY

DESCRIPTION, and PEOPLE DESCRIPTION. The COUNTRY COMPETENCE measures include beliefs about how, *rich, industrialized, technologically advanced, and stable* the economy of the country is while the PEOPLE COMPETENCE is measured by scales concerning *education, industriousness, work ethic, and skill level* of the people. The COUNTRY DESCRIPTION construct is measured by six variables: *political stability, rights, knowledge of the country, quality of life, role in world politics, and environmental protection*. Three variables are used to measure the PEOPLE DESCRIPTION construct: *trustworthy, individualistic, and friendly*. Descriptive measures of a country and its people, accompanied by the competence constructs, are hypothesized to lead to an evaluation of the country. The COUNTRY EVALUATION construct is measured with two variables: *alignment with Canada and like the people*.

PRODUCT BELIEFS (cognitive attitude component toward products) stem directly from a feeling that the country has the structure, and the people have the skills and characteristics (cognitive attitude component toward country), to produce a certain caliber of products. This is very similar to the views expressed by Han (1989).

An expression of the desired RELATIONSHIP with the country and its people is proposed to be linked to COUNTRY EVALUATION. This construct is measured with six variables: *immigration, ties, investment in, investment from, imports, and exports*. The COUNTRY EVALUATION construct is also linked to product

evaluations. Thus, the affective components of both country and products are linked in the model. The desired RELATIONSHIP (or conative component of attitude toward country and people) is linked to two constructs: PRODUCT EVALUATION and WILLINGNESS TO BUY (the conative component of product attitude).

As noted, five NAFTA countries were selected to be tested as origins: Canada, United States, Mexico, Chile, and Argentina. For each country, the paths were tested and compared to the paths in the remaining four countries. The following hypotheses were developed and tested to validate the consumer models for each country:

- H₁: Canadian consumers' beliefs about the descriptive characteristics of a country (COUNTRY DESCRIPTION) are positively related to their evaluation of that country (COUNTRY EVALUATION).
- H₂: Canadian consumers' beliefs about the descriptive characteristics of the people from a country (PEOPLE DESCRIPTION) are positively related to their evaluation of that country (COUNTRY EVALUATION).
- H₃: Canadian consumers' beliefs about the productive capabilities or competence of a country (COUNTRY COMPETENCE) are positively related to their evaluation of that country (COUNTRY EVALUATION).
- H₄: Canadian consumers' beliefs about the productive capabilities or competence of the people from a country (PEOPLE COMPETENCE) are positively related to their evaluation of that country (COUNTRY EVALUATION).
- H₅: Canadian consumers' beliefs about the productive capabilities or competence of a country (COUNTRY COMPETENCE) are positively related to their beliefs about its products (PRODUCT BELIEFS).

- H₆: Canadian consumers' beliefs about the productive capabilities or competence of the people from a country (PEOPLE COMPETENCE) are positively related to their beliefs about its products (PRODUCT BELIEFS).
- H₇: Canadian consumers' country evaluation (COUNTRY EVALUATION) is positively related to their desired relations with that country (RELATIONSHIP).
- H₈: Canadian consumers' country evaluation (COUNTRY EVALUATION) is positively related to their evaluation of the products from that country (PRODUCT EVALUATION).
- H₉: Canadian consumers' beliefs about the products from a country (PRODUCT BELIEFS) are positively related to their evaluation of products from that country (PRODUCT EVALUATION).
- H₁₀: Canadian consumers' familiarity with a country's products (FAMILIARITY) is positively related to their beliefs about products from that country (PRODUCT BELIEFS).
- H₁₁: Canadian consumers' familiarity with a country's products (FAMILIARITY) is positively related to their evaluation of products from that country (PRODUCT EVALUATION).
- H₁₂: Canadian consumers' familiarity with a country's products (FAMILIARITY) is positively related to their willingness to buy products from that country (WILLINGNESS TO BUY).
- H₁₃: Canadian consumers' desired relationship with a country (RELATIONSHIP) is positively related to their evaluation of products from that country (PRODUCT EVALUATION).
- H₁₄: Canadian consumers' desired relationship with a country (RELATIONSHIP) is positively related to their willingness to buy products from that country (WILLINGNESS TO BUY).
- H₁₅: Canadian consumers' evaluations of a country's products (PRODUCT EVALUATION) is positively related to their willingness to buy products from that country (WILLINGNESS TO BUY).

The following hypotheses were developed and tested to validate the retail buyer models for each of the five countries (Canada, U.S., Mexico, Chile, Argentina):

- H₁₆: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about the descriptive characteristics of a country (COUNTRY DESCRIPTION) are positively related to their evaluation of that country (COUNTRY EVALUATION).**
- H₁₇: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about the descriptive characteristics of the people from a country (PEOPLE DESCRIPTION) are positively related to their evaluation of that country (COUNTRY EVALUATION).**
- H₁₈: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about the productive capabilities or competence of a country (COUNTRY COMPETENCE) are positively related to their evaluation of that country (COUNTRY EVALUATION).**
- H₁₉: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about the productive capabilities or competence of the people from a country (PEOPLE COMPETENCE) are positively related to their evaluation of that country (COUNTRY EVALUATION).**
- H₂₀: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about the productive capabilities or competence of a country (COUNTRY COMPETENCE) are positively related to their beliefs about its products (PRODUCT BELIEFS).**
- H₂₁: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about the productive capabilities or competence of the people from a country (PEOPLE COMPETENCE) are positively related to their beliefs about its products (PRODUCT BELIEFS).**
- H₂₂: Canadian retail buyers' country evaluation (COUNTRY EVALUATION) is positively related to their desired relations with that country (RELATIONSHIP).**
- H₂₃: Canadian retail buyers' country evaluations (COUNTRY EVALUATION) are positively related to their evaluation of the products from that country (PRODUCT EVALUATION).**
- H₂₄: Canadian retail buyers' beliefs about the products from a country (PRODUCT BELIEFS) are positively related to their evaluation of products from that country (PRODUCT EVALUATION).**
- H₂₅: Canadian retail buyers' familiarity with a country's products (FAMILIARITY) is positively related to their beliefs about products from that country (PRODUCT BELIEFS).**
- H₂₆: Canadian retail buyers' familiarity with a country's products (FAMILIARITY) is positively related to their evaluation of products from that country (PRODUCT EVALUATION).**

- H₂₇: Canadian retail buyers' familiarity with a country's products (FAMILIARITY) is positively related to their willingness to buy products from that country (WILLINGNESS TO BUY).
- H₂₈: Canadian retail buyers' desired relationship with a country (RELATIONSHIP) are positively related to their evaluation of products from that country (PRODUCT EVALUATION).
- H₂₉: Canadian retail buyers' desired relationship with a country (RELATIONSHIP) are positively related to their willingness to buy products from that country (WILLINGNESS TO BUY).
- H₃₀: Canadian retail buyers' evaluation of a country's products (PRODUCT EVALUATION) are positively related to their willingness to buy products from that country (WILLINGNESS TO BUY).

In their study of retail buyers, Kline and Wagner (1994) found that one's own knowledge was the most frequently cited information source. Since the purchase of merchandise from some of the countries in this study is a relatively new phenomenon and many retail buyers are not familiar with the countries or products through professional knowledge, it is possible that different measurement and structural models will emerge for Canada and the U.S. compared to the Latin American countries. Han's research (1989) supports this premise. Han (1989) found that when a respondent is not familiar with a country's products, beliefs will be inferred from the country image or views of a country's ability to produce certain products. The following hypotheses were developed to test for differences in the measurement and structural models between the NAFTA and potential NAFTA countries:

H₃₁: The measurement models for Canada and the U.S. will differ from those of Mexico, Chile, and Argentina.

H₃₂: The structural models for Canada and the U.S. will differ from those of Mexico, Chile, and Argentina.

The proposed model was tested on both consumers and retail buyers. Once obtained, the resulting models were compared and similarities and differences noted. Trade with some of the countries under study has been limited to date, and professional knowledge is virtually non-existent in many cases. Retail buyers may form their opinions based on personal knowledge as a consumer. For this reason, consumers and retail buyers may or may not be similar in the structure of their views and the models will be comparable. The following hypotheses were developed to test for similarities in the measurement and structural models between Canadian consumers and retail buyers:

H₃₃: The measurement models for Canadian consumers and retail buyers will differ.

H₃₄: The structural models for Canadian retail buyers and consumers will differ.

2.2 Secondary Objectives

Past research has not looked at consumer reaction to countries within a trading bloc. This research has three secondary objectives. First, it will determine how Canadian consumers view current NAFTA partners, Canada, the United States, and Mexico, and potential partners, Chile, and Argentina. This includes their

beliefs about the countries and the people. Second, this research was designed to determine Canadian consumers' views of the products from these countries. The following null hypotheses were suggested:

H₃₅: There are differences in the beliefs held by Canadian consumers about current and potential members of NAFTA.

H₃₆: There are differences in the beliefs held by Canadian consumers about the products made in current and potential NAFTA countries.

Finally, this research examined the relationship between PCI and consumer demographics of gender, household income, age, and level of education. The following hypotheses were developed for this purpose:

H₃₇: Views of the products and countries of the NAFTA will be related to the gender of Canadian respondents.

H₃₈: Views of the products and countries of the NAFTA will be related to the age level of Canadian respondents.

H₃₉: Views of the products and countries of the NAFTA will be related to the education level of Canadian respondents.

H₄₀: Views of the products and countries of the NAFTA will be related to the family income level of Canadian respondents.

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research followed an *ex post facto* survey design measuring the attitudes of Canadian consumers and retail buyers towards the current and potential NAFTA countries and their products. The data for the consumer and retail buyer studies have been collected as part of a study by Heslop, Papadopoulos, Liefeld, and Wall supported by a grant from the Social Sciences Humanities Research Council. The following sections detail the Consumer Survey and summarize the Retail Buyer Survey.

3.1 Consumer Survey

3.1.1 The Sample

The sample population was comprised of individuals living in households in Ottawa-Carleton. Potential respondents were selected using probability area sampling. City blocks were randomly selected. Following the selection of city blocks, individual households were randomly selected using a random starting point and walking pattern. Households were approached and the person who answered the door (if over 18 years) was asked to complete the questionnaires. In order to maintain an equal number of male and female respondents, this information was tracked and when necessary the male or female head of household was asked to complete the questionnaire. A sample of 312 was obtained resulting in a response rate of 46 percent of households that were approached that were at home.

3.1.2 Data Collection

The drop-off / pick-up technique was utilized. This method tends to yield higher response rates within a shorter amount of time. Questionnaires were dropped off at homes and subsequently picked up after about an hour and a half.

3.1.3 Research Instrument

The questionnaire was designed on the basis of similar research tools and relevant literature (see Appendix A). Many of the constructs were chosen in order to be consistent with and comparable to the retail survey instrument. They are divided into three distinct sections: Country evaluation, Product evaluation, and Demographic information. The five countries were presented for evaluation in alphabetical order in the first two sections of the questionnaire.

3.2 Retail Buyer Survey

A sample of 204 retail buyers was obtained from a list of over 2000 Canadian retail buyers obtained from the Maclean Hunter Publishing company. The data were collected through a mail survey within Canada. The questionnaire is divided into four distinct sections (See Appendix B). For the purposes of this research, only the first two sections (Country Evaluations and Product Evaluations) were used in the analysis. Similar to the consumer questionnaire, the five countries were presented for evaluation in alphabetical order in the first

two sections. Details will be found in the MMS thesis of John Nadeau (forthcoming).

4.0 DATA PREPARATION & DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

4.1 Data Preparation

Both questionnaires (consumer and retail) had two sections with corresponding scales. However, different data dictionaries were utilized in the statistical coding procedures. The first step ensured that the corresponding variables in each data set used the same variable names. Since PLS does not permit missing values, the second step involved determining the treatment of missing values. The number of cases with missing values was identified along with the percentage of missing values within each case. Once a cutoff of an acceptable level of missing values was determined, missing values were substituted with the series mean (mean across respondents for the missing variable). To ensure comparability, the same treatment of missing values was performed for both consumer and retail buyer data sets. Table 4.1 summarizes the data preparation and acceptable missing values for both the consumer and retail buyer data sets.

Logical cutoffs of 7 and 10 for consumers and retail buyers respectively, were chosen since there was a large jump to the next level, i.e. for consumers, after 7, there is a jump to 19 missing values. These cutoff levels roughly correspond with a 10% missing value cutoff that is often used in research.

Table 4.1 - Data Preparation

	<u>Consumers</u>	<u>Retail Buyers</u>
# of respondents overall	312	204
# of respondents with no missing values	260	89
Number of missing values accepted (approx. 10%)	7	10
% of respondents remaining (# of respondents)	96.5 (301)	72.1 (147)

4.2 Data Analysis Procedures

The comprehensive model and research hypotheses were tested using several different statistical techniques. For ease of understanding the data analysis procedures have been broken down two sections: Model Validation and Consumer Study.

4.2.1 Model Validation

In order to test the hypotheses, ten models were run using PLS, one for each country for both consumers and retail buyers. The following sections detail the procedures used to test the hypotheses for the measurement, structural and consumer/retail buyer comparison.

Measurement Model

Individual loadings for each variable in the constructs were observed for both the consumer models and the retail buyer models. The magnitude of these loadings determined how well the measures within each construct were reflecting the

constructs. Variables which were found to have low loadings were discussed and the possibility of removing them from the model or moving them to another construct for better fit was determined. This procedure was replicated for all five study countries. To test Hypothesis 31, concerning the comparability of the measurement models across countries, the models were visually compared with respect to the measures in the models.

Structural Model

Once the measurement models were determined, a jackknifing technique was used to test statistical significance of Hypothesis 1 through Hypothesis 30. The program was set to repeatedly omit a specified number of cases to give a large enough sample size (>30) (10 for consumers and 4 for retail buyers). This procedure was replicated for all five study countries for both the consumers and retail buyers. Once the models were obtained, the path coefficients for each subsample obtained from the jackknifing procedure for each model was placed in a spreadsheet. ANOVA and Scheffé post hoc comparisons were used to test Hypothesis 32, that the structural models for Canada and the United States differ from those of Mexico, Chile, and Argentina.

Canadian Consumer and Retail Buyer Comparison

For Hypothesis 33, that the measurement models for Canadian consumers and retail buyers will not differ, the results obtained when determining the measurement models were visually compared for the consumer and retail buyer

models. Subsequently, in accordance to Hypothesis 34, the structural models for Canadian consumers and retail buyers will not differ, ANOVA and Scheffé post hoc comparisons were performed to compare the path coefficients of the consumer model and retail buyer model for each of the five countries. ANOVA comparisons were used to identify any significant differences in the two models for each country on the individual links between the constructs.

4.2.2 Consumer Study

Hypotheses 35 and 36

To determine whether differences existed between the beliefs held by Canadians about current and potential NAFTA countries (H35) and their products (H36), a repeated measures approach was taken. Doubly multivariate analysis was performed, since more than one variable is being measured across more than one treatment. This within-subject repeated measures design removes the individual differences due to variability from the error term (Stevens, 1992). If the overall difference was significant, paired comparisons were subsequently run to determine which countries and which variables differ. The following were the necessary comparisons: Canada/United States, Canada/Mexico, Canada/Chile, Canada/Argentina, United States/Mexico, United States/Chile, United States/Argentina, Mexico/Chile, Mexico/Argentina, Chile/Argentina.

Hypothesis 37 - 40

Tests were run to determine whether gender, age, education or income differences are related to perceptions of current and potential NAFTA countries and their products. ANOVA and Scheffé post hoc comparisons were used to test for significant differences using demographic variables as the independent variables and the sum of all product rating scales as the dependent variable. If overall significant differences were found, post-hoc analysis determined where the differences exist. The same process was repeated using an overall country score as the dependent variable. The overall country score was obtained by taking the average of all country scales for each respondent.

5.0 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF CONSUMER SURVEY

This chapter describes the results of the consumer study. It is separated into four subsections as follows: 1) descriptive sample statistics, 2) general results of country ratings (significance test of null H_{35}), 3) general results of product ratings (significance test of null H_{36}), and 4) analysis of the relationship between demographic information and country and product evaluations (significance test of null H_{37-40}).

5.1 Descriptive Sample Statistics

This section discusses the demographics for the sample obtained in this study. Table 5.1 provides a complete breakdown of the sample and the population (Ottawa-Hull). Male respondents represent 55% of the sample while females represent 45% of the overall response. The middle ranges of age are overrepresented in the sample due to the desire for respondents over the age of eighteen. Also, seniors are underrepresented because those living in group homes or long-term care facilities are not accessible. Education levels were higher for the sample than for the general population of Ottawa-Hull. Again, this is due in part to the required minimum of eighteen years of age for respondents thus eliminating those under 18 with incomplete education. Income levels were represented reasonably well in the sample. There is a slight displacement toward high household income from extremely low household income. This can be attributed to the inability to access apartment buildings which often contain

lower income families and also the inability to access homeless and student populations. So, the sample was somewhat upscale. This could play a role in beliefs about countries and their products, which is a useful bias in drawing conclusions of interest to most marketers.

Table 5.1 Demographic Breakdown of Survey and Overall Population

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Population</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Gender		
Male	55	49
Female	45	51
Age		
Less than 20	3*	26
20-24 years	6	8
25-29 years	11	10
30-34 years	11	10
35-39 years	16	9
40-44 years	17	8
45-49 years	17	6
50-54 years	9	5
55-59 years	3	4
60-64 years	4	4
65 or more	3	10
Education		
Less than High School	3**	28
High School	15	15
Post Secondary	42	37
University Degree	40	20
Family/Household Income		
Under \$20,000	2	11
\$20,000-\$29,999	5	9
\$30,000-\$39,999	9	11
\$40,000-\$49,999	10	12
\$50,000-\$59,999	13	13
\$60,000-\$69,999	12	11
\$70,000 and over	49	34

Note: The population statistics are from the Statistics Canada 1991 Census of the Ottawa-Hull Metropolitan Area.

* The main reason only 3% of the sample was under twenty years of age is that the survey required respondents to be a minimum of eighteen years.

** The survey sample had few respondents with less than high school education largely due to having no respondents under eighteen years of age.

5.2 General Results of Country Ratings

This section looks at respondents' views of NAFTA and potential NAFTA countries and their people. Table 5.2 summarizes the mean rating for each scale.

Table 5.2 indicates several differences between country profiles. Canada and the United States tend to have higher ratings than the less developed countries of Mexico, Chile, and Argentina. Canada had the highest rating on 9 of the 16 applicable scales while the United States had the highest rating on 14 of the 23 scales. Seven of the scales were relevant only to the foreign countries being used as origins and were not included in the Canadian profile. Thus, the United States had a higher number of top ratings on an absolute basis but the overall mean for Canada (5.49) was higher than that for the United States (5.42). The lowest scores were divided among Mexico (12 scales), Chile (6 scales), and Argentina (5 scales). Note that Mexico, the first NAFTA partner, received the lowest scores.

Table 5.2: Means (Standard Deviations) for Country Items

Variable	Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Political Stability of country	4.92 (1.57)	<u>5.89</u> (1.08)	2.77 (1.22)	2.88 (1.22)	2.90 (1.28)
Individual Rights and Freedoms	<u>6.25</u> (1.00)	6.04 (1.00)	2.73 (1.11)	2.65 (1.09)	2.61 (1.17)
Your Knowledge of the Country	6.43 (0.80)	5.91 (1.01)	3.48 (1.41)	2.62 (1.30)	2.63 (1.30)
Quality Of Life	<u>5.95</u> (1.11)	5.41 (1.08)	2.45 (1.05)	2.87 (1.13)	2.95 (1.16)
Role In World Politics	5.24 (1.31)	<u>6.41</u> (1.03)	2.69 (1.13)	2.55 (1.06)	2.53 (1.09)
Environmental/Pollution Controls	<u>5.37</u> (1.14)	4.70 (1.31)	1.97 (1.14)	2.38 (1.10)	2.37 (1.15)
Trustworthiness	<u>5.45</u> (1.10)	4.52 (1.17)	3.60 (1.25)	3.96 (1.12)	4.01 (1.12)
Individualism	5.36 (1.25)	<u>5.60</u> (1.32)	3.49 (1.33)	3.69 (1.20)	3.87 (1.19)
Friendliness	<u>5.40</u> (1.17)	4.95 (1.29)	4.52 (1.29)	4.46 (1.19)	4.65 (1.17)
Wealth	5.14 (1.01)	<u>5.66</u> (1.02)	2.43 (1.04)	2.86 (1.11)	3.10 (1.26)
Technology Level of country	5.96 (0.94)	<u>6.38</u> (0.73)	2.79 (1.19)	2.88 (1.10)	3.04 (1.15)
Stability of Economy	4.63 (1.45)	<u>5.69</u> (1.04)	2.47 (1.16)	2.82 (1.14)	2.81 (1.17)
Education Level	<u>5.66</u> (1.01)	5.25 (1.10)	2.63 (1.07)	2.93 (1.19)	3.20 (1.26)
Industriousness	5.26 (1.10)	<u>5.44</u> (1.06)	3.71 (1.32)	3.91 (1.26)	4.05 (1.18)
Work Ethic	5.12 (1.25)	4.94 (1.14)	3.57 (1.43)	3.93 (1.24)	3.98 (1.14)
Likeability of People	<u>5.66</u> (1.10)	4.77 (1.30)	4.54 (1.37)	4.37 (1.20)	4.56 (1.15)
Alignment With Canada	-	<u>6.25</u> (1.00)	3.79 (1.26)	3.07 (1.15)	3.14 (1.22)
Political and Economic Ties	-	5.11 (1.50)	4.28 (1.42)	4.13 (1.34)	4.19 (1.31)
Immigration from the country	-	4.47 (1.70)	3.27 (1.58)	3.37 (1.49)	3.45 (1.45)
Desire for investment in the country	-	<u>5.23</u> (1.49)	4.26 (1.61)	4.07 (1.47)	3.91 (1.50)
Desire for investment from the country	-	<u>5.17</u> (1.65)	4.36 (1.61)	4.29 (1.52)	4.27 (1.52)
Desire for exports to the country	-	<u>6.10</u> (1.04)	5.22 (1.41)	5.04 (1.39)	5.19 (1.39)
Desire for imports from the country	-	<u>4.66</u> (1.64)	3.89 (1.57)	3.90 (1.40)	3.86 (1.40)
Mean	<u>5.49</u>	5.42	3.43	3.46	3.53
Legend - = not applicable <u>Underline</u> = highest score of all the countries Bold = lowest score of all the countries					

5.2.1 Analysis of H₃₅ (differences in NAFTA country images)

Doubly multivariate within-subjects comparisons were performed to determine whether differences existed in the beliefs held by Canadians of NAFTA countries. This involved a comparison of all five countries and, if significant, a series of ten paired-comparisons: Canada vs. U.S., Canada vs. Mexico, Canada vs. Chile, Canada vs. Argentina, U.S. vs. Mexico, U.S. vs. Chile, U.S. vs. Argentina, Mexico vs. Chile, Mexico vs. Argentina, and Chile vs. Argentina. The null hypothesis was rejected if significant differences were found between respondents' attitudes toward the different country profiles.

The doubly multivariate analysis was run using SPSS Repeated Measures (see Appendix C for exact Wilks F). The decision rule was to reject the null hypothesis if $p < .05$ for the observed F value. The overall doubly multivariate analysis was significant at the $p < .001$ thus the null hypothesis was rejected. Given the overall difference, the next step involved the paired comparisons of the five countries to determine which country profiles differ. Stevens (1992) suggests that in order to maintain the overall alpha for a set of pairwise comparisons, the target overall alpha level should be partitioned among the individual pairwise multivariate tests. Given ten pairwise multivariate tests, an alpha level of $.05/10 = .005$ was used. Country profiles were considered significantly different when the F value was significant at $p < .005$. All pairwise country comparisons were significantly different at $p < .001$.

Having established that all country profile comparisons were different, the next question was, how do the profiles differ? To ascertain which variables were rated as significantly different by respondents, Tukey confidence intervals were used. In this analysis, there were twenty-three potential differentiating variables. Each variable was assessed using the univariate F-tests. Variables were considered significantly different at $p < .005$. Table 5.3 provides a summary of within-subjects differences and similarities.

Table 5.3 demonstrates that the NAFTA and potential NAFTA countries are viewed differently by respondents. The study results indicate that these countries have distinct profiles. All ten country profiles are seen as significantly different. However the variables on which the differences occur are not consistent across the ten comparisons. Consumers report very little knowledge of Mexico, Chile, and Argentina but proceed to find significant differences among them. This finding is similar to the finding of Papadopoulos, Heslop, and Bennett (1992) in their study of Eastern European countries.

Table 5.3 - Doubly Multivariate Analysis of NAFTA and Potential NAFTA Country Differences - Significant Differences for Country Items

Overall Doubly Multivariate Significance $p < .001$

Pairwise Doubly Multivariate Significance	C/U $p < .001$	C/M $p < .001$	C/CH $p < .001$	C/A $p < .001$	U/M $p < .001$	U/CH $p < .001$	U/A $p < .001$	M/CH $p < .001$	M/A $p < .001$	CH/A $p < .001$
Variable/Country Comparison	Significant Tukey's Tests									
Political Stability of country	U	C	C	C	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Individual Rights and Freedoms	C	C	C	C	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Your Knowledge of the Country	C	C	C	C	U	U	U	M	M	n.s.
Quality Of Life	C	C	C	C	U	U	U	CH	A	n.s.
Role In World Politics	U	C	C	C	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Environmental/Pollution Controls	C	C	C	C	U	U	U	C	A	n.s.
Trustworthiness	C	C	C	C	U	U	U	C	A	n.s.
Individualism	n.s.	C	C	C	U	U	U	C	A	n.s.
Friendliness	C	C	C	C	U	U	U	C	A	A
Wealth	U	C	C	C	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	A
Technology Level of country	U	C	C	C	U	U	U	CH	A	A
Stability of Economy	U	C	C	C	U	U	U	n.s.	A	n.s.
Education Level	C	C	C	C	U	U	U	CH	A	n.s.
Industriousness	n.s.	C	C	C	U	U	U	CH	A	A
Work Ethic	n.s.	C	C	C	U	U	U	CH	A	n.s.
Alignment With Canada	--	--	--	--	U	U	U	M	M	n.s.
Likeability of People	C	C	C	C	n.s.	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	A
Political and Economic Ties	--	--	--	--	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Immigration from the country	--	--	--	--	U	U	U	n.s.	A	n.s.
Investment In	--	--	--	--	U	U	U	n.s.	M	n.s.
Investment From	--	--	--	--	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Exports to	--	--	--	--	U	U	U	M	n.s.	n.s.
Imports from	--	--	--	--	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Total # of Sig. Differences	13	16	16	16	22	23	22	12	14	5

Legend

Letter indicates significance at $p < .005$ and country which is rated higher
 C = Canada, U = United States, M = Mexico, CH = Chile, A = Argentina
 n.s. = Not Significant -- = Not Applicable

Compared to Canada, the developing countries of Mexico, Chile, and Argentina significantly differ on all sixteen applicable variables. Similar to the findings of Labrie, Propeck, and Arellano (1994), who found that Mexican companies have a poorly qualified work force in the eyes of Canadian businesses, Canadian consumers appear to hold the same views in this study. Canada and the United States are perceived to be different on all but three variables: *industriousness*, *work ethic*, and *individualism*. The people of Canada and the United States are generally viewed as similar while country factors differ significantly. The United States significantly differs from Mexico, Chile, and Argentina on all twenty-three variables except for views about Mexico and Argentina where the likeability of the people is perceived to be the same as those for the U.S..

Non-significant differences are more common on perceptions of the less developed countries: Mexico, Chile, and Argentina. Views of Mexico differ from Chile and Argentina on just over half of the variables. They differ on the perceived capability to produce products (Mexico is rated lower), the knowledge of the country (more knowledge of Mexico than Chile or Argentina), and descriptive aspects of the people (Mexico is rated lower). Although doubly-variate MANOVA suggests that consumers see Mexico as more similar to Chile and Argentina than to Canada and the United States, Mexico is viewed as more aligned with Canada than Chile and Argentina. This is most likely due to their membership in NAFTA. Canadians gave lower ratings for their desire to exports

to Chile and Argentina than Mexico. Again, this can probably be attributed to NAFTA membership.

Chile and Argentina are viewed as very similar by Canadian consumers. Their ratings differ significantly on just five variables: *likeability of people*, *education level*, *wealth*, *friendliness*, and *individualism*. Argentina is rated higher on all five aspects.

5.3 General Results of Product Ratings

This section looks at Canadian consumers' views of products from NAFTA and potential NAFTA countries. Table 5.4 provides a summary of the mean ratings for the product scales.

5.3.1 Analysis of H_{36} (differences in NAFTA product images)

Doubly multivariate within-subjects comparisons were performed to determine whether differences in the beliefs held by Canadians of products from NAFTA countries existed (See Appendix D for exact Wilks F). Similar to the analysis of differences in country profiles, this involved an overall, five-country comparison followed by a series of ten paired-comparisons if overall significance was found: Canada vs. U.S., Canada vs. Mexico, Canada vs. Chile, Canada vs. Argentina, U.S. vs. Mexico, U.S. vs. Chile, U.S. vs. Argentina, Mexico vs. Chile, Mexico vs. Argentina, and Chile vs. Argentina. The null hypothesis was rejected if

significant differences were found between respondents' attitudes toward the different product profiles.

Table 5.4: Means (Standard Deviations) for Product Items

Variable	Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Attractiveness	5.23 (1.09)	<u>5.39</u> (1.01)	3.77 (1.26)	3.74 (1.19)	3.83 (1.22)
Innovativeness	5.17 (1.21)	<u>5.69</u> (1.06)	3.09 (1.24)	3.09 (1.21)	3.12 (1.23)
Quality	<u>5.64</u> (0.98)	5.21 (1.11)	3.12 (1.22)	3.16 (1.21)	3.24 (1.07)
Technology level	5.67 (1.01)	<u>6.00</u> (0.99)	2.79 (1.10)	2.76 (1.08)	2.67 (1.12)
Workmanship	<u>5.35</u> (1.10)	4.99 (1.07)	3.28 (1.31)	3.42 (1.20)	3.51 (1.17)
Reliability	<u>5.39</u> (0.98)	5.08 (1.16)	3.00 (1.02)	3.09 (1.06)	3.10 (1.10)
Price Level	<u>5.10</u> (1.14)	4.62 (1.24)	3.04 (1.20)	3.18 (1.24)	3.13 (1.21)
After Sales Service	<u>5.55</u> (1.19)	4.98 (1.27)	2.78 (1.15)	2.70 (1.13)	2.68 (1.18)
Defects in merchandise	<u>4.55</u> (1.41)	4.38 (1.29)	4.00 (1.44)	4.10 (1.31)	4.02 (1.29)
Variety	5.22 (1.37)	<u>6.19</u> (0.96)	3.73 (1.33)	3.06 (1.18)	3.23 (1.28)
Durability	<u>5.15</u> (1.03)	4.84 (1.13)	3.00 (1.05)	3.17 (1.00)	3.18 (1.18)
Brand names	5.06 (1.80)	<u>5.37</u> (2.08)	3.36 (1.77)	2.77 (1.93)	2.92 (2.24)
Ease of Finding	5.69 (1.21)	<u>6.10</u> (0.98)	3.42 (1.36)	2.51 (1.31)	2.41 (1.26)
Your knowledge of the country's products	5.79 (1.12)	<u>5.92</u> (1.09)	3.02 (1.46)	2.03 (1.22)	1.88 (1.22)
Value	<u>5.06</u> (1.22)	5.00 (1.17)	3.37 (1.38)	3.40 (1.33)	3.43 (1.22)
Rating compared to product from other countries	<u>5.79</u> (0.93)	5.47 (1.01)	3.23 (1.11)	3.00 (0.98)	3.05 (1.02)
Proud to Own	<u>6.07</u> (1.07)	4.91 (1.32)	3.10 (1.21)	3.02 (1.18)	3.00 (1.27)
Overall Satisfaction	<u>5.48</u> (1.02)	5.16 (1.03)	3.24 (1.14)	3.22 (1.15)	3.15 (1.17)
Willing to Buy	<u>6.05</u> (1.00)	5.35 (1.23)	3.47 (1.22)	3.35 (1.27)	3.37 (1.28)
Mean	5.42	5.30	3.25	3.09	3.10
Legend <u>Underline</u> = highest score of all the countries Bold = lowest score of all the countries					

The overall doubly multivariate analysis was significant at $p < .001$. Thus the null hypothesis was rejected, and the conclusion was made that respondents do believe there are differences between NAFTA countries' products. Pairwise country comparisons were significantly different at $p < .001$, with the exception of Chile vs. Argentina with $p < .003$.

Tukey confidence intervals were used to ascertain which variables were rated significantly different by respondents. In the analysis, there were eighteen potential differentiating variables. Each variable was assessed using the univariate F-tests. Table 5.5 provides a summary of within-subjects differences and similarities.

Products of Canada and the United States are viewed by respondents as similar on five variables: *value*, *defects in merchandise*, *attractiveness*, *know brands*, and *know products*. Canadian products were rated significantly higher on ten variables while the United States was rated higher on four variables. The products of the United States are viewed as more *innovative* and as having a higher *technology level*. They are also *easy to find* and provide more *variety*. Canadian products on the other hand, are seen as made with more care, having better *workmanship*, higher *quality*, more *durability*, and more *reliability*.

Table 5.5 - Doubly Multivariate Analysis of NAFTA and Potential NAFTA Country Differences - Significant Differences for Product Items

Overall Doubly Multivariate Significance $p < .001$

Painwise Doubly Multivariate Significance	C/U $p < .001$	C/M $p < .001$	C/CH $p < .001$	C/A $p < .001$	U/M $p < .001$	U/CH $p < .001$	U/A $p < .001$	M/CH $p < .001$	M/A $p < .001$	CH/A $p < .003$
Variable/Country Comparison	Significant Tukey's Tests									
Attractiveness	n.s.	C	C	C	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Innovativeness	U	C	C	C	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Quality	C	C	C	C	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Technology level	U	C	C	C	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Workmanship	C	C	C	C	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Reliability	C	C	C	C	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Price Level	C	C	C	C	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
After Sales Service	C	C	C	C	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Defects in merchandise	n.s.	C	C	C	U	n.s.	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Variety	U	C	C	C	U	U	U	M	M	n.s.
Durability	C	C	C	C	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Brand names	n.s.	C	C	C	U	U	U	M	M	n.s.
Ease of Finding	U	C	C	C	U	U	U	M	M	n.s.
Your knowledge of the country's products	n.s.	C	C	C	U	U	U	M	M	n.s.
Value	n.s.	C	C	C	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Rating compared to products from other countries	C	C	C	C	U	U	U	M	n.s.	n.s.
Proud to Own	C	C	C	C	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Overall Satisfaction	C	C	C	C	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Willing to Buy	C	C	C	C	U	U	U	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Total # of Sig. Differences	14	19	19	19	19	18	19	5	6	0

Legend

Letter indicates significance at $p < .005$ and country which is rated higher

C = Canada, U = United States, M = Mexico, CH = Chile, A = Argentina

n.s. = Not Significant

Canadians are more *willing to buy, proud to own, and satisfied* with Canadian products, and rate them higher overall. Canadian products are viewed as providing better *service* than American products. They are also considered significantly less *expensive*.

Compared to Canada, the developing countries of Mexico, Chile, and Argentina differ on all product variables. Canadian products were rated higher on all variables. Labrie, Propeck, and Arellano (1994) found that Mexican companies offered unsatisfactory after-sales service, are perceived to have a low level of innovation and offer a poor selection in the eyes of Canadians. Canadian consumers appear to hold the same views in this study. Similar findings were found when comparing the United States to Mexico, Chile, and Argentina. In accordance with the findings of Gaedeke (1973), the quality of products from the developed countries, Canada and the United States, were rated higher than the quality of products from less developed countries (Mexico, Chile, and Argentina).

Mexico and Chile differ on just five product variables: *variety, knowledge of brands, knowledge of products, ease of finding, and overall rating*. Mexican products were rated higher on all variables suggesting that the presence of Mexican products in Canada is more pronounced than for Chilean products. Similar differences were cited between Mexican and Argentinean products with the addition of *workmanship* on which Argentina was rated higher. Mexican

products were rated higher on all other significant variables. Although the overall doubly variate MANOVA was significant for Chilean vs. Argentinean products, none of the individual variable scales was found to be significantly different.

5.4 Analysis of H₃₇ to H₄₀ (Demographic Differences)

This section looks at the difference in overall country and product ratings based on gender, age, education, and income. Each is discussed separately, identifying both whether and how respondents differ. The overall country rating was obtained by the sum of all country scales. Similarly, the overall product rating was obtained by the sum of all product scales.

5.4.1 Analysis of H₃₇ (gender)

For the analysis of H₃₇, ANOVA yielded significant differences by men and women in the country ratings for the United States ($p < .001$), Mexico ($p < .022$), Chile ($p < .004$), and Argentina ($p < .012$). (See Appendix E) Table 5.7 provides a summary of differences. Male respondents rated all four countries higher than female respondents. On views of Canada, differences between males and females did approach significance ($p < .075$). These findings provide general support for the hypothesis that Canadian males and females differ on their country ratings. Males and females differed significantly on their overall rating of American products ($p < .05$). Males gave higher ratings than females. This is opposite to the findings of Heslop and Wall (1986) and Schooler (1971) who

found that females generally rated products higher than males. No significant differences existed between male and female respondents on their product ratings for Canada ($p < .338$), Mexico ($p < .978$), Chile ($p < .380$), and Argentina ($p < .247$). So there are fewer differences on product ratings than country ratings.

Table 5.7: Significant Effects of Gender on Country & Product Ratings

	Canada		United States		Mexico		Chile		Argentina	
Gender	C	P	C*	P*	C*	P	C*	P	C*	P
male	5.55	5.39	5.55	5.37	3.52	3.24	3.58	3.12	3.63	3.16
female	5.41	5.46	5.26	5.21	3.32	3.25	3.32	3.04	3.41	3.06

C - mean country rating P - mean product rating
 * - overall country or product rating difference

5.4.2 Analysis of H₃₈ (age)

The objective of the analysis was to ascertain whether a respondent's age was related to his/her overall rating of the country or products. The original eleven age categories were collapsed so that four reasonably sized groupings could be created. These categories were constructed as under 30 years (19.9% of sample), 30 to 39 years (26.9%), 40 to 49 years (34.2%), and 50 years and over (18.9%).

The ANOVA yielded significant differences in country ratings for Mexico ($p < .001$), Chile ($p < .004$), and Argentina ($p < .022$). (See Appendix F) Table 5.8 provides a summary of significant differences. Scheffé post hoc comparisons indicate the two younger groupings differed from the 50 and over group in their rating of Mexico and Chile. The oldest group rated the Mexico and Chile lower

than the two youngest groups. Although significant overall, the individual groups do not differ at $p < .05$ for Argentina. Canada and the United States country ratings do not differ by age ($p < .086$ and $p < .469$ respectively).

Table 5.8: Significant Effects of Age on Country & Product Ratings

	Canada		United States		Mexico		Chile		Argentina	
Age	C	P	C	P	C*	P	C*	P*	C*	P
under 30 yrs	5.68	5.39	5.32	5.36	3.66a	3.43	3.64a	3.22a	3.67a	3.11
30 - 39 yrs	5.49	5.44	5.43	5.35	3.54a	3.25	3.60a	3.20a	3.67a	3.14
40 - 49 yrs	5.39	5.37	5.41	5.18	3.39ab	3.23	3.40ab	3.06a	3.46a	3.08
50 yrs and over	5.47	5.54	5.53	5.40	3.13b	3.08	3.17b	2.85a	3.33a	3.13

C - mean country rating P - mean product rating

* - overall country or product rating difference

letters in the columns indicate a significant difference between groups

- same letter suggests no difference

- different letter suggests significant difference

For the product rating, differences by age existed only for Chile ($p < .035$).

Scheffé post hoc comparisons found no significant difference between the individual age groups at $p < .05$. Canada ($p < .493$), the United States ($p < .202$), Mexico ($p < .106$), and Argentina ($p < .950$) did not significantly differ by age.

These findings lend virtually no support for product rating differences, but older respondents rate developing countries lower.

5.4.3 Analysis of H₃₉ (education)

The objective of this analysis was to determine whether a respondent's level of education was related to his/her overall country and product ratings for each

study country. The categories were condensed into three groupings: high school or less (17.6% of sample), some college or university (35.5% of sample), and a university degree completed or higher (39.2%).

ANOVA revealed a significant difference for the United States ($p < .015$), Chile ($p < .003$), and Argentina ($p < .004$) on the overall country rating. (See Appendix G) Table 5.9 provides a summary of significant differences based on education. For the United States, post hoc comparisons indicated that those with a university degree rated the United States more positively than those with only some college/university. Post hoc comparisons for both Chile and Argentina suggest that those with a university degree rate the countries higher than both groups with less education. So, the higher the education, the higher the ratings for non-domestic countries.

A significant difference was found for the United States ($p < .034$) and Chile ($p < .047$) on the product ratings. Scheffé post hoc comparisons indicate higher product ratings from those with a university degree than those with some college/university for the United States and no difference between the groups for Chile. The findings for the U.S. are similar to those found by Schooler (1971), higher education leads to more positive products ratings. No significant differences by education level were found for Canada ($p < .780$), Mexico ($p < .077$), and Argentina ($p < .125$).

Table 5.9: Significant Effects of Education on Country & Product Ratings

	Canada		United States		Mexico		Chile		Argentina	
Education	C	P	C*	P*	C	P	C*	P*	C*	P
high school or less	5.37	5.43	5.33ab	5.27ab	3.30	3.40	3.25a	2.99a	3.37a	3.22
some college or university	5.47	5.39	5.29a	5.17a	3.40	3.12	3.36a	2.97a	3.42a	2.99
university degree	5.57	5.45	5.55b	5.42b	3.54	3.27	3.65b	3.21a	3.71b	3.15

C - mean country rating P - mean product rating

* - overall country or product rating difference

letters in the columns indicate a significant difference between groups

- same letter suggests no difference

- different letter suggests significant difference

These findings partially support H_{39} that respondents with different levels of education rate the countries and products differently.

5.4.4 Analysis of H_{40} (income)

The objective of this analysis was to determine if household income level was related to respondents ratings of countries and products. Originally, there were eight categories. These categories were condensed into three groupings. The groupings selected assured that the groups sizes were comparable. These include lower income (under \$50,000, 25.2% of sample), middle income (\$50,000 to \$70,000, 36.9%), and high income (over \$70,000, 35.9%).

ANOVA on both the country and product ratings yielded just one significant difference. (See Appendix H) Table 5.10 provides a summary of significant differences based on income. For the United States, the country rating was

related to household income level ($p < .029$). Scheffé post hoc comparisons indicate that the lower income group rated the United States significantly lower than the middle income group. This finding suggests little or no support to H_{40} that country and product ratings will differ based on household income levels.

Table 5.10: Significant Effects of Income on Country & Product Ratings

	Canada		United States		Mexico		Chile		Argentina	
Household Income	C	P	C*	P	C	P	C	P	C	P
under \$50,000	5.46	5.43	5.24a	5.25	3.38	3.24	3.34	2.93	3.43	3.08
\$50,000-\$70,000	5.51	5.40	5.50b	5.33	3.50	3.28	3.48	3.10	3.56	3.15
over \$70,000	5.50	5.44	5.46ab	5.31	3.42	3.24	3.54	3.21	3.60	3.11

C - mean country rating P - mean product rating

* - overall country or product rating difference

letters in the columns indicate a significant difference between groups

- same letter suggests no difference

- different letter suggests significant difference

6.0 ANALYSIS AND RESULTS OF THE PCI MODEL

6.1 Measurement Model

This section has been divided into two subsections: Consumers and Retail Buyers. The initial results from the models are reported along with subsequent changes to the model and the final measurement model used in further tests of the structural model.

6.1.1 Consumers

The initial run of the five consumer models using Partial Least Squares (PLS) recognized several problematic variables within the measurement model. This section reports these problems and discusses the solutions for further analysis.

Tables 6.1 through 6.18 outline for each construct, the indicators, their loadings, and the average communality obtained through PLS analysis. Loadings above .7 are considered to be a strong fit, while loadings of less than .5 are considered a poor fit. The average communality indicates the strength of the measurement of the construct for a given country. Average communalities less than .5 are considered problematic when determining the stability of the model. (See Appendix I for the PLS findings)

The COUNTRY DESCRIPTION construct incorporates the descriptive values of a country including *individual rights and freedoms, quality of life, role in world*

politics, environmental/pollution controls, political stability, and knowledge of the country. Table 6.1 indicates one consistently problematic indicator across the five countries, *knowledge of the country*. Country knowledge had very low loadings for the developing countries (Mexico, Chile, and Argentina) and moderate loadings for both Canada and the United States. This indicator does not appear to fit with the other measures of COUNTRY DESCRIPTION.

Knowledge of the country was dropped from further analysis since it appears as though it may be a construct on its own that affects all of the models' constructs, not just Country Description. This variable is summarized in a separate section after the discussion of the structural models.

Table 6.1: COUNTRY DESCRIPTION Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings
Consumer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Country Description	Individual Rights and Freedoms	.764	.789	.843	.862	.842
	Quality of Life	.752	.667	.842	.841	.784
	Role in World Politics	.663	.645	.797	.822	.770
	Environmental/Pollution Control	.648	.546	.754	.862	.805
	Political Stability	.639	.697	.756	.837	.778
	Knowledge of Country	.596	.611	.216	.301	.293
Average Communalities		.46	.44	.54	.61	.54

The PEOPLE DESCRIPTION construct was relatively well represented in the initial model. It is intended to capture the descriptive characteristics of the people from the study countries. Three indicators, *friendliness*, *trustworthiness*, and *individualism* were used. The average communalities were strong across all countries. As reported in Table 6.2, the *individualism* indicator was low for both Canada and the United States (.500 and .583 respectively) but at acceptable

levels for the other countries. This construct was left unchanged in further analysis.

Table 6.2: PEOPLE DESCRIPTION Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings Consumer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
People Description	Friendliness	.898	.900	.864	.896	.845
	Trustworthiness	.905	.896	.854	.895	.868
	Individualism	.500	.583	.634	.750	.682
Average Communalities		.62	.65	.63	.72	.64

The COUNTRY COMPETENCE construct is a measure of a country's ability to produce products. It is measured by respondents' beliefs about a country's *wealth, technology level, and stability of economy*. From Table 6.3, PLS results suggest that the COUNTRY COMPETENCE construct is acceptable across the five countries with respect to the loadings and the average communalities. This construct proceeded to further analysis as is.

Table 6.3: COUNTRY COMPETENCE Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings Consumer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Country Competence	Wealthy	.640	.696	.769	.827	.819
	Technology Level	.851	.851	.875	.884	.859
	Stability of Economy	.769	.780	.816	.905	.829
	Average Communalities	.57	.61	.67	.76	.70

The PEOPLE COMPETENCE construct was intended to reflect respondents' beliefs about a country's capabilities for producing products. It includes three indicators, *work ethic, industriousness, and education level*. Similar to the COUNTRY COMPETENCE construct, the PEOPLE COMPETENCE construct as

proposed in the model appeared to work well through PLS analysis. Table 6.4 illustrates the results obtained from PLS.

Table 6.4: PEOPLE COMPETENCE Indicator Variables - Initial Findings
Consumer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
People Competence	Work Ethic	.847	.842	.831	.824	.791
	Industriousness	.880	.820	.912	.897	.865
	Education Level	.685	.781	.744	.762	.729
Average Communality		.65	.66	.69	.69	.64

COUNTRY EVALUATION is measured by *likeability of the people* across all five countries and *alignment with Canada* for all countries except Canada which is measured by just *likeability of the people*. It is intended to reflect respondents' overall assessment of a country and its people. Table 6.5 reports the PLS results. The loadings indicate a strong fit with the exception of *alignment with Canada* for Mexico which is only moderate fit (.586). The average communalities are strong across all countries. This construct was not altered in further analysis.

Table 6.5: COUNTRY EVALUATION Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Country Evaluations	Likeability of People	1.000	.874	.862	.853	.804
	Alignment with Canada	n/a	.720	.586	.796	.785
Average Communality		1.0	.64	.55	.68	.63

The desired RELATIONSHIP construct measured respondents' desire for further links with a given country and was measured by interest in closer *political and*

economic ties, immigration from, investment in, investment from, exports to, and imports from. Although the average communality suggested relative stability across the five countries, the loadings for *exports to* suggested a low fit for the United States (.500), Mexico (.539), and Argentina (.529), and a moderate fit for Chile (.664). These results are reported in Table 6.6. Since exporting products to a country involves little sustained involvement, it likely does not reflect the desire for further relationships, so *exports to* was removed from further analysis.

Table 6.6: RELATIONSHIP Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings
Consumer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Relationship	Political and Economic Ties	n/a	.807	.833	.845	.836
	Immigration from		.747	.763	.745	.753
	Investment in		.710	.785	.805	.794
	Investment from		.732	.724	.764	.724
	Imports from		.774	.869	.855	.804
	Exports to		.500	.539	.664	.529
Average Communality		1.0	.52	.58	.61	.56

The PRODUCT BELIEFS construct was designed to reflect respondents' beliefs about a country's products. It is measured by eleven variables: *attractiveness, innovativeness, price level, variety, durability, technology level, defects in merchandise, reliability, after sales service, workmanship, and quality.* Table 6.7 shows the PLS results for PRODUCT BELIEFS. Two of the variables had low loadings across all countries: *price level* (Canada - .115, U.S. - .182, Mexico - .435, Chile - .595, and Argentina - .497) and *defects in merchandise* which is low and negative (Canada - -.359, U.S. - -.322, Mexico - -.120, Chile - -.063, and Argentina - -.225). Consequently, the average communalities indicate the

instability of this construct (Canada - .42, U.S. - .42, Mexico - .49, Chile - .53, Argentina - .46). *Price level* and *defects in merchandise* were removed from further analysis. It is felt that *price level* is not necessarily a product belief in the same way as the other measures and therefore does not fit with the Product Belief construct. *Defects in merchandise* was introduced for the first time in this study as a Product Belief variable. Possibly due to consumer's inability to consistently perceive *defects in merchandise*, it simply does not work in the consumer models. Unlike with the *knowledge of country* variable, these variables do not affect the model.

Table 6.7: PRODUCT BELIEFS Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings
Consumer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Product Beliefs	Attractiveness	.688	.663	.724	.756	.631
	Innovativeness	.705	.664	.715	.782	.733
	Price Level	.115	.182	.435	.595	.497
	Variety	.561	.625	.581	.670	.648
	Durability	.726	.721	.800	.832	.822
	Technology Level	.711	.671	.769	.770	.685
	Defects in Merchandise	-.359	-.322	-.120	-.063	-.225
	Reliability	.805	.785	.848	.861	.825
	After Sales Service	.658	.648	.699	.694	.612
	Workmanship	.737	.766	.844	.810	.770
	Quality	.739	.800	.792	.830	.790
Average Communality		.42	.42	.49	.53	.46

Another construct which warranted no change was PRODUCT EVALUATION. This construct represents respondents' evaluation of a country's products and is measured by four variables: *value*, *overall satisfaction*, *proud to own*, and *overall rating*. Both the loadings and average communality indicate a stable construct. The results are reported in Table 6.8.

Table 6.8: PRODUCT EVALUATION Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings
Consumer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Product Evaluations	Value	.679	.778	.778	.813	.735
	Overall Satisfaction	.848	.870	.875	.891	.833
	Proud to Own	.860	.823	.791	.840	.814
	Overall Rating	.851	.877	.885	.873	.857
Average Communalities		.66	.70	.69	.73	.66

Another construct which caused some difficulty was FAMILIARITY. This construct measured respondents' product knowledge with respect to *ease of finding, knowledge of brand names, and overall knowledge of products* from the study countries. Table 6.9 illustrates the results from the PLS analysis. Average communalities are relatively stable with the exception of Argentina (.44). The loadings suggest that *knowledge of brand names* is not a good fit on this construct (Canada - .517, United States - .509, Mexico - .531, Chile - .422, and Argentina - -.080). The question which addressed *knowledge of brand names* may have been problematic in that it is unclear to the respondent whether one should indicate the level of personal knowledge or the general public's knowledge of brand names from a certain country. This variable was subsequently eliminated from further analysis.

Table 6.9: FAMILIARITY Indicator Loadings - Initial Findings
Consumer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Familiarity	Ease of Finding	.778	.868	.814	.875	.851
	Brand Names	.517	.509	.531	.422	.080
	Knowledge of Products	.822	.845	.822	.789	.769
Average Communalities		.52	.58	.54	.52	.44

The final construct, WILLINGNESS TO BUY, had just one indicator.

To summarize, the initial PLS results led to the elimination of five indicators:

knowledge of the country, price level, defects in merchandise, knowledge of brand names, and exports to. Each of the models was run a second time with more favorable results. These improvements are summarized below. (See Appendix J)

In the absence of the *knowledge of country* indicator, COUNTRY DESCRIPTION stabilized. All of the loadings increased by a small degree with the exception of Argentina which dropped in the third decimal place for *role in world politics*. The average communalities increased to acceptable levels with the United States lagging, at .49, slightly below the desired level. These results are summarized in Table 6.10.

Table 6.10: COUNTRY DESCRIPTION Indicator Loadings - Final Model
Consumer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Country Description	Individual Rights and Freedoms	.765	.810	.842	.876	.850
	Quality of Life	.752	.692	.851	.848	.790
	Role in World Politics	.691	.666	.800	.824	.768
	Environmental/Pollution Control	.680	.600	.768	.871	.812
	Political Stability	.655	.708	.772	.840	.790
Average Communality		.50	.49	.65	.73	.64

With the elimination of *price level* and *defects in merchandise*, PRODUCT BELIEFS improved significantly. The loadings for all variables fluctuated both

upward and downward but did not drop below acceptable levels. The average communalities indicate strong constructs across the five countries, a major improvement over the initial model. Table 6.11 reports the final loadings and communalities.

Table 6.11: PRODUCT BELIEFS Indicator Loadings - Final Model Consumer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Product Beliefs	Attractiveness	.698	.663	.730	.760	.636
	Innovativeness	.718	.672	.713	.782	.731
	Variety	.563	.630	.586	.671	.654
	Durability	.727	.717	.795	.831	.818
	Technology Level	.718	.669	.768	.768	.688
	Reliability	.806	.782	.850	.865	.828
	After Sales Service	.658	.658	.704	.694	.619
	Workmanship	.730	.766	.842	.814	.773
	Quality	.739	.799	.795	.838	.798
Average Communality		.50	.50	.57	.61	.53

Table 6.12 reports results for the RELATIONSHIP construct after the elimination of *exports to* from the model. Similar to PRODUCT BELIEFS, loadings fluctuated upward and downward by small degrees. The average communalities increased slightly for all five countries.

Table 6.12: RELATIONSHIP Indicator Loadings - Final Model Consumer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Relationship	Political and Economic Ties	n/a	.816	.828	.843	.837
	Immigration from		.761	.779	.777	.775
	Investment in		.699	.781	.808	.800
	Investment from		.717	.707	.739	.700
	Imports to		.790	.879	.870	.816
	Average Communality	n/a	.57	.63	.65	.62

Table 6.13 shows increases to all loadings in the absence of *knowledge of brand names* for the FAMILIARITY construct. The average communalities increased for all countries including Argentina which increased from .44 to a more desirable .66 stabilizing the model.

**Table 6.13: FAMILIARITY Indicator Loadings - Final Model
Consumer Model**

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Familiarity	Ease of Finding	.795	.875	.875	.895	.853
	Knowledge of Products	.866	.882	.849	.803	.769
Average Communality		.69	.77	.74	.72	.66

The constructs which were not altered, PEOPLE DESCRIPTION, COUNTRY COMPETENCE, PEOPLE COMPETENCE, COUNTRY EVALUATIONS and PRODUCT EVALUATION, were not significantly affected by changes to the other constructs. The loadings for each construct are given below.

**Table 6.14: PEOPLE DESCRIPTION Indicator Loadings - Final Model
Consumer Model**

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
People Description	Friendliness	.898	.901	.865	.896	.846
	Trustworthiness	.905	.896	.854	.895	.868
	Individualism	.500	.580	.632	.750	.681
Average Communality		.63	.65	.63	.72	.64

**Table 6.15: COUNTRY COMPETENCE Indicator Loadings - Final Model
Consumer Model**

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Country Competence	Wealth	.636	.700	.768	.826	.818
	Technology Level	.854	.852	.876	.884	.861
	Stability of the Economy	.768	.777	.817	.905	.829
Average Communality		.57	.61	.67	.76	.70

**Table 6.16: PEOPLE COMPETENCE Indicator Loadings - Final Model
Consumer Model**

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
People Competence	Work Ethic	.848	.842	.832	.824	.793
	Industriousness	.881	.820	.912	.897	.865
	Education Level	.682	.781	.742	.762	.727
Average Communalities		.65	.66	.69	.69	.64

**Table 6.17: COUNTRY EVALUATION Indicator Loadings - Final Model
Consumer Model**

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Country Evaluation	Likeability of People	1.000	.888	.869	.856	.806
	Alignment with Canada	n/a	.699	.586	.794	.783
Average Communalities		1.000	.64	.55	.68	.63

**Table 6.18: PRODUCT EVALUATION Indicator Loadings - Final Model
Consumer Model**

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Product Evaluation	Value	.679	.778	.778	.813	.734
	Overall Satisfaction	.848	.870	.875	.891	.834
	Proud to Own	.860	.823	.791	.840	.814
	Overall Rating	.851	.877	.885	.873	.857
Average Communalities		.66	.70	.69	.73	.66

6.1.2 Retail Buyers

Similar to the consumer models, the initial runs of the five retail buyer models using Partial Least Squares (PLS) indicated a few problematic variables. This section reports the problems and discusses the solutions for further analysis. Again, several tables outlining each construct and the indicators, loadings, and average communalities obtained through PLS analysis are provided. As with the consumer models, loadings above .7 are considered a strong fit, while loadings of less than .5 are considered a poor fit. Average communalities less than .5 are

considered problematic when determining the convergent validity of the model.

(See Appendix K for Initial Findings for the Retail Buyer models)

For the COUNTRY DESCRIPTION construct, *knowledge of the country* had a similar fit on the retail buyer models as it did in the consumer models. The loadings were extremely low for Canada (.412), Mexico (.321), Chile (.353), and Argentina (.290). The United States was at an acceptable level (.725). For Canada, *political stability* (.534) was relatively low compared to the other countries. *Role in world politics* and *environmental/pollution controls* were problematic variables for the United States with loadings of .532 and .375 respectively. These results are summarized in Table 6.19. The average communalities were low, dropping below acceptable levels for Canada (.40), the United States (.41), and Mexico (.42). Consistent with the consumer models, *knowledge of the country* was removed from the COUNTRY DESCRIPTION construct in further analysis.

Table 6.19: COUNTRY DESCRIPTION Indicator Loadings - Initial Model
Retail Buyer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Country Description	Individual Rights and Freedoms	.734	.760	.668	.782	.727
	Quality of Life	.754	.661	.755	.773	.785
	Role in World Politics	.669	.532	.705	.803	.791
	Environmental/Pollution Control	.625	.375	.641	.818	.817
	Political Stability	.534	.718	.683	.641	.765
	Knowledge of Country	.412	.725	.321	.353	.290
Average Communality		.40	.41	.42	.51	.52

Similar to the consumer models, the PEOPLE DESCRIPTION, COUNTRY COMPETENCE, PEOPLE COMPETENCE, COUNTRY EVALUATION, PRODUCT EVALUATION constructs had acceptable loadings and average communalities and were left unchanged in further analysis. Unlike with the consumer models, the RELATIONSHIP construct was also left unchanged. The *exports to* variable was of moderate to good fit across the five countries. For retail buyers, *exports to* seems to be considered a part of a construct measuring association likely reflecting their interest in international trading. The loadings and communalities are summarized in Table 6.20 through 6.25.

Table 6.20: PEOPLE DESCRIPTION Indicator Loadings - Initial Model
Retail Buyer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
People Description	Friendliness	.893	.886	.839	.843	.791
	Trustworthiness	.892	.794	.729	.764	.733
	Individualism	.476	.574	.619	.639	.724
Average Communality		.61	.58	.54	.57	.56

Table 6.21: COUNTRY COMPETENCE Indicator Loadings - Initial Model
Retail Buyer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Country Competence	Wealth	.761	.767	.823	.892	.689
	Technology Level	.723	.766	.877	.874	.883
	Stability of Economy	.781	.782	.798	.905	.847
Average Communality		.57	.60	.69	.79	.66

Table 6.22: PEOPLE COMPETENCE Indicator Loadings - Initial Model
Retail Buyer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
People Competence	Work Ethic	.858	.871	.856	.811	.790
	Industriousness	.902	.826	.823	.816	.773
	Education Level	.724	.573	.682	.746	.761
Average Communality		.69	.59	.62	.63	.60

**Table 6.23: COUNTRY EVALUATION Indicator Loadings - Initial Model
Retail Buyer Model**

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Country Evaluations	Likeability of People	1.000	.876	.876	.822	.854
	Alignment with Canada	n/a	.657	.693	.722	.676
Average Communalities		1.0	.60	.62	.60	.59

**Table 6.24: RELATIONSHIP Indicator Loadings - Initial Model
Retail Buyer Model**

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Relationship	Political and Economic Ties	n/a	.779	.875	.845	.830
	Immigration from		.768	.709	.747	.773
	Investment in		.782	.808	.819	.782
	Investment from		.726	.682	.715	.623
	Imports from		.758	.807	.832	.820
	Exports to		.591	.627	.664	.636
Average Communalities		n/a	.54	.57	.60	.56

**Table 6.25: PRODUCT EVALUATION Indicator Loadings - Initial Model
Retail Buyer Model**

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Product Evaluations	Value	.676	.784	.757	.771	.679
	Overall Satisfaction	.883	.886	.882	.818	.815
	Proud to Own	.743	.816	.867	.804	.803
	Overall Rating	.855	.889	.905	.887	.869
Average Communalities		.63	.71	.73	.67	.63

As with the consumer models, the PRODUCT BELIEFS construct was a source of concern for the retail buyer models with the average communalities being pulled down by poor fits of both *price level* (Canada - -.030, U.S. - .159, Mexico - -.318, Chile - -.325, and Argentina - -.361) and *defects in merchandise* (Canada - .320, U.S. - .264, Mexico - .555, Chile - .316, and Argentina - .355) across the five study countries. Average communalities dropped below desired levels for Canada (.45), the United States (.44), and Argentina (.47) as illustrated in Table

6.26. *Price level* and *defects in merchandise* were dropped from the construct in further analysis.

Table 6.26: PRODUCT BELIEFS Indicator Loadings - Initial Model
Retail Buyer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Product Beliefs	Attractiveness	.768	.767	.803	.761	.651
	Innovativeness	.751	.703	.785	.783	.787
	Price Level	-.030	.159	-.318	-.325	-.361
	Variety	.712	.576	.704	.764	.540
	Durability	.756	.777	.833	.818	.867
	Technology Level	.738	.623	.782	.784	.753
	Defects in Merchandise	.320	.264	.555	.316	.355
	Reliability	.818	.762	.846	.806	.822
	Workmanship	.660	.782	.812	.782	.721
	Quality	.697	.823	.811	.790	.790
Average Communalities		.45	.44	.55	.52	.47

The FAMILIARITY construct showed two problem variables of which only one was eliminated from further analysis. *Ease of finding* was of low fit for Canada (.539), the United States (.443), Mexico (.559), and Argentina (.287), but maintained a good fit for Chile (.821). Similarly, *knowledge of brand names* was low across all five countries (Canada - .582, United States - .468, Mexico - .356, Chile - .537, Argentina - .596). These loadings pulled the average communalities below desired levels for Canada (.46), the United States (.44), Mexico (.41) and Argentina (.39). *Knowledge of brand names* was more consistently low and had been eliminated in the consumer model, thus, the decision was made to eliminate it while keeping *ease of finding* in further analysis. These results are summarized in Table 6.27.

Table 6.27: FAMILIARITY Indicator Loadings - Initial Model
Retail Buyer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Familiarity	Ease of Finding	.539	.443	.559	.821	.287
	Know Brand Names	.582	.468	.356	.537	.596
	Knowledge of Products	.862	.958	.895	.823	.849
Average Communalities		.46	.44	.41	.55	.39

The final construct, WILLINGNESS TO BUY, had just one indicator.

To summarize, the initial PLS results led to the elimination of four variables:

knowledge of the country, price level, defects in merchandise, and knowledge of brand names. Similar to the consumer models, each of the retail buyer models was run a second time with more supporting results. These improvements are summarized below.

In the absence of the *knowledge of country* indicator, the average communalities for the COUNTRY DESCRIPTION construct increased. However, Canada and the United States are still below desirable levels (.45 and .42 respectively).

Political stability for Canada continues to have a low loading (.548). Both *role in world politics* and *environmental/pollution controls* are low for the United States (.509 and .411 respectively). Since these low loadings are not consistent across the countries, additional modifications to the model were not made. The results are summarized in Table 6.28.

Table 6.28: COUNTRY DESCRIPTION Indicator Loadings - Final Model
Retail Buyer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Country Description	Individual Rights and Freedoms	.720	.792	.727	.800	.740
	Quality of Life	.768	.678	.753	.773	.778
	Role in World Politics	.683	.509	.752	.808	.797
	Environmental/Pollution Control	.620	.411	.706	.848	.840
	Political Stability	.548	.757	.753	.666	.781
Average Communalities		.45	.42	.55	.61	.62

With the elimination of *price level* and *defects in merchandise*, the average communalities across all five countries increased to desirable levels in the Product Beliefs construct. Table 6.29 summarizes the results obtained by the modified model. Loadings fluctuated upward and downward in response to the changes but did not fall below a moderate to good fit.

Table 6.29: PRODUCT BELIEFS Indicator Loadings - Final Model
Retail Buyer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Product Beliefs	Attractiveness	.771	.768	.817	.770	.671
	Innovativeness	.758	.708	.800	.796	.795
	Variety	.717	.587	.717	.774	.567
	Durability	.757	.776	.835	.814	.863
	Technology Level	.740	.638	.787	.784	.747
	Reliability	.815	.762	.846	.805	.820
	Workmanship	.657	.771	.808	.790	.721
	Quality	.694	.821	.805	.782	.788
Average Communalities		.55	.54	.64	.62	.56

The elimination of the *knowledge of brand names* variable provided the desired effect on the average communalities in the Familiarity construct. The average communalities rose above desired levels for all countries. However, the loadings for *ease of finding* decreased rather than increased maintaining low fits for

Canada, the United States, Mexico, and Argentina. These results are summarized in Table 6.30.

Table 6.30: FAMILIARITY Indicator Loadings - Final Model
Retail Buyer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Familiarity	Ease of Finding	.489	.369	.495	.810	.106
	Knowledge of Products	.946	.997	.952	.872	.999
Average Communality		.57	.57	.58	.71	.50

As with the consumer models, the constructs which were not altered, PEOPLE DESCRIPTION, COUNTRY COMPETENCE, PEOPLE COMPETENCE, COUNTRY EVALUATIONS, PRODUCT EVALUATION, and RELATIONSHIP were not significantly affected by changes to the other constructs. These constructs are summarized below.

Table 6.31: PEOPLE DESCRIPTION Indicator Loadings - Final Model
Retail Buyer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
People Description	Friendliness	.893	.887	.840	.844	.791
	Trustworthiness	.892	.795	.727	.764	.733
	Individualism	.476	.571	.619	.638	.724
Average Communality		.61	.58	.54	.57	.56

Table 6.32: COUNTRY COMPETENCE Indicator Loadings - Final Model
Retail Buyer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Country Competence	Wealth	.759	.768	.820	.891	.688
	Technology Level	.725	.766	.881	.818	.884
	Stability of the Economy	.781	.781	.795	.905	.847
	Average Communality	.57	.60	.69	.79	.66

Table 6.33: PEOPLE COMPETENCE Indicator Loadings - Final Model
Retail Buyer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
People Competence	Work Ethic	.857	.870	.856	.812	.792
	Industriousness	.902	.827	.824	.817	.773
	Education Level	.725	.573	.680	.742	.759
Average Communalilty		.69	.59	.62	.63	.60

Table 6.34: COUNTRY EVALUATION Indicator Loadings - Final Model
Retail Buyer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Country Evaluation	Likeability of People	1.000	.888	.884	.828	.856
	Alignment with Canada	n/a	.637	.680	.715	.674
Average Communalilty		1.000	.60	.62	.60	.59

Table 6.35: RELATIONSHIP Indicator Loadings - Final Model
Retail Buyer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Relationship	Political and Economic Ties	n/a	.778	.875	.845	.830
	Immigration from		.770	.709	.747	.773
	Invest in		.782	.808	.819	.782
	Investment from		.725	.682	.715	.623
	Exports to		.590	.627	.665	.637
	Imports from		.758	.806	.832	.820
Average Communalilty		n/a	.54	.57	.60	.56

Table 6.36: PRODUCT EVALUATION Indicator Loadings - Final Model
Retail Buyer Model

		Variable Loadings				
		Canada	United States	Mexico	Chile	Argentina
Product Evaluation	Value	.674	.784	.758	.771	.680
	Overall Satisfaction	.884	.886	.882	.818	.816
	Proud to Own	.745	.817	.867	.804	.802
	Overall Rating	.854	.889	.905	.886	.869
Average Communalilty		.63	.71	.73	.67	.63

6.2 Structural Model

Hypotheses 1 through 30 pertain to the structural model paths. In this section, these hypotheses were tested and the results are reported. Using PLS's jackknifing technique, the models path coefficients and their significance were determined. PLS calculated an t-statistic for each path. Results obtained for both the consumer and retail buyer models for each of the five study countries are discussed. In accordance to Hypothesis 32, it is proposed that the structural models for Canada and the United States differ from those of Mexico, Chile, and Argentina. ANOVA was run to determine differences for each path.

6.2.1 Consumers

Examination of the measurement model indicated high and consistent loadings. Tables 6.37 through 6.41 show the discriminant validity coefficients for the models. Discriminant validity was indicated for all constructs except Product Beliefs and Product Evaluations. The square root of the variance for Product Beliefs is higher than the correlation between Product Beliefs and Product Evaluations suggesting that discriminant validity was not satisfied between these two constructs. Consumers do not appear to discriminate between the Product Beliefs and Evaluation constructs. However, psychological theory posits a clear distinction between the two constructs which, nonetheless, are expected to be highly correlated. Under conditions such as survey research of this type in which both are measured in the same way and at the same time, this association is

likely to be further augmented. Therefore, the high correlation is not unexpected. However, due to theoretical reasons, these constructs were left as separate constructs in the models.

Table 6.37: Discriminant Validity Coefficients - Canada (Consumers)²

	C Desc	C Desc	C Comp	P Comp	Familiar	P Belief	C Eval	P Eval	Willing
C Desc	.710								
P Desc	.489	.791							
C Comp	.672	.444	.756						
P Comp	.460	.683	.553	.809					
Familiar	.340	.254	.395	.331	.831				
P Belief	.431	.452	.457	.496	.438	.709			
C Eval	.426	.677	.349	.587	.218	.362	1.00		
P Eval	.378	.439	.354	.478	.401	.802	.447	.813	
Willing	.331	.308	.270	.352	.429	.587	.295	.745	1.00

Table 6.38: Discriminant Validity Coefficients - United States (Consumers)

	C Desc	C Desc	C Comp	P Comp	C Eval	Relation	P Belief	P Eval	Willing	Familiar
C Desc	.700									
P Desc	.488	.806								
C Comp	.678	.407	.779							
P Comp	.599	.664	.587	.815						
C Eval	.491	.680	.364	.565	.799					
Familiar	.362	.206	.425	.300	.256	.878				
P Belief	.487	.389	.507	.497	.326	.511	.709			
P Eval	.419	.353	.398	.395	.310	.396	.825	.838		
Willing	.363	.292	.345	.326	.302	.420	.607	.721	1.00	
Relation	.402	.451	.407	.439	.430	.177	.367	.425	.332	.758

² For Tables 6.37 through 6.41, off diagonal entries are correlation coefficients and diagonal entries are the square roots of the average communalities.

Table 6.39: Discriminant Validity Coefficients - Mexico (Consumers)

	C Desc	C Desc	C Comp	P Comp	C Eval	Relation	P Belief	P Eval	Willing	Familiar
C Desc	.807									
P Desc	.444	.791								
C Comp	.778	.382	.821							
P Comp	.619	.699	.594	.832						
C Eval	.430	.687	.324	.602	.741					
Relation	.382	.438	.348	.455	.507	.797				
P Belief	.485	.390	.422	.484	.386	.375	.758			
P Eval	.405	.379	.310	.440	.434	.445	.858	.834		
Willing	.239	.242	.160	.235	.333	.413	.590	.733	1.00	
Familiar	.176	.132	.172	.192	.188	.126	.287	.341	.272	.862

Table 6.40: Discriminant Validity Coefficients - Chile (Consumers)

	C Desc	C Desc	C Comp	P Comp	C Eval	Relation	P Belief	P Eval	Willing	Familiar
C Desc	.852									
P Desc	.477	.850								
C Comp	.850	.430	.873							
P Comp	.632	.756	.664	.830						
C Eval	.582	.742	.549	.729	.825					
Relation	.361	.494	.421	.539	.554	.809				
P Belief	.510	.406	.518	.545	.513	.361	.786			
P Eval	.443	.412	.461	.515	.493	.427	.856	.855		
Willing	.265	.312	.305	.380	.396	.409	.603	.766	1.00	
Familiar	.220	.144	.227	.221	.233	.093	.437	.399	.341	.850

Table 6.41: Discriminant Validity Coefficients - Argentina (Consumers)

	C Desc	C Desc	C Comp	P Comp	P Belief	P Eval	C Eval	Relation	Familiar	Willing
C Desc	.802									
P Desc	.464	.803								
C Comp	.774	.454	.836							
P Comp	.570	.735	.641	.797						
P Belief	.486	.408	.484	.522	.731					
P Eval	.414	.418	.455	.482	.836	.811				
C Eval	.543	.697	.430	.671	.416	.379	.794			
Relation	.485	.420	.491	.469	.377	.413	.496	.787		
Familiar	.207	.187	.190	.249	.431	.390	.272	.096	.812	
Willing	.219	.319	.234	.306	.526	.692	.294	.346	.285	1.00

Hypotheses 1 through 15 concern the validation of the paths for the consumer models. The models obtained for each country differ greatly. Table 6.42 and 6.43 show the results of the hypothesis testing for the revised models. Both the incidence of significant relationships (Table 6.42) and the specific path coefficients (Table 6.43) are shown. (See Appendix M - for T-statistics for each path) The following sections summarize the findings with respect to each hypothesis accompanied by ANOVA results which determine whether significant country differences exist between each significant path (Hypothesis 32). (See Appendix N for exact F values)

Table 6.42: Incidence of Significant Relationships - Consumer Models

Hypothesis	C	U	M	Ch	A
H1: Country Description → Country Evaluation	n.s	✓	n.s	n.s	✓
H2: People Description → Country Evaluation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
H3: Country Competence → Country Evaluation	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s	x
H4: People Competence → Country Evaluation	✓	n.s	n.s	✓	✓
H5: Country Competence → Product Beliefs	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
H6: People Competence → Product Beliefs	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
H7: Country Evaluations → Relationship	n/a	✓	n.s	✓	✓
H8: Country Evaluations → Product Evaluations	✓	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s
H9: Product Beliefs → Product Evaluations	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
H10: Familiarity → Product Beliefs	✓	✓	n.s	✓	✓
H11: Familiarity → Product Evaluations	n.s.	x	✓	n.s	✓
H12: Familiarity → Willingness to Buy	✓	✓	n.s	n.s	n.s
H13: Relationship → Product Evaluations	n/a	✓	✓	✓	✓
H14: Relationship → Willingness to Buy	n/a	n.s	✓	n.s	n.s
H15: Product Evaluations → Willingness to Buy	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Positive Significant Relationships	9/12	10/15	8/15	9/15	11/15

✓ means path is positive and hypothesis is supported at $p < .10$

x means path is in opposite direction to prediction

n.s means not significant

Table 6.43: Summary of Hypotheses (Path Coefficients) - Consumer Models

Hypothesis	C	U	M	Ch	A
H1: Country Description → Country Evaluation	.143	.197 _a **	.176	.176	.352 _b **
H2: People Description → Country Evaluation	.482 _a ***	.517 _b ***	.508 _c **	.454 _d ***	.401 _e ***
H3: Country Competence → Country Evaluation	-.097	-.063	-.138	.038	-.232**
H4: People Competence → Country Evaluation	.246 _a **	.140	.220	.249 _a **	.324 _b **
H5: Country Competence → Product Beliefs	.183 _c **	.197 _a *	.190 _a **	.234 _b **	.236 _b **
H6: People Competence → Product Beliefs	.308 _a ***	.278 _b **	.335 _c **	.321 _d **	.293 _e **
H7: Country Evaluations → Relationship	n/a	.430 _a ***	.507	.554 _b **	.496 _c ***
H8: Country Evaluations → Product Evaluations	.176**	-.000	.063	.004	-.020
H9: Product Beliefs → Product Evaluations	.716 _b ***	.790 _a ***	.762 _c **	.786 _a ***	.776 _d ***
H10: Familiarity → Product Beliefs	.264 _a **	.344 _a **	.190	.313 _b ***	.313 _b *
H11: Familiarity → Product Evaluations	.050	-.033**	.096*	.043	.049*
H12: Familiarity → Willingness to Buy	.155 _a **	.160 _b **	.027	.051	.024
H13: Relationship → Product Evaluations	n/a	.141 _a **	.115 _b **	.137 _a **	.126 _b **
H14: Relationship → Willingness to Buy	n/a	.029	.108*	.105	.075
H15: Product Evaluations → Willingness to Buy	.683 _b ***	.645 _a ***	.676 _c **	.701 _d ***	.652 _e ***
Positive Significant Relationships	9/12	10/15	8/15	9/15	11/15

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

* - $p < .10$ ** - $p < .05$ *** - $p < .001$

letters in the columns indicate a significant difference between countries

- same letter suggests no difference

- different letter suggests significant difference

H1. Country Description → Country Evaluation. This hypothesis was supported for the United States and Argentina but not Canada, Mexico, or Chile. That is, Country Description was positive and significantly related to Country Evaluation only for the United States and Argentina. This suggests that when evaluating the likeability of the people from Argentina and the United States and their

alignment with Canada, consumers rely, in part, on descriptive aspects of the country when making country evaluations.

Overall ANOVA yielded significant differences between the countries ($p < .001$). Scheffé post hoc comparison of the significant paths indicate a significant difference between the United States and Argentina. The relationship between Country Description and Country Evaluation is stronger for Argentina than the United States.

H2. People Description → Country Evaluation. People Description was significantly related to Country Evaluation for all five study countries, supporting this hypothesis. This suggests that the descriptive qualities of the people within a country contribute to country evaluation regardless of the country being evaluated.

ANOVA yielded overall significant differences among the countries ($p < .001$). Post hoc paired comparisons indicate significant differences for all combinations ($p < .05$). The relationship between People Description and Country Evaluation is stronger for the United States followed by Mexico, Chile, Canada, and for Argentina which has the weakest path.

H3. Country Competence → Country Evaluation. This hypothesis was significant only for Argentina but not in the predicted direction. Thus, Country Competence is not positively related to Country Evaluation for any of the countries. So, the likeability of the people from a country and its perceived alignment with Canada is not related to belief in the overall competence of the country (wealth, technological capability, stability of the economy).

ANOVA was not performed since no significant and positive paths existed.

H4. People Competence → Country Evaluation. People Competence was found to be significant and positively related to Country Evaluation for Canada, Chile, and Argentina. The education level, industriousness, and work ethic of the people play a role in the evaluation of the likeability of the people for Canada, Chile, and Argentina, and the country's perceived alignment with Canada for Chile and Argentina.

Overall, ANOVA found significant differences among the three countries, Canada, Chile, and Argentina ($p < .001$). Scheffé post hoc comparisons indicate a significant difference between Argentina and Canada, and Argentina and Chile. The path between People Competence and Country Evaluation was higher for Argentina than for Canada or Chile. There was no significant difference between Canada and Chile for this path.

H5. Country Competence → Product Beliefs. This hypothesis was supported for Canada, Mexico, Chile, and Argentina and approaches significance at 0.1 for the United States. Country Competence is generally positively related to Product Beliefs. This suggests that beliefs about a country's ability to produce products affects product beliefs for Canada and the less developed countries. It is the first indication of the existence of a Halo Effect (Han, 1989) which is not restricted to unknown countries as Han (1989) had suggested in his research.

ANOVA yielded overall differences among the five countries ($p < .001$). Scheffé post hoc comparisons suggest similarities between Mexico and the United States as well as for Chile and Argentina. All other pairwise comparisons indicate significant differences. Argentina has the highest path coefficient between Country Competence and Product Beliefs, followed by Chile, the United States, Mexico, and Canada.

H6. People Competence → Product Beliefs. This hypothesis was supported across all five countries. People Competence had a significant positive impact on Product Beliefs. So, regardless of the country, the perceived ability of the people to produce products will positively affect product beliefs. Again, this finding suggests the potential of a Halo Effect (Han, 1989) for all five country models.

Significant differences were found through ANOVA for the five countries ($p < .001$). Post hoc paired comparisons reveal significant differences between each paired combination of countries. Mexico had the highest path coefficient between the two constructs, followed by Chile, Canada, Argentina, and the United States.

H7. Country Evaluations → Relationship. The relationship between Country Evaluation and desired Relationship was found to be significant and positive for the United States, Chile, and Argentina, and not significant for Mexico. This suggests that consumers are unsure of the relationship they desire with Mexico regardless of the country evaluation. This may be attributed to consumers' uncertainty of NAFTA benefits.

ANOVA revealed significant differences among the three countries, the United States, Chile, and Argentina. Scheffé post hoc comparisons differences for all paired comparisons. The relationship between Country Evaluation and Relationship is strongest for Chile, followed by the United States and Argentina.

H8. Country Evaluation → Product Evaluation. The link between Country Evaluation and Product Evaluation is only significant for Canada. This suggests a possible patriotism effect toward products from one's own country. For the other countries (United States, Mexico, Chile, and Argentina), country evaluation does not lead to product evaluations.

ANOVA was not performed since just one path (Canada) was significant.

H9. Product Beliefs → Product Evaluations. Product Beliefs is significant and positively related to Product Evaluations for all five countries. Regardless of the country, beliefs about their products affects the evaluation of products with respect to value, overall satisfaction, pride in ownership, and an overall rating. Accompanied by the relationship between Country and/or People Competence, the significance of this relationship confirms a Halo Effect for all five study countries.

Although all paths are significant and positive, ANOVA yielded significant differences between the countries ($p < .001$). Post hoc comparisons indicate a similarity for the United States and Chile but all other countries differ significantly ($p < .05$). The relationship between Product Beliefs and Product Evaluations is strongest for the United States followed by Chile, Argentina, Mexico, and Canada.

H10. Familiarity → Product Beliefs. This hypothesis is supported for Canada, the United States, Chile and to a lesser extent, Argentina, but not Mexico. Knowledge of products and ease of finding them participate in the formation of product beliefs. This is most likely due to exposure. Very few products from Mexico and Argentina are familiar to consumers while Canadian and American

products are abundant. Familiarity with Chilean products may be significant due to knowledge of Chilean wines and fruit.

Overall, ANOVA revealed significant differences across the four significant country's paths. Scheffé post hoc comparisons identified two similarities on this path: Chile and Argentina, and Canada and the United States. All other post hoc paired comparisons significantly differ at $p < .05$. The relationship between Familiarity and Product Beliefs was strongest for Chile, followed by Canada, Argentina, and the United States.

H11. Familiarity → Product Evaluations. The link between Familiarity and Product Evaluations is significant and positive for Mexico and Argentina. It is also significant for the United States but in the opposite direction to that predicted. The higher the familiarity, the lower the evaluation of American products. Through experience of certain American products i.e. electronics or cars, negative evaluations may be formed if being compared to superior products e.g. Japanese electronics or cars. For Mexico and Argentina, the higher the familiarity, the higher the evaluation of Mexican and Argentinean products. So, looking at H10 and H11, it seems that for Mexico, Familiarity only leads to Product Evaluations, while for the other countries, Familiarity leads to the formation of Product Beliefs. Consumers do not form beliefs about Mexican

products but instead, evaluate them with respect to value, satisfaction, pride in ownership, and an overall rating.

ANOVA was not performed since just one positive and significant path existed.

H12. Familiarity → Willingness to Buy. Familiarity is significantly and positively related to Willingness to Buy products for Canada and the United States. More familiarity with products from Canada or the United States increases the willingness to buy products from these countries. So, Familiarity leads to the Willingness to Buy for developed countries and not the developing countries. The non-significance for Mexico, Chile, and Argentina, may be due to the lack of product knowledge or exposure.

ANOVA yielded significant differences between Canada and the United States ($p < .006$). The relationship between Familiarity and Willingness to Buy is stronger for the United States.

H13. Relationship → Product Evaluations. This hypothesis was supported for all four applicable countries. The desired Relationship positively affects Product Evaluations. Regardless of the country, if a stronger relationship is desired, Product Evaluations are positively affected.

ANOVA yielded significant differences among the four countries. Scheffé post hoc paired comparisons suggest that this path is similar for Mexico and Argentina, and for the United States and Chile, but all other paired country comparisons differ significantly. The United States is strongest on this path, followed by Chile, Mexico, and Argentina.

H14. Relationship → Willingness to Buy. This hypothesis was supported only for Mexico at a significance of 0.1. The desired relationship with Mexico directly affects the willingness to buy their products. This is probably attributable to their membership in NAFTA.

ANOVA was not performed since there was only one significant path.

H15. Product Evaluations → Willingness to Buy. This hypothesis was supported for all five countries. A country's Product Evaluation is positively related to one's Willingness to Buy products from that country. For the less developed countries, Product Evaluations is the only construct that significantly led to Willingness to Buy. Familiarity with the products also led to Willingness to Buy products only from the developed countries of Canada and the United States which have strong market presence.

ANOVA showed significant difference among the five countries ($p < .001$). Scheffé post hoc comparisons revealed a similarity between the United States and

Argentina. Significant differences ($p < .05$) exist for all other post hoc country comparisons. The relationship between Product Evaluation and Willingness to Buy is greatest for Chile, followed by Canada, Mexico, Argentina, and the United States.

Summary of Models of Consumer PCI Effects

This section amalgamates the results from the hypothesis testing and provides a summary of each country's resulting model.

Canada

Figure 3 illustrates the resulting model for Canada. Just two of the four paths leading to Country Evaluation are significant: People Description and People Competence. This suggests that Canadians evaluate Canada based on their views of the qualities of the people within the country rather than their views of the country's economy, political system, or technology and industrial base.

These country aspects do not play a significant role in the PCI model. The path from Country Evaluation to Product Evaluation was also found to be significant confirming the proposed effect of country evaluation on the evaluation of products. This indicates a domestic bias or patriotism since these two constructs only link for Canada.

Similar to the model tested by Papadopoulos et. al (1988), views of the country (Country Competence) and the people (People Competence) affect Product

Beliefs. It is the specific attributes of the economy, population, and productivity that lead to the formation of beliefs. Familiarity leads directly to Product Beliefs and Willingness to Buy. Familiarity only indirectly affects Product Evaluations through Product Beliefs. So, nine of the twelve relationships proposed are confirmed.

In this model, a halo effect (Han, 1989) is evident. Regardless of the level of country knowledge (mean = 6.43), consumers have taken a country image (Country and People Competence, People Description, and Country Evaluation) to form Product Beliefs and Product Evaluations, or what Han refers to as the formation of a Brand Attitude.

Figure 3: Canadian Consumers' Model of PCI Effects for Canada

United States

Figure 4 illustrates the resulting U.S. consumer model. Two of the four paths leading to Country Evaluation are significant: Country Description and People Description. This suggests that Canadians evaluate the United States based on the descriptive aspects of the country unlike for the home country. The path from Country Evaluation to Product Evaluation is not significant. However, Country Evaluation does link indirectly to Product Evaluation through its positive link with the Relationship construct. Respondents evaluation of the United States is positively related to the desired relationship with the United States. The desired Relationship does not directly lead to Willingness to Buy as proposed in the model but affects it indirectly through Product Evaluations.

People and Country Competence are positively related to Product Beliefs which is subsequently related to Product Evaluations. Familiarity also leads to Product Beliefs. In addition to its positive relation with Product Beliefs, Familiarity with American products is positively related to Willingness to Buy products from the United States. This indicates the that U.S. presence is a dominating force. Overall, ten of the fifteen proposed paths are significant.

Figure 4: Canadian Consumers' Model of PCI Effects for the United States

Similar to the Canadian model, in this model, a halo effect (Han, 1989) is evident. Han (1989) suggested that a halo effect existed only with very little product knowledge, however, this model suggests that the halo effect can exist with high levels of product knowledge. Consumers rated their overall knowledge of the United States with a mean = 5.91 on a scale of 1 to 7. Consumers have taken a country image (Country and People Competence) to form Product Beliefs and Product Evaluations.

Mexico

From Figure 5, it can be seen that People Description is significantly related to Country Evaluation which, however does not significantly lead to either Relationship or Product Evaluations. Thus, People Description and Country Evaluation do not directly or indirectly affect the Willingness to Buy Mexican products. Country and People Competence both significantly affect Product Beliefs. It is the perceived capability of Mexico and its people that lead to Product Beliefs. Familiarity does not affect Product Beliefs but rather Product Evaluations only. Product Beliefs, Familiarity, and the desired Relationship lead to Product Evaluations and subsequent Willingness to Buy Mexican Products.

Figure 5: Canadian Consumers' Model of PCI Effects for Mexico

Given the lack of a link between Country Evaluation and either Relationship or Product Evaluation, the model appears disjointed. This may be the result of uncertainty among consumers as to the benefits of NAFTA and relationships with Mexico with respect to themselves as consumers and as Canadian citizens. However, the existence of a PCI effect is evident since Country and People Competence affect product attributes through Product Beliefs. The Competence of the people and the country are consistent with the other country models but the general country images are not linked. The desired Relationship is important to final evaluations but it is unclear how these are formed. Overall, eight of the fifteen paths proposed are significant.

Canadian consumers indicate limited knowledge of Mexican products (novice) yet familiarity still affects Product Evaluation. This suggests the possibility of stereotyping. This coincides with the findings of Mahaswaran (1994). When experienced, i.e. for Canadian or U.S. products, consumers will not base product evaluations on Familiarity, however, a link does exist indirectly through beliefs. For novice consumers, stereotypes were used.

In this model, based on Han's model and knowledge criteria, a halo effect (Han, 1989) is evident. With very little knowledge of Mexico (mean = 3.48), consumers have taken a country image (Country and People Competence) to form Product Beliefs, and Product Evaluations or what Han refers to as the formation of a Brand Attitude.

Chile

Figure 6 illustrates the resulting model for Chile. This model is similar to that obtained for Canada. Two of the four paths leading to Country Evaluation are significant: People Description and People Competence. This suggests that Canadians evaluate Chile based on their views of the qualities of the people within the country rather than their views of the country's economy, political system or technology and industrial base. These country aspects do not play a significant role in Country Evaluations. This was also found for the Canadian model.

The path from Country Evaluation to Product Evaluation is not significant. However, Country Evaluation does lead to the Relationship construct and indirectly to Product Evaluations. The desired Relationship does not directly lead to Willingness to Buy as proposed in the model but affects it indirectly through Product Evaluations. Country Competence and People Competence lead to Product Beliefs indicating a PCI effect. Familiarity also leads to Product Beliefs and subsequently Product Evaluations and Willingness to Buy. So, nine of fifteen paths proposed are significant.

Figure 6: Canadian Consumers' Model of PCI Effects for Chile

Similar to the other countries models, a halo effect (Han, 1989) emerges for Chile. As predicted by Han (1989), this halo effect was based on little or no knowledge of Chile (mean = 2.62). Consumers have taken a country image (Country and People Competence) to form Product Beliefs, and Product Evaluations.

Argentina

The resulting model for Argentina is illustrated in Figure 7. As hypothesized, Country Description, People Description, and People Competence, all lead to the formation of the Country Evaluation. Argentina provides the richest interpretation

of Country Evaluation. Country Evaluation does not lead directly to Product Evaluation, but affects Product Evaluations indirectly through the Relationship construct.

Both Country and People Competence are related to Product Beliefs, and subsequently Product Evaluations and Willingness to Buy products from Argentina. So, Competence affects Willingness to Buy through two pathways. Familiarity with Argentinean products significant affects both Product Beliefs and Product Evaluations. Eleven of the fifteen proposed paths are significant.

Figure 7: Canadian Consumers Views of Argentina

A halo effect (Han, 1989) appears to emerge for Argentina. Again, based on little or no knowledge (mean = 2.63) of Argentina, consumers are using the country image (Country and People Competence) to form Product Beliefs and subsequent Product Evaluations.

6.3.2 Retail Buyers

Examination of the measurement model indicated high and consistent loadings. Tables 6.44 through 6.48 show correlation matrices of measures to test for discriminant validity. Ideally, the diagonal which contains the square root of the variance should be higher than any of the correlations to confirm discriminant validity is found. All constructs except for Product Beliefs and Product Evaluations confirm discriminant validity. Since the square root of the variance for Product Beliefs is higher than the correlation between Product Beliefs and Product Evaluations for Canada, the United States, and Argentina, discriminant validity was not satisfied for this one construct. Retail Buyers do not discriminate between the Product Beliefs and Evaluation constructs. However, as in the consumer model, theoretical reasons substantiate leaving these constructs separate.

Table 6.44: Discriminant Validity Coefficients - Canada (Retail Buyers)³

	C Desc	C Desc	C Comp	P Comp	Familiar	P Belief	C Eval	P Eval	Willing
C Desc	.672								
P Desc	.536	.778							
C Comp	.686	.553	.755						
P Comp	.514	.656	.616	.831					
Familiar	.289	.216	.215	.167	.753				
P Belief	.351	.405	.351	.454	.481	.740			
C Eval	.362	.696	.330	.533	.207	.405	1.00		
P Eval	.443	.519	.397	.404	.523	.770	.457	.793	
Willing	.370	.329	.332	.286	.516	.490	.278	.637	1.00

Table 6.45: Discriminant Validity Coefficients - United States (Retail Buyers)

	C Desc	C Desc	C Comp	P Comp	C Eval	Familiar	P Belief	P Eval	Willing	Relation
C Desc	.646									
P Desc	.465	.763								
C Comp	.687	.472	.772							
P Comp	.438	.558	.513	.768						
C Eval	.436	.661	.386	.509	.773					
Familiar	.226	.155	.305	.280	.218	.752				
P Belief	.375	.459	.470	.427	.321	.327	.733			
P Eval	.308	.417	.394	.316	.320	.332	.850	.845		
Willing	.257	.339	.359	.161	.262	.329	.598	.756	1.00	
Relation	.387	.335	.331	.246	.365	.269	.201	.226	.231	.737

Table 6.46: Discriminant Validity Coefficients - Mexico (Retail Buyers)

	C Desc	C Desc	C Comp	P Comp	C Eval	Relation	P Belief	P Eval	Willing	Familiar
C Desc	.739									
P Desc	.436	.734								
C Comp	.699	.405	.833							
P Comp	.493	.639	.680	.790						
C Eval	.329	.726	.291	.503	.789					
Relation	.374	.567	.297	.409	.541	.756				
P Belief	.293	.441	.477	.590	.375	.383	.803			
P Eval	.264	.383	.351	.493	.292	.359	.802	.855		
Willing	.111	.292	.200	.382	.238	.334	.579	.759	1.00	
Familiar	.015	.181	.151	.154	.199	.133	.376	.438	.0401	.758

^{3 3} For Tables 6.44 through 6.48, off diagonal entries are correlation coefficients and diagonal entries are the square roots of the average communalities.

Table 6.47: Discriminant Validity Coefficients - Chile (Retail Buyers)

	C Desc	C Desc	C Comp	P Comp	C Eval	Relation	P Belief	P Eval	Willing	Familiar
C Desc	.781									
P Desc	.272	.753								
C Comp	.743	.343	.890							
P Comp	.485	.593	.663	.792						
P Belief	.499	.224	.548	.502	.789					
C Eval	.375	.634	.387	.515	.301	.773				
Familiar	.243	.040	.158	.123	.235	.065	.842			
P Eval	.476	.191	.413	.419	.780	.350	.372	.821		
Relation	.237	.502	.291	.407	.154	.570	.008	.227	.773	
Willing	.277	.096	.187	.173	.508	.232	.326	.723	.117	1.00

Table 6.48: Discriminant Validity Coefficients - Argentina (Retail Buyers)

	C Desc	C Desc	C Comp	P Comp	P Belief	P Eval	C Eval	Relation	Familiar	Willing
C Desc	.788									
P Desc	.332	.750								
C Comp	.793	.349	.811							
P Comp	.505	.578	.550	.775						
P Belief	.577	.347	.614	.388	.752					
P Eval	.480	.383	.440	.237	.763	.795				
C Eval	.421	.625	.365	.498	.292	.385	.770			
Relation	.196	.474	.280	.352	.202	.293	.411	.749		
Familiar	.064	.061	.066	.011	.152	.224	.067	.039	.710	
Willing	.425	.211	.360	.196	.545	.695	.290	.236	.149	1.00

The structural models obtained for each country differ on several aspects. This section tests H16 through H30 to determine the significance of each path.

Tables 6.49 and 6.50 show the results of the hypothesis testing for the revised models. Both incidence of significance (Table 6.49) and the specific path coefficients (Table 6.50) are shown. (See Appendix O for T-statistics) The following sections summarize the findings with respect to each hypothesis.

ANOVA results are provided which determine whether significant country

differences exist for each path (Hypothesis 32). (See Appendix P for exact F values)

Table 6.49: Incidence of Significant Relationships - Retail Buyers

Hypothesis	C	U	M	Ch	A
H16: Country Description → Country Evaluation	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s
H17: People Description → Country Evaluation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
H18: Country Competence → Country Evaluation	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s
H19: People Competence → Country Evaluation	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s
H20: Country Competence → Product Beliefs	n.s	✓	n.s	✓	✓
H21: People Competence → Product Beliefs	✓	✓	✓	✓	n.s
H22: Country Evaluations → Relationship	n/a	✓	✓	✓	✓
H23: Country Evaluations → Product Evaluations	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s
H24: Product Beliefs → Product Evaluations	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
H25: Familiarity → Product Beliefs	✓	n.s	✓	n.s	n.s
H26: Familiarity → Product Evaluations	✓	n.s	✓	✓	n.s
H27: Familiarity → Willingness to Buy	✓	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s
H28: Relationship → Product Evaluations	n/a	n.s	✓	n.s	✓
H29: Relationship → Willingness to Buy	n/a	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s
H30: Product Evaluations → Willingness to Buy	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Positive Significant Relationships	7/12	6/15	8/15	7/15	6/15
✓ means path is positive and hypothesis is supported at $p < .10$ n.s means not significant					

Table 6.50: Summary of Hypotheses (Path Coefficients) - Retail Buyer Models

Hypothesis	C	U	M	Ch	A
H16: Country Description → Country Evaluation	.031	.157	.036	.177	.258
H17: People Description → Country Evaluation	.641 _{ab} ***	.513 _c **	.674 _d ***	.512 _a **	.495 _b **
H18: Country Competence → Country Evaluation	-.169	-.059	-.077	-.006	-.081
H19: People Competence → Country Evaluation	.200	.185	.105	.129	.126
H20: Country Competence → Product Beliefs	.040	.303 _a **	.131	.364 _b **	.562 _c ***
H21: People Competence → Product Beliefs	.361 _a **	.223 _b *	.459 _c ***	.242 _d **	.081
H22: Country Evaluations → Relationship	n/a	.365 _a **	.541 _b ***	.570 _b ***	.411 _a ***
H23: Country Evaluations → Product Evaluations	.170	.034	-.065	.085	.135
H24: Product Beliefs → Product Evaluations	.606 _a ***	.816 _b ***	.729 _c ***	.696 _d ***	.685 _e ***
H25: Familiarity → Product Beliefs	.413 _a ***	.172	.285 _b **	.148	.115
H26: Familiarity → Product Evaluations	.196 _a **	.048	.165 _b *	.203 _a **	.115
H27: Familiarity → Willingness to Buy	.252*	.078	.087	.062	-.003
H28: Relationship → Product Evaluations	n/a	.037	.093*	.073	.104*
H29: Relationship → Willingness to Buy	n/a	.047	.073	-.044	.035
H30: Product Evaluations → Willingness to Buy	.504 _a ***	.719 _b ***	.695 _c ***	.710 _d ***	.685 _e ***
Positive Significant Relationships	7/12	6/15	8/15	7/15	6/15

C = Canada, U = United States, M = Mexico, Ch = Chile, A = Argentina
 * - p<.10 ** - p<.05 *** - p<.001
 letters in the columns indicate a significant difference between countries
 - same letter suggests no difference
 - different letter suggests significant difference

H16. Country Description → Country Evaluation. This hypothesis was not supported for any of the retail buyer models. Country Description was not related to Country Evaluation for any of the countries. This suggests that when making country evaluations, Canadian retail buyers do not take into account descriptive country factors such as individual rights and freedoms, political stability, environmental/pollution controls, quality of life, and role in world politics.

ANOVA was not performed since none of the models had significant paths.

H17. People Description → Country Evaluation. People Description was positive and significantly related to Country Evaluation for all five study countries, supporting this hypothesis. When making judgements about the likeability of the people from a country or the country's alignment with Canada, Canadian retail buyers consider factors which describe the people from the country being evaluated but not aspects of the country itself.

ANOVA yielded significant differences among the five countries ($p < .001$). Scheffé post hoc comparisons of the countries indicate similarities between Canada and Chile as well as Canada and Mexico. Significant differences were found for all other pairwise comparisons ($p < .05$). The relationship between People Description and Country Evaluation was strongest for Mexico, followed by Canada, the United States, Chile, and Argentina.

H18. Country Competence → Country Evaluation. This hypothesis was not supported for any of the five countries. The ability of a country to make products does not affect retail buyers evaluation of that country.

ANOVA was not performed since no paths were significant in the models.

H19. People Competence → Country Evaluation. People Competence was not significantly related to Country Evaluation for any of the models. Similar to the general ability of a country to make products, the ability of the people does not affect the evaluation of that country.

Again, ANOVA was not performed since no paths were significant for the models.

H20. Country Competence → Product Beliefs. This hypothesis was supported for the United States, Chile, and Argentina but not Canada and Mexico. Country Competence is positively related to product beliefs. This suggests that beliefs about a country's ability to produce products affects product beliefs for the United States, Chile, and Argentina.

Significant differences were found through ANOVA for the three countries ($p < .001$). Post hoc paired comparisons reveal significant differences between each combination of countries. The relationship between Country Competence and Product Beliefs is greatest for Argentina, followed by Chile and the United States.

H21. People Competence → Product Beliefs. People Competence had a significant positive effect on Product Beliefs for Canada, the United States, Mexico, and Chile. So, the perceived ability of the people to produce products

will positively affect product beliefs for these countries. For Argentina, it is just the Country Competence that affects Product Beliefs.

ANOVA yielded significant differences among the four countries ($p < .001$).

Scheffé post hoc paired comparisons reveal significant differences between each combination of countries. The relationship between People Competence and Product Beliefs is strongest for Mexico, followed by Canada, Chile, and the United States.

H22. Country Evaluations → Relationship. The relationship between Country Evaluation and desired Relationship was found to be significant and positive for the four applicable countries. The likeability of the people and the perceived alignment with Canada is a determinant of the desired relationship with a given country. Overall, retail buyers are interested in closer relationships with these countries.

ANOVA yielded significant differences overall ($p < .001$). Post hoc comparisons revealed two similarities: Chile and Mexico, United States and Argentina. All other post hoc comparisons yielded significant differences ($p < .05$). The relationship between Country Evaluation and Relationship is strongest for Chile, followed by Mexico, the United States, and Argentina.

H23. Country Evaluation → Product Evaluations. The link between Country Evaluation and Product Evaluation is not significant for any of the countries. ANOVA was not conducted since no significant paths existed.

H24. Product Beliefs → Product Evaluations. Product Beliefs are significantly and positively related to Product Evaluations for all five countries. So, for all countries, beliefs about products affects retailers' product evaluations. This corresponds with findings obtained from the consumer models.

Significant differences were found through ANOVA for the five countries ($p < .001$). Post hoc paired comparisons reveal significant differences between each combination of countries. The relationship between Product Beliefs and Product Evaluations is strongest for the United States, followed by Mexico, Chile, Argentina, and Canada.

H25. Familiarity → Product Beliefs. This hypothesis is supported for Canada and Mexico, but not the United States, Chile and Argentina. Knowledge of products and ease of finding them participate in the formation of product beliefs. So, if knowledge of products is very low, as it is for Chile and Argentina, or very high as in the U.S., it may not affect Product Beliefs.

ANOVA results suggest a significant differences between Canada and Mexico ($p < .001$). The relationship between Familiarity and Product Beliefs is stronger for Canada than for Mexico.

H26. Familiarity → Product Evaluations. The link between Familiarity and Product Evaluations is significant and positive for Canada, Mexico, and Chile. The more familiar the country, the higher the evaluation of its products. For the other two countries, there is no significant relationship between these two constructs.

ANOVA results suggest a significant differences among the three countries ($p < .002$). Scheffé post hoc comparisons indicate significant differences between Mexico and Chile as well as between Mexico and Canada. The relationship between Familiarity and Product Evaluations is strongest for Canada, followed by Chile and Mexico.

H27. Familiarity → Willingness to Buy. This hypothesis was supported for Canada but not the other models. Familiarity with Canadian products affects the willingness to buy Canadian products. This suggests a domestic bias in favour of Canadian products.

ANOVA was not performed since just one significant path existed.

H28. Relationship → Product Evaluations. This hypothesis was supported for Mexico and Argentina. The desired relationship with these countries affects the evaluation of Mexican and Argentinean products.

ANOVA did not yield significant differences between the two countries. The paths do not differ.

H29. Relationship → Willingness to Buy. This hypothesis was not supported. The desired relationship with a country does not affect the willingness to buy their products for any of the four applicable country models.

ANOVA was not performed since there were no significant paths for comparison.

H30. Product Evaluations → Willingness to Buy. Product Evaluations had a significant positive effect on Willingness to Buy for all five countries. Regardless of the country, higher product evaluations lead to a stronger willingness to buy.

ANOVA yielded significant differences for the five countries ($p < .001$). Scheffé post hoc paired comparisons reveal significant differences between each combination of countries. The relationship between Product Evaluation and Willingness to Buy is strongest for the United States, followed by Chile, Mexico, Argentina, and Canada.

Summary of Models of Retail Buyer PCI Effects

Canada

Although fewer significant paths exist between country image constructs to product constructs compared to the consumer model, there is at least one construct representing the country image domain (People Competence) which links to at least one construct from the product choice domain (Product Beliefs). (See Figure 8) Overall, seven of the twelve paths are significant.

Figure 8: Canadian Retail Buyers Views of Canada

Only one construct, People Description leads to Country Evaluation. Country Evaluation, however, does not lead to product evaluations as hypothesized.

Thus, the model has been divided into two distinct parts. The second part deals with the ability of a country to make products and the subsequent product constructs. People Competence and Familiarity both play a role in the formation of Product Beliefs. Product Beliefs and Familiarity lead to the evaluation of products and subsequently to the willingness to buy products from Canada. Similar to the consumer model, Familiarity with Canadian products also leads to the Willingness to Buy Canadian products.

Similar to the consumer model, the retail buyer model suggests a halo effect (Han, 1989) which is not dependent on the country knowledge. For Canada, country knowledge has a mean of 6.34. People Competence (Country Image) is positively related to Product Beliefs and subsequent Evaluations (Brand Attitude).

United States

Figure 9 illustrates the resulting model for the United States. Overall, six of the fifteen proposed paths are significant. Similar to the Canadian model, the U.S. model is separated into two parts but maintaining a link between the country and product domains. The first part suggests that retail buyers evaluate the United States based on descriptive qualities of the people. This evaluation, likeability of the people and perceived alignment with Canada, determines the desired relationship with the United States. In the second part, it is the competence of the country and the people that lead to Product Beliefs. Beliefs about American

products lead to the evaluation of and the willingness to buy American products.

Familiarity with American products does not contribute to the model.

Similar to the consumer model, the retail buyer model suggests a halo effect (Han, 1989) which is not dependent on the country knowledge. For the United States, country knowledge has a mean = 5.78. Country and People Competence (Country Image) is positively related to Product Beliefs and subsequent Evaluations (Brand Attitude).

Figure 10: Canadian Retail Buyers' Models of PCI Effects for the United States

Mexico

For the Mexican model, the country and product domains are linked by two sets of constructs, People Competence and Product Beliefs, and Relationship and Product Evaluations (See Figure 10). The descriptive qualities of the people lead to the evaluation of the country. Country Evaluation is subsequently related to retail buyers' desired relationship with Mexico. The ability of Mexicans to make products and retail buyers familiarity with Mexican products lead to the formation of Product Beliefs. These beliefs, accompanied by a desired Relationship with Mexico and Familiarity with their products contribute to Product Evaluations and subsequent Willingness to Buy. So, the desired business Relationship with Mexico, indirectly affects the Willingness to Buy Mexican products. Overall, eight of the fifteen paths are significant.

Similar to the findings from the consumer model for Mexico, a halo effect emerges. Retail buyers use the image of the country (People Competence) to form Product Beliefs and subsequent Product Evaluations. People Description leads to Country Evaluation and subsequently to desired Relationship which also affects Product Evaluations. This is done on the basis of little knowledge of Mexico (mean = 3.48).

Figure 10: Canadian Retail Buyers' Model of PCI Effects for Mexico

Chile

The Chilean model appears similar to the Canadian and American retail buyer models and is separated into two models, one ending with the Willingness to Buy and the other with the desired Relationship. (See Figure 11) The descriptive aspects of the Chilean people lead to the likeability of the people and perceived alignment with Canada. These evaluations lead to retail buyers desired Relationship with Chile. Both Country and People Competence are related to the formation of Product Beliefs. These beliefs, along with retail buyers' Familiarity with Chilean products induce Product Evaluations. Product Evaluations then

determine retail buyers Willingness to Buy products from Chile. So, seven of the fifteen paths are significant.

Again, this models suggests the existence of a halo effect. Retail buyers are forming product beliefs based on the image of the country (Country and People Competence). Following the criteria set out by Han (1989), retail buyers have very little knowledge of Chile (mean = 2.46).

Figure 11: Canadian Retail Buyers' Model of PCI Effects for Chile

Argentina

Figure 12 illustrates the resulting model for Argentina. The description of the people leads to the evaluation of the country. This country evaluation is related to the desired relationship with Argentina. Product Evaluations emerge from the desire to do business with Argentina. The perceived ability of Argentina to produce products leads to the formation of Product Beliefs. These beliefs are related to how retail buyers evaluate products from Argentina which consequently leads to their willingness to buy Argentinean products. Product Familiarity, as in the case of the United States, does not play a part in the model. So, six of the fifteen proposed paths are significant for the Argentina retail buyer model.

Figure 12: Canadian Retail Buyers' Model of PCI Effects for Argentina

A halo effect is apparent in the model for Argentina. Retail buyers are using a country image (Country Competence) to form product beliefs and subsequent Product Evaluations. This is done based on very little knowledge of Argentina (mean = 2.46).

7.0 COMPARISON OF CONSUMERS' AND RETAIL BUYERS' MODELS

This chapter looks at the similarities and differences between consumers' and retail buyers' models for each of the five countries. Multivariate analysis of variance and corresponding univariate F-tests were used to identify any significant differences in path coefficients (Appendix Q) and variable loadings in the measurement models (Appendix R).

7.1 Canada

When comparing the resulting models for Canadian consumers and retail buyers, six of the twelve possible paths are significant for both groups: People Description → Country Evaluation, People Competence → Product Beliefs, Product Beliefs → Product Evaluations, Familiarity → Product Beliefs, Familiarity → Willingness to Buy, and Product Evaluation → Willingness to Buy (See Figure 13). Three paths are significant for just consumers, People Competence → Country Evaluation, Country Competence → Product Beliefs, and Country Evaluation → Product Evaluation. Just one path, Familiarity → Product Evaluations was only significant for retail buyers. Of the twelve paths proposed for both consumers and retail buyers, just two were not significant for either group, Country Description → Country Evaluation and Country Competence → Country Evaluation.

Figure 13 - A Comparison of Canadian Consumers' and Retail Buyers' Models of PCI Effects for Canada

The Canadian models for both consumers and retail buyers are quite similar, however, the strength of association differed significantly on all applicable paths. This suggests the relationship among the constructs is not the same for Canadian consumers and retail buyers. They are not using the same criteria in forming their beliefs and making buying decisions. Consumers work more at the front end and exhibit more patriotism while retail buyers are more concerned with competence and familiarity. Table 7.1 indicates the path coefficients for both

consumers and retail buyers and the significance of the ANOVA results for Canada.

Table 7.1: Comparison of Consumers and Retail Buyers - Canada

Paths	Consumers Path Coefficients	Retail Buyers Path Coefficients	Prob. Sig. difference
Country Description → Country Evaluation	.143	.031	.001
People Description → Country Evaluation	.482***	.641***	.001
Country Competence → Country Evaluation	-.097	-.169	.001
People Competence → Country Evaluation	.246**	.200	.001
Country Competence → Product Beliefs	.183**	.040	.001
People Competence → Product Beliefs	.308***	.361**	.001
Country Evaluations → Relationship	n/a	n/a	
Country Evaluations → Product Evaluations	.176**	.170	.012
Product Beliefs → Product Evaluations	.716***	.606***	.001
Familiarity → Product Beliefs	.264**	.413***	.001
Familiarity → Product Evaluations	.050	.196**	.001
Familiarity → Willingness to Buy	.155**	.252*	.001
Relationship → Product Evaluations	n/a	n/a	
Relationship → Willingness to Buy	n/a	n/a	
Product Evaluations → Willingness to Buy	.683***	.504***	.001
	9/12	7/12	

* - p<.10

** - p<.05

*** - p<.001

The loadings for all variables in the measurement models differed significantly for consumers and retail buyers (See Appendix T).

7.2 United States

Similar to Canada's models, the models for the United States for both consumers and retail buyers had six paths that were significant for both groups. These include, People Description → Country Evaluation, Country Evaluation → Relationship, Country Competence → Product Beliefs, People Competence → Product Beliefs, Product Beliefs → Product Evaluations, and Product Evaluation

→ Willingness to Buy. (See Figure 14) Five paths are significant for just consumers: Country Description → Country Evaluation, Relationship → Product Evaluation, Familiarity → Product Beliefs, Familiarity → Product Evaluation, Familiarity → Willingness to Buy. Note that Familiarity with products plays a strong role for consumers but does not play a significant role for retail buyers. No paths were found to be significant for just retail buyers. Of the fifteen proposed paths, only four paths were not significant to the models of either group: Country Competence → Country Evaluation, People Competence → Country Evaluation, Country Evaluation → Product Evaluation, and Relationship → Willingness to Buy.

Figure 14 - A Comparison of Canadian Consumers' and Retail Buyers' Models of PCI Effects for the United States

Canadian consumer and retail buyer models for the United States differed significantly ($p < .05$) on all but four paths. The relationships are similar between People Description → Country Evaluation, Country Competence → Country Evaluation, Familiarity → Product Beliefs, and Familiarity → Willingness to Buy for consumers and retail buyers. The path coefficients and ANOVA significance are summarized in Table 7.2 for the United States.

Table 7.2: Comparison of Consumers and Retail Buyers - United States

Paths	Consumers Path Coefficients	Retail Buyers Path Coefficients	Prob. Sig. difference
Country Description → Country Evaluation	.197**	.157	.001
People Description → Country Evaluation	.517***	.513**	.240
Country Competence → Country Evaluation	-.063	-.059	.403
People Competence → Country Evaluation	.140	.185	.007
Country Competence → Product Beliefs	.197*	.303**	.001
People Competence → Product Beliefs	.278**	.223*	.001
Country Evaluations → Relationship	.430***	.365**	.001
Country Evaluations → Product Evaluations	-.000	.034	.001
Product Beliefs → Product Evaluations	.790***	.816***	.001
Familiarity → Product Beliefs	.344**	.172	.801
Familiarity → Product Evaluations	-.033**	.048	.001
Familiarity → Willingness to Buy	.160**	.078	.805
Relationship → Product Evaluations	.141**	.037	.001
Relationship → Willingness to Buy	.029	.047	.001
Product Evaluations → Willingness to Buy	.645***	.719***	.001
	10/15	6/15	

* - $p < .10$ ** - $p < .05$ *** - $p < .001$

Univariate F-tests identified similar variable loadings from the consumer and retail buyer measurement models for five variables: individualism, industriousness, work ethic, likeability of the people, and ease of finding products. The remaining variable loadings significantly differed between the consumer and retail buyer models.

7.3 Mexico

When comparing the resulting models of Mexico for consumers and retail buyers, six of the fifteen proposed paths are significant for both groups. These include, Product Description → Country Evaluation, People Competence → Product Beliefs, Product Beliefs → Product Evaluations, Relationship → Product Evaluations, Familiarity → Product Evaluations, and Product Evaluations → Willingness to Buy. (See Figure 15) Two paths, Country Competence → Product Beliefs and Relationship → Willingness to Buy are significant for just consumers, while Country Evaluation → Relationship and Familiarity → Product Beliefs are significant for just retail buyers. Five paths are not significant to either model including Country Description → Country Evaluation, Country Competence → Country Evaluation, People Competence → Country Evaluation, Country Evaluation → Product Evaluation, and Familiarity → Willingness to Buy. Note that for both consumers and retail buyers, just the descriptive qualities of the Mexican people lead to their likeability and perceived alignment with Canada.

Figure 15 - A Comparison of Canadian Consumers' and Retail Buyers' Models of PCI Effects for Mexico

The Mexican models for both consumers and retail buyers significantly differed on all paths. This suggests that the relationship among the constructs is not the same for Canadian consumers and retail buyers. The consumer and retail buyer path coefficients and the significance of the ANOVA is summarized in Table 7.3 for Mexico.

Table 7.3: Comparison of Consumers and Retail Buyers - Mexico

Paths	Consumers Path Coefficients	Retail Buyers Path Coefficients	Prob. Sig. difference
Country Description → Country Evaluation	.176	.036	.001
People Description → Country Evaluation	.508**	.674***	.001
Country Competence → Country Evaluation	-.138	-.077	.001
People Competence → Country Evaluation	.220	.105	.001
Country Competence → Product Beliefs	.190**	.131	.001
People Competence → Product Beliefs	.335**	.459***	.001
Country Evaluations → Relationship	.507	.541***	.029
Country Evaluations → Product Evaluations	.063	-.065	.001
Product Beliefs → Product Evaluations	.762**	.729***	.001
Familiarity → Product Beliefs	.190	.285**	.001
Familiarity → Product Evaluations	.096*	.165*	.001
Familiarity → Willingness to Buy	.027	.087	.001
Relationship → Product Evaluations	.115**	.093*	.001
Relationship → Willingness to Buy	.108*	.073	.001
Product Evaluations → Willingness to Buy	.676**	.695***	.001
	6/15	8/15	

* - $p < .10$

** - $p < .05$

*** - $p < .001$

Univariate F-tests identified nine variables which did not differ between consumers and retail buyers on their loadings. These include political stability, quality of life, role in world politics, environmental/pollution controls, individual rights and freedoms, trustworthiness, individualism, friendliness, and likeability of the people. This suggests that the Country Description and People Description constructs are similar for both consumers and retail buyers views of Mexico.

7.4 Chile

When comparing the consumer and retail buyer models for Chile, five pathways emerged as being significant for both groups: People Description → Country Evaluation, Country Evaluation → Relationship, People Competence → Product Beliefs, Product Beliefs → Product Evaluations, and Product Evaluations → Willingness to Buy. (See Figure 16) Four paths are significant for just the consumer model including, People Competence → Country Evaluation, Country Competence → Product Beliefs, Familiarity → Product Beliefs, and Relationship → Product Evaluation. Just one pathway, Familiarity → Product Evaluation is significant for retail buyers only. Note that the Familiarity construct feeds into the model differently for consumers and retail buyers. For consumers, Familiarity leads to Product Beliefs, while for retail buyers, Familiarity leads directly to Product Evaluations. Five paths were not significant to either group. These include Country Description → Country Evaluation, Country Competence → Country Evaluation, Country Evaluation → Product Evaluation, Relationship → Willingness to Buy, and Familiarity → Willingness to Buy.

Figure 16 - A Comparison of Canadian Consumers' and Retail Buyers' Models of PCI Effects for Chile

The consumer and retail buyer models for Chile significantly differed on all paths. This suggests that the relationships among the constructs differs for Canadian consumers and retail buyers. The path coefficients for consumers and retail buyers are summarized in Table 7.4 accompanied by the significance of the ANOVA results.

Table 7.4: Comparison of Consumers and Retail Buyers - Chile

Paths	Consumers Path Coefficients	Retail Buyers Path Coefficients	Prob. Sig. difference
Country Description → Country Evaluation	.176	.177	.003
People Description → Country Evaluation	.454***	.512**	.001
Country Competence → Country Evaluation	.038	-.006	.001
People Competence → Country Evaluation	.249**	.129	.001
Country Competence → Product Beliefs	.234**	.364**	.001
People Competence → Product Beliefs	.321**	.242**	.001
Country Evaluations → Relationship	.554**	.570***	.001
Country Evaluations → Product Evaluations	.004	.085	.001
Product Beliefs → Product Evaluations	.786***	.696***	.001
Familiarity → Product Beliefs	.313***	.148	.001
Familiarity → Product Evaluations	.043	.203**	.001
Familiarity → Willingness to Buy	.051	.062	.001
Relationship → Product Evaluations	.137**	.073	.001
Relationship → Willingness to Buy	.105	-.044	.001
Product Evaluations → Willingness to Buy	.701***	.710***	.001
	9/15	7/15	

* - $p < .10$

** - $p < .05$

*** - $p < .001$

Univariate F-tests identified just two variables in the measurement model whose loadings do not differ across consumers and retail buyers: stability of economy and political and economic ties. All other variable loadings are significantly different ($p < .05$).

7.5 Argentina

For Argentina, six of the fifteen pathways emerge as significant for both consumers and retail buyers when comparing the resulting models. These include, People Description → Country Evaluation, Country Evaluation → Relationship, Relationship → Product Evaluation, Country Competence → Product Beliefs, Product Beliefs → Product Evaluations, and Product Evaluations → Willingness to Buy. (See Figure 17) An additional six pathways are

significant for just the consumer model including Country Description → Country Evaluation, Country Competence → Country Evaluation, People Competence → Country Evaluation, People Competence → Product Beliefs, Familiarity → Product Beliefs, and Familiarity → Product Evaluations. No paths are significant in the retail buyer model that were not significant in the consumer model. Just three paths are not significant in either model: Country Evaluation → Product Evaluation, Relationship → Willingness to Buy, and Familiarity → Willingness to Buy.

Figure 17 - A Comparison of Canadian Consumers' and Retail Buyers' Models of PCI Effects for Argentina

Both the consumers and retail buyer models significantly differed on all paths for Argentina. This suggests that the relationship among constructs is not the same for Canadian consumers and retail buyers. Table 7.5 summarizes the path coefficients for both consumers and retail buyers and the significance of the ANOVA results.

Table 7.5: Comparison of Consumers and Retail Buyers - Argentina

Paths	Consumers Path Coefficients	Retail Buyers Path Coefficients	Sig.
Country Description → Country Evaluation	.352**	.258	.017
People Description → Country Evaluation	.401***	.495**	.001
Country Competence → Country Evaluation	-.232**	-.081	.001
People Competence → Country Evaluation	.324**	.126	.001
Country Competence → Product Beliefs	.236**	.562***	.001
People Competence → Product Beliefs	.293**	.081	.001
Country Evaluations → Relationship	.496***	.411***	.001
Country Evaluations → Product Evaluations	-.020	.135	.001
Product Beliefs → Product Evaluations	.776***	.685***	.001
Familiarity → Product Beliefs	.313*	.115	.001
Familiarity → Product Evaluations	.049*	.115	.001
Familiarity → Willingness to Buy	.024	-.003	.001
Relationship → Product Evaluations	.126**	.104*	.001
Relationship → Willingness to Buy	.075	.035	.001
Product Evaluations → Willingness to Buy	.652***	.685***	.001
	11/15	6/15	

* - $p < .10$

** - $p < .05$

*** - $p < .001$

Just four variables from the measurement models were identified through univariate F-tests as having similar loadings across consumers and retail buyers: work ethic, political and economic ties, immigration from, investment in, and imports to Argentina. This suggests that the relationship construct is quite similar for the consumer and retail buyer models.

9.0 DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the main findings of the study. The first section of the chapter looks at how consumers view NAFTA and potential NAFTA countries and their products. Demographic impacts on country and product ratings will be examined in the second section. The third section discusses the consumer models which emerged from this research. The fourth section provides a similar discussion for the retail buyer models. Finally, section five will overview the similarities and differences between consumers and retail buyers in their product and country images.

9.1 Views of Countries and Attitudes Towards Products

The main finding of the consumer study was that Canadian consumers see few differences between Mexico, Chile, and Argentina in their people, country, and product views. Mexico is viewed as being a less developed country regardless of its attempts to be considered a newly developed country through its membership in NAFTA. Mexico is seen as more similar to Chile and Argentina and as very dissimilar from Canada and the United States on both country and product items. Where differences exist between Mexico and Chile and Argentina, Mexico is most often rated more positively on the product items but more negatively on the country items. Although Mexico as a country is generally viewed negatively, this does not wholly reflect in consumers' views of their products.

For the most part, Chile and Argentina are not differentiated by consumers. Some differences do exist but these deal mainly with differences in how consumers view the people from Chile and Argentina. Canadian consumers give more favourable ratings of people and country factors to Argentina over those for Chile.

When comparing Canada and the United States, trustworthiness and friendliness, part of the People Description construct, were rated higher for Canada. The U.S. rated higher on Country Competence variables such as wealth, technology level of the country, and stability of the economy. On the product variables, Canada fared better than the U.S. overall, but was however rated significantly lower on innovativeness, technology level, variety, and ease of finding. These findings are supported somewhat in an overview of research which looks at attitudes towards Canada and the United States (Heslop and Wall, 1993). They report that Canadians gave higher ratings to American products with respect to engineering-design and market presence.

9.2 Demographic Impacts On Country And Product Ratings

The main finding of this portion of the study is that Canadians do tend to rate some NAFTA countries and products differently on the basis of gender, age, education, and income. However, more differences are identified when rating the countries than in making product ratings.

Male respondents rated the United States, Mexico, Chile, and Argentina higher than female respondents. However, only the evaluation of products from the United States differed based on gender. Again, male respondents gave a more favourable overall rating. Interestingly, Schooler (1971) found that females gave more favourable foreign country ratings except for Chile where males gave more positive ratings. Schooler's Chilean finding fits with the findings of this study. Country ratings differed for Mexico, Chile, and Argentina, and product ratings for Chile, on the basis of age. For both Mexico and Chile, it was the younger adults who provided higher country ratings. Wall and Heslop (1986) found similar results for ratings of domestic products. On the basis of consumers' education level, the United States, Chile, and Argentina were rated differently on the overall country scale. Those respondents with a university education rate these countries higher than those that do not. On the product ratings, the United States and Chile were rated differently based on consumer education level. For American products, those with a university education rated them higher than those with just some college/university. These findings coincide with the findings of Schooler (1971) and Bennett (1991). Finally, the United States differed on its country rating based on family income. Lower income respondents rated the United States lower overall than middle income respondents. Similarly, on the product ratings, lower income groups rated American products lower than middle income respondents.

To summarize, in general, the most important demographic factors that are related to product and country ratings are gender, age, and education. For the most part, household income is not related to ratings of foreign countries and products.

9.3 Consumer PCI Models

Research results indicate substantial support for the hypothesized model.

Across all consumer models, only five variables were removed from the initial model suggesting the hypothesized measurement model is quite strong. These findings were consistent across the five countries. The structural models were similar on core model (People or Country Competence, Product Beliefs, Product Evaluations, and Willingness to Buy) suggesting the existence of a PCI effect for all countries. Although a few paths were not consistent across the five countries, each model provided positive support for the majority of the hypotheses.

Hypothesis 31, which suggests that the Canadian and American measurement models would differ from those of Mexico, Chile, and Argentina, was not supported. All five measurement models were the same. For Hypothesis 32, regarding the structural models, Canada and the United States were not similar. All five models differed significantly. This suggests that there are not separate models which represents developed and less developed countries.

The Canadian model provided the greatest support with nine of twelve significant paths, followed closely by the Argentinean model with eleven of fifteen significant paths. Mexico proved the most problematic with eight of fifteen significant paths. The most consistent results are found in the portion of the model which evolved from the model developed by Papadopoulos et. al (1988), thus corroborating their findings. Included in this portion are Country and People Competence, Product Beliefs, Product Evaluations, and Willingness to Buy. Figure 18 illustrates the number of models significant on each path. Six paths were significant across all applicable countries including, People Description → Country Evaluation, Country Competence → Product Beliefs, People Competence → Product Beliefs, Product Beliefs → Product Evaluations, Relationship → Product Evaluations, and Product Evaluations → Willingness to Buy. Just one path was not significant for any of the models, Relationship → Willingness to Buy. This suggests that the desired relationship with a country does not directly affect a consumers' willingness to buy their products. However, for all four applicable country models, the Relationship construct indirectly affects Willingness to Buy through Product Evaluations.

Country Evaluation is formed mainly from people beliefs, both descriptive qualities of the people and less often the competence of the people. The Country Description affects Country Evaluation for both the United States and Argentina. With the exception of Mexico, Country Evaluation leads to the desired Relationship for the applicable countries. For Canada and no other

country, Country Evaluation leads directly to Product Evaluations. In general, the descriptive qualities of the people indirectly affect the product domain through the Country Evaluation and Relationship constructs.

Figure 18 - Amalgamated Consumer Model - Significant Paths

Familiarity plays a role in all five consumer models but its role differs across the five countries. This suggests that the level of Familiarity may influence when it will affect the decision making process, during the belief formation, evaluation, or willingness to buy.

With just a few exceptions, the strength of the association between constructs differed for most pairwise country comparisons. Regardless of these differences, the models for consumers are significant on many of the same paths. This suggests that although a “comprehensive” Product /Country Image model has not yet been achieved, a solid core exists.

9.3 Retail Buyer PCI Models

Research results for the retail buyers indicate substantial support for the hypothesized model. Across all retail buyer models, only four variables were removed from the initial model suggesting the hypothesized measurement model is strong. These findings were consistent across the five countries. The structural model was inconsistent across the five countries, however each model provided individual support for several of the hypotheses. The structural models were similar on the core model paths suggesting the existence of a PCI effect for all countries. Although a few paths were not consistent across the five countries, each model provided positive support for most hypotheses with the exception of the United States and Argentina in the retail buyer models where only 6 of 15 paths are significant. Figure 19 illustrates the amalgamation of the retail buyer models indicating the number of countries significant for each path. For retail buyers, four paths are significant for all applicable countries including, People Description to Country Evaluation, Country Evaluation to Relationship, Product Beliefs to Product Evaluations, and Product Evaluations to Willingness to Buy.

Competence (either Country or People) is the only country construct that plays a role in the formation of attitudes toward products for Canada, the United States, and Chile. In addition to Country Competence for Argentina, and People Competence for Mexico, the country and product domains are linked by the Relationship and Product Evaluation constructs. Five of the fifteen paths are not significant for any of the countries. These include, Country Description to Country Evaluation, Country Competence to Country Evaluation, People Competence to Country Evaluation, Country Evaluation to Product Evaluation, and Relationship to Willingness to Buy. Familiarity feeds into the process at some point but not the same point for Canada, Mexico, and Chile. It is not a part of the model for the United States or Argentina.

Similar to the results of the consumer models, Hypothesis 31 and 32 which suggest there will be a difference between the developed countries and less developed on the measurement and structural models were not supported. There is no difference across the five countries on the measurement model and all countries differ on the structural model.

Figure 19 - Amalgamated Retail Buyer Model - Significant Paths

9.5 Country Knowledge

Although not a part of the final models that were tested, country knowledge is a significant factor in understanding the results from modeling. For consumers, knowledge of the study countries differed significantly between all countries except Chile and Argentina which received similar ratings. Canada was rated highest (mean = 6.43) followed by the United States (mean = 5.91), Mexico (mean = 3.48), and Chile and Argentina (means = 2.62 and 2.63 respectively).

Retail buyers' knowledge of the study countries differs significantly for all countries except Chile and Argentina which had low means of 2.46. Similar to ratings given by consumers, Canada was rated highest (mean = 6.34), followed by the United States (mean = 5.78), and Mexico (mean = 3.48) for retail buyers.

Regardless of the level of knowledge, all ten models indicate a halo construct. Contrary to Han's (1989) findings, a halo construct can exist with high levels of knowledge and are not confined to countries that are not well known. So, for all models, the country image leads to the product image, or what is referred to by Han (1989) as the brand attitude.

9.6 Comparison of Consumer and Retail Buyer Models

One of the main findings of this research was the realization that the structure of the Canadian consumers' and retail buyers' models are similar on many aspects. Both consumers and retail buyers use the competence constructs in forming product beliefs. They differ somewhat in their evaluation of the actual countries. Consumers place more emphasis on all types of country variables when making Country Evaluations while retail buyers make Country Evaluations based solely on the descriptive qualities of the people. In general, consumers generally use more stereotyping or country factors when evaluating products than retail buyers.

For four of the five study countries (all but Chile), the consumers' and retail buyers' models had six corresponding significant paths (five for Chile). Across

the countries, the comparisons found three paths that were significant for consumers and retail buyers in all comparisons including, People Description to Country Evaluation, Product Beliefs to Product Evaluations, and Product Evaluations to Willingness to Buy. So, these three paths are consistent across countries and across the two groups of respondents. Two other paths were significant for all but one of the applicable countries. People Competence to Product Beliefs was significant for all but Argentina (only significant in the consumer model) while Country Evaluation to Relationship was significant for all but Mexico (only significant in retail buyer model).

For the three developing countries, Mexico, Chile, and Argentina, the association of Familiarity to Willingness to Buy was not significant for any of their consumer or retail buyer models. This suggests that a purchase decision is not based directly on the Familiarity with products from these countries most probably due to the lack of product knowledge. However, Familiarity affects Willingness to Buy indirectly through Product Beliefs. The Country Description to Country Evaluation link was not significant for the Canadian, Mexican, or Chilean Models. The Country Competence to Country Evaluation link was also problematic. It was significant for Argentina only. The Country Evaluation to Product Evaluation construct was significant for both the consumer and retail buyer models for Canada, however, it was not significant across the remaining countries for both respondent groups. For the other countries, the Country Evaluation to Product Evaluation link is most often indirect through the Relationship construct.

The measurement models for Canadian consumers and retail buyers differ on only one variable: exports. This provides adequate support for Hypothesis 33 which indicates that the consumer and retail buyer measurement models will not differ. The structural models, however, differ across consumers and retail buyers for all five study countries.

9.0 LIMITATIONS

Although every precaution was taken to eliminate potential problems, limitations are inherent in all research studies.

As with all self report measurement instruments, one must rely on the accuracy of the respondent to report their attitudes and perceptions. Respondents may misinterpret certain questions or answer based on what they think to be the socially acceptable answer. To compensate for these anomalies, the respondents are anonymous and know they can not be identified.

The consumer study was conducted in Ottawa-Carleton. This area is metropolitan in nature and the results may not be generalizable to the population of Canada as a whole. On the other hand, since most of Canada's population is in metropolitan regions, the sample demographics should be quite close to the population demographics.

The retail buyer questionnaire was lengthy which may have contributed to low response rates on many questions. This led to the elimination of respondents who did not address at least 90 percent of the questions. It is possible that those respondents that were dropped from the data analysis, were respondents with little knowledge of NAFTA and potential NAFTA countries. As a result, less stereotyping may be reported which is often used in the place of knowledge. So,

ratings will be given mainly by those with some knowledge which is not necessarily representative of the population.

10.0 RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

10.1 Implications for Business Practitioners and Marketers

This research will have several implications for business practitioners and marketers. Since the views of Canadians toward the countries and products of current and potential NAFTA countries have not been previously studied, the results of this study should be of great interest to business people in all of the countries involved in the NAFTA. Based on consumers' and retail buyers' beliefs about a country and its products, the most appropriate way of approaching both consumers and retail buyers with products and services can be devised. Negative beliefs or perceptions can be remedied through product offerings and marketing efforts.

For Canadian businesses, there is still a struggle to compete with American products. Canadian consumers acknowledge more variety for American products compared to Canadian products. American products are seen as being more innovative and of higher technology. Canadian marketers must work at overcoming these images held by consumers. Canadians seem to prefer Canadian-made products over American-made ones but feel it is easier to find the latter. Wall and Heslop (1989), in their study of patriotic appeals, found that Canadian consumer judgements are affected by the made-in Canada appeal. Given this finding, and the findings of this study, patriotic appeals for many product types will be successful.

Mexican, Chilean, and Argentinean marketers must overcome negative country images before gaining acceptance in Canadian markets. Mexico rated extremely low on political stability, quality of life, environment/pollution controls, individualism, wealth, technology level, stability of economy, and education level. Canadians seem to have difficulty identifying with Mexico as something other than a less developed country. These variables contribute to the formation of product beliefs. Before Mexico can successfully produce products for sale in Canada, Canadians must be made aware of the steps that have been taken to become industrialized. Mexicans must first improve internal political and economic stability which should in turn improve the quality of life. The Mexican people need to be perceived as more educated so that technologies emerging from their society will be more acceptable to Canadians.

Similar approaches should be taken by Chilean and Argentinean marketers. Among other variables, low ratings were given to individual rights and freedoms, role in world politics, political and economic stability. Internal country changes must be made before acceptance into Canadian markets. When evaluating the country, Canadians place emphasis on the descriptive aspects of the country for Argentina, therefore, improvement in these areas will indirectly impact product decisions.

One of the main difficulties Mexico, Chile, and Argentina will face, is in making their presence known to Canadians. Canadians are rating products based on

stereotypes or simply because they have not gained experience with the products. Low ratings were given across the three countries for quality, workmanship, reliability, price level, and after sales service. These product beliefs can change with positive exposure to products. One way of increasing exposure may be to offer special promotions to retail buyers in order to get them interested in their products and allow them to become more accessible in the Canadian market.

For all three countries, the desired relationship affects product evaluations. Once the benefits of NAFTA have become evident to Canadian consumers, product evaluations may become more positive.

When marketing to consumers, it is important to realize that they use a wide range of country information when making product evaluations and buying decisions. For all countries, maintaining a positive country image is necessary to successful product introduction. When marketing to retail buyers, it is mainly the competence factors that are used when forming attitudes toward products and/or making buying decisions. For both consumers and retail buyers, the perceived competence of a country and/or its people is the first step in accepting products from a country. A qualified and competent work force, not bargain labour, will greatly improve beliefs held by both consumers and retail buyers. Again, this involves a considerably better educated work force.

Other approaches to improving the image of the work force or the company or country in general include warranties, the use of distinct brand names, and joint ventures. Offering product warranties gives security to the purchaser whether a retail buyer or direct consumer. Warranties suggest that a company, from whatever country, stands behind the work performed by its work force. A strong brand image can overcome negative country images. Bamossy and Papadopoulos (1987) suggested that a strong brand image for innovative and quality products may lead to more positive country images. Ahmed, d'Astous, and Mendez (1995) found that for Latin American countries, as opposed to European countries, the emphasis on brand name may not be sufficient to overcome a negative image. They suggest combining the strong brand image with a warranty and whenever possible, country-of-design information. Finally, a joint venture can benefit and improve the image of a lesser known company if paired with a well-known company that holds a positive image in foreign markets.

One of the key objectives for NAFTA is to increase trade and investment between all countries (Reddy, Buskirk, and Vyas, 1994). Companies wishing to invest in Canada can easily see Canadians' feelings toward further relations with the foreign country. Canadians indicate the desire for increased relations with all countries, except in the areas of immigration and imports from Mexico, Chile, and Argentina. Stronger relationships should, therefore, be in the form of investment in or from and exports to the NAFTA countries. The desired relationship does not directly affect the willingness to buy products from a

country but affects the product evaluations. So, the willingness to buy products from Mexico, Chile, and Argentina is still dependent on factors such as value, overall satisfaction, pride in ownership, and the products' overall rating compared to products from other countries. For the most part, the desired relationship does not affect retail buyers' product evaluations or willingness to buy from the given country. Canadian businesses wishing to transfer their operations to other NAFTA or potential NAFTA countries can see the possible effect this will have on the views of consumers and retail buyers. Products from Mexico, Chile, and Argentina are generally less desirable. Transferring operations to these countries may have a negative impact on product sales. It is important to consider how consumers and retail buyers will react to a product's place of production and whether or not there is a negative country-of-origin effect. Ahmed, d'Astous, and Mendez (1995) suggest that emphasis be placed on the country-of-design, warranty, and brand information to overcome negative country-of-manufacture image.

The views of retail buyers and consumers should be similar in order to meet everyone's needs. The beliefs of consumers help to determine behaviour and/or purchase intentions. Similarly, retail buyers' beliefs are estimates of their behaviour intentions. The importance of knowing how consumers and retail buyers beliefs and purchase intentions differ cannot be stressed enough. This research suggests that consumers and retail buyers form attitudes toward products using different criteria. Consumers are more prone to rely on country

stereotypes than retail buyers. Given this difference, it is difficult for retail buyers, without understanding and being sensitive to consumers reactions, to make effective purchase decisions on behalf of the consumer.

10.2 Implications for Government and Policy Makers

The results from this study can assist government and policy makers by providing them with essential information, enabling them to gauge the effects of NAFTA on international trade. The product and country beliefs measured in the study can be used to estimate the behavioural intentions of Canadian consumers and retail buyers toward products from NAFTA and potential NAFTA countries. Based on the results, foreign governments can assist domestic businesses in their international endeavours.

Governments from Mexico, Chile, and Argentina will harvest more success from NAFTA membership if the negative country image is eliminated. This will take a lot of time and marketing efforts on the part of the governments and business people. Businesses within the countries will benefit by governments' efforts to improve the overall country image and subsequent negative product images. However, businesses must simultaneously be working toward stronger brand images and distinctiveness and not rely on government only to make significant and positive changes. Governments can, however, impose labour laws ensuring qualified labour forces. They can provide subsidized training programs and education to enhance the competency of the current and future work force.

Knowledge of both consumers' and retail buyers' attitudes of current and potential NAFTA countries and their products during the implementation and administration of NAFTA can play an important role in policy making. As Canada works to increase competitiveness within North America, it is essential to have accurate market intelligence on which to base strategies. Both government and business policies can promote effective market presence if the attitudes toward member countries and their products are determined at the retail buyer and consumer level.

10.3 Implications for Market Researchers

This research has looked at Canadians' views of all current and two potential countries in the NAFTA trading bloc and their products. It appears as though Canadian consumers may be confused as to the benefits that the NAFTA brings. Market researchers can use this research to further interpret the effect NAFTA has had on Canadians and more generally, the effect that established trading blocs have on views of countries and their products.

Product and Country Image (PCI) research is further enhanced by the success of the tested model. Future research can refine the model and test its applicability to other countries and situations. The model establishes the existence of a PCI effect for both developed and less developed countries and consumers and retail buyers. It also suggests that a halo effect is possible regardless of the level of knowledge one has of a certain country, as opposed to existing only for countries

of which respondents have little or no knowledge as Han (1989) had originally stipulated.

The retail buyer results are of particular interest to market researchers since research which looks at PCI has not looked at retail buyers specifically. It can also be noted that the consumer and retail buyer models do not differ a great deal. This enhances the limited research which compares the two groups.

References

- Ahmed, Sadrudin A. and Alain d'Astous (1995), "Country-of-Origin Effects in the Context of NAFTA: The Case of Chile", *American Marketing Association*, Winter, 437-443.
- Ahmed, Sadrudin A. and Alain d'Astous (1993), "Cross-national Evaluation of Made-in Concept Using Multiple Cues", *European Journal of Marketing*, 27(7), 39-52.
- 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 Ann E. Crowley (1993), "Country-of-Origin, Perceived Risk and Evaluation Strategy," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 20, 678-683.
- Assael, Henry (1995). *Consumer Behavior and Marketing Action*. Cincinnati, Ohio, South-Western College Publishing, 235-238.
- Bamossy, Gary J. and Nicolas Papadopoulos (1987), "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*, York University, p. k59-k70.
- Bennett, David (1991), *Canadian Consumer Evaluations of European Countries and Their Products*, Unpublished MMS Thesis, Carleton University.
- Bettman, James R. (1979). *An Information Processing Theory of Consumer Choice*. Reading, Mass., Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Bilkey, Warren and Erik Nes (1982), "Country-of-Origin Effects on Product Evaluations," *Journal of International Business Studies*, 8(1) Spring/Summer, 89-99.

- 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.
- Engel, James F., Roger D. Blackwell, and Paul W. Miniard (1993). *Consumer Behavior*. Fort Worth, TX, Dryden Press.
- Ettenson, Richard and Janet Wagner (1986), "Retail Buyers' Saleability Judgements: A Comparison of Information Use Across Three Levels of Experience," *Journal of Retailing*, 6 (1), 41-63.
- Fornell, Claes (1984), "A Second Generation of Multivariate Analysis: Classification of Methods and Implications For Marketing Research," *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.
- Gaedeke, Ralph (1973), "Consumer Attitudes Toward Products "Made-In" Developing Countries," *Journal of Retailing*, 49 (2), 13-24
- Gooding, Elmer R and Mendez, Jose (1992), "The North American Free Trade Agreement", *Arizona Business*, 39(11) November 1992 p. 1-3
- 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.
- Heslop, Louise; Liefeld, John; and Marjorie Wall (1987), "An Experimental Study of the Impact of Country-of-Origin Information", In: Turner R. ed, Marketing, Proceedings of the Administrative Science Association of Canada, Annual Conference, Marketing Division, Toronto. Ontario, 179-185.

- 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.
- Heslop, Louise A. and Marjorie Wall (1993), "Through the Looking Glass: Product-Country Images and International Trade Agreements", in Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise Heslop (eds.), *Product-Country Images: Impact and Role in International Marketing*, Binghamton, NY, International Business Press, 401-432.
- 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, May 14-17, 1-5.
- Hong, Sung-Tai and Robert S. Wyer (1989), "Effects of Country of Origin and Product Attribute Information on Product Evaluation: An Information Processing Perspective", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16 (September), 175-187.
- Hughes, Marie Adele; Price, R. Leon; and Daniel W. Marrs (1986), "Linking Theory Construction and Theory Testing: Models with Multiple Indicators of Latent Variables", *Academy of Management Review*, 11(1), 128-144.
- Jacoby, Jacob, Jerry C. Olson, and Rafael A. Haddock (1971). "Price, Brand Name, and Product Composition Characteristics as Determinants of Perceived Quality", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 55(6), 570-579.
- Johansson, Johnny K. And I.D. Nebenzahl (1987), "Country-of-Origin, Social Norms and Behavioral Intentions," *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*, Summer, 27.
- Kline, Barbara and Wagner, Janet (1994). "Information Sources and Retail Buyer Decision-Making: The Effect of Product-Specific Buying Experience", *Journal of Retailing*, 70(1) p. 75-88.

- Labrie, Marie-Helene, Jan Propeck, and Rolando Arellano (1994). "The Mutual Perceptions of Canadian and Mexican Business People Within the North American Market", In: Marketing, Procedures of the Administrative Science Association of Canada, Annual Conference, Marketing Division, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 48-57.
- Liefeld, John (1993), "Experiments on Country-of-Origin Effects: Review and Meta-Analysis of Effect Size", in Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise Heslop (eds.), *Product-Country Images: Impact and Role in International Marketing*, Binghamton, NY, International Business Press, 117-156.
- Mahaswaran, Durairaj (1994), "Country of Origin as a Stereotype: Effects of Consumer Expertise and Attribute Strength on Product Evaluations". *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21 (September), p. 354-365.
- Nagashima, Akira (1970), "A Comparison of Japanese and U.S. Attitudes Toward Foreign Products," *Journal of Marketing*, 34 (January), 68-74.
- 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.
- Olson, Jerry C. (1977). "Price as an Informational Cue: Effects on Product Evaluations", in Arch G. Woodside, Jagdish N. Sheth, and Peter D. Bennett (eds.), *Consumer and Industrial Buying Behavior*, New York, North-Holland, 267-286.
- Olson, Jerry C. (1978). "Inferential Belief Formation in the Cue Utilization Process", *Advances in Consumer Research*, 5, 706-713.
- 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 (eds.) (1993), "Product-Country Images: Impact and Role in International Marketing", International Business Press, Binghamton, NY.
- Papadopoulos, Nicolas, Louise Heslop, and Gary Bamossy (1993), "A Comparative Image Analysis of Domestic Versus Imported Products," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 7, 283-294.

- Papadopoulos, Nicolas, Louise Heslop, and David Bennett (1992). "National Image Correlates of Product Stereotypes: A Study of Attitudes Towards East European Countries", in Marketing, Procedures of the Administrative Science Association of Canada, Annual Conference, Marketing Division.
- 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.
- Reddy, Allan C., Bruce D. Buskirk, and Niren M. Vyas (1994). "NAFTA: A Global Marketing Perspective", *Journal of International Marketing*, 2(2), p. 3-9.
- 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.
- Schooler, Robert D. (1971). "Bias Phenomena Attendant to the Marketing of Foreign Goods in the U.S.", *Journal of International Business Studies*, 2 (Spring), 71-80.
- Sheth, Jagdish (1973), "A Model of Industrial Buyer Behavior," *Journal of Marketing*, 37 (4), 50-56.
- Stevens, James (1992). *Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences: Second Edition.*, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Taylor, Ruth A. Lesher(1984), "Do Retail Buyers Short-Circuit Profit-Making Items in the Apparel Industry," in Michael R. Solomon (ed.), *The Psychology of Fashion*, Lexington Books, 143-153.
- 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", In: Marketing, Procedures of the Administrative Science Association of Canada, Annual Conference, Marketing Division, Toronto, Ontario, 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.
- 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.
- Zeithaml, Valerie A. (1988), "Consumers Perceptions of Price, Quality, and Value: A Means-End Model and Synthesis of Evidence", *Journal of Marketing*, 52, (July), 2-22.

Appendix A: Consumer Survey

INTERNATIONAL TRADE: THE QUALITY OF PRODUCTS FROM FOREIGN NATIONS

Dear Respondent,

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

The purpose of this study is to understand the views of consumers about products made in various countries. This study is funded by a grant from the federal government to study Canadian Global Competitiveness. Specifically, we are interested in how you view products from current NAFTA countries and possible future ones. The five countries are Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, and United States. This information is important to many groups including businesses, marketers, and consumers. Results of the study will be distributed to government and industry policy makers.

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

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

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

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

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

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 item on the left,

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

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

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

IMPORTANT NOTES

- Please put your "X" marks in the middle of the spaces 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 products made in Argentina:

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

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

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

How would you describe products made in Canada:

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

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

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

How would you describe products made in Chile:

Quality	Low	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	High
Value	Low	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	High
Workmanship	Poor	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	Good
Defects in merchandise	Low	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	High
Attractiveness	Low	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	High
Innovativeness	Low	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	High
Variety	Low	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	High
Brand names	Well-known	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	Unknown
Price level	Low	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	High
Durability	Low	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	High
Technology level	Low	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	High
Reliability	Low	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	High
Your knowledge of Chilean products	Low	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	High
Overall satisfaction	Low	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	High
Ease of finding	Difficult	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	Easy
Willing to Buy	Never	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	Always
Proud to Own	Never	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	Always
After Sales Service	Poor	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	Good

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

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

How would you describe products made in Mexico?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section II. Countries and Their People

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

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

How would you describe the country and people of Argentina?

Likeability of people	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Industriousness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Education level	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Wealth	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Rich
Friendliness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Trustworthiness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Work ethic	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Individualism	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Political stability of country	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Technology level of country	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Stability of economy	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Quality of life	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Role in World politics	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good
Environmental/pollution controls	Few	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Many
Individual Rights and Freedoms	Few	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Many
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
Investments in Argentina	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Investments from Argentina	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Exports to Argentina	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Imports from Argentina	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More

How would you describe the country and people of Canada?

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

How would you describe the country and people of Chile?

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

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

Political and Economic Ties	Less	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	More
Immigration from Chile	Less	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	More
Investments in Chile	Less	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	More
Investments from Chile	Less	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	More
Exports to Chile	Less	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	More
Imports from Chile	Less	:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:_:	More

How would you describe the country and people of Mexico?

Likeability of people	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Industriousness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Education level	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Wealth	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Rich
Friendliness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Trustworthiness	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Work ethic	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Individualism	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Political stability of country	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Technology level of country	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Stability of economy	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Quality of life	Low	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	High
Role in World politics	Poor	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Good
Environmental/pollution controls	Few	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Many
Individual Rights and Freedoms	Few	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	Many
Alignment with 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
Investments in Mexico	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Investments from Mexico	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Exports to Mexico	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Imports from Mexico	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More

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

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

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
Investments in the U.S.A.	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Investments from the U.S.A.	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Exports to the U.S.A.	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More
Imports from the U.S.A.	Less	: _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ :	More

Background Information:

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

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

1. Are you male _____ or female _____ ?

2. In which bracket is your age?

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

3. What is the highest educational level you attained?

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

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

Under \$20,000	_____	\$50,000-\$59,999	_____
\$20,000-\$29,999	_____	\$60,000-\$69,999	_____
\$30,000-\$39,999	_____	\$70,000-\$79,999	_____
\$40,000-\$49,999	_____	\$80,000 and over	_____

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

Your contribution to this effort is very greatly appreciated.

THANK YOU!

Appendix B: Retail Buyer Survey

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,

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

**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.

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.**

[illegible][illegible]

How would you describe the country and people of Canada?

Likeability of people	Low	_____	High
Industriousness	Low	_____	High
Education level	Low	_____	High
Wealth	Poor	_____	Rich
Friendliness	Low	_____	High
Trustworthiness	Low	_____	High
Work ethic	Low	_____	High
Individualism	Low	_____	High
Political stability of country	Low	_____	High
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
Your knowledge of Canada	Low	_____	High

How would you describe the country and people of Chile?

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

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
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 the U.S.A.	Low		High

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:

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

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 / Yarn / 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	_____ %
Other _____	_____ %
TOTAL	100 %

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

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

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!

Appendix C: Doubly Multivariate Analysis of Variance - Country Profiles

OVERALL

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

AVERAGED Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 4, M = 5 1/2, N = 561 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	1.70297	52.26707	64.00	4512.00	.000
Hotellings	10.17241	178.57357	64.00	4494.00	.000
Wilks	.03561	92.54368	64.00	4406.45	.000
Roys	.89702				

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (4,1140) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	295.50070	1224.09930	73.87517	1.07377	68.79973	.000
INDUS	786.22098	1216.97902	196.55524	1.06753	184.12230	.000
EDUC	2291.26853	1100.73147	572.81713	.96555	593.25235	.000
WEALTH	2467.11469	1004.08531	616.77867	.88078	700.26687	.000
FRIEND	177.82238	1224.57762	44.45559	1.07419	41.38519	.000
TRUST	594.69231	1105.70769	148.67308	.96992	153.28401	.000
WETHIC	559.69650	1351.90350	139.92413	1.18588	117.99178	.000
INDIV	1157.08392	1386.91608	289.27098	1.21659	237.77135	.000
POLIT	2396.29091	1496.90909	599.07273	1.31308	456.23539	.000
TECHC	3743.90909	956.49091	935.97727	.83903	1115.55069	.000
STAB	2291.59161	1283.60839	572.89790	1.12597	508.80285	.000
LIFE	2999.00280	1082.59720	749.75070	.94965	789.50490	.000
ROLE	3827.95524	1131.24476	956.98881	.99232	964.39541	.000
ENVIRO	2791.26993	1153.13007	697.81748	1.01152	689.87181	.000
RIGHTS	4161.37483	1007.42517	1040.34371	.88371	1177.25053	.000
KNOWC	3849.60140	899.19860	962.40035	.78877	1220.12690	.000

Canada vs. United States

* * * * * 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 = 7 , N = 139 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.75121	53.02920	16.00	281.00	.000
Hotellings	3.01946	53.02920	16.00	281.00	.000
Wilks	.24879	53.02920	16.00	281.00	.000
Roys	.75121				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,296) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	117.33333	330.66667	117.33333	1.11712	105.03226	.000
INDUS	4.55219	198.44781	4.55219	.67043	6.78994	.010
EDUC	25.88552	191.11448	25.88552	.64566	40.09175	.000
WEALTH	38.89562	187.10438	38.89562	.63211	61.53306	.000
FRIEND	29.33333	383.66667	29.33333	1.29617	22.63076	.000
TRUST	122.72727	244.27273	122.72727	.82525	148.71604	.000
WETHIC	4.72896	257.77104	4.72896	.87085	5.43029	.020
INDIV	9.21886	355.78114	9.21886	1.20196	7.66983	.006
POLIT	136.74242	373.75758	136.74242	1.26269	108.29415	.000
TEHC	27.15320	128.34680	27.15320	.43360	62.62210	.000
STAB	165.98653	273.01347	165.98653	.92234	179.96187	.000
LIFE	40.96970	222.03030	40.96970	.75010	54.61881	.000
ROLE	199.21886	337.78114	199.21886	1.14115	174.57689	.000
ENVIRO	64.01515	265.48485	64.01515	.89691	71.37313	.000
RIGHTS	6.47138	170.52862	6.47138	.57611	11.23289	.001
KNOWC	40.44613	131.05387	40.44613	.44275	91.35216	.000

Canada vs. Mexico

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 7 , N = 139 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.91978	201.37635	16.00	281.00	.000
Hottellings	11.46627	201.37635	16.00	281.00	.000
Wilks	.08022	201.37635	16.00	281.00	.000
Rois	.91978				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,296) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	182.22391	377.27609	182.22391	1.27458	142.96765	.000
INDUS	354.68182	397.81818	354.68182	1.34398	263.90402	.000
EDUC	1348.52694	273.97306	1348.52694	.92558	1456.94605	.000
WEALTH	1104.54545	272.45455	1104.54545	.92045	1200.00000	.000
FRIEND	118.22391	361.27609	118.22391	1.22053	96.86297	.000
TRUST	507.40909	383.09091	507.40909	1.29423	392.05600	.000
WETHIC	356.22896	574.77104	356.22896	1.94179	183.45352	.000
INDIV	507.40909	467.09091	507.40909	1.57801	321.55002	.000
POLIT	676.69360	567.30640	676.69360	1.91658	353.07430	.000
TECHC	1478.06229	320.43771	1478.06229	1.08256	1365.34004	.000
STAB	689.56229	462.43771	689.56229	1.56229	441.37931	.000
LIFE	1803.40909	327.09091	1803.40909	1.10504	1631.98999	.000
ROLE	952.02694	404.97306	952.02694	1.36815	695.84868	.000
ENVIRO	1696.99663	406.00337	1696.99663	1.37163	1237.20896	.000
RIGHTS	1824.37879	318.12121	1824.37879	1.07473	1697.51686	.000
KNOWC	1291.87879	311.12121	1291.87879	1.05109	1229.09048	.000

Canada vs. Chile

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 7, N = 137 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.89958	155.08554	16.00	277.00	.000
Hotellings	8.95801	155.08554	16.00	277.00	.000
Wilks	.10042	155.08554	16.00	277.00	.000
Rois	.89958				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,292) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	243.82935	320.17065	243.82935	1.09647	222.37570	.000
INDUS	260.88908	375.61092	260.88908	1.28634	202.81522	.000
EDUC	1086.69625	335.30375	1086.69625	1.14830	946.35178	.000
WEALTH	763.75597	289.74403	763.75597	.99227	769.70264	.000
FRIEND	130.93686	328.56314	130.93686	1.12522	116.36595	.000
TRUST	322.90956	301.59044	322.90956	1.03284	312.64117	.000
WETHIC	209.04437	453.95563	209.04437	1.55464	134.46459	.000
INDIV	401.40785	416.09215	401.40785	1.42497	281.69503	.000
POLIT	612.28840	578.21160	612.28840	1.98018	309.20896	.000
TECHC	1379.18259	313.31741	1379.18259	1.07300	1285.34614	.000
STAB	473.94027	429.55973	473.94027	1.47109	322.16838	.000
LIFE	1369.99317	328.00683	1369.99317	1.12331	1219.60269	.000
ROLE	1051.57850	354.92150	1051.57850	1.21548	865.15165	.000
ENVIRO	1297.58362	344.41638	1297.58362	1.17951	1100.10567	.000
RIGHTS	1888.57338	325.42662	1888.57338	1.11447	1694.58609	.000
KNOWC	38.90956	128.59044	38.90956	.44038	88.35486	.000

Canada vs. Argentina

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 7 , N = 139)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.92410	213.07836	16.00	280.00	.000
Hotellings	12.17591	213.07836	16.00	280.00	.000
Wilks	.07590	213.07836	16.00	280.00	.000
Rois	.92410				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,295) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	172.97297	314.02703	172.97297	1.06450	162.49247	.000
INDUS	216.49324	348.50676	216.49324	1.18138	183.25472	.000
EDUC	907.58277	349.91723	907.58277	1.18616	765.14357	.000
WEALTH	634.74493	292.75507	634.74493	.99239	639.61234	.000
FRIEND	84.75676	303.24324	84.75676	1.02794	82.45276	.000
TRUST	303.67568	324.32432	303.67568	1.09940	276.21833	.000
WETHIC	186.18919	419.81081	186.18919	1.42309	130.83467	.000
INDIV	328.51520	416.98480	328.51520	1.41351	232.41131	.000
POLIT	606.08277	547.41723	606.08277	1.85565	326.61452	.000
TECHC	1284.43243	298.56757	1284.43243	1.01209	1269.08482	.000
STAB	492.56757	439.43243	492.56757	1.48960	330.67071	.000
LIFE	1341.01520	349.48480	1341.01520	1.18469	1131.95048	.000
ROLE	1108.27703	364.72297	1108.27703	1.23635	896.41110	.000
ENVIRO	1362.16892	368.83108	1362.16892	1.25027	1089.49558	.000
RIGHTS	1955.70270	334.29730	1955.70270	1.13321	1725.80605	.000
KNOWC	2156.92568	289.07432	2156.92568	.97991	2201.14006	.000

United States vs. Mexico

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 10 1/2, N = 134 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.91397	125.17454	23.00	271.00	.000
Hotellings	10.62367	125.17454	23.00	271.00	.000
Wilks	.08603	125.17454	23.00	271.00	.000
Roys	.91397				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,293) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	8.09694	424.40306	8.09694	1.44847	5.58998	.019
INDUS	444.08333	423.41667	444.08333	1.44511	307.30112	.000
EDUC	1010.95408	343.54592	1010.95408	1.17251	862.21239	.000
WEALTH	1541.33333	323.66667	1541.33333	1.10466	1395.29557	.000
FRIEND	27.43027	407.06973	27.43027	1.38932	19.74372	.000
TRUST	128.61395	394.88605	128.61395	1.34773	95.42977	.000
WETHIC	278.95408	470.54592	278.95408	1.60596	173.69940	.000
INDIV	668.58673	472.91327	668.58673	1.61404	414.23222	.000
POLIT	1442.58673	367.91327	1442.58673	1.25568	1148.85206	.000
TECHC	1903.68027	297.31973	1903.68027	1.01474	1876.02190	.000
STAB	1534.86395	365.13605	1534.86395	1.24620	1231.63717	.000
LIFE	1287.24490	317.75510	1287.24490	1.08449	1186.96050	.000
ROLE	2005.77551	352.22449	2005.77551	1.20213	1668.51608	.000
ENVIRO	1085.71599	414.78401	1085.71599	1.41565	766.94080	.000
RIGHTS	1610.08333	348.41667	1610.08333	1.18914	1353.99498	.000
ALIGN	884.08333	313.41667	884.08333	1.06968	826.49216	.000
KNOWC	862.14966	288.85034	862.14966	.98584	874.53541	.000
TIES	101.25170	456.74830	101.25170	1.55887	64.95207	.000
IMMIG	211.92007	518.57993	211.92007	1.76990	119.73579	.000
INVEST	142.04252	448.45748	142.04252	1.53057	92.80357	.000
INVFR	99.59864	505.40136	99.59864	1.72492	57.74104	.000
EXPORT	118.53061	257.46939	118.53061	.87874	134.88776	.000
IMPORT	89.96599	492.03401	89.96599	1.67930	53.57360	.000

United States 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 = 10 1/2, N = 133)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.92817	150.55872	23.00	268.00	.000
Hotellings	12.92108	150.55872	23.00	268.00	.000
Wilks	.07183	150.55872	23.00	268.00	.000
Roys	.92817				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,290) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	25.15636	413.34364	25.15636	1.42532	17.64958	.000
INDUS	343.31443	393.18557	343.31443	1.35581	253.21679	.000
EDUC	782.86082	395.63918	782.86082	1.36427	573.83003	.000
WEALTH	1135.68557	370.81443	1135.68557	1.27867	888.17690	.000
FRIEND	35.62887	392.37113	35.62887	1.35300	26.33316	.000
TRUST	47.91924	373.58076	47.91924	1.28821	37.19833	.000
WETHIC	154.63918	378.36082	154.63918	1.30469	118.52538	.000
INDIV	544.62027	423.87973	544.62027	1.46165	372.60541	.000
POLIT	1330.58419	381.41581	1330.58419	1.31523	1011.67652	.000
TECHC	1794.64605	269.35395	1794.64605	.92881	1932.20612	.000
STAB	1206.60481	352.39519	1206.60481	1.21516	992.96303	.000
LIFE	933.28007	377.21993	933.28007	1.30076	717.48918	.000
ROLE	2178.48110	321.51890	2178.48110	1.10869	1964.92187	.000
ENVIRO	792.16667	382.33333	792.16667	1.31839	600.85876	.000
RIGHTS	1663.67010	325.32990	1663.67010	1.12183	1483.00029	.000
ALIGN	1498.89347	320.10653	1498.89347	1.10382	1357.92015	.000
KNOWC	1570.33677	279.66323	1570.33677	.96436	1628.37876	.000
TIES	146.50172	464.49828	146.50172	1.60172	91.46535	.000
IMMIG	177.04639	518.45361	177.04639	1.78777	99.03191	.000
INVEST	202.14605	435.35395	202.14605	1.50122	134.65447	.000
INVFR	119.75258	479.24742	119.75258	1.65258	72.46413	.000
EXPORT	167.25773	270.74227	167.25773	.93359	179.15467	.000
IMPORT	92.48110	480.51890	92.48110	1.65696	55.81366	.000

United States 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 = 10 1/2, N = 133 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.92766	149.98297	23.00	269.00	.000
Hotellings	12.82382	149.98297	23.00	269.00	.000
Wilks	.07234	149.98297	23.00	269.00	.000
Roys	.92766				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,291) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	6.37158	372.12842	6.37158	1.27879	4.98250	.026
INDUS	289.24829	382.25171	289.24829	1.31358	220.19849	.000
EDUC	626.75514	362.74486	626.75514	1.24655	502.79346	.000
WEALTH	958.05479	367.94521	958.05479	1.26442	757.70506	.000
FRIEND	14.17979	418.32021	14.17979	1.43753	9.86402	.002
TRUST	39.04281	362.45719	39.04281	1.24556	31.34565	.000
WETHIC	133.28938	351.21062	133.28938	1.20691	110.43861	.000
INDIV	447.12500	457.37500	447.12500	1.57174	284.47855	.000
POLIT	1317.00171	349.49829	1317.00171	1.20103	1096.56474	.000
TECHC	1668.09760	264.40240	1668.09760	.90860	1835.90016	.000
STAB	1219.75342	353.24658	1219.75342	1.21391	1004.81723	.000
LIFE	892.60959	366.39041	892.60959	1.25907	708.94156	.000
ROLE	2225.34247	355.65753	2225.34247	1.22219	1820.78150	.000
ENVIRO	824.71918	401.28082	824.71918	1.37897	598.06816	.000
RIGHTS	1736.38527	320.11473	1736.38527	1.10005	1578.45945	.000
ALIGN	1452.46747	366.03253	1452.46747	1.25784	1154.72804	.000
KNOWC	1587.96062	265.53938	1587.96062	.91251	1740.21847	.000
TIES	123.90582	482.59418	123.90582	1.65840	74.71411	.000
IMMIG	151.04281	499.45719	151.04281	1.71635	88.00245	.000
INVEST	264.46747	474.03253	264.46747	1.62898	162.35179	.000
INFR	122.07021	499.42979	122.07021	1.71625	71.12597	.000
EXPORT	127.61815	283.88185	127.61815	.97554	130.81809	.000
IMPORT	95.36986	498.63014	95.36986	1.71351	55.65775	.000

Mexico vs. Chile

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 10 1/2, N = 134)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.64413	21.24798	23.00	270.00	.000
Hotellings	1.81001	21.24798	23.00	270.00	.000
Wilks	.35587	21.24798	23.00	270.00	.000
Roys	.64413				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,292) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	4.09727	199.40273	4.09727	.68289	5.99993	.015
INDUS	6.98976	236.01024	6.98976	.80825	8.64797	.004
EDUC	12.62116	210.37884	12.62116	.72048	17.51782	.000
WEALTH	27.95904	194.04096	27.95904	.66452	42.07380	.000
FRIEND	.68259	167.31741	.68259	.57300	1.19125	.276
TRUST	17.75427	163.24573	17.75427	.55906	31.75731	.000
WETHIC	19.17406	214.82594	19.17406	.73571	26.06215	.000
INDIV	6.55973	173.44027	6.55973	.59397	11.04380	.001
POLIT	1.53584	266.46416	1.53584	.91255	1.68302	.196
TECHC	1.33788	234.66212	1.33788	.80364	1.66479	.198
STAB	18.81399	243.68601	18.81399	.83454	22.54412	.000
LIFE	27.09215	164.90785	27.09215	.56475	47.97169	.000
ROLE	2.21160	180.78840	2.21160	.61914	3.57207	.060
ENVIRO	25.39932	157.60068	25.39932	.53973	47.05945	.000
RIGHTS	.61604	177.88396	.61604	.60919	1.01124	.315
ALIGN	75.97440	249.52560	75.97440	.85454	88.90681	.000
KNOWC	105.80375	170.69625	105.80375	.58458	180.99224	.000
TIES	3.30375	171.69625	3.30375	.58800	5.61862	.018
IMMIG	1.43515	162.06485	1.43515	.55502	2.58578	.109
INVEST	5.16212	209.33788	5.16212	.71691	7.20050	.008
INVFR	.55290	143.44710	.55290	.49126	1.12548	.290
EXPORT	4.26621	101.73379	4.26621	.34840	12.24503	.001
IMPORT	.06143	155.93857	.06143	.53404	.11504	.735

Mexico vs. Argentina

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 10 1/2, N = 134 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.62713	19.81706	23.00	271.00	.000
Hotellings	1.68189	19.81706	23.00	271.00	.000
Wilks	.37287	19.81706	23.00	271.00	.000
Rois	.62713				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,293) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	.13776	246.36224	.13776	.84083	.16383	.686
INDUS	18.39456	245.60544	18.39456	.83824	21.94416	.000
EDUC	50.31293	240.68707	50.31293	.82146	61.24835	.000
WEALTH	69.39456	222.60544	69.39456	.75975	91.33921	.000
FRIEND	2.45578	227.54422	2.45578	.77660	3.16222	.076
TRUST	27.43027	184.06973	27.43027	.62822	43.66318	.000
WETHIC	27.00000	233.00000	27.00000	.79522	33.95279	.000
INDIV	22.49150	212.00850	22.49150	.72358	31.08370	.000
POLIT	2.32823	269.17177	2.32823	.91867	2.53434	.112
TECHC	7.86395	230.13605	7.86395	.78545	10.01206	.002
STAB	17.69388	259.30612	17.69388	.88500	19.99300	.000
LIFE	40.33333	187.66667	40.33333	.64050	62.97158	.000
ROLE	4.08333	177.41667	4.08333	.60552	6.74354	.010
ENVIRO	23.28061	152.21939	23.28061	.51952	44.81176	.000
RIGHTS	1.33333	189.66667	1.33333	.64733	2.05975	.152
ALIGN	64.66837	278.83163	64.66837	.95164	67.95438	.000
KNOWC	108.85884	184.64116	108.85884	.63017	172.74394	.000
TIES	1.14966	198.85034	1.14966	.67867	1.69399	.194
IMMIG	4.77721	170.72279	4.77721	.58267	8.19880	.004
INVEST	17.69388	323.30612	17.69388	1.10343	16.03529	.000
INVFR	1.06293	192.43707	1.06293	.65678	1.61838	.204
EXPORT	.24490	174.75510	.24490	.59643	.41060	.522
IMPORT	.24490	210.75510	.24490	.71930	.34047	.560

Chile vs. Argentina

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 10 1/2, N = 133)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.22623	3.40681	23.00	268.00	.000
Hotellings	.29238	3.40681	23.00	268.00	.000
Wilks	.77377	3.40681	23.00	268.00	.000
Roys	.22623				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,290) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
LIKE	5.98110	141.51890	5.98110	.48800	12.25645	.001
INDUS	2.35223	150.14777	2.35223	.51775	4.54318	.034
EDUC	8.66151	160.83849	8.66151	.55462	15.61715	.000
WEALTH	7.71306	138.78694	7.71306	.47858	16.11670	.000
FRIEND	5.58247	138.91753	5.58247	.47903	11.65380	.001
TRUST	.33677	121.66323	.33677	.41953	.80273	.371
WETHIC	.43986	118.56014	.43986	.40883	1.07591	.300
INDIV	4.82646	170.67354	4.82646	.58853	8.20088	.004
POLIT	.04296	185.45704	.04296	.63951	.06717	.796
TECHC	2.48110	149.51890	2.48110	.51558	4.81223	.029
STAB	.06186	154.93814	.06186	.53427	.11578	.734
LIFE	.75773	179.74227	.75773	.61980	1.22254	.270
ROLE	.38660	132.11340	.38660	.45556	.84861	.358
ENVIRO	.24742	107.75258	.24742	.37156	.66590	.415
RIGHTS	.29038	141.20962	.29038	.48693	.59634	.441
ALIGN	.55670	174.44330	.55670	.60153	.92548	.337
KNOWC	.02749	108.97251	.02749	.37577	.07316	.787
TIES	.38660	128.11340	.38660	.44177	.87511	.350
IMMIG	1.07388	86.42612	1.07388	.29802	3.60338	.059
INVEST	3.17698	176.32302	3.17698	.60801	5.22520	.023
INVFR	.08419	175.41581	.08419	.60488	.13919	.709
EXPORT	2.61340	117.88660	2.61340	.40651	6.42895	.012
IMPORT	.33677	144.66323	.33677	.49884	.67511	.412

Appendix D: Doubly Multivariate Analysis of Variance - Product Profiles

OVERALL

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

AVERAGED Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 4, M = 7, N = 538)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	1.35251	29.06539	76.00	4324.00	.000
Hotellings	7.18616	101.78815	76.00	4306.00	.000
Wilks	.07551	51.81355	76.00	4248.69	.000
Roys	.86695				

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (4,1096) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	1723.69745	1168.30255	430.92436	1.06597	404.25582	.000
VALUE	873.32655	1580.67345	218.33164	1.44222	151.38577	.000
WORK	1037.52291	1213.67709	259.38073	1.10737	234.23139	.000
DEFECT	57.74109	1813.45891	14.43527	1.65462	8.72424	.000
ATTRAC	789.50836	1211.69164	197.37709	1.10556	178.53164	.000
INNOV	1838.41164	1295.58836	459.60291	1.18211	388.80003	.000
VARIET	2084.92364	1355.87636	521.23091	1.23711	421.32829	.000
BRAND	1759.22618	4245.17382	439.80655	3.87333	113.54729	.000
PRICE	1019.70473	1357.49527	254.92618	1.23859	205.81957	.000
DURAB	1168.59200	1128.20800	292.14800	1.02939	283.80778	.000
TECH	3201.30473	1045.89527	800.32618	.95428	838.66666	.000
RELIAB	1543.89382	1116.10618	385.97345	1.01835	379.02031	.000
KNOW	4411.23345	1140.36655	1102.80836	1.04048	1059.90304	.000
SATIS	1470.01164	1090.78836	367.50291	.99524	369.25879	.000
FIND	3432.89164	1403.90836	858.22291	1.28094	669.99552	.000
BUY	1842.40436	1157.19564	460.60109	1.05584	436.24326	.000
PROUD	2175.44436	1268.95564	543.86109	1.15781	469.73412	.000
SERV	2215.36436	1185.43564	553.84109	1.08160	512.05634	.000
RATE	2150.40436	943.19564	537.60109	.86058	624.69627	.000

Canada vs. United States

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 8 1/2, N = 135 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.62293	23.73703	19.00	273.00	.000
Hotellings	1.65203	23.73703	19.00	273.00	.000
Wilks	.37707	23.73703	19.00	273.00	.000
Roys	.62293				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,291) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	24.65753	219.34247	24.65753	.75375	32.71297	.000
VALUE	.49486	298.00514	.49486	1.02407	.48323	.488
WORK	17.81507	233.18493	17.81507	.80132	22.23208	.000
DEFECT	2.87842	324.62158	2.87842	1.11554	2.58030	.109
ATTRAC	4.11130	222.38870	4.11130	.76422	5.37972	.021
INNOV	41.67123	240.32877	41.67123	.82587	50.45725	.000
VARIET	150.02740	308.97260	150.02740	1.06176	141.30047	.000
BRAND	16.11130	635.38870	16.11130	2.18347	7.37877	.007
PRICE	34.52740	327.47260	34.52740	1.12534	30.68187	.000
DURAB	14.17979	253.32021	14.17979	.87052	16.28895	.000
TECH	18.52055	176.47945	18.52055	.60646	30.53885	.000
RELIAB	11.51370	238.48630	11.51370	.81954	14.04897	.000
KNOW	3.46747	167.03253	3.46747	.57399	6.04093	.015
SATIS	12.08219	221.91781	12.08219	.76260	15.84333	.000
FIND	26.75514	255.74486	26.75514	.87885	30.44341	.000
BUY	65.78082	310.21918	65.78082	1.06605	61.70547	.000
PROUD	194.46747	381.03253	194.46747	1.30939	148.51759	.000
SERV	44.93836	356.06164	44.93836	1.22358	36.72696	.000
RATE	14.49315	209.50685	14.49315	.71995	20.13064	.000

Canada vs. Mexico

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 8 1/2, N = 136 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.89329	121.15998	19.00	275.00	.000
Hotellings	8.37105	121.15998	19.00	275.00	.000
Wilks	.10671	121.15998	19.00	275.00	.000
Rois	.89329				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,293) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	951.53741	371.46259	951.53741	1.26779	750.54790	.000
VALUE	433.71599	577.78401	433.71599	1.97196	219.94168	.000
WORK	643.23980	409.26020	643.23980	1.39679	460.51206	.000
DEFECT	48.00000	655.00000	48.00000	2.23549	21.47176	.000
ATTRAC	326.26531	409.73469	326.26531	1.39841	233.31130	.000
INNOV	651.63435	460.86565	651.63435	1.57292	414.28314	.000
VARIET	336.77721	498.72279	336.77721	1.70213	197.85686	.000
BRAND	430.28741	1121.21259	430.28741	3.82666	112.44452	.000
PRICE	626.61395	418.88605	626.61395	1.42965	438.30031	.000
DURAB	690.08333	327.41667	690.08333	1.11746	617.54467	.000
TECH	1220.08333	317.41667	1220.08333	1.08333	1126.23077	.000
RELIAB	840.49150	314.00850	840.49150	1.07170	784.25904	.000
KNOW	1146.32823	372.17177	1146.32823	1.27021	902.47085	.000
SATIS	740.81633	360.18367	740.81633	1.22930	602.63471	.000
FIND	770.28741	456.21259	770.28741	1.55704	494.71282	.000
BUY	987.48980	370.51020	987.48980	1.26454	780.90834	.000
PROUD	1308.04252	403.45748	1308.04252	1.37699	949.93022	.000
SERV	1137.96599	380.03401	1137.96599	1.29704	877.35314	.000
RATE	977.14966	312.85034	977.14966	1.06775	915.14956	.000

Canada vs. Chile

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 8 1/2, N = 136 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.91677	159.42031	19.00	275.00	.000
Hotellings	11.01449	159.42031	19.00	275.00	.000
Wilks	.08323	159.42031	19.00	275.00	.000
Roys	.91677				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,293) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	911.26531	371.73469	911.26531	1.26872	718.25616	.000
VALUE	415.02721	562.97279	415.02721	1.92141	216.00151	.000
WORK	548.68027	394.31973	548.68027	1.34580	407.69789	.000
DEFECT	28.30102	638.19898	28.30102	2.17815	12.99312	.000
ATTRAC	330.75000	409.75000	330.75000	1.39846	236.50946	.000
INNOV	647.43027	436.06973	647.43027	1.48829	435.01545	.000
VARIET	692.25170	472.74830	692.25170	1.61348	429.04385	.000
BRAND	805.00680	1267.99320	805.00680	4.32762	186.01598	.000
PRICE	539.06293	471.43707	539.06293	1.60900	335.02973	.000
DURAB	584.00680	345.99320	584.00680	1.18086	494.55884	.000
TECH	1257.82313	324.17687	1257.82313	1.10641	1136.85525	.000
RELIAB	786.39456	339.60544	786.39456	1.15906	678.47442	.000
KNCW	2061.56633	317.93367	2061.56633	1.08510	1899.88977	.000
SATIS	747.56633	367.93367	747.56633	1.25575	595.31636	.000
FIND	1502.72109	470.27891	1502.72109	1.60505	936.24713	.000
BUY	1064.08333	397.41667	1064.08333	1.35637	784.50765	.000
PROUD	1362.28741	421.21259	1362.28741	1.43759	947.62176	.000
SERV	1208.58673	409.91327	1208.58673	1.39902	863.88010	.000
RATE	1154.72109	285.27891	1154.72109	.97365	1185.97367	.000

Canada vs. Argentina

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 8 1/2, N = 133)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.91807	158.05056	19.00	268.00	.000
Hotellings	11.20508	158.05056	19.00	268.00	.000
Wilks	.08193	158.05056	19.00	268.00	.000
Rois	.91807				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,286) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	824.64111	314.35889	824.64111	1.09916	750.24874	.000
VALUE	368.64111	485.35889	368.64111	1.69706	217.22351	.000
WORK	460.27178	396.72822	460.27178	1.38716	331.80833	.000
DEFECT	36.12544	576.87456	36.12544	2.01704	17.91009	.000
ATTRAC	269.07491	397.42509	269.07491	1.38960	193.63505	.000
INNOV	590.11150	442.88850	590.11150	1.54856	381.07083	.000
VARIET	566.02787	508.97213	566.02787	1.77962	318.06059	.000
BRAND	691.46341	1504.53659	691.46341	5.26062	131.44149	.000
PRICE	552.21080	422.28920	552.21080	1.47654	373.99083	.000
DURAB	538.56446	404.43554	538.56446	1.41411	380.85040	.000
TECH	1288.50174	324.49826	1288.50174	1.13461	1135.63475	.000
RELIAB	740.59930	355.40070	740.59930	1.24266	595.97914	.000
KNOW	2177.56794	355.43206	2177.56794	1.24277	1752.18983	.000
SATIS	756.58711	343.91289	756.58711	1.20249	629.18232	.000
FIND	1549.21429	489.28571	1549.21429	1.71079	905.55533	.000
BUY	1024.89373	386.60627	1024.89373	1.35177	758.18637	.000
PROUD	1349.12892	427.87108	1349.12892	1.49605	901.79236	.000
SERV	1160.02787	432.97213	1160.02787	1.51389	766.25712	.000
RATE	1062.64983	291.85017	1062.64983	1.02046	1041.34887	.000

United States vs. Mexico

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 8 1/2, N = 134 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.88084	105.43378	19.00	271.00	.000
Hotellings	7.39204	105.43378	19.00	271.00	.000
Wilks	.11916	105.43378	19.00	271.00	.000
Rois	.88084				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,289) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	643.65690	366.84310	643.65690	1.26935	507.07466	.000
VALUE	407.23448	483.76552	407.23448	1.67393	243.28060	.000
WORK	431.03448	379.96552	431.03448	1.31476	327.84282	.000
DEFECT	19.00862	529.49138	19.00862	1.83215	10.37503	.001
ATTRAC	392.29138	394.20862	392.29138	1.36404	287.59444	.000
INNOV	1009.00862	423.49138	1009.00862	1.46537	688.57008	.000
VARIET	913.76552	340.23448	913.76552	1.17728	776.16540	.000
BRAND	594.08448	1493.41552	594.08448	5.16753	114.96493	.000
PRICE	358.51034	392.48966	358.51034	1.35810	263.98018	.000
DURAB	493.49138	311.00862	493.49138	1.07615	458.56931	.000
TECH	1520.20862	338.29138	1520.20862	1.17056	1298.70378	.000
RELIAB	628.99310	348.00690	628.99310	1.20418	522.34312	.000
KNOW	1239.83448	388.16552	1239.83448	1.34313	923.09118	.000
SATIS	536.83448	332.16552	536.83448	1.14936	467.07186	.000
FIND	1048.96552	332.03448	1048.96552	1.14891	913.01070	.000
BUY	536.83448	362.16552	536.83448	1.25317	428.38194	.000
PROUD	486.13966	379.36034	486.13966	1.31267	370.34540	.000
SERV	730.69138	364.80862	730.69138	1.26231	578.85093	.000
RATE	748.76034	292.73966	748.76034	1.01294	739.19517	.000

United States vs. Chile

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 8 1/2, N = 134 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.90916	142.74449	19.00	271.00	.000
Hotellings	10.00792	142.74449	19.00	271.00	.000
Wilks	.09084	142.74449	19.00	271.00	.000
Rois	.90916				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,289) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	628.99310	407.00690	628.99310	1.40833	446.62390	.000
VALUE	389.00862	511.49138	389.00862	1.76987	219.79548	.000
WORK	366.41552	354.08448	366.41552	1.22521	299.06446	.000
DEFECT	12.45690	519.04310	12.45690	1.79600	6.93592	.009
ATTRAC	398.89828	397.60172	398.89828	1.37578	289.94241	.000
INNOV	993.24310	408.25690	993.24310	1.41265	703.10449	.000
VARIET	1452.97241	332.02759	1452.97241	1.14888	1264.68114	.000
BRAND	1035.56034	1626.93966	1035.56034	5.62955	183.95085	.000
PRICE	301.24828	448.75172	301.24828	1.55277	194.00650	.000
DURAB	408.91207	341.58793	408.91207	1.18197	345.95949	.000
TECH	1559.31207	348.18793	1559.31207	1.20480	1294.24701	.000
RELIAB	588.02759	380.97241	588.02759	1.31824	446.06897	.000
KNOW	2213.25690	354.24310	2213.25690	1.22575	1805.62793	.000
SATIS	554.29138	339.20862	554.29138	1.17373	472.24687	.000
FIND	1911.73966	377.76034	1911.73966	1.30713	1462.54833	.000
BUY	598.13966	390.36034	598.13966	1.35073	442.82767	.000
PROUD	536.83448	409.16552	536.83448	1.41580	379.17459	.000
SERV	794.89828	391.60172	794.89828	1.35502	586.63072	.000
RATE	901.25690	299.24310	901.25690	1.03544	870.40684	.000

United States vs. Argentina

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 8 1/2, N = 131)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.90862	138.16365	19.00	264.00	.000
Hotellings	9.94360	138.16365	19.00	264.00	.000
Wilks	.09138	138.16365	19.00	264.00	.000
Roys	.90862				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

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

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	548.14311	336.35689	548.14311	1.19275	459.56055	.000
VALUE	349.86749	442.63251	349.86749	1.56962	222.89965	.000
WORK	295.54947	353.95053	295.54947	1.25514	235.47062	.000
DEFECT	19.47880	543.02120	19.47880	1.92561	10.11567	.002
ATTRAC	343.60601	371.89399	343.60601	1.31877	260.54977	.000
INNOV	926.10601	381.89399	926.10601	1.35423	683.85965	.000
VARIET	1237.75442	397.74558	1237.75442	1.41045	877.56285	.000
BRAND	853.40106	1867.09894	853.40106	6.62092	128.89467	.000
PRICE	304.28445	420.21555	304.28445	1.49013	204.20048	.000
DURAB	373.85159	366.14841	373.85159	1.29840	287.93283	.000
TECH	1587.81625	334.18375	1587.81625	1.18505	1339.87421	.000
RELIAB	542.25442	380.74558	542.25442	1.35016	401.62185	.000
KNOW	2300.14311	348.35689	2300.14311	1.23531	1861.99950	.000
SATIS	558.02827	324.97173	558.02827	1.15238	484.23896	.000
FIND	1929.37279	378.12721	1929.37279	1.34088	1438.88912	.000
BUY	560.01590	382.48410	560.01590	1.35633	412.89163	.000
PROUD	519.01767	435.98233	519.01767	1.54604	335.70852	.000
SERV	746.46643	411.53357	746.46643	1.45934	511.50999	.000
RATE	814.56007	298.93993	814.56007	1.06007	768.40167	.000

Mexico vs. Chile

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 8 1/2, N = 136)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.49711	14.25512	19.00	274.00	.000
Hotellings	.98849	14.25512	19.00	274.00	.000
Wilks	.50289	14.25512	19.00	274.00	.000
Roys	.49711				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,292) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	.33447	249.66553	.33447	.85502	.39119	.532
VALUE	.17065	268.82935	.17065	.92065	.18536	.667
WORK	2.86860	250.63140	2.86860	.85833	3.34208	.069
DEFECT	1.24403	306.25597	1.24403	1.04882	1.18612	.277
ATTRAC	.08362	189.41638	.08362	.64869	.12890	.720
INNOV	.00683	208.99317	.00683	.71573	.00954	.922
VARIET	66.90102	234.09898	66.90102	.80171	83.44803	.000
BRAND	55.29010	505.70990	55.29010	1.73188	31.92484	.000
PRICE	3.30375	222.69625	3.30375	.76266	4.33189	.038
DURAB	4.79352	181.70648	4.79352	.62228	7.70312	.006
TECH	.10922	195.89078	.10922	.67086	.16280	.687
RELIAB	1.15358	180.84642	1.15358	.61934	1.86261	.173
KNOW	142.52730	244.97270	142.52730	.83895	169.88821	.000
SATIS	.04266	220.45734	.04266	.75499	.05651	.812
FIND	124.40273	290.59727	124.40273	.99520	125.00323	.000
BUY	2.09044	166.40956	2.09044	.56990	3.66812	.056
PROUD	.68259	168.31741	.68259	.57643	1.18418	.277
SERV	.75256	133.74744	.75256	.45804	1.64300	.201
RATE	7.43345	181.56655	7.43345	.62180	11.95466	.001

Mexico vs. Argentina

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 8 1/2, N = 132)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.50574	14.32507	19.00	266.00	.000
Hotellings	1.02322	14.32507	19.00	266.00	.000
Wilks	.49426	14.32507	19.00	266.00	.000
Roys	.50574				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,284) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	1.91053	275.58947	1.91053	.97039	1.96883	.162
VALUE	1.01053	302.98947	1.01053	1.06686	.94719	.331
WORK	8.11228	294.88772	8.11228	1.03834	7.81276	.006
DEFECT	.08596	419.41404	.08596	1.47681	.05821	.810
ATTRAC	1.57895	268.42105	1.57895	.94514	1.67059	.197
INNOV	.50702	233.99298	.50702	.82392	.61537	.433
VARIET	33.89649	296.60351	33.89649	1.04438	32.45613	.000
BRAND	29.19474	754.30526	29.19474	2.65600	10.99198	.001
PRICE	1.37544	248.62456	1.37544	.87544	1.57114	.211
DURAB	5.70000	238.80000	5.70000	.84085	6.77889	.010
TECH	1.91053	210.58947	1.91053	.74151	2.57653	.110
RELIAB	2.02807	221.97193	2.02807	.78159	2.59480	.108
KNOW	183.03333	280.46667	183.03333	.98756	185.33920	.000
SATIS	.92807	223.57193	.92807	.78723	1.17891	.278
FIND	141.50175	349.49825	141.50175	1.23063	114.98340	.000
BUY	1.37544	215.62456	1.37544	.75924	1.81160	.179
PROUD	1.37544	224.62456	1.37544	.79093	1.73901	.188
SERV	.92807	177.57193	.92807	.62525	1.48431	.224
RATE	4.38596	194.61404	4.38596	.68526	6.40043	.012

Chile vs. Argentina

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

Tests involving 'COUNTRY' Within-Subject Effect.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 8 1/2, N = 132)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.13696	2.22169	19.00	266.00	.003
Hotellings	.15869	2.22169	19.00	266.00	.003
Wilks	.86304	2.22169	19.00	266.00	.003
Rois	.13696				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. COUNTRY (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,284) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
QUAL	.70175	206.29825	.70175	.72640	.96607	.326
VALUE	.08596	253.41404	.08596	.89230	.09634	.756
WORK	1.79649	209.20351	1.79649	.73663	2.43879	.119
DEFECT	1.57895	315.42105	1.57895	1.11064	1.42166	.234
ATTRAC	1.68596	197.81404	1.68596	.69653	2.42053	.121
INNOV	.34386	201.65614	.34386	.71006	.48427	.487
VARIET	5.50175	217.49825	5.50175	.76584	7.18396	.008
BRAND	4.74386	516.25614	4.74386	1.81780	2.60967	.107
PRICE	.34386	186.65614	.34386	.65724	.52319	.470
DURAB	.01579	199.48421	.01579	.70241	.02248	.881
TECH	1.18596	177.81404	1.18596	.62611	1.89419	.170
RELIAB	.00175	196.49825	.00175	.69190	.00254	.960
KNOW	3.71228	223.28772	3.71228	.78622	4.72166	.031
SATIS	1.47544	180.02456	1.47544	.63389	2.32760	.128
FIND	1.57895	272.42105	1.57895	.95923	1.64606	.201
BUY	.00175	189.49825	.00175	.66725	.00263	.959
PROUD	.29649	170.20351	.29649	.59931	.49472	.482
SERV	.00175	145.49825	.00175	.51232	.00342	.953
RATE	.34386	132.65614	.34386	.46710	.73616	.392

Appendix E: Analysis of Gender Differences

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable	ARGALL					
By Variable	GENDER	respondent gender				
Analysis of Variance						
Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.	
Between Groups	1	3.5311	3.5311	6.3764	.0121	
Within Groups	293	162.2562	.5538			
Total	294	165.7872				

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable	CANALL					
By Variable	GENDER	respondent gender				
Analysis of Variance						
Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.	
Between Groups	1	1.5734	1.5734	3.1930	.0750	
Within Groups	296	145.8551	.4928			
Total	297	147.4284				

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable	CHILALL					
By Variable	GENDER	respondent gender				
Analysis of Variance						
Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.	
Between Groups	1	5.0810	5.0810	8.3139	.0042	
Within Groups	292	178.4537	.6111			
Total	293	183.5347				

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable MEXALL
By Variable GENDER respondent gender

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	3.0237	3.0237	5.2971	.0221
Within Groups	295	168.3915	.5708		
Total	296	171.4152			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable USALL
By Variable GENDER respondent gender

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	6.1527	6.1527	13.0663	.0004
Within Groups	293	137.9696	.4709		
Total			294	144.1224	

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable ARGALLP
By Variable GENDER respondent gender

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	.7295	.7295	1.3481	.2466
Within Groups	285	154.2254	.5411		
Total	286	154.9549			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CANALLP
By Variable GENDER respondent gender

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	.4142	.4142	.9203	.3382
Within Groups	294	132.3253	.4501		
Total	295	132.7395			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CHIALLP
By Variable GENDER respondent gender

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	.4747	.4747	.7716	.3804
Within Groups	292	179.6389	.6152		
Total	293	180.1136			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable MEXALLP
By Variable GENDER respondent gender

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	.0004	.0004	.0007	.9783
Within Groups	292	168.8037	.5781		
Total	293	168.8042			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable USALLP
By Variable GENDER respondent gender

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	1.8705	1.8705	3.8553	.0505
Within Groups	291	141.1898	.4852		
Total	292	143.0603			

Appendix F: Analysis of Age Differences

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable ARGALL
By Variable THEAGE

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	3	5.3903	1.7968	3.2709	.0216
Within Groups	292	160.3999	.5493		
Total	295	165.7902			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable ARGALL
By Variable THEAGE

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if

$\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .5241 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
with the following value(s) for RANGE: 3.98

- No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CANALL
By Variable THEAGE

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	3	3.2442	1.0814	2.2179	.0861
Within Groups	296	144.3207	.4876		
Total	299	147.5648			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CHILALL
By Variable THEAGE

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	3	8.2900	2.7633	4.5880	.0037
Within Groups	291	175.2688	.6023		
Total	294	183.5588			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CHILALL
By Variable THEAGE

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .5488 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 3.98

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G G
		r r r r
		p p p p
		4 3 2 1
Mean	THEAGE	
3.1747	Grp 4	
3.3913	Grp 3	
3.5973	Grp 2	*
3.6420	Grp 1	*

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable MEXALL
By Variable THEAGE

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	3	9.1776	3.0592	5.5405	.0010
Within Groups	294	162.3318	.5521		
Total	297	171.5093			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable MEXALL
By Variable THEAGE

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .5254 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 3.98

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G G
		r r r r
		P P P P
		4 3 2 1
Mean	THEAGE	
3.1327	Grp 4	
3.3896	Grp 3	
3.5353	Grp 2	*
3.6588	Grp 1	*

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable USALL
By Variable THEAGE

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	3	1.2460	.4153	.8472	.4690
Within Groups	293	143.6384	.4902		
Total	296	144.8845			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable ARGALLP
By Variable THEAGE

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	3	.1897	.0632	.1164	.9504
Within Groups	285	154.7777	.5431		
Total	288	154.9674			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CANALLP
By Variable THEAGE

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	3	1.0849	.3616	.8038	.4926
Within Groups	294	132.2774	.4499		
Total	297	133.3623			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CHIALLP
By Variable THEAGE

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	3	5.2452	1.7484	2.9125	.0347
Within Groups	292	175.2883	.6003		
Total	295	180.5335			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable MEXALLP
By Variable THEAGE

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	3	3.5068	1.1689	2.0548	.1063
Within Groups	292	166.1114	.5689		
Total	295	169.6181			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable USALLP
By Variable THEAGE

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	3	2.2498	.7499	1.5486	.2021
Within Groups	291	140.9160	.4842		
Total	294	143.1658			

Appendix G: Analysis of Education Differences

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable ARGALL
By Variable THEEDUC

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	6.2384	3.1192	5.5608	.0043
Within Groups	271	152.0107	.5609		
Total	273	158.2491			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable ARGALL
By Variable THEEDUC

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .5296 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 3.48

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G
		r r r
		p p p
		1 2 3
Mean	THEEDUC	
3.3749	Grp 1	
3.4197	Grp 2	
3.7079	Grp 3	* *

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CANALL
By Variable THEEDUC

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	1.6609	.8305	1.7428	.1770
Within Groups	274	130.5593	.4765		
Total	276	132.2202			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CHILALL
By Variable THEEDUC

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	7.2026	3.6013	5.7916	.0034
Within Groups	269	167.2701	.6218		
Total	271	174.4727			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CHILALL
By Variable THEEDUC

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if

$\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .5576 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
with the following value(s) for RANGE: 3.48

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G
		r r r
		P P P
		1 2 3
Mean	THEEDUC	
3.2502	Grp 1	
3.3636	Grp 2	
3.6459	Grp 3	* *

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable MEXALL
By Variable THEEDUC

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	2.1838	1.0919	1.8623	.1573
Within Groups	272	159.4744	.5863		
Total	274	161.6581			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable USALL
By Variable THEEDUC

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	4.0484	2.0242	4.2819	.0148
Within Groups	272	128.5822	.4727		
Total	274	132.6306			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable USALL
By Variable THEEDUC

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .4862 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 3.48

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G
		r r r
		P P P
		2 1 3
Mean	THEEDUC	
5.2926	Grp 2	
5.3319	Grp 1	
5.5495	Grp 3	*

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable ARGALLP
By Variable THEEDUC

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	2.2886	1.1443	2.0968	.1249
Within Groups	264	144.0715	.5457		
Total	266	146.3601			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CANALLP
By Variable THEEDUC

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	.2255	.1128	.2480	.7805
Within Groups	272	123.6886	.4547		
Total	274	123.9141			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CHIALLP
By Variable THEEDUC

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	3.8145	1.9072	3.0958	.0468
Within Groups	270	166.3389	.6161		
Total	272	170.1534			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable MEXALLP
By Variable THEEDUC

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	3.0670	1.5335	2.5845	.0773
Within Groups	270	160.2011	.5933		
Total	272	163.2680			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable USALLP
By Variable THEEDUC

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	3.3356	1.6678	3.4265	.0339
Within Groups	270	131.4195	.4867		
Total	272	134.7552			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable USALLP
By Variable THEEDUC

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G
		r r r
		P P P
		2 1 3
Mean	THEEDUC	
5.1731	Grp 2	
5.2681	Grp 1	
5.4179	Grp 3	*

Appendix H: Analysis of Income Differences

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable ARGALL
By Variable THEINCOM

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	1.3575	.6788	1.2074	.3005
Within Groups	288	161.9028	.5622		
Total	290	163.2603			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CANALL
By Variable THEINCOM

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	.1057	.0529	.1089	.8969
Within Groups	291	141.2751	.4855		
Total	293	141.3808			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CHILALL
By Variable THEINCOM

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	1.7828	.8914	1.4273	.2417
Within Groups	286	178.6189	.6245		
Total	288	180.4018			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable MEXALL
By Variable THEINCOM

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	.7355	.3677	.6386	.5288
Within Groups	289	166.4215	.5759		
Total	291	167.1570			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable USALL
By Variable THEINCOM

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	3.4228	1.7114	3.5955	.0287
Within Groups	288	137.0842	.4760		
Total	290	140.5069			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable USALL
By Variable THEINCOM

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .4878 * \text{RANGE} * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 3.48

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G
		r r r
		p p p
		1 3 2
Mean	THEINCOM	
5.2371	Grp 1	
5.4600	Grp 3	
5.5026	Grp 2	*

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable ARGALLP
By Variable THEINCOM

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	.2610	.1305	.2443	.7835
Within Groups	280	149.5899	.5342		
Total	282	149.8509			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CANALLP
By Variable THEINCOM

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	.0773	.0387	.0850	.9186
Within Groups	289	131.5373	.4551		
Total	291	131.6147			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CHIALLP
By Variable THEINCOM

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	3.4528	1.7264	2.8800	.0578
Within Groups	288	172.6397	.5994		
Total	290	176.0925			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable MEXALLP
By Variable THEINCOM

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	.1370	.0685	.1202	.8868
Within Groups	287	163.5465	.5698		
Total	289	163.6835			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable USALLP
By Variable THEINCOM

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	.2961	.1481	.3029	.7389
Within Groups	286	139.7984	.4888		
Total	288	140.0945			

Appendix I - Consumer Measurement Models - Initial Findings

Canada

Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
CRIGHTS	0.2985	0.7642	0.0000	0.4160	0.5840	0.0000
CLIFE	0.2705	0.7522	0.0000	0.4341	0.5659	0.0000
CROLE	0.2328	0.6632	0.0000	0.5601	0.4399	0.0000
CENVIRO	0.2356	0.6480	0.0000	0.5801	0.4199	0.0000
CPOLIT	0.2071	0.6387	0.0000	0.5920	0.4080	0.0000
CKNOWC	0.2167	0.5957	0.0000	0.6451	0.3549	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
CFRIEND	0.5118	0.8980	0.0000	0.1936	0.8064	0.0000
CTRUST	0.4894	0.9047	0.0000	0.1816	0.8184	0.0000
CINDIV	0.1954	0.5002	0.0000	0.7498	0.2502	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
CWEALTH	0.3230	0.6402	0.0000	0.5901	0.4099	0.0000
CTECHC	0.5899	0.8512	0.0000	0.2755	0.7245	0.0000
CSTAB	0.3788	0.7686	0.0000	0.4093	0.5907	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
CWETHIC	0.4169	0.8474	0.0000	0.2819	0.7181	0.0000
CINDUS	0.4941	0.8800	0.0000	0.2256	0.7744	0.0000
CEduc	0.3092	0.6852	0.0000	0.5305	0.4695	0.0000

Familiar	outward					
CBRAND	0.2834	0.5173	0.0000	0.7324	0.2676	0.0000
CKNOW	0.5808	0.8221	0.0000	0.3241	0.6759	0.0000
CFIND	0.4830	0.7782	0.0000	0.3945	0.6055	0.0000

P Belief	outward					
CATTRAC	0.1500	0.6886	0.0000	0.5258	0.4742	0.1750
CINNOV	0.1404	0.7053	0.0000	0.5026	0.4974	0.1836
CVARIET	0.1321	0.5609	0.0000	0.6854	0.3146	0.1161
CDURAB	0.1431	0.7259	0.0000	0.4731	0.5269	0.1945
CTECH	0.1409	0.7112	0.0000	0.4941	0.5059	0.1867
CRELIAB	0.1724	0.8048	0.0000	0.3523	0.6477	0.2391
CSERV	0.1552	0.6583	0.0000	0.5666	0.4334	0.1599
CWORK	0.1679	0.7367	0.0000	0.4573	0.5427	0.2003
CQUAL	0.1694	0.7388	0.0000	0.4542	0.5458	0.2014
CDEFECT	-0.0859	-0.3590	0.0000	0.8711	0.1289	0.0476
CPRICE	-0.0099	0.1150	0.0000	0.9868	0.0132	0.0049

C Eval	outward					
CLIKE	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.4985

P Eval	outward					
CVALUE	0.2248	0.6787	0.0000	0.5393	0.4607	0.3117
CSATIS	0.3249	0.8482	0.0000	0.2806	0.7194	0.4868
CPROUD	0.3487	0.8600	0.0000	0.2604	0.7396	0.5005
CRATE	0.3195	0.8513	0.0000	0.2752	0.7248	0.4905

Willingn	outward					
CBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5714

United States

Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
UPOLIT	0.2110	0.6974	0.0000	0.5136	0.4864	0.0000
ULIFE	0.2475	0.6668	0.0000	0.5553	0.4447	0.0000
URole	0.2477	0.6451	0.0000	0.5839	0.4161	0.0000
UENVIRO	0.1816	0.5459	0.0000	0.7020	0.2980	0.0000
URIGHTS	0.3235	0.7892	0.0000	0.3771	0.6229	0.0000
UKNOWC	0.2842	0.6107	0.0000	0.6270	0.3730	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
UFRIEND	0.5075	0.8993	0.0000	0.1912	0.8088	0.0000
UTRUST	0.4409	0.8956	0.0000	0.1978	0.8022	0.0000
UINDIV	0.2551	0.5828	0.0000	0.6603	0.3397	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
UWEALTH	0.3691	0.6963	0.0000	0.5151	0.4849	0.0000
UTECHC	0.4905	0.8515	0.0000	0.2750	0.7250	0.0000
USTAB	0.4169	0.7804	0.0000	0.3910	0.6090	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
UINDUS	0.4228	0.8201	0.0000	0.3274	0.6726	0.0000
UEDUC	0.3757	0.7811	0.0000	0.3899	0.6101	0.0000
UWETHIC	0.4271	0.8422	0.0000	0.2907	0.7093	0.0000

C Eval	outward					
UALIGN	-0.5072	-0.7196	0.0000	0.4822	0.5178	0.2678
ULIKE	-0.7261	-0.8745	0.0000	0.2353	0.7647	0.3955

Familiar	outward					
UBRAND	0.2335	0.5093	0.0000	0.7407	0.2593	0.0000
UKNOW	0.5219	0.8452	0.0000	0.2856	0.7144	0.0000
UFIND	0.5068	0.8681	0.0000	0.2463	0.7537	0.0000

P Belief	outward					
USERV	0.1706	0.6478	0.0000	0.5804	0.4196	0.1719
UPRICE	0.0285	0.1821	0.0000	0.9669	0.0331	0.0136
UDURAB	0.1491	0.7206	0.0000	0.4807	0.5193	0.2127
UTECH	0.1437	0.6708	0.0000	0.5500	0.4500	0.1843
URELIAB	0.1721	0.7851	0.0000	0.3836	0.6164	0.2524
UWORK	0.1628	0.7659	0.0000	0.4135	0.5865	0.2402
UDEFECT	-0.0642	-0.3221	0.0000	0.8962	0.1038	0.0425
UATTRAC	0.1328	0.6626	0.0000	0.5609	0.4391	0.1798
UINNOV	0.1222	0.6636	0.0000	0.5596	0.4404	0.1803
UVARIET	0.1318	0.6248	0.0000	0.6096	0.3904	0.1599
UQUAL	0.1857	0.8000	0.0000	0.3600	0.6400	0.2621

P Eval	outward					
URATE	0.3106	0.8769	0.0000	0.2311	0.7689	0.5344
UPROUD	0.3106	0.8231	0.0000	0.3226	0.6774	0.4708
USATIS	0.3131	0.8704	0.0000	0.2424	0.7576	0.5265
UVALUE	0.2563	0.7782	0.0000	0.3944	0.6056	0.4209

Willingn	outward					
UBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5435

Relation	outward					
UTIES	0.2879	0.8069	0.0000	0.3489	0.6511	0.1195
UIMMIG	0.2570	0.7470	0.0000	0.4419	0.5581	0.1024
UINVEST	0.2050	0.7105	0.0000	0.4952	0.5048	0.0926
UINVFR	0.2009	0.7323	0.0000	0.4638	0.5362	0.0984
UEXPORT	0.1200	0.4995	0.0000	0.7505	0.2495	0.0458
UIMPORT	0.2881	0.7740	0.0000	0.4010	0.5990	0.1099

Mexico

Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
MROLE	0.2676	0.7973	0.0000	0.3642	0.6358	0.0000
MRIGHTS	0.2792	0.8433	0.0000	0.2889	0.7111	0.0000
MLIFE	0.2450	0.8418	0.0000	0.2914	0.7086	0.0000
MENVIRO	0.1967	0.7539	0.0000	0.4317	0.5683	0.0000
MPOLIT	0.2212	0.7557	0.0000	0.4288	0.5712	0.0000
MKNOWC	0.1364	0.2161	0.0000	0.9533	0.0467	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
MINDIV	0.2829	0.6338	0.0000	0.5983	0.4017	0.0000
MFRIEND	0.5348	0.8639	0.0000	0.2538	0.7462	0.0000
MTRUST	0.4203	0.8535	0.0000	0.2716	0.7284	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
MWEALTH	0.3615	0.7695	0.0000	0.4079	0.5921	0.0000
MTECHC	0.4574	0.8749	0.0000	0.2346	0.7654	0.0000
MSTAB	0.3941	0.8162	0.0000	0.3339	0.6661	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
MEDUC	0.3618	0.7440	0.0000	0.4465	0.5535	0.0000
MWETHIC	0.3757	0.8310	0.0000	0.3094	0.6906	0.0000
MINDUS	0.4592	0.9116	0.0000	0.1690	0.8310	0.0000

C Eval	outward					
MLIKE	0.8063	0.8617	0.0000	0.2575	0.7425	0.3809
MALIGN	0.5104	0.5980	0.0000	0.6424	0.3576	0.1834

Relation	outward					
MTIES	0.2529	0.8326	0.0000	0.3069	0.6931	0.1757
MIMMIG	0.2663	0.7625	0.0000	0.4186	0.5814	0.1473
MINVEST	0.2015	0.7851	0.0000	0.3836	0.6164	0.1562
MINVFR	0.1663	0.7242	0.0000	0.4756	0.5244	0.1329
MEXPORT	0.0798	0.5386	0.0000	0.7099	0.2901	0.0735
MIMPORTS	0.3046	0.8693	0.0000	0.2444	0.7556	0.1915

P Belief	outward					
MATTRAC	0.1427	0.7240	0.0000	0.4759	0.5241	0.1580
MINNOV	0.1175	0.7150	0.0000	0.4888	0.5112	0.1541
MVARIET	0.1182	0.5806	0.0000	0.6629	0.3371	0.1016
MQUAL	0.1554	0.7924	0.0000	0.3721	0.6279	0.1893
MWORK	0.1695	0.8443	0.0000	0.2872	0.7128	0.2149
MDURAB	0.1428	0.8002	0.0000	0.3597	0.6403	0.1930
MTECH	0.1358	0.7690	0.0000	0.4087	0.5913	0.1783
MRELIAB	0.1571	0.8475	0.0000	0.2817	0.7183	0.2166
MSERV	0.1402	0.6987	0.0000	0.5118	0.4882	0.1472
MDEFECT	-0.0172	-0.1201	0.0000	0.9856	0.0144	0.0043
MPRICE	0.0593	0.4351	0.0000	0.8107	0.1893	0.0571

P Eval	outward					
MRATE	0.3183	0.8849	0.0000	0.2170	0.7830	0.5905
MSATIS	0.3134	0.8746	0.0000	0.2350	0.7650	0.5770
MPROUD	0.3026	0.7910	0.0000	0.3743	0.6257	0.4719
MVALUE	0.2632	0.7782	0.0000	0.3944	0.6056	0.4568

Willingn	outward					
MBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5471

Familiar	outward					
MBRAND	0.3258	0.5310	0.0000	0.7180	0.2820	0.0000
MKNOW	0.4850	0.8220	0.0000	0.3243	0.6757	0.0000
MFIND	0.5262	0.8139	0.0000	0.3376	0.6624	0.0000

Chile

Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

Country outward						
CHLIFE	0.2372	0.8410	0.0000	0.2926	0.7074	0.0000
CHROLE	0.2227	0.8216	0.0000	0.3249	0.6751	0.0000
CHENVIRO	0.2037	0.8622	0.0000	0.2566	0.7434	0.0000
CHRIGHTS	0.2256	0.8618	0.0000	0.2573	0.7427	0.0000
CHKNOWC	0.1291	0.3013	0.0000	0.9092	0.0908	0.0000
CHPOLIT	0.2491	0.8372	0.0000	0.2990	0.7010	0.0000

People D outward						
CHFRIEND	0.4358	0.8960	0.0000	0.1972	0.8028	0.0000
CHTRUST	0.4125	0.8947	0.0000	0.1995	0.8005	0.0000
CHINDIV	0.3207	0.7500	0.0000	0.4374	0.5626	0.0000

Country outward						
CHWEALTH	0.3500	0.8269	0.0000	0.3163	0.6837	0.0000
CHTECHC	0.3882	0.8837	0.0000	0.2191	0.7809	0.0000
CHSTAB	0.4060	0.9053	0.0000	0.1803	0.8197	0.0000

People C outward						
CHWETHIC	0.3805	0.8243	0.0000	0.3206	0.6794	0.0000
CHINDUS	0.4672	0.8968	0.0000	0.1957	0.8043	0.0000
CHEDUC	0.3510	0.7620	0.0000	0.4193	0.5807	0.0000

Product outward						
CHWORK	0.1444	0.8099	0.0000	0.3441	0.6559	0.2822
CHDEFECT	-0.0091	-0.0631	0.0000	0.9960	0.0040	0.0017
CHATTRAC	0.1226	0.7561	0.0000	0.4282	0.5718	0.2460
CHINNOV	0.1199	0.7816	0.0000	0.3891	0.6109	0.2628
CHVARIET	0.1098	0.6702	0.0000	0.5508	0.4492	0.1933
CHPRICE	0.0854	0.5948	0.0000	0.6463	0.3537	0.1522
CHDURAB	0.1374	0.8325	0.0000	0.3070	0.6930	0.2982
CHTECH	0.1375	0.7696	0.0000	0.4077	0.5923	0.2548
CHRELIAB	0.1541	0.8615	0.0000	0.2578	0.7422	0.3193
CHQUAL	0.1559	0.8302	0.0000	0.3108	0.6892	0.2965
CHSERV	0.1286	0.6943	0.0000	0.5179	0.4821	0.2074

Country outward						
CHLIKE	0.6497	0.8534	0.0000	0.2717	0.7283	0.4696
CHALIGN	0.5597	0.7962	0.0000	0.3661	0.6339	0.4088

Familiar outward						
CHBRAND	0.2066	0.4217	0.0000	0.8222	0.1778	0.0000
CHKNOW	0.4649	0.7886	0.0000	0.3780	0.6220	0.0000
CHFIND	0.6243	0.8749	0.0000	0.2346	0.7654	0.0000

Product outward						
CHRATE	0.2970	0.8733	0.0000	0.2374	0.7626	0.5657
CHSATIS	0.3071	0.8912	0.0000	0.2058	0.7942	0.5891
CHPROUD	0.2982	0.8395	0.0000	0.2952	0.7048	0.5228
CHVALUE	0.2662	0.8134	0.0000	0.3384	0.6616	0.4907

Relation outward						
CHTIES	0.2480	0.8446	0.0000	0.2866	0.7134	0.2117
CHIMMIG	0.2188	0.7450	0.0000	0.4449	0.5551	0.1647
CHINVEST	0.2074	0.8048	0.0000	0.3523	0.6477	0.1922
CHINVFR	0.1912	0.7640	0.0000	0.4163	0.5837	0.1732
CHEXPORT	0.1449	0.6636	0.0000	0.5596	0.4404	0.1307
CHIMPORT	0.2553	0.8552	0.0000	0.2686	0.7314	0.2170

Willingn outward						
CHBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5960

Argentina

Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
APOLIT	0.2431	0.7779	0.0000	0.3948	0.6052	0.0000
AROLE	0.2671	0.7703	0.0000	0.4066	0.5934	0.0000
AENVIRO	0.2087	0.8046	0.0000	0.3526	0.6474	0.0000
ARIGHTS	0.2837	0.8418	0.0000	0.2914	0.7086	0.0000
ALIFE	0.2068	0.7843	0.0000	0.3848	0.6152	0.0000
AKNOWC	0.1238	0.2930	0.0000	0.9142	0.0858	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
AINDIV	-0.3363	-0.6817	0.0000	0.5353	0.4647	0.0000
ATRUST	-0.4453	-0.8683	0.0000	0.2460	0.7540	0.0000
AFRIEND	-0.4542	-0.8454	0.0000	0.2853	0.7147	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
ASTAB	0.3750	0.8292	0.0000	0.3124	0.6876	0.0000
ATECHC	0.4248	0.8592	0.0000	0.2618	0.7382	0.0000
AWEALTH	0.3957	0.8187	0.0000	0.3297	0.6703	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
AEDUC	0.3814	0.7290	0.0000	0.4685	0.5315	0.0000
AWETHIC	0.4000	0.7911	0.0000	0.3742	0.6258	0.0000
AINDUS	0.4690	0.8647	0.0000	0.2523	0.7477	0.0000

P Belief	outward					
AATRAC	0.1224	0.6312	0.0000	0.6016	0.3984	0.1636
AQUAL	0.1628	0.7904	0.0000	0.3753	0.6247	0.2565
AWORK	0.1547	0.7699	0.0000	0.4073	0.5927	0.2433
ADEFECT	-0.0424	-0.2249	0.0000	0.9494	0.0506	0.0208
AINNOV	0.1334	0.7326	0.0000	0.4632	0.5368	0.2203
AVARIET	0.1319	0.6475	0.0000	0.5807	0.4193	0.1721
APRICE	0.0905	0.4966	0.0000	0.7534	0.2466	0.1012
ADURAB	0.1513	0.8220	0.0000	0.3243	0.6757	0.2774
ATECH	0.1440	0.6849	0.0000	0.5308	0.4692	0.1926
ARELIAB	0.1653	0.8249	0.0000	0.3195	0.6805	0.2793
ASERV	0.1275	0.6121	0.0000	0.6253	0.3747	0.1538

C Eval	outward					
AALIGN	0.6169	0.7853	0.0000	0.3834	0.6166	0.3658
ALIKE	0.6416	0.8035	0.0000	0.3544	0.6456	0.3830

Relation	outward					
ATIES	0.2805	0.8361	0.0000	0.3010	0.6990	0.1706
AIMMIG	0.2401	0.7534	0.0000	0.4324	0.5676	0.1385
AINVEST	0.1963	0.7943	0.0000	0.3691	0.6309	0.1540
AINVFR	0.2111	0.7237	0.0000	0.4763	0.5237	0.1278
AEXPORT	0.1119	0.5293	0.0000	0.7198	0.2802	0.0684
AIMPORT	0.2694	0.8043	0.0000	0.3530	0.6470	0.1579

P Eval	outward					
AVALUE	0.2645	0.7348	0.0000	0.4601	0.5399	0.3822
ASATIS	0.3124	0.8333	0.0000	0.3057	0.6943	0.4915
APROUD	0.3244	0.8138	0.0000	0.3377	0.6623	0.4688
ARATE	0.3284	0.8568	0.0000	0.2659	0.7341	0.5197

Familiar	outward					
ABRAND	0.0506	-0.0797	0.0000	0.9937	0.0063	0.0000
AKNOW	-0.5596	-0.7691	0.0000	0.4086	0.5914	0.0000
AFIND	-0.6740	-0.8511	0.0000	0.2757	0.7243	0.0000

Willingn	outward					
ABUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.4844

Appendix J: Consumer Measurement Models - Final Models

Canada

OB .. Path coefficients

	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	Familiar	P Belief	C Eval
C Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000	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
P Belief	0.000	0.000	0.183	0.308	0.264	0.000	0.000
C Eval	0.143	0.482	-0.097	0.246	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Eval	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.050	0.716	0.176
Willingn	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.155	0.000	0.000

OB .. Path coefficients

	P Eval	Willingn
C Descrp	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000
Familiar	0.000	0.000
P Belief	0.000	0.000
C Eval	0.000	0.000
P Eval	0.000	0.000
Willingn	0.683	0.000

0Inner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4964	0.5036	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3750	0.6250	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4256	0.5744	0.0000
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3462	0.6538	0.0000
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3087	0.6913	0.0000
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.3515	0.4974	0.5026	0.1767
C Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.4977	0.0000	1.0000	0.4977
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.6729	0.3389	0.6611	0.4448
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.5754	0.0000	1.0000	0.5754
Average			0.2331	0.3991	0.6009	0.1433

0Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
CRIGHTS	0.3362	0.7648	0.0000	0.4151	0.5849	0.0000
CLIFE	0.3046	0.7515	0.0000	0.4353	0.5647	0.0000
CROLE	0.2621	0.6912	0.0000	0.5222	0.4778	0.0000
CENVIRO	0.2652	0.6795	0.0000	0.5383	0.4617	0.0000
CPOLIT	0.2332	0.6548	0.0000	0.5713	0.4287	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
CFRIEND	0.5118	0.8980	0.0000	0.1936	0.8064	0.0000
CTRUST	0.4894	0.9047	0.0000	0.1816	0.8184	0.0000
CINDIV	0.1954	0.5002	0.0000	0.7498	0.2502	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
CWEALTH	0.3177	0.6360	0.0000	0.5956	0.4044	0.0000
CTECHC	0.5945	0.8540	0.0000	0.2707	0.7293	0.0000
CSTAB	0.3780	0.7678	0.0000	0.4105	0.5895	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
CWETHIC	0.4184	0.8484	0.0000	0.2803	0.7197	0.0000
CINDUS	0.4961	0.8811	0.0000	0.2237	0.7763	0.0000
CEduc	0.3048	0.6822	0.0000	0.5346	0.4654	0.0000

Familiar	outward					
CKNOW	0.6571	0.8661	0.0000	0.2499	0.7501	0.0000
CFIND	0.5418	0.7953	0.0000	0.3676	0.6324	0.0000

P Belief	outward					
CATTRAC	0.1535	0.6970	0.0000	0.5142	0.4858	0.1708
CINNOV	0.1454	0.7175	0.0000	0.4852	0.5148	0.1810
CVARIET	0.1357	0.5633	0.0000	0.6827	0.3173	0.1115
CDURAB	0.1480	0.7269	0.0000	0.4716	0.5284	0.1857
CTECH	0.1440	0.7180	0.0000	0.4845	0.5155	0.1812
CRELIAB	0.1773	0.8063	0.0000	0.3499	0.6501	0.2285
CSERV	0.1590	0.6580	0.0000	0.5670	0.4330	0.1522
CWORK	0.1726	0.7297	0.0000	0.4675	0.5325	0.1872
CQUAL	0.1728	0.7390	0.0000	0.4538	0.5462	0.1920

C Eval	outward					
CLIKE	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.4977

P Eval	outward					
CVALUE	0.2250	0.6789	0.0000	0.5391	0.4609	0.3101
CSATIS	0.3246	0.8481	0.0000	0.2808	0.7192	0.4839
CPROUD	0.3488	0.8600	0.0000	0.2604	0.7396	0.4976
CRATE	0.3195	0.8514	0.0000	0.2752	0.7248	0.4877

Willingn	outward					
CBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5754
=====						

U.S.

OB .. Path coefficients

	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	C Eval	Familiar	P Belief
C Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Eval	-0.197	-0.517	0.063	-0.140	0.000	0.000	0.000
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Belief	0.000	0.000	0.197	0.278	0.000	0.344	0.000
P Eval	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.033	0.790
Willingn	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.160	0.000
Relation	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.430	0.000	0.000

OB .. Path coefficients

	P Eval	Willingn	Relation
C Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Eval	0.000	0.000	0.000
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Belief	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Eval	0.000	0.000	0.141
Willingn	0.645	0.000	0.029
Relation	0.000	0.000	0.000

0Inner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.5121	0.4879	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3500	0.6500	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3937	0.6063	0.0000
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3360	0.6640	0.0000
C Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.5046	0.3612	0.6388	0.3224
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.2283	0.7717	0.0000
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.4138	0.4977	0.5023	0.2079
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.6994	0.2976	0.7024	0.4912
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.5422	0.0000	1.0000	0.5422
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	0.1845	0.4252	0.5748	0.1060
Average			0.2344	0.3993	0.6007	0.1501

0Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
UPOLIT	0.2454	0.7085	0.0000	0.4980	0.5020	0.0000
ULIFE	0.2903	0.6917	0.0000	0.5215	0.4785	0.0000
UROLE	0.2891	0.6660	0.0000	0.5565	0.4435	0.0000
UENVIRO	0.2123	0.6003	0.0000	0.6397	0.3603	0.0000
URIGHTS	0.3772	0.8095	0.0000	0.3448	0.6552	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
UFRIEND	0.5101	0.9006	0.0000	0.1889	0.8111	0.0000
UTRUST	0.4407	0.8959	0.0000	0.1974	0.8026	0.0000
UINDIV	0.2514	0.5799	0.0000	0.6638	0.3362	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
UWEALTH	0.3734	0.6995	0.0000	0.5108	0.4892	0.0000
UTECHC	0.4915	0.8517	0.0000	0.2746	0.7254	0.0000
USTAB	0.4120	0.7773	0.0000	0.3958	0.6042	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
UINDUS	0.4225	0.8200	0.0000	0.3277	0.6723	0.0000
UEDUC	0.3761	0.7813	0.0000	0.3895	0.6105	0.0000
UWETHIC	0.4271	0.8422	0.0000	0.2907	0.7093	0.0000

C Eval	outward					
UALIGN	-0.4803	-0.6990	0.0000	0.5114	0.4886	0.2465
ULIKE	-0.7478	-0.8883	0.0000	0.2109	0.7891	0.3982

Familiar	outward					
UKNOW	0.5775	0.8823	0.0000	0.2216	0.7784	0.0000
UFIND	0.5608	0.8746	0.0000	0.2350	0.7650	0.0000

P Belief	outward					
UDURAB	0.1530	0.7170	0.0000	0.4858	0.5142	0.2128
UTECH	0.1477	0.6687	0.0000	0.5529	0.4471	0.1850
URELIAB	0.1760	0.7822	0.0000	0.3882	0.6118	0.2532
UWORK	0.1663	0.7664	0.0000	0.4127	0.5873	0.2431
UATTRAC	0.1358	0.6633	0.0000	0.5600	0.4400	0.1821
UINNOV	0.1246	0.6721	0.0000	0.5483	0.4517	0.1869
UVARIET	0.1346	0.6300	0.0000	0.6031	0.3969	0.1643
UQUAL	0.1900	0.7993	0.0000	0.3611	0.6389	0.2644
USERV	0.1763	0.6580	0.0000	0.5671	0.4329	0.1792

P Eval	outward					
URATE	0.3108	0.8769	0.0000	0.2310	0.7690	0.5378
UPROUD	0.3103	0.8229	0.0000	0.3228	0.6772	0.4736
USATIS	0.3130	0.8704	0.0000	0.2424	0.7576	0.5298
UVALUE	0.2565	0.7783	0.0000	0.3942	0.6058	0.4237

Willingn	outward					
UBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5422

Relation	outward					
UTIES	0.3045	0.8164	0.0000	0.3335	0.6665	0.1229
UIMMIG	0.2720	0.7611	0.0000	0.4207	0.5793	0.1069
UINVEST	0.2159	0.6990	0.0000	0.5115	0.4885	0.0901
UINVFR	0.2126	0.7174	0.0000	0.4853	0.5147	0.0949
UIMPORT	0.3049	0.7904	0.0000	0.3752	0.6248	0.1153

Mexico

OB .. Path coefficients

	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	C Eval	Relation	P Belief
C Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Eval	0.176	0.508	-0.138	0.220	0.000	0.000	0.000
Relation	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.507	0.000	0.000
P Belief	0.000	0.000	0.190	0.335	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Eval	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.063	0.115	0.762
Willingn	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.108	0.000
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

OB .. Path coefficients

	P Eval	Willingn	Familiar
C Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Eval	0.000	0.000	0.000
Relation	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Belief	0.000	0.000	-0.190
P Eval	0.000	0.000	-0.096
Willingn	0.676	0.000	-0.027
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000

0Inner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3481	0.6519	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3748	0.6252	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3255	0.6745	0.0000
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3083	0.6917	0.0000
C Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.5122	0.4506	0.5494	0.2814
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	0.2566	0.3653	0.6347	0.1629
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.2967	0.4260	0.5740	0.1703
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.7654	0.3052	0.6948	0.5319
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.5479	0.0000	1.0000	0.5479
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.2575	0.7425	0.0000
Average			0.2379	0.3531	0.6469	0.1509

Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
MROLE	0.2731	0.8000	0.0000	0.3601	0.6399	0.0000
MRIGHTS	0.2847	0.8422	0.0000	0.2907	0.7093	0.0000
MLIFE	0.2505	0.8512	0.0000	0.2755	0.7245	0.0000
MENVIRO	0.2003	0.7679	0.0000	0.4104	0.5896	0.0000
MPOLIT	0.2263	0.7722	0.0000	0.4037	0.5963	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
MINDIV	0.2803	0.6318	0.0000	0.6008	0.3992	0.0000
MFRIEND	0.5363	0.8648	0.0000	0.2521	0.7479	0.0000
MTRUST	0.4208	0.8536	0.0000	0.2714	0.7286	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
MWEALTH	0.3579	0.7675	0.0000	0.4110	0.5890	0.0000
MTECHC	0.4593	0.8757	0.0000	0.2332	0.7668	0.0000
MSTAB	0.3955	0.8171	0.0000	0.3324	0.6676	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
MEDUC	0.3607	0.7432	0.0000	0.4477	0.5523	0.0000
MWETHIC	0.3774	0.8319	0.0000	0.3080	0.6920	0.0000
MINDUS	0.4585	0.9116	0.0000	0.1691	0.8309	0.0000

C Eval	outward					
MLIKE	0.8155	0.8694	0.0000	0.2441	0.7559	0.3872
MALIGN	0.4970	0.5855	0.0000	0.6572	0.3428	0.1756

Relation	outward					
MTIES	0.2633	0.8280	0.0000	0.3144	0.6856	0.1759
MIMMIG	0.2777	0.7793	0.0000	0.3927	0.6073	0.1558
MINVEST	0.2100	0.7807	0.0000	0.3906	0.6094	0.1564
MINVFR	0.1730	0.7065	0.0000	0.5008	0.4992	0.1281
MIMPORTS	0.3181	0.8786	0.0000	0.2280	0.7720	0.1981

P Belief	outward					
MATTRAC	0.1463	0.7299	0.0000	0.4673	0.5327	0.1581
MINNOV	0.1202	0.7127	0.0000	0.4920	0.5080	0.1507
MVARIET	0.1215	0.5858	0.0000	0.6568	0.3432	0.1018
MQUAL	0.1604	0.7954	0.0000	0.3674	0.6326	0.1877
MWORK	0.1742	0.8422	0.0000	0.2908	0.7092	0.2104
MDURAB	0.1462	0.7953	0.0000	0.3675	0.6325	0.1877
MTECH	0.1397	0.7684	0.0000	0.4095	0.5905	0.1752
MRELIAB	0.1615	0.8499	0.0000	0.2777	0.7223	0.2143
MSERV	0.1439	0.7037	0.0000	0.5048	0.4952	0.1469

P Eval	outward					
MRATE	0.3179	0.8847	0.0000	0.2172	0.7828	0.5992
MSATIS	0.3132	0.8746	0.0000	0.2351	0.7649	0.5855
MPROUD	0.3030	0.7911	0.0000	0.3741	0.6259	0.4791
MVALUE	0.2635	0.7783	0.0000	0.3942	0.6058	0.4637

Willingn	outward					
MBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5479

Familiar	outward					
MKNOW	-0.5540	-0.8483	0.0000	0.2804	0.7196	0.0000
MFIND	-0.6059	-0.8750	0.0000	0.2345	0.7655	0.0000

Chile

OB .. Path coefficients

	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	P Belief	C Eval	Familiar
C Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Belief	0.000	0.000	0.234	0.321	0.000	0.000	-0.313
C Eval	0.176	0.454	0.038	0.249	0.000	0.000	0.000
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Eval	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.786	0.004	-0.043
Relation	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.554	0.000
Willingn	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.051

OB .. Path coefficients

	P Eval	Relation	Willingn
C Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Belief	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Eval	0.000	0.000	0.000
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Eval	0.000	0.137	0.000
Relation	0.000	0.000	0.000
Willingn	0.701	0.105	0.000

0Inner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.2741	0.7259	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.2780	0.7220	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.2386	0.7614	0.0000
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3119	0.6881	0.0000
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.4327	0.3872	0.6128	0.2652
C Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.6419	0.3191	0.6809	0.4371
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.2774	0.7226	0.0000
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.7506	0.2692	0.7308	0.5485
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	0.3065	0.3456	0.6544	0.2005
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.5969	0.0000	1.0000	0.5969
Average			0.2729	0.3064	0.6936	0.1907

0Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
CHLIFE	0.2450	0.8485	0.0000	0.2801	0.7199	0.0000
CHROLE	0.2297	0.8235	0.0000	0.3219	0.6781	0.0000
CHENVIRO	0.2100	0.8709	0.0000	0.2415	0.7585	0.0000
CHRIGHTS	0.2328	0.8762	0.0000	0.2323	0.7677	0.0000
CHPOLIT	0.2573	0.8398	0.0000	0.2947	0.7053	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
CHFRIEND	0.4361	0.8962	0.0000	0.1969	0.8031	0.0000
CHTRUST	0.4124	0.8947	0.0000	0.1995	0.8005	0.0000
CHINDIV	0.3203	0.7498	0.0000	0.4378	0.5622	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
CHWEALTH	0.3488	0.8263	0.0000	0.3172	0.6828	0.0000
CHTECHC	0.3893	0.8841	0.0000	0.2184	0.7816	0.0000
CHSTAB	0.4060	0.9054	0.0000	0.1802	0.8198	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
CHWETHIC	0.3805	0.8244	0.0000	0.3204	0.6796	0.0000
CHINDUS	0.4676	0.8970	0.0000	0.1955	0.8045	0.0000
CHEDUC	0.3504	0.7617	0.0000	0.4198	0.5802	0.0000

P Belief	outward					
CHWORK	0.1515	0.8143	0.0000	0.3370	0.6630	0.2869
CHATTRAC	0.1287	0.7595	0.0000	0.4232	0.5768	0.2496
CHINNOV	0.1260	0.7825	0.0000	0.3878	0.6122	0.2649
CHVARIET	0.1153	0.6714	0.0000	0.5492	0.4508	0.1951
CHDURAB	0.1448	0.8314	0.0000	0.3087	0.6913	0.2992
CHTECH	0.1446	0.7676	0.0000	0.4107	0.5893	0.2550
CHRELIAB	0.1621	0.8651	0.0000	0.2516	0.7484	0.3239
CHQUAL	0.1632	0.8375	0.0000	0.2986	0.7014	0.3035
CHSERV	0.1362	0.6943	0.0000	0.5179	0.4821	0.2086

C Eval	outward					
CHLIKE	0.6533	0.8556	0.0000	0.2679	0.7321	0.4699
CHALIGN	0.5557	0.7936	0.0000	0.3703	0.6297	0.4042

Familiar	outward					
CHKNOW	-0.5004	-0.8027	0.0000	0.3556	0.6444	0.0000
CHFIND	-0.6686	-0.8949	0.0000	0.1992	0.8008	0.0000

P Eval	outward					
CHRATE	0.2973	0.8734	0.0000	0.2372	0.7628	0.5725
CHSATIS	0.3066	0.8910	0.0000	0.2061	0.7939	0.5959
CHPROUD	0.2992	0.8399	0.0000	0.2945	0.7055	0.5295
CHVALUE	0.2656	0.8131	0.0000	0.3389	0.6611	0.4962

Relation	outward					
CHTIES	0.2724	0.8433	0.0000	0.2888	0.7112	0.2180
CHIMMIG	0.2404	0.7774	0.0000	0.3956	0.6044	0.1852
CHINVEST	0.2278	0.8082	0.0000	0.3468	0.6532	0.2002
CHINVFR	0.2101	0.7389	0.0000	0.4541	0.5459	0.1673
CHIMPORT	0.2805	0.8702	0.0000	0.2428	0.7572	0.2320

Willingn	outward					
CHBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5969

Argentina

OB .. Path coefficients

	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	P Belief	P Eval	C Eval
C Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Belief	0.000	0.000	0.236	0.293	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Eval	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.776	0.000	0.020
C Eval	-0.352	0.401	0.232	-0.324	0.000	0.000	0.000
Relation	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.496
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Willingn	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.652	0.000

OB .. Path coefficients

	Relation	Familiar	Willingn
C Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Belief	0.000	-0.313	0.000
P Eval	0.126	-0.049	0.000
C Eval	0.000	0.000	0.000
Relation	0.000	0.000	0.000
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000
Willingn	0.075	-0.024	0.000

0Inner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3562	0.6438	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3555	0.6445	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3013	0.6987	0.0000
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3650	0.6350	0.0000
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.4023	0.4656	0.5344	0.2150
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.7119	0.3424	0.6576	0.4682
C Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.5883	0.3689	0.6311	0.3713
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	0.2462	0.3805	0.6195	0.1525
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3405	0.6595	0.0000
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.4841	0.0000	1.0000	0.4841
Average			0.2433	0.3710	0.6290	0.1567

00Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
APOLIT	0.2505	0.7899	0.0000	0.3761	0.6239	0.0000
ALIFE	0.2130	0.7903	0.0000	0.3754	0.6246	0.0000
AROLE	0.2750	0.7684	0.0000	0.4096	0.5904	0.0000
AENVIRO	0.2148	0.8116	0.0000	0.3414	0.6586	0.0000
ARIGHTS	0.2922	0.8495	0.0000	0.2784	0.7216	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
ATRUST	-0.4453	-0.8684	0.0000	0.2459	0.7541	0.0000
AINDIV	-0.3359	-0.6814	0.0000	0.5357	0.4643	0.0000
AFRIEND	-0.4546	-0.8456	0.0000	0.2850	0.7150	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
AWEALTH	0.3935	0.8177	0.0000	0.3314	0.6686	0.0000
ATECHC	0.4281	0.8606	0.0000	0.2594	0.7406	0.0000
ASTAB	0.3738	0.8288	0.0000	0.3131	0.6869	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
AEDUC	0.3779	0.7267	0.0000	0.4719	0.5281	0.0000
AINDUS	0.4695	0.8651	0.0000	0.2515	0.7485	0.0000
AWETHIC	0.4026	0.7928	0.0000	0.3715	0.6285	0.0000

P Belief	outward					
AATTRAC	0.1293	0.6356	0.0000	0.5960	0.4040	0.1625
AQUAL	0.1713	0.7977	0.0000	0.3636	0.6364	0.2560
AWORK	0.1632	0.7730	0.0000	0.4025	0.5975	0.2404
AINNOV	0.1404	0.7307	0.0000	0.4661	0.5339	0.2148
AVARIET	0.1388	0.6542	0.0000	0.5721	0.4279	0.1721
ADURAB	0.1596	0.8176	0.0000	0.3315	0.6685	0.2689
ATECH	0.1512	0.6878	0.0000	0.5269	0.4731	0.1903
ARELIAB	0.1742	0.8276	0.0000	0.3150	0.6850	0.2756
ASERV	0.1339	0.6189	0.0000	0.6170	0.3830	0.1541

P Eval	outward					
AVALUE	0.2637	0.7343	0.0000	0.4608	0.5392	0.3838
ASATIS	0.3135	0.8337	0.0000	0.3049	0.6951	0.4948
APROUD	0.3241	0.8137	0.0000	0.3378	0.6622	0.4714
ARATE	0.3283	0.8568	0.0000	0.2659	0.7341	0.5226

C Eval	outward					
ALIKE	-0.6447	-0.8058	0.0000	0.3508	0.6492	0.3820
AALIGN	-0.6138	-0.7829	0.0000	0.3871	0.6129	0.3606

Relation	outward					
ATIES	0.2966	0.8372	0.0000	0.2991	0.7009	0.1725
AIMMIG	0.2539	0.7749	0.0000	0.3995	0.6005	0.1478
AINVEST	0.2075	0.7999	0.0000	0.3601	0.6399	0.1575
AINVFR	0.2232	0.6997	0.0000	0.5104	0.4896	0.1205
AIMPORT	0.2851	0.8164	0.0000	0.3336	0.6664	0.1641

Familiar	outward					
AKNOW	-0.5516	-0.7692	0.0000	0.4084	0.5916	0.0000
AFIND	-0.6751	-0.8528	0.0000	0.2727	0.7273	0.0000

Willingn	outward					
ABUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.4841

Appendix K: Retail Buyer Measurement Models - Initial Findings

Canada

Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
CRIGHTS	0.2365	0.7344	0.0000	0.4607	0.5393	0.0000
CLIFE	0.4546	0.7543	0.0000	0.4310	0.5690	0.0000
CROLE	0.3052	0.6692	0.0000	0.5522	0.4478	0.0000
CENVIRO	0.2459	0.6251	0.0000	0.6092	0.3908	0.0000
CPOLIT	0.1332	0.5343	0.0000	0.7145	0.2855	0.0000
CKNOWC	0.1319	0.4116	0.0000	0.8306	0.1694	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
CFRIEND	-0.5361	-0.9102	0.0000	0.1715	0.8285	0.0000
CTRUST	-0.5581	-0.9175	0.0000	0.1583	0.8417	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
CWEALTH	0.4119	0.7608	0.0000	0.4212	0.5788	0.0000
CTECHC	0.4527	0.7233	0.0000	0.4769	0.5231	0.0000
CSTAB	0.4601	0.7807	0.0000	0.3904	0.6096	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
CWETHIC	0.3890	0.8576	0.0000	0.2645	0.7355	0.0000
CINDUS	0.4753	0.9017	0.0000	0.1870	0.8130	0.0000
CEDUC	0.3284	0.7242	0.0000	0.4756	0.5244	0.0000

Familiar	outward					
CBRAND	0.3475	0.5820	0.0000	0.6612	0.3388	0.0000
CKNOW	0.7481	0.8619	0.0000	0.2571	0.7429	0.0000
CFIND	0.2837	0.5392	0.0000	0.7092	0.2908	0.0000

P Belief	outward					
CATTRAC	0.1725	0.7680	0.0000	0.4102	0.5898	0.2242
CINNOV	0.1592	0.7513	0.0000	0.4356	0.5644	0.2146
CVARIET	0.1517	0.7118	0.0000	0.4934	0.5066	0.1926
CDURAB	0.1665	0.7558	0.0000	0.4287	0.5713	0.2172
CTECH	0.1609	0.7384	0.0000	0.4548	0.5452	0.2073
CRELIAB	0.2009	0.8175	0.0000	0.3317	0.6683	0.2540
CWORK	0.1494	0.6595	0.0000	0.5650	0.4350	0.1653
CQUAL	0.1662	0.6970	0.0000	0.5141	0.4859	0.1847
CDEFECT	0.0537	0.3204	0.0000	0.8973	0.1027	0.0390
CPRICE	0.0197	-0.0297	0.0000	0.9991	0.0009	0.0003

C Eval	outward					
CLIKE	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5071

P Eval	outward					
CVALUE	0.2125	0.6755	0.0000	0.5437	0.4563	0.2915
CSATIS	0.3747	0.8831	0.0000	0.2201	0.7799	0.4983
CRATE	0.3328	0.8548	0.0000	0.2694	0.7306	0.4668
CPROUD	0.3245	0.7429	0.0000	0.4482	0.5518	0.3526

Willingn	outward					
CBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.4588

United States

0Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
UPOLIT	0.3161	0.7181	0.0000	0.4843	0.5157	0.0000
ULIFE	0.2296	0.6607	0.0000	0.5635	0.4365	0.0000
UROLE	0.1200	0.5324	0.0000	0.7165	0.2835	0.0000
UENVIRO	0.1432	0.3748	0.0000	0.8595	0.1405	0.0000
URIGHTS	0.3617	0.7605	0.0000	0.4217	0.5783	0.0000
UKNOWC	0.3156	0.7246	0.0000	0.4750	0.5250	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
UFRIEND	0.5907	0.8861	0.0000	0.2148	0.7852	0.0000
UTRUST	0.3615	0.7940	0.0000	0.3696	0.6304	0.0000
UINDIV	0.3305	0.5736	0.0000	0.6710	0.3290	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
UWEALTH	0.4754	0.7674	0.0000	0.4112	0.5888	0.0000
UTECHC	0.3748	0.7657	0.0000	0.4137	0.5863	0.0000
USTAB	0.4455	0.7816	0.0000	0.3891	0.6109	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
UINDUS	0.4614	0.8255	0.0000	0.3186	0.6814	0.0000
UEDUC	0.2174	0.5731	0.0000	0.6715	0.3285	0.0000
UWETHIC	0.5676	0.8712	0.0000	0.2410	0.7590	0.0000

C Eval	outward					
UALIGN	-0.4943	-0.6574	0.0000	0.5678	0.4322	0.2121
ULIKE	-0.7710	-0.8756	0.0000	0.2334	0.7666	0.3763

Familiar	outward					
UBRAND	0.2547	0.4680	0.0000	0.7810	0.2190	0.0000
UKNOW	0.8816	0.9585	0.0000	0.0813	0.9187	0.0000
UPIND	0.0808	0.4429	0.0000	0.8038	0.1962	0.0000

P Belief	outward					
UDURAB	0.1802	0.7767	0.0000	0.3967	0.6033	0.1719
UTECH	0.1258	0.6234	0.0000	0.6114	0.3886	0.1107
URELIAB	0.1712	0.7618	0.0000	0.4197	0.5803	0.1653
UWORK	0.1739	0.7825	0.0000	0.3877	0.6123	0.1745
UATTRAC	0.1892	0.7669	0.0000	0.4119	0.5881	0.1676
UINNOV	0.1526	0.7028	0.0000	0.5060	0.4940	0.1407
UVARIET	0.1393	0.5762	0.0000	0.6680	0.3320	0.0946
UQUAL	0.1999	0.8233	0.0000	0.3222	0.6778	0.1931
UDEFFECT	0.0502	0.2636	0.0000	0.9305	0.0695	0.0198
UPRICE	0.0300	0.1586	0.0000	0.9748	0.0252	0.0072

P Eval	outward					
URATE	0.3150	0.8893	0.0000	0.2091	0.7909	0.5807
USATIS	0.3175	0.8857	0.0000	0.2156	0.7844	0.5760
UVALUE	0.2691	0.7844	0.0000	0.3847	0.6153	0.4518
UPROUD	0.2790	0.8160	0.0000	0.3341	0.6659	0.4889

Willingn	outward					
UBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5793

Relation	outward					
UTIES	0.2784	0.7788	0.0000	0.3934	0.6066	0.0818
UIMMIG	0.3225	0.7681	0.0000	0.4100	0.5900	0.0795
UINVEST	0.2179	0.7819	0.0000	0.3887	0.6113	0.0824
UINVER	0.0973	0.7263	0.0000	0.4725	0.5275	0.0711
UEXPORT	0.2132	0.5914	0.0000	0.6502	0.3498	0.0471
UIMPORT	0.2219	0.7582	0.0000	0.4251	0.5749	0.0775

Mexico

Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
MROLE	0.2564	0.7050	0.0000	0.5030	0.4970	0.0000
MRIGHTS	0.3354	0.6685	0.0000	0.5531	0.4469	0.0000
MLIFE	0.2979	0.7548	0.0000	0.4303	0.5697	0.0000
MENVIRO	0.1444	0.6411	0.0000	0.5889	0.4111	0.0000
MPOLIT	0.2442	0.6829	0.0000	0.5336	0.4664	0.0000
MKNOWC	0.3445	0.3214	0.0000	0.8967	0.1033	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
MINDIV	0.3107	0.6190	0.0000	0.6168	0.3832	0.0000
MFRIEND	0.6106	0.8390	0.0000	0.2961	0.7039	0.0000
MTRUST	0.4052	0.7289	0.0000	0.4687	0.5313	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
MWEALTH	0.3448	0.8230	0.0000	0.3226	0.6774	0.0000
MTECHC	0.5283	0.8773	0.0000	0.2304	0.7696	0.0000
MSTAB	0.3166	0.7984	0.0000	0.3626	0.6374	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
MEDUC	0.3139	0.6816	0.0000	0.5354	0.4646	0.0000
MWETHIC	0.4492	0.8558	0.0000	0.2676	0.7324	0.0000
MINDUS	0.4879	0.8231	0.0000	0.3224	0.6776	0.0000

C Eval	outward					
MLIKE	0.7466	0.8758	0.0000	0.2329	0.7671	0.4163
MALIGN	0.4996	0.6928	0.0000	0.5201	0.4799	0.2604

Relation	outward					
MTIES	0.2771	0.8751	0.0000	0.2341	0.7659	0.2244
MIMMIG	0.2112	0.7088	0.0000	0.4976	0.5024	0.1472
MINVEST	0.1995	0.8075	0.0000	0.3479	0.6521	0.1910
MINVFR	0.1720	0.6821	0.0000	0.5348	0.4652	0.1363
MEXPORT	0.1433	0.6267	0.0000	0.6072	0.3928	0.1151
MIMPORTS	0.2970	0.8066	0.0000	0.3494	0.6506	0.1906

P Belief	outward					
MATTRAC	0.1419	0.8029	0.0000	0.3553	0.6447	0.2874
MINNOV	0.1229	0.7847	0.0000	0.3842	0.6158	0.2745
MVARIET	0.1105	0.7041	0.0000	0.5043	0.4957	0.2210
MQUAL	0.1583	0.8112	0.0000	0.3419	0.6581	0.2933
MWORK	0.1525	0.8118	0.0000	0.3410	0.6590	0.2937
MDURAB	0.1646	0.8326	0.0000	0.3067	0.6933	0.3090
MTECH	0.1372	0.7819	0.0000	0.3887	0.6113	0.2725
MRELIAB	0.1652	0.8456	0.0000	0.2849	0.7151	0.3187
MDEPECT	0.1038	0.5554	0.0000	0.6915	0.3085	0.1375
MPRICE	-0.0562	-0.3183	0.0000	0.8987	0.1013	0.0452

P Eval	outward					
MRATE	0.3076	0.9047	0.0000	0.1814	0.8186	0.5518
MSATIS	0.2978	0.8825	0.0000	0.2213	0.7787	0.5249
MVALUE	0.2541	0.7574	0.0000	0.4263	0.5737	0.3867
MPROUD	0.3072	0.8670	0.0000	0.2483	0.7517	0.5067

Willingn	outward					
MBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5835

Familiar	outward					
MBRAND	0.2420	0.3555	0.0000	0.8736	0.1264	0.0000
MKNOW	0.8295	0.8947	0.0000	0.1995	0.8005	0.0000
MFIND	0.3074	0.5588	0.0000	0.6877	0.3123	0.0000

Chile

00Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
CHLIFE	0.2914	0.7733	0.0000	0.4020	0.5980	0.0000
CHROLE	0.2168	0.8027	0.0000	0.3556	0.6444	0.0000
CHENVIRO	0.2221	0.8181	0.0000	0.3308	0.6692	0.0000
CHRIGHTS	0.2823	0.7815	0.0000	0.3892	0.6108	0.0000
CHPOLIT	0.2019	0.6411	0.0000	0.5890	0.4110	0.0000
CHKNOWC	0.1950	0.3532	0.0000	0.8753	0.1247	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
CHFRIEND	0.5706	0.8431	0.0000	0.2891	0.7109	0.0000
CHTRUST	0.3771	0.7640	0.0000	0.4163	0.5837	0.0000
CHINDIV	0.3614	0.6387	0.0000	0.5921	0.4079	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
CHWEALTH	0.3603	0.8917	0.0000	0.2049	0.7951	0.0000
CHTECHC	0.3756	0.8742	0.0000	0.2357	0.7643	0.0000
CHSTAB	0.3873	0.9046	0.0000	0.1816	0.8184	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
CHWETHIC	0.4235	0.8113	0.0000	0.3419	0.6581	0.0000
CHINDUS	0.4404	0.8155	0.0000	0.3350	0.6650	0.0000
CHEDUC	0.3985	0.7461	0.0000	0.4434	0.5566	0.0000

P Belief	outward					
CHWORK	0.1492	0.7825	0.0000	0.3877	0.6123	0.2234
CHATTRAC	0.1408	0.7614	0.0000	0.4203	0.5797	0.2115
CHINNOV	0.1315	0.7828	0.0000	0.3872	0.6128	0.2236
CHVARIET	0.1364	0.7636	0.0000	0.4169	0.5831	0.2127
CHDURAB	0.1625	0.8176	0.0000	0.3315	0.6685	0.2439
CHTECH	0.1458	0.7836	0.0000	0.3859	0.6141	0.2240
CHRELIAB	0.1656	0.8065	0.0000	0.3496	0.6504	0.2373
CHQUAL	0.1831	0.7902	0.0000	0.3755	0.6245	0.2278
CHDEPCT	0.0736	0.3159	0.0000	0.9002	0.0998	0.0364
CHPRICE	-0.0622	-0.3254	0.0000	0.8941	0.1059	0.0386

C Eval	outward					
CHLIKE	0.7063	0.8222	0.0000	0.3240	0.6760	0.3119
CHALIGN	0.5809	0.7219	0.0000	0.4789	0.5211	0.2404

Familiar	outward					
CHBRAND	0.2398	0.5368	0.0000	0.7118	0.2882	0.0000
CHKNOW	0.5750	0.8227	0.0000	0.3232	0.6768	0.0000
CHFIND	0.4852	0.8209	0.0000	0.3262	0.6738	0.0000

P Eval	outward					
CHRATE	0.3261	0.8867	0.0000	0.2137	0.7863	0.5215
CHSATIS	0.3049	0.8177	0.0000	0.3313	0.6687	0.4434
CHVALUE	0.2769	0.7714	0.0000	0.4049	0.5951	0.3947
CHPROUD	0.3083	0.8041	0.0000	0.3535	0.6465	0.4288

Relation	outward					
CHTIES	0.2339	0.8446	0.0000	0.2867	0.7133	0.2311
CHIMMIG	0.2327	0.7473	0.0000	0.4415	0.5585	0.1809
CHINVEST	0.2072	0.8191	0.0000	0.3291	0.6709	0.2173
CHINVFR	0.1893	0.7150	0.0000	0.4888	0.5112	0.1656
CHEXPORT	0.1663	0.6645	0.0000	0.5585	0.4415	0.1430
CHIMPORT	0.2558	0.8324	0.0000	0.3070	0.6930	0.2245

Willingn	outward					
CHBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5266

Argentina

0Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
APOLIT	0.2391	0.7648	0.0000	0.4150	0.5850	0.0000
ALIFE	0.2319	0.7854	0.0000	0.3832	0.6168	0.0000
AROLE	0.2790	0.7914	0.0000	0.3737	0.6263	0.0000
AENVIRO	0.2232	0.8173	0.0000	0.3320	0.6680	0.0000
ARIGHTS	0.2552	0.7266	0.0000	0.4721	0.5279	0.0000
AKNOWC	0.1602	0.2896	0.0000	0.9161	0.0839	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
ATRUST	-0.4397	-0.7331	0.0000	0.4626	0.5374	0.0000
AINDIV	-0.4216	-0.7237	0.0000	0.4763	0.5237	0.0000
AFRIEND	-0.4710	-0.7909	0.0000	0.3745	0.6255	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
AWEALTH	0.2907	0.6886	0.0000	0.5258	0.4742	0.0000
ATECHC	0.5122	0.8830	0.0000	0.2203	0.7797	0.0000
ASTAB	0.4101	0.8474	0.0000	0.2819	0.7181	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
AEDUC	0.4401	0.7608	0.0000	0.4212	0.5788	0.0000
AINDUS	0.3954	0.7727	0.0000	0.4030	0.5970	0.0000
AWETHIC	0.4551	0.7903	0.0000	0.3755	0.6245	0.0000

P Belief	outward					
AATTRAC	0.1387	0.6508	0.0000	0.5765	0.4235	0.1696
AQUAL	0.1711	0.7896	0.0000	0.3765	0.6235	0.2497
AWORK	0.1623	0.7210	0.0000	0.4801	0.5199	0.2082
AINNOV	0.1558	0.7868	0.0000	0.3810	0.6190	0.2479
AVARIET	0.0930	0.5401	0.0000	0.7083	0.2917	0.1168
ADURAB	0.1888	0.8672	0.0000	0.2480	0.7520	0.3012
ATECH	0.1672	0.7530	0.0000	0.4330	0.5670	0.2271
ARELIAB	0.1790	0.8225	0.0000	0.3235	0.6765	0.2710
ADEFECT	0.0832	0.3546	0.0000	0.8743	0.1257	0.0504
APRICE	-0.0512	-0.3607	0.0000	0.8699	0.1301	0.0521

P Eval	outward					
AVALUE	0.2556	0.6794	0.0000	0.5383	0.4617	0.2883
ASATIS	0.3133	0.8152	0.0000	0.3355	0.6645	0.4150
ARATE	0.3356	0.8691	0.0000	0.2447	0.7553	0.4716
APROUD	0.3480	0.8026	0.0000	0.3559	0.6441	0.4022

C Eval	outward					
ALIKE	-0.7512	-0.8541	0.0000	0.2705	0.7295	0.3331
AALIGN	-0.5302	-0.6760	0.0000	0.5431	0.4569	0.2087

Relation	outward					
ATIES	0.2428	0.8301	0.0000	0.3110	0.6890	0.1161
AIMMIG	0.2624	0.7732	0.0000	0.4021	0.5979	0.1007
AINVEST	0.2308	0.7816	0.0000	0.3891	0.6109	0.1029
AINVFR	0.1356	0.6227	0.0000	0.6122	0.3878	0.0653
AEXPORT	0.1522	0.6365	0.0000	0.5948	0.4052	0.0683
AIMPORT	0.2851	0.8205	0.0000	0.3268	0.6732	0.1134

Familiar	outward					
ABRAND	0.5261	0.5961	0.0000	0.6446	0.3554	0.0000
AKNOW	0.8036	0.8489	0.0000	0.2794	0.7206	0.0000
AFIND	0.0147	0.2874	0.0000	0.9174	0.0826	0.0000

Willingn	outward					
ABUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.4842

Appendix L: Retail Buyer Measurement Models - Final Models

Canada

0B .. Path coefficients

	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	Familiar	P Belief	C Eval
C Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000	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
P Belief	0.000	0.000	0.040	0.361	0.413	0.000	0.000
C Eval	0.031	0.641	-0.169	0.200	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Eval	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.196	0.606	0.170
Willingn	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.252	0.000	0.000

0B .. Path coefficients

	P Eval	Willingn
C Descrp	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000
Familiar	0.000	0.000
P Belief	0.000	0.000
C Eval	0.000	0.000
P Eval	0.000	0.000
Willingn	0.504	0.000

0Inner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.5480	0.4520	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3940	0.6060	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4296	0.5704	0.0000
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3091	0.6909	0.0000
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4332	0.5668	0.0000
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.3763	0.4522	0.5478	0.2062
C Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.5085	0.0000	1.0000	0.5085
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.6470	0.3706	0.6294	0.4073
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.4514	0.0000	1.0000	0.4514
Average			0.2204	0.4035	0.5965	0.1413

0Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
CRIGHTS	0.2481	0.7203	0.0000	0.4811	0.5189	0.0000
CLIFE	0.4769	0.7677	0.0000	0.4107	0.5893	0.0000
CROLE	0.3201	0.6834	0.0000	0.5330	0.4670	0.0000
CENVIRO	0.2580	0.6197	0.0000	0.6160	0.3840	0.0000
CPOLIT	0.1397	0.5484	0.0000	0.6992	0.3008	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
CFRIEND	0.4902	0.8926	0.0000	0.2033	0.7967	0.0000
CTRUST	0.5102	0.8915	0.0000	0.2052	0.7948	0.0000
CINDIV	0.2261	0.4759	0.0000	0.7735	0.2265	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
CWEALTH	0.4090	0.7589	0.0000	0.4240	0.5760	0.0000
CTECHC	0.4551	0.7249	0.0000	0.4745	0.5255	0.0000
CSTAB	0.4606	0.7808	0.0000	0.3904	0.6096	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
CWETHIC	0.3868	0.8568	0.0000	0.2659	0.7341	0.0000
CINDUS	0.4769	0.9020	0.0000	0.1863	0.8137	0.0000
CEDEC	0.3290	0.7246	0.0000	0.4749	0.5251	0.0000

Familiar	outward					
CKNOW	0.8868	0.9460	0.0000	0.1052	0.8948	0.0000
CFIND	0.3296	0.4887	0.0000	0.7612	0.2388	0.0000

P Belief	outward					
CATTRAC	0.1757	0.7713	0.0000	0.4051	0.5949	0.2239
CINNOV	0.1612	0.7575	0.0000	0.4262	0.5738	0.2159
CVARIET	0.1547	0.7171	0.0000	0.4858	0.5142	0.1935
CDURAB	0.1706	0.7568	0.0000	0.4272	0.5728	0.2156
CTECH	0.1612	0.7402	0.0000	0.4522	0.5478	0.2062
CRELIAB	0.2066	0.8153	0.0000	0.3353	0.6647	0.2502
CWORK	0.1508	0.6573	0.0000	0.5679	0.4321	0.1626
CQUAL	0.1662	0.6944	0.0000	0.5178	0.4822	0.1815

C Eval	outward					
CLIKE	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5085

P Eval	outward					
CVALUE	0.2104	0.6737	0.0000	0.5462	0.4538	0.2936
CSATIS	0.3763	0.8835	0.0000	0.2194	0.7806	0.5051
CPROUD	0.3271	0.7447	0.0000	0.4455	0.5545	0.3588
CRATE	0.3306	0.8537	0.0000	0.2713	0.7287	0.4715

Willingn	outward					
CBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.4514
=====						

United States

OB .. Path coefficients

	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	C Eval	Familiar	P Belief
C Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Eval	-0.157	-0.513	0.059	-0.185	0.000	0.000	0.000
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Belief	0.000	0.000	0.303	0.223	0.000	0.172	0.000
P Eval	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.034	0.048	0.816
Willingn	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.078	0.000
Relation	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.365	0.000	0.000

OB .. Path coefficients

	P Eval	Willingn	Relation
C Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Eval	0.000	0.000	0.000
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Belief	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Eval	0.000	0.000	0.037
Willingn	0.719	0.000	0.047
Relation	0.000	0.000	0.000

0Inner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.5824	0.4176	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4185	0.5815	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4046	0.5954	0.0000
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4102	0.5898	0.0000
C Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.4788	0.4027	0.5973	0.2860
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4346	0.5654	0.0000
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.2939	0.4633	0.5367	0.1577
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.7290	0.2859	0.7141	0.5206
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.5804	0.0000	1.0000	0.5804
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	0.1332	0.4568	0.5432	0.0723
Average			0.2215	0.4291	0.5709	0.1333

Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
UPOLIT	0.3942	0.7572	0.0000	0.4266	0.5734	0.0000
ULIFE	0.2880	0.6784	0.0000	0.5398	0.4602	0.0000
UROLE	0.1466	0.5088	0.0000	0.7412	0.2588	0.0000
UENVIRO	0.1809	0.4111	0.0000	0.8310	0.1690	0.0000
URIGHTS	0.4512	0.7917	0.0000	0.3733	0.6267	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
UFRIEND	0.5917	0.8869	0.0000	0.2133	0.7867	0.0000
UTRUST	0.3625	0.7948	0.0000	0.3683	0.6317	0.0000
UINDIV	0.3276	0.5712	0.0000	0.6737	0.3263	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
UWEALTH	0.4756	0.7676	0.0000	0.4108	0.5892	0.0000
UTECHC	0.3754	0.7660	0.0000	0.4132	0.5868	0.0000
USTAB	0.4447	0.7811	0.0000	0.3899	0.6101	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
UINDUS	0.4640	0.8269	0.0000	0.3163	0.6837	0.0000
UEDUC	0.2176	0.5734	0.0000	0.6712	0.3288	0.0000
UWETHIC	0.5650	0.8700	0.0000	0.2431	0.7569	0.0000

C Eval	outward					
UALIGN	-0.4704	-0.6372	0.0000	0.5939	0.4061	0.1944
ULIKE	-0.7885	-0.8881	0.0000	0.2114	0.7886	0.3776

Familiar	outward					
UKNOW	0.9741	0.9973	0.0000	0.0054	0.9946	0.0000
UFIND	0.0773	0.3692	0.0000	0.8637	0.1363	0.0000

P Belief	outward					
UDURAB	0.1831	0.7764	0.0000	0.3972	0.6028	0.1772
UTECH	0.1288	0.6377	0.0000	0.5934	0.4066	0.1195
URELIAB	0.1742	0.7619	0.0000	0.4194	0.5806	0.1706
UWORK	0.1765	0.7713	0.0000	0.4050	0.5950	0.1748
UATTRAC	0.1917	0.7684	0.0000	0.4095	0.5905	0.1735
UINNOV	0.1550	0.7076	0.0000	0.4993	0.5007	0.1471
UVARIET	0.1428	0.5868	0.0000	0.6556	0.3444	0.1012
UQUAL	0.2023	0.8207	0.0000	0.3265	0.6735	0.1979

P Eval	outward					
URATE	0.3145	0.8893	0.0000	0.2092	0.7908	0.5765
UPROUD	0.2797	0.8165	0.0000	0.3334	0.6666	0.4860
USATIS	0.3183	0.8859	0.0000	0.2152	0.7848	0.5721
UVALUE	0.2679	0.7838	0.0000	0.3856	0.6144	0.4479

Willingn	outward					
UBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5804

Relation	outward					
UTIES	0.2765	0.7776	0.0000	0.3954	0.6046	0.0805
UIMMIG	0.3255	0.7699	0.0000	0.4073	0.5927	0.0789
UINVEST	0.2187	0.7823	0.0000	0.3880	0.6120	0.0815
UINVFR	0.0966	0.7254	0.0000	0.4738	0.5262	0.0701
UEXPORT	0.2121	0.5902	0.0000	0.6517	0.3483	0.0464
UIMPORT	0.2217	0.7584	0.0000	0.4249	0.5751	0.0766

Mexico

OB .. Path coefficients

	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	C Eval	Relation	P Belief
C Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Eval	0.036	0.674	-0.077	0.105	0.000	0.000	0.000
Relation	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.541	0.000	0.000
P Belief	0.000	0.000	0.131	0.459	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Eval	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.065	0.093	0.729
Willingn	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.073	0.000
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

OB .. Path coefficients

	P Eval	Willingn	Familiar
C Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Eval	0.000	0.000	0.000
Relation	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Belief	0.000	0.000	0.285
P Eval	0.000	0.000	0.165
Willingn	0.695	0.000	0.087
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000

OInner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4544	0.5456	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4607	0.5393	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3063	0.6937	0.0000
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3753	0.6247	0.0000
C Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.5321	0.3779	0.6221	0.3310
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	0.2928	0.4285	0.5715	0.1674
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.4407	0.3556	0.6444	0.2840
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.6713	0.2693	0.7307	0.4905
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.5868	0.0000	1.0000	0.5868
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4248	0.5752	0.0000
Average			0.2524	0.3729	0.6271	0.1753

Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
MROLE	0.2679	0.7522	0.0000	0.4343	0.5657	0.0000
MRIGHTS	0.3563	0.7274	0.0000	0.4709	0.5291	0.0000
MLIFE	0.3158	0.7534	0.0000	0.4324	0.5676	0.0000
MENVIRO	0.1492	0.7064	0.0000	0.5010	0.4990	0.0000
MPOLIT	0.2604	0.7529	0.0000	0.4331	0.5669	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
MINDIV	0.3105	0.6187	0.0000	0.6173	0.3827	0.0000
MFRIEND	0.6126	0.8402	0.0000	0.2941	0.7059	0.0000
MTRUST	0.4030	0.7274	0.0000	0.4709	0.5291	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
MWEALTH	0.3409	0.8205	0.0000	0.3269	0.6731	0.0000
MTECHC	0.5367	0.8809	0.0000	0.2241	0.7759	0.0000
MSTAB	0.3114	0.7951	0.0000	0.3678	0.6322	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
MEDUC	0.3112	0.6798	0.0000	0.5379	0.4621	0.0000
MWETHIC	0.4503	0.8562	0.0000	0.2669	0.7331	0.0000
MINDUS	0.4890	0.8239	0.0000	0.3211	0.6789	0.0000

C Eval	outward					
MLIKE	0.7589	0.8841	0.0000	0.2184	0.7816	0.4159
MALIGN	0.4838	0.6801	0.0000	0.5374	0.4626	0.2461

Relation	outward					
MTIES	0.2769	0.8752	0.0000	0.2341	0.7659	0.2243
MIMMIG	0.2110	0.7086	0.0000	0.4979	0.5021	0.1470
MINVEST	0.1998	0.8076	0.0000	0.3478	0.6522	0.1910
MINVFR	0.1721	0.6823	0.0000	0.5344	0.4656	0.1363
MEXPORT	0.1439	0.6272	0.0000	0.6066	0.3934	0.1152
MIMPORTS	0.2965	0.8063	0.0000	0.3499	0.6501	0.1904

P Belief	outward					
MATTRAC	0.1532	0.8170	0.0000	0.3326	0.6674	0.2941
MINNOV	0.1320	0.7997	0.0000	0.3606	0.6394	0.2818
MVARIET	0.1180	0.7172	0.0000	0.4856	0.5144	0.2267
MQUAL	0.1710	0.8053	0.0000	0.3515	0.6485	0.2858
MWORK	0.1646	0.8085	0.0000	0.3464	0.6536	0.2880
MDURAB	0.1781	0.8348	0.0000	0.3031	0.6969	0.3071
MTECH	0.1460	0.7866	0.0000	0.3812	0.6188	0.2727
MRELIAB	0.1777	0.8464	0.0000	0.2836	0.7164	0.3157

P Eval	outward					
MRATE	0.3083	0.9049	0.0000	0.1811	0.8189	0.5497
MSATIS	0.2978	0.8824	0.0000	0.2214	0.7786	0.5227
MPROUD	0.3058	0.8665	0.0000	0.2492	0.7508	0.5040
MVALUE	0.2550	0.7579	0.0000	0.4255	0.5745	0.3856

Willingn	outward					
MBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5868

Familiar	outward					
MKNOW	0.8875	0.9515	0.0000	0.0947	0.9053	0.0000
MFIND	0.3143	0.4951	0.0000	0.7549	0.2451	0.0000

Chile

OB .. Path coefficients

	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	P Belief	C Eval	Familiar
C Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Belief	0.000	0.000	0.364	0.242	0.000	0.000	0.148
C Eval	0.177	0.512	-0.006	0.129	0.000	0.000	0.000
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Eval	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.696	0.085	0.203
Relation	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.570	0.000
Willingn	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.062

OB .. Path coefficients

	P Eval	Relation	Willingn
C Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Belief	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Eval	0.000	0.000	0.000
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Eval	0.000	0.073	0.000
Relation	0.000	0.000	0.000
Willingn	0.710	-0.044	0.000

0Inner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3897	0.6103	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4326	0.5674	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.2074	0.7926	0.0000
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3734	0.6266	0.0000
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.3555	0.3769	0.6231	0.2216
C Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.4552	0.4018	0.5982	0.2723
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.2916	0.7084	0.0000
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.6646	0.3259	0.6741	0.4480
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	0.3253	0.4019	0.5981	0.1946
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.5280	0.0000	1.0000	0.5280
Average			0.2329	0.3542	0.6458	0.1569

0Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
CHLIFE	0.3083	0.7726	0.0000	0.4031	0.5969	0.0000
CHROLE	0.2268	0.8079	0.0000	0.3473	0.6527	0.0000
CHENVIRO	0.2331	0.8475	0.0000	0.2817	0.7183	0.0000
CHRIGHTS	0.2986	0.8004	0.0000	0.3594	0.6406	0.0000
CHPOLIT	0.2133	0.6655	0.0000	0.5571	0.4429	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
CHFRIEND	0.5718	0.8437	0.0000	0.2881	0.7119	0.0000
CHTRUST	0.3761	0.7635	0.0000	0.4171	0.5829	0.0000
CHINDIV	0.3610	0.6383	0.0000	0.5926	0.4074	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
CHWEALTH	0.3594	0.8914	0.0000	0.2055	0.7945	0.0000
CHTECHC	0.3765	0.8746	0.0000	0.2352	0.7648	0.0000
CHSTAB	0.3873	0.9046	0.0000	0.1817	0.8183	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
CHWETHIC	0.4253	0.8125	0.0000	0.3399	0.6601	0.0000
CHINDUS	0.4439	0.8176	0.0000	0.3315	0.6685	0.0000
CHEDUC	0.3927	0.7423	0.0000	0.4489	0.5511	0.0000

P Belief	outward					
CHWORK	0.1569	0.7895	0.0000	0.3766	0.6234	0.2216
CHATTRAC	0.1465	0.7700	0.0000	0.4071	0.5929	0.2108
CHINNOV	0.1364	0.7961	0.0000	0.3662	0.6338	0.2253
CHVARIET	0.1415	0.7735	0.0000	0.4017	0.5983	0.2127
CHDURAB	0.1696	0.8140	0.0000	0.3374	0.6626	0.2356
CHTECH	0.1513	0.7843	0.0000	0.3849	0.6151	0.2187
CHRELIAB	0.1728	0.8050	0.0000	0.3520	0.6480	0.2304
CHQUAL	0.1912	0.7817	0.0000	0.3889	0.6111	0.2173

C Eval	outward					
CHLIKE	0.7140	0.8282	0.0000	0.3141	0.6859	0.3122
CHALIGN	0.5720	0.7145	0.0000	0.4895	0.5105	0.2324

Familiar	outward					
CHKNOW	0.6459	0.8721	0.0000	0.2395	0.7605	0.0000
CHFIND	0.5391	0.8101	0.0000	0.3438	0.6562	0.0000

P Eval	outward					
CHRATE	0.3250	0.8864	0.0000	0.2144	0.7856	0.5221
CHSATIS	0.3059	0.8181	0.0000	0.3307	0.6693	0.4448
CHPROUD	0.3091	0.8044	0.0000	0.3529	0.6471	0.4301
CHVALUE	0.2763	0.7710	0.0000	0.4055	0.5945	0.3951

Relation	outward					
CHTIES	0.2339	0.8446	0.0000	0.2867	0.7133	0.2320
CHIMMIG	0.2324	0.7471	0.0000	0.4419	0.5581	0.1815
CHINVEST	0.2069	0.8189	0.0000	0.3294	0.6706	0.2181
CHINVFR	0.1897	0.7153	0.0000	0.4883	0.5117	0.1665
CHEXPORT	0.1667	0.6648	0.0000	0.5580	0.4420	0.1438
CHIMPORT	0.2558	0.8323	0.0000	0.3072	0.6928	0.2254

Willingn	outward					
CHBUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.5280

Argentina

OB .. Path coefficients

	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	P Belief	P Eval	C Eval
C Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Belief	0.000	0.000	0.562	0.081	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Eval	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.685	0.000	-0.135
C Eval	-0.258	0.495	0.081	-0.126	0.000	0.000	0.000
Relation	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.411
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Willingn	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.685	0.000

OB .. Path coefficients

	Relation	Familiar	Willingn
C Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Descrp	0.000	0.000	0.000
C Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Comp	0.000	0.000	0.000
P Belief	0.000	0.115	0.000
P Eval	0.104	0.115	0.000
C Eval	0.000	0.000	0.000
Relation	0.000	0.000	0.000
Familiar	0.000	0.000	0.000
Willingn	0.035	-0.003	0.000

0Inner Model

Block	Mean	Location	Mult.RSq	AvResVar	AvCommun	AvRedund
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3792	0.6208	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4378	0.5622	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3428	0.6572	0.0000
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3999	0.6001	0.0000
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.3937	0.4350	0.5650	0.2224
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.6303	0.3686	0.6314	0.3980
C Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.4515	0.4069	0.5931	0.2678
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	0.1687	0.4393	0.5607	0.0946
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4954	0.5046	0.0000
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.4839	0.0000	1.0000	0.4839
Average			0.2128	0.4009	0.5991	0.1340

00Outer Model

Variable	Weight	Loading	Location	ResidVar	Communal	Redundan

C Descrp	outward					
APOLIT	0.2475	0.7807	0.0000	0.3905	0.6095	0.0000
ALIFE	0.2401	0.7783	0.0000	0.3942	0.6058	0.0000
AROLE	0.2888	0.7971	0.0000	0.3646	0.6354	0.0000
AENVIRO	0.2311	0.8400	0.0000	0.2943	0.7057	0.0000
ARIGHTS	0.2643	0.7400	0.0000	0.4524	0.5476	0.0000

P Descrp	outward					
ATRUST	-0.4394	-0.7328	0.0000	0.4630	0.5370	0.0000
AINDIV	-0.4215	-0.7237	0.0000	0.4763	0.5237	0.0000
AFRIEND	-0.4715	-0.7912	0.0000	0.3741	0.6259	0.0000

C Comp	outward					
AWEALTH	0.2899	0.6880	0.0000	0.5267	0.4733	0.0000
ATECHC	0.5144	0.8839	0.0000	0.2188	0.7812	0.0000
ASTAB	0.4085	0.8467	0.0000	0.2831	0.7169	0.0000

P Comp	outward					
AEDUC	0.4367	0.7586	0.0000	0.4246	0.5754	0.0000
AINDUS	0.3952	0.7727	0.0000	0.4029	0.5971	0.0000
AWETHIC	0.4585	0.7924	0.0000	0.3722	0.6278	0.0000

P Belief	outward					
AATTRAC	0.1467	0.6706	0.0000	0.5502	0.4498	0.1771
AQUAL	0.1802	0.7880	0.0000	0.3790	0.6210	0.2444
AWORK	0.1701	0.7206	0.0000	0.4808	0.5192	0.2044
AINNOV	0.1640	0.7954	0.0000	0.3674	0.6326	0.2490
AVARIET	0.0995	0.5674	0.0000	0.6781	0.3219	0.1267
ADURAB	0.1964	0.8630	0.0000	0.2552	0.7448	0.2932
ATECH	0.1716	0.7468	0.0000	0.4423	0.5577	0.2196
ARELIAB	0.1859	0.8203	0.0000	0.3271	0.6729	0.2649

P Eval	outward					
AVALUE	0.2571	0.6804	0.0000	0.5371	0.4629	0.2918
ASATIS	0.3143	0.8155	0.0000	0.3349	0.6651	0.4193
APROUD	0.3472	0.8020	0.0000	0.3568	0.6432	0.4054
ARATE	0.3341	0.8686	0.0000	0.2455	0.7545	0.4756

C Eval	outward					
ALIKE	-0.7531	-0.8555	0.0000	0.2680	0.7320	0.3305
AALIGN	-0.5278	-0.6739	0.0000	0.5458	0.4542	0.2051

Relation	outward					
ATIES	0.2428	0.8301	0.0000	0.3109	0.6891	0.1162
AIMMIG	0.2623	0.7732	0.0000	0.4022	0.5978	0.1008
AINVEST	0.2308	0.7815	0.0000	0.3892	0.6108	0.1030
AINVFR	0.1356	0.6228	0.0000	0.6121	0.3879	0.0654
AEXPORT	0.1523	0.6366	0.0000	0.5947	0.4053	0.0684
AIMPORT	0.2850	0.8205	0.0000	0.3268	0.6732	0.1135

Familiar	outward					
AKNOW	1.0058	0.9990	0.0000	0.0020	0.9980	0.0000
AFIND	-0.0454	0.1062	0.0000	0.9887	0.0113	0.0000

Willingn	outward					
ABUY	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.4839

Appendix M: Adjusted T-Statistics - Consumers

Canada

Number of cases in full model: 301

Jackknife deletion number: 10

Number of samples generated: 30

Number of good samples: 30

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimate):

Eval	P Eval	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	Familiar	P Belief	C
		Willingn						
C Descrp		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000						
P Descrp		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000						
C Comp		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000						
P Comp		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	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000						
P Belief		0.0000	0.0000	0.1830	0.3080	0.2640	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000						
C Eval		0.1430	0.4820	-0.0970	0.2460	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000						
P Eval		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0500	0.7160	
0.1760	0.0000	0.0000						
Willingn		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.1550	0.0000	
0.0000	0.6830	0.0000						

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted)

Eval	P Eval	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	Familiar	P Belief	C
		Willingn						
C Descrp		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000						
P Descrp		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000						
C Comp		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000						
P Comp		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	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000						
P Belief		0.0000	0.0000	2.1444	4.1453	3.0870	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000						
C Eval		1.3988	4.7880	-0.5936	2.1208	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000						
P Eval		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0368	16.8690	
2.6138	0.0000	0.0000						
Willingn		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	2.7179	0.0000	
0.0000	11.5398	0.0000						

United States

Number of cases in full model: 301
 Jackknife deletion number: 10
 Number of samples generated: 30
 Number of good samples: 30

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimate):

		C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	C Eval	Familiar	P
Belief	P Eval	Willingn	Relation					
C Descrp	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	0.0000	
P Descrp	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	0.0000	
C Comp	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	0.0000	
P Comp	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	0.0000	
C Eval	-0.1970	-0.5170	0.0630	-0.1400	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	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.1970	0.2780	0.0000	0.3440	
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.0330	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.1410	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.1600	
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.0290	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
0.7900	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.4300	0.0000	
Willingn	0.6450	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	
Relation	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	0.0000	

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted)

		C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	C Eval	Familiar	P
Belief	P Eval	Willingn	Relation					
C Descrp	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	0.0000	
P Descrp	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	0.0000	
C Comp	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	0.0000	
P Comp	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	0.0000	
C Eval	-2.1324	-6.3115	0.8544	-1.0915	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	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.9819	3.1016	0.0000	2.2420	
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.1504	-2.2766	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	3.1307	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	2.2915	
P Eval	18.0654	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	7.4386	0.0000	0.3576	0.0000	0.0000	-8.6393	0.0000	
Willingn	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	0.0000	
Relation	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	0.0000	

Mexico

Number of cases in full model: 301

Jackknife deletion number: 10

Number of samples generated: 30

Number of good samples: 30

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimate):

		C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	C Eval	Relation	P
Belief	P Eval	Willingn	Familiar					
C Descrp	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	0.0000	
P Descrp	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	0.0000	
C Comp	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	0.0000	
P Comp	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	0.0000	
C Eval	0.1760	0.5070	-0.1380	0.2210	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.5070	0.0000	
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.5070	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.5070	0.0000	
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.1950	0.3310	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.1790	0.0000	0.0000	0.0560	0.1300	
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0560	0.1300	
0.7470	0.0000	0.0000	-0.1080	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.1090	
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.1090	
0.0000	0.6750	0.0000	-0.0270	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Familiar	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	0.0000	

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted)

		C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	C Eval	Relation	P
Belief	P Eval	Willingn	Familiar					
C Descrp	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	0.0000	
P Descrp	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	0.0000	
C Comp	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	0.0000	
P Comp	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	0.0000	
C Eval	1.3009	3.8036	-1.0409	1.0760	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0826	0.0000	
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0826	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0826	0.0000	
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	2.0482	3.8654	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-1.3246	0.0000	0.0000	0.9402	2.5145	
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.9402	2.5145	
16.6701	0.0000	0.0000	-1.8677	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.9217	
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.9217	
0.0000	10.8808	0.0000	-0.2168	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Familiar	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	0.0000	

Chile

Number of cases in full model: 301
 Jackknife deletion number: 10
 Number of samples generated: 30
 Number of good samples: 30

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimate):

		C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	P Belief	C Eval
Familiar	P Eval	Relation	Willingn				
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.2340	0.3210	0.0000	0.0000
-0.3130	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
C Eval	0.0000	0.1760	0.4540	0.0380	0.2490	0.0000	0.0000
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7860	0.0040
-0.0430	0.0000	0.1370	0.0000				
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.5540
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
-0.0510	0.7010	0.1050	0.0000				

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted)

		C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	P Belief	C Eval
Familiar	P Eval	Relation	Willingn				
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	2.7985	3.5086	0.0000	0.0000
-4.9376	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
C Eval	0.0000	1.3668	4.4290	0.2049	2.4846	0.0000	0.0000
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	17.3137	-0.0162
-1.1205	0.0000	2.5728	0.0000				
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	6.7579
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
-0.5700	13.3966	1.4670	0.0000				

Argentina

Number of cases in full model: 301

Jackknife deletion number: 10

Number of samples generated: 30

Number of good samples: 30

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimate):

	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	P Belief	P Eval	C
Eval	Relation	Familiar	Willingn				
C Descrp		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
P Descrp		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
C Comp		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
P Comp		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
P Belief		0.0000	0.0000	0.2360	0.2930	0.0000	0.0000
0.0000	0.0000	-0.3130	0.0000				
P Eval		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7760	0.0000
0.0200	0.1260	-0.0490	0.0000				
C Eval		-0.3520	0.4010	0.2320	-0.3240	0.0000	0.0000
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
Relation		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
-0.4960	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
Familiar		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
Willingn		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.6520
0.0000	0.0750	-0.0240	0.0000				

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted)

	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	P Belief	P Eval	C
Eval	Relation	Familiar	Willingn				
C Descrp		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
P Descrp		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
C Comp		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
P Comp		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
P Belief		0.0000	0.0000	2.3164	3.4474	0.0000	0.0000
0.0000	0.0000	-1.6927	0.0000				
P Eval		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	17.2138	0.0000
0.5324	2.4784	-1.7071	0.0000				
C Eval		-3.3713	4.3065	2.6840	-3.5233	0.0000	0.0000
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
Relation		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
-8.5153	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
Familiar		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000				
Willingn		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	9.0419
0.0000	1.0259	-1.4779	0.0000				

Appendix N: Comparison of Consumer Models - ANOVA Results

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CDSC_CEV
By Variable COUNTRY2

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	.3585	.3585	2002.7748	.0000
Within Groups	58	.0104	.0002		
Total	59	.3689			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable PDSC_CEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	23.1603	5.7901	31807.7448	.0000
Within Groups	145	.0264	.0002		
Total	149	23.1867			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable PDSC_CEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .0095 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.41

(*) 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
		S 1 3 2 4
Mean	COUNTRY	
-.5168	Grp 5	
.4014	Grp 1	*
.4542	Grp 3	* *
.4821	Grp 2	* * *
.5085	Grp 4	* * * *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 5
Mean -.5168
- - - - -

Subset 2

Group Grp 1
Mean .4014
- - - - -

Subset 3

Group Grp 3
Mean .4542
- - - - -

Subset 4

Group Grp 2
Mean .4821
- - - - -

Subset 5

Group Grp 4
Mean .5085

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable PCOM_CEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	6.5468	3.2734	19192.0612	.0000
Within Groups	87	.0148	.0002		
Total	89	6.5616			

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0092 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 3.52

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G
		r r r
		p p p
		1 2 3
Mean	COUNTRY	
-.3242	Grp 1	
.2469	Grp 2	*
.2489	Grp 3	*

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 1
 Mean -.3242
 - - - - -

Subset 2

Group Grp 2 Grp 3
 Mean .2469 .2489
 - - - - -

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CCOM_PBF
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	.0711	.0178	121.5604	.0000
Within Groups	145	.0212	.0001		
Total	149	.0923			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CCOM_PBF
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if

$MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0085 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.41

(*) 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	
.1833	Grp 2	
.1951	Grp 4	*
.1977	Grp 5	*
.2344	Grp 3	* * *
.2363	Grp 1	* * *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1		
Group	Grp 2	
Mean	.1833	
- - - - -		
Subset 2		
Group	Grp 4	Grp 5
Mean	.1951	.1977
- - - - -		
Subset 3		
Group	Grp 3	Grp 1
Mean	.2344	.2363
- - - - -		

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable PCOM_PBF
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	.0541	.0135	104.4184	.0000
Within Groups	145	.0188	.0001		
Total	149	.0729			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable PCOM_PBF
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0080 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.41

(*) 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	
.2780	Grp 5	
.2929	Grp 1	*
.3076	Grp 2	* *
.3204	Grp 3	* * *
.3312	Grp 4	* * * *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 5
Mean .2780
- - - - -

Subset 2

Group Grp 1
Mean .2929

- - - - -

Subset 3

Group	Grp 2
Mean	.3076

- - - - -

Subset 4

Group	Grp 3
Mean	.3204

- - - - -

Subset 5

Group	Grp 4
Mean	.3312

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CEV_REL
By Variable COUNTRY7

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	20.7648	10.3824	145828.379	.0000
Within Groups	87	.0062	.0001		
Total	89	20.7710			

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0060 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 3.52

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G
		r r r
		p p p
		1 3 2
Mean	COUNTRY7	
-.4966	Grp 1	
-.4295	Grp 3	*
.5542	Grp 2	* *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 1
Mean -.4966
- - - - -

Subset 2

Group Grp 3
Mean -.4295
- - - - -

Subset 3

Group Grp 2
Mean .5542
- - - - -

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable PBEL_PEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	.1150	.0287	871.8274	.0000
Within Groups	145	.0048	.0000		
Total	149	.1198			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable PBEL_PEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0041 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.41

(*) 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 1 3 5
Mean	COUNTRY	
.7163	Grp 2	
.7471	Grp 4	*
.7750	Grp 1	* *
.7861	Grp 3	* * *
.7899	Grp 5	* * *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 2
Mean .7163
- - - - -

Subset 2

Group Grp 4
Mean .7471

- - - - -

Subset 3

Group	Grp 1
-------	-------

Mean	.7750
------	-------

- - - - -

Subset 4

Group	Grp 3	Grp 5
-------	-------	-------

Mean	.7861	.7899
------	-------	-------

- - - - -

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable FAM_PB
By Variable COUNTR10

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	3	7.5519	2.5173	75.1940	.0000
Within Groups	116	3.8834	.0335		
Total	119	11.4352			

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .1294 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.01

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G G
		r r r r
		p p p p
		3 1 4 2
Mean	COUNTR10	
-.3126	Grp 3	
-.2289	Grp 1	
.1853	Grp 4	* *
.2634	Grp 2	* *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group	Grp 3	Grp 1
Mean	-.3126	-.2289
- - - - -		

Subset 2

Group	Grp 4	Grp 2
Mean	.1853	.2634
- - - - -		

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable FAM_WILL
By Variable COUNTR12

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	.0770	.0770	7.9719	.0065
Within Groups	58	.5600	.0097		
Total	59	.6370			

No range tests performed with fewer than three non-empty groups.

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable REL_PE
By Variable COUNTR13

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	3	.0044	.0015	35.8883	.0000
Within Groups	116	.0047	.0000		
Total	119	.0091			

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0045 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.01

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G G
		r r r r
		p p p p
		2 4 3 5
Mean	COUNTR13	
.1261	Grp 2	
.1299	Grp 4	
.1370	Grp 3	* *
.1416	Grp 5	* *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group	Grp 2	Grp 4
Mean	.1261	.1299
- - - - -		

Subset 2

Group	Grp 3	Grp 5
Mean	.1370	.1416

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable PEV_WILL
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	.0613	.0153	192.1042	.0000
Within Groups	145	.0116	.0001		
Total	149	.0729			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable PEV_WILL
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0063 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 4.41

(*) 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 4 2 3
Mean	COUNTRY	
.6454	Grp 5	
.6521	Grp 1	
.6754	Grp 4	* *
.6831	Grp 2	* * *
.7004	Grp 3	* * * *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group	Grp 5	Grp 1
Mean	.6454	.6521
- - - - -		

Subset 2

Group	Grp 4
Mean	.6754
- - - - -	

Subset 3

Group	Grp 2
Mean	.6831
- - - - -	

Subset 4

Group	Grp 3
Mean	.7004
- - - - -	

Appendix O: Adjusted T-Statistics - Retail Buyers

Canada

Number of cases in full model: 147
Jackknife deletion number: 4
Number of samples generated: 36
Number of good samples: 36

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimate):

	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	Familiar	P Belief	C Eval	P Eval	Willingn
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Comp	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	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3610	0.4130	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Eval	0.0310	0.6410	-0.1690	0.2000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.1960	0.6060	0.1700	0.0000	0.0000
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.2520	0.0000	0.0000	0.5040	0.0000

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted)

	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	Familiar	P Belief	C Eval	P Eval	Willingn
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Comp	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	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.1939	2.3947	4.1504	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Eval	-0.2822	4.6941	-1.2170	1.4173	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	2.4950	6.0602	1.6292	0.0000	0.0000
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.8162	0.0000	0.0000	3.9425	0.0000

United States

Number of cases in full model: 147
 Jackknife deletion number: 4
 Number of samples generated: 36
 Number of good samples: 36

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimate):

	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	C Eval	Familiar	P Belief	P Eval	Willingn	Relation
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Eval	-0.1570	-0.5130	0.0590	-0.1850	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.3030	0.2230	0.0000	0.1720	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.0340	0.0480	0.8160	0.0000	0.0000	0.0370
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0780	0.0000	0.7190	0.0000	0.0470
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.3650	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted)

	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	C Eval	Familiar	P Belief	P Eval	Willingn	Relation
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Eval	-1.3151	-3.2024	0.3482	-1.4499	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	2.3322	1.9757	0.0000	1.2131	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.5037	0.6554	16.1311	0.0000	0.0000	0.3585
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.8213	0.0000	7.6406	0.0000	0.5868
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-2.9980	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Mexico

Number of cases in full model: 147

Jackknife deletion number: 4

Number of samples generated: 36

Number of good samples: 36

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimate):

C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	C Eval	Relation	P Belief	P Eval	Willingn	Familiar
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Eval	0.0360	0.6740	-0.0770	0.1050	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.5410	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.1310	0.4590	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.2850
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0930	0.7290	0.0000	0.0000	0.1650
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0730	0.0000	0.6950	0.0000	0.0870
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted)

C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	C Eval	Relation	P Belief	P Eval	Willingn	Familiar
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Eval	0.2778	6.2236	-0.3898	0.8972	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	5.0096	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	1.0788	4.0954	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	2.4838
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-1.0667	10.5457	0.0000	0.0000	1.7414
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.9765	0.0000	8.9063	0.0000	1.0345
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Chile

Number of cases in full model: 147
 Jackknife deletion number: 4
 Number of samples generated: 36
 Number of good samples: 36

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimate):

	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	P Belief	C Eval	Familiar	P Eval	Relation	Willingn
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Eval	0.1770	0.5120	0.3640	0.2420	0.0000	0.0000	0.1480	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	-0.0060	0.1290	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.6960	0.0850	0.2030	0.0000	0.0730	0.0000
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.5700	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
						0.0000	0.0620	0.7100	-0.0440	0.0000

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted)

	C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	P Belief	C Eval	Familiar	P Eval	Relation	Willingn
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Eval	1.2075	3.3112	2.9095	2.4387	0.0000	0.0000	1.4482	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	-0.3541	1.1626	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	10.5876	1.1681	2.8027	0.0000	0.8539	0.0000
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	5.2793	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
						0.0000	1.1502	10.5345	-0.7481	0.0000

Argentina

Number of cases in full model: 147
 Jackknife deletion number: 4
 Number of samples generated: 36
 Number of good samples: 36

Path Coefficients Table (Entire Sample Estimate):

C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	P Belief	P Eval	C Eval	Relation	Familiar	Willingn
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.1150	0.0000
C Eval	-0.2580	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.1350	0.1040	0.1150	0.0000
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	-0.1260	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.4110	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
								-0.0030	0.0000
								0.0350	0.0000

Path Coefficients Table (T-Statistic Adjusted)

C Descrp	P Descrp	C Comp	P Comp	P Belief	P Eval	C Eval	Relation	Familiar	Willingn
C Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Descrp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
C Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Comp	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Belief	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
P Eval	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.1970	0.0000
C Eval	-1.2551	3.0436	0.6257	9.6352	0.0000	-1.5606	1.7943	1.4086	0.0000
Relation	0.0000	0.0000	-0.6979	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Familiar	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-4.2564	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Willingn	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	9.5031	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
								-0.3600	0.0000
								0.2656	0.0000

Appendix P: Comparison of Retail Buyer Models - ANOVA Results

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable PDSC_CEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	35.0095	8.7524	203.3556	.0000
Within Groups	175	7.5320	.0430		
Total	179	42.5415			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable PDSC_CEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if

$\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .1467 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$
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 1 3 2 4
Mean	COUNTRY	
-.5120	Grp 5	
.1940	Grp 1	*
.5127	Grp 3	* *
.6408	Grp 2	* *
.6749	Grp 4	* * *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 5
Mean -.5120
- - - - -

Subset 2

Group	Grp 1
Mean	.1940
- - - - -	

Subset 3

Group	Grp 3	Grp 2
Mean	.5127	.6408
- - - - -		

Subset 4

Group	Grp 2	Grp 4
Mean	.6408	.6749
- - - - -		

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CCOM_PBF
By Variable COUNT20

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	1.2994	.6497	3065.3656	.0000
Within Groups	104	.0220	.0002		
Total	106	1.3215			

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0103 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 3.51

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G
		r r r
		p p p
		3 2 1
Mean	COUNT20	
.3034	Grp 3	
.3644	Grp 2	*
.5615	Grp 1	* *

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable PCOM_PBF
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	3	1.4125	.4708	308.8416	.0000
Within Groups	140	.2134	.0015		
Total	143	1.6260			

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if

$MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0276 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
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 3 2 4
Mean	COUNTRY	
.2111	Grp 5	
.2413	Grp 3	*
.3604	Grp 2	* *
.4599	Grp 4	* * *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1
Group Grp 5
Mean .2111
- - - - -

Subset 2
Group Grp 3
Mean .2413
- - - - -

Subset 3
Group Grp 2
Mean .3604
- - - - -

Subset 4
Group Grp 4
Mean .4599
- - - - -

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CEV_REL
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	2317.8668	579.4667	150186.270	.0000
Within Groups	175	.6752	.0039		
Total	179	2318.5421			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable CEV_REL
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if

$MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0439 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
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 4 3 2
Mean	COUNTRY	
-.3881	Grp 1	
-.3654	Grp 5	
.5417	Grp 4	* *
.5708	Grp 3	* *
9.0000	Grp 2	* * * *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1		
Group	Grp 1	Grp 5
Mean	-.3881	-.3654
- - - - -		

Subset 2		
Group	Grp 4	Grp 3
Mean	.5417	.5708
- - - - -		

Subset 3	
Group	Grp 2
Mean	9.0000

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable PBEL_PEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	.8289	.2072	2719.8633	.0000
Within Groups	175	.0133	.0001		
Total	179	.8422			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable PBEL_PEV
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 $MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0062 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
 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	
.6066	Grp 2	
.6856	Grp 1	*
.6957	Grp 3	* *
.7288	Grp 4	* * *
.8161	Grp 5	* * * *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 2
Mean .6066
- - - - -

Subset 2

Group Grp 1
Mean .6856
- - - - -

Subset 3

Group Grp 3
Mean .6957
- - - - -

Subset 4

Group Grp 4
Mean .7288
- - - - -

Subset 5

Group Grp 5
Mean .8161
- - - - -

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable FAM_PB
By Variable COUNT25

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	.2985	.2985	2030.9332	.0000
Within Groups	70	.0103	.0001		
Total	71	.3088			

No range tests performed with fewer than three non-empty groups.

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable FAM_PE
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	.0212	.0106	6.4059	.0024
Within Groups	105	.1734	.0017		
Total	107	.1946			

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if

$$\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq .0287 * \text{RANGE} * \text{SQRT}(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))$$

with the following value(s) for RANGE: 3.51

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

		G G G
		r r r
		p p p
		4 3 2
Mean	COUNTRY	
.1645	Grp 4	
.1915	Grp 3	*
.1964	Grp 2	*

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group	Grp 4
Mean	.1645
- - - - -	

Subset 2

Group	Grp 3	Grp 2
Mean	.1915	.1964
- - - - -		

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable REL_PB
By Variable COUNT28

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	.0005	.0005	.7234	.3979
Within Groups	70	.0440	.0006		
Total	71	.0445			

No range tests performed with fewer than three non-empty groups.

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable PEV_WILL
By Variable COUNTRY

Analysis of Variance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	1.1512	.2878	2462.4142	.0000
Within Groups	175	.0205	.0001		
Total	179	1.1717			

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable PEV_WILL
By Variable COUNTRY

Multiple Range Tests: Scheffe test with significance level .05

The difference between two means is significant if

$MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) \geq .0076 * RANGE * \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}$
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 4 3 5
Mean	COUNTRY	
.5046	Grp 2	
.6852	Grp 1	*
.6953	Grp 4	* *
.7097	Grp 3	* * *
.7194	Grp 5	* * * *

Homogeneous Subsets (highest and lowest means are not significantly different)

Subset 1

Group Grp 2
Mean .5046
- - - - -

Subset 2

Group Grp 1
Mean .6852
- - - - -

Subset 3

Group	Grp 4
-------	-------

Mean	.6953
------	-------

- - - - -

Subset 4

Group	Grp 3
-------	-------

Mean	.7097
------	-------

- - - - -

Subset 5

Group	Grp 5
-------	-------

Mean	.7194
------	-------

- - - - -

Appendix Q: Comparison of Consumer and Retail Buyers - Paths

Canada - Group Effect

* * * * * 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 * * * * *

EFFECT .. GROUP

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 5 , N = 25 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.99657	1282.03001	12.00	53.00	.000
Hotellings	290.27095	1282.03001	12.00	53.00	.000
Wilks	.00343	1282.03001	12.00	53.00	.000
Roys	.99657				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. GROUP (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,64) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
CCOM_PBF	.33720	.01674	.33720	.00026	1289.09076	.000
PCOM_PBF	.04570	.01677	.04570	.00026	174.36982	.000
PBEL_PEV	.19690	.00572	.19690	.00009	2203.48994	.000
CEV_PEV	.00072	.00684	.00072	.00011	6.72671	.012
CDSC_CEV	.19672	.00948	.19672	.00015	1328.49877	.000
PDSC_CEV	.41213	.01466	.41213	.00023	1798.89829	.000
CCOM_CEV	.08492	.01854	.08492	.00029	293.09065	.000
PCOM_CEV	.03600	.01675	.03600	.00026	137.56997	.000
PEV_WILL	.52132	.00973	.52132	.00015	3429.27691	.000
FAM_PB	.36919	.00781	.36919	.00012	3024.73808	.000
FAM_PE	.35341	.00459	.35341	.00007	4926.17157	.000
FAM_WILL	.15515	.01029	.15515	.00016	965.01808	.000

United States - Group Effect

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

EFFECT .. GROUP

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 6 1/2, N = 23 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.99266	441.89781	15.00	49.00	.000
Hotellings	135.27484	441.89781	15.00	49.00	.000
Wilks	.00734	441.89781	15.00	49.00	.000
Rois	.99266				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. GROUP (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,63) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
CCOM_PBF	.18049	.01249	.18049	.00020	910.65341	.000
PCOM_PBF	.07301	.19171	.07301	.00304	23.99270	.000
PBEL_PEV	.01105	.00224	.01105	.00004	310.49031	.000
CEV_PEV	.01849	.00315	.01849	.00005	369.80479	.000
CDSC_CEV	.02520	.01221	.02520	.00019	130.06778	.000
PDSC_CEV	.00038	.01704	.00038	.00027	1.40910	.240
CCOM_CEV	.00023	.02088	.00023	.00033	.70737	.403
PCOM_CEV	.01845	.15113	.01845	.00240	7.69320	.007
CEV_REL	.06625	.00861	.06625	.00014	485.00607	.000
PEV_WILL	.08839	.00814	.08839	.00013	684.15363	.000
FAM_PB	.00257	2.51933	.00257	.03999	.06428	.801
REL_PB	.17637	.00314	.17637	.00005	3537.26077	.000
FAM_PE	.06737	.02712	.06737	.00043	156.52726	.000
REL_WILL	.00522	.00502	.00522	.00008	65.55772	.000
FAM_WILL	.00055	.56261	.00055	.00893	.06115	.805

Mexico - Group Effect

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

EFFECT .. GROUP

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 6 1/2, N = 24)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.99912	3791.35506	15.00	50.00	.000
Hotellings	1137.40652	3791.35506	15.00	50.00	.000
Wilks	.00088	3791.35506	15.00	50.00	.000
Rois	.99912				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. GROUP (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,64) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
CCOM_PBF	.06783	.01225	.06783	.00019	354.49064	.000
PCOM_PBF	.27086	.00944	.27086	.00015	1835.34831	.000
PBEL_PEV	.00551	.00348	.00551	.00005	101.34560	.000
CEV_PEV	.22598	.01556	.22598	.00024	929.34315	.000
CDSC_CEV	.21653	.25155	.21653	.00393	55.09045	.000
PDSC_CEV	.45336	.01339	.45336	.00021	2166.90459	.000
CCOM_CEV	.04229	.08856	.04229	.00138	30.56460	.000
PCOM_CEV	.16123	.21041	.16123	.00329	49.04052	.000
CEV_REL	.07938	1.01565	.07938	.01587	5.00216	.029
PEV_WILL	.00647	.00498	.00647	.00008	83.14450	.000
FAM_PB	3.52345	.00981	3.52345	.00015	22976.3375	.000
REL_PB	.02278	.00310	.02278	.00005	470.24551	.000
FAM_PE	1.21624	.00620	1.21624	.00010	12551.3717	.000
REL_WILL	.02147	.00584	.02147	.00009	235.38509	.000
FAM_WILL	.21335	.00631	.21335	.00010	2163.68198	.000

Chile - Group Effect

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

EFFECT .. GROUP

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 6 1/2, N = 24)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.99822	1867.18525	15.00	50.00	.000
Hotellings	560.15557	1867.18525	15.00	50.00	.000
Wilks	.00178	1867.18525	15.00	50.00	.000
Rois	.99822				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. GROUP (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,64) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
CCOM_PBF	.27638	.01077	.27638	.00017	1642.44510	.000
PCOM_PBF	.10230	.01033	.10230	.00016	633.59511	.000
PBEL_PEV	.13384	.00335	.13384	.00005	2556.12520	.000
CEV_PEV	.10760	.00393	.10760	.00006	1753.25632	.000
CDSC_CEV	.12820	.87178	.12820	.01362	9.41126	.003
PDSC_CEV	.05611	.01704	.05611	.00027	210.78706	.000
CCOM_CEV	.03083	.02078	.03083	.00032	94.95747	.000
PCOM_CEV	.24048	.01500	.24048	.00023	1025.93894	.000
CEV_REL	.00449	.00872	.00449	.00014	32.97275	.000
PEV_WILL	.00140	.00388	.00140	.00006	23.15611	.000
FAM_PB	3.33527	.10409	3.33527	.00163	2050.77963	.000
REL_PB	.06721	.00525	.06721	.00008	818.89802	.000
FAM_PE	.89631	.16705	.89631	.00261	343.39067	.000
REL_WILL	.36096	.00661	.36096	.00010	3494.67587	.000
FAM_WILL	.19730	.01858	.19730	.00029	679.50592	.000

Argentina - Group Effect

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

EFFECT .. GROUP

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 6 1/2, N = 24)

Test Name	Value	Exact F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.99717	1173.16247	15.00	50.00	.000
Hotellings	351.94874	1173.16247	15.00	50.00	.000
Wilks	.00283	1173.16247	15.00	50.00	.000
Rois	.99717				

Note.. F statistics are exact.

EFFECT .. GROUP (Cont.)

Univariate F-tests with (1,64) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
CCOM_PBF	1.73119	.01153	1.73119	.00018	9607.00134	.000
PCOM_PBF	.73491	.01492	.73491	.00023	3152.13285	.000
PBEL_PEV	.13085	.00332	.13085	.00005	2522.75532	.000
CEV_PEV	.39232	.00453	.39232	.00007	5546.24775	.000
CDSC_CEV	.14312	.02676	.14312	.00042	342.34167	.000
PDSC_CEV	.70346	7.49623	.70346	.11713	6.00590	.017
CCOM_CEV	.37064	.01218	.37064	.00019	1948.14918	.000
PCOM_CEV	.64267	.02302	.64267	.00036	1786.96548	.000
CEV_REL	.19270	.65855	.19270	.01029	18.72693	.000
PEV_WILL	.01795	.00530	.01795	.00008	216.90778	.000
FAM_PB	1.93222	1.37114	1.93222	.02142	90.18897	.000
REL_PB	.01334	.04353	.01334	.00068	19.61016	.000
FAM_PE	.36690	.04401	.36690	.00069	533.56514	.000
REL_WILL	.02762	.01174	.02762	.00018	150.57855	.000
FAM_WILL	.00412	.01328	.00412	.00021	19.86771	.000

Appendix R: Comparison of Consumers and Retail Buyers - Loadings

Canada - Group Effect

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

EFFECT .. GROUP

Univariate F-tests with (1,64) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
POLIT	.18435	.01539	.18435	.00024	766.66492	.000
LIFE	.00436	.00539	.00436	.00008	51.75298	.000
ROLE	.00100	.00985	.00100	.00015	6.47222	.013
ENVIRO	.06000	.01754	.06000	.00027	218.89718	.000
RIGHTS	.03310	.00435	.03310	.00007	487.41303	.000
TRUST	.00280	.00079	.00280	.00001	228.04888	.000
INDIV	.00997	.02785	.00997	.00044	22.91110	.000
FRIEND	.00049	.00109	.00049	.00002	28.74777	.000
WEALTH	.25084	.00798	.25084	.00012	2012.18841	.000
TECHC	.27384	.00552	.27384	.00009	3172.56270	.000
STAB	.00256	.00629	.00256	.00010	26.03216	.000
EDUC	.02913	.00619	.02913	.00010	301.34674	.000
INDUS	.00717	.00056	.00717	.00001	824.99402	.000
WETHIC	.00112	.00113	.00112	.00002	63.45714	.000
ATTRAC	.09135	.00274	.09135	.00004	2137.65284	.000
QUAL	.03138	.00360	.03138	.00006	558.66857	.000
WORK	.08316	.00228	.08316	.00004	2334.58342	.000
INNOV	.02578	.00329	.02578	.00005	501.73793	.000
VARIET	.38575	.00474	.38575	.00007	5203.08409	.000
DURAB	.01445	.00206	.01445	.00003	449.56666	.000
TECH	.00685	.00354	.00685	.00006	123.90097	.000
RELIAB	.00138	.00137	.00138	.00002	64.74664	.000
VALUE	.00053	.00694	.00053	.00011	4.88722	.031
SATIS	.02093	.00075	.02093	.00001	1778.29006	.000
PROUD	.21473	.00165	.21473	.00003	8309.66666	.000
RATE	.00009	.00111	.00009	.00002	5.08795	.028
LIKE	.00000	.00000	.00000	.00000	.	.
KNOW	.10594	.00216	.10594	.00003	3145.22447	.000
FIND	1.55599	.02579	1.55599	.00040	3861.70906	.000
BUY	.00000	.00000	.00000	.00000	.	.

United States - Group Effect

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

EFFECT .. GROUP

Univariate F-tests with (1,64) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
POLIT	.03871	.00772	.03871	.00012	320.80909	.000
LIFE	.00291	.00942	.00291	.00015	19.79686	.000
ROLE	.39787	.01636	.39787	.00026	1556.37839	.000
ENVIRO	.58331	.01876	.58331	.00029	1989.74844	.000
RIGHTS	.00528	.00271	.00528	.00004	124.46675	.000
TRUST	.16810	.00439	.16810	.00007	2453.14691	.000
INDIV	.00112	.01879	.00112	.00029	3.82182	.055
FRIEND	.00323	.00042	.00323	.00001	485.98873	.000
WEALTH	.07604	.00348	.07604	.00005	1399.90240	.000
TECHC	.12044	.00503	.12044	.00008	1531.10489	.000
STAB	.00024	.00272	.00024	.00004	5.76074	.019
EDUC	.92157	1.19958	.92157	.01874	49.16802	.000
INDUS	.02491	2.64873	.02491	.04139	.60200	.441
WETHIC	.00709	2.97185	.00709	.04644	.15273	.697
ATTRAC	.18144	.00438	.18144	.00007	2649.13626	.000
QUAL	.00742	.00110	.00742	.00002	430.08798	.000
WORK	.00041	.00158	.00041	.00002	16.76995	.000
INNOV	.02077	.00552	.02077	.00009	241.05524	.000
VARIET	.03013	.01343	.03013	.00021	143.58872	.000
DURAB	.05651	.00284	.05651	.00004	1272.01682	.000
TECH	.01538	.01008	.01538	.00016	97.65953	.000
RELIAS	.00669	.00365	.00669	.00006	117.25392	.000
VALUE	.00049	.00217	.00049	.00003	14.56814	.000
SATIS	.00386	.00081	.00386	.00001	305.28550	.000
PROUD	.00065	.00177	.00065	.00003	23.51646	.000
RATE	.00255	.00094	.00255	.00001	174.43582	.000
LIKE	.00000	.00335	.00000	.00005	.02335	.879
ALIGN	.06420	.01836	.06420	.00029	223.82591	.000
TIES	.02497	.00439	.02497	.00007	364.29055	.000
IMMIG	.00107	.00331	.00107	.00005	20.75490	.000
INVEST	.11203	.00570	.11203	.00009	1257.14712	.000
INVFR	.00107	.00700	.00107	.00011	9.81032	.003
IMPORT	.01727	.00605	.01727	.00009	182.75947	.000
KNOW	4.50225	16.66333	4.50225	.26036	17.29211	.000
FIND	.15008	16.57043	.15008	.25891	.57964	.449
BUY	.00000	.00000	.00000	.00000	.	.

Mexico - Group Effect

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

EFFECT .. GROUP

Univariate F-tests with (1,64) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
POLIT	.01771	2.31208	.01771	.03613	.49033	.486
LIFE	.02727	2.82753	.02727	.04418	.61733	.435
ROLE	.00041	2.46971	.00041	.03859	.01058	.918
ENVIRO	.00190	2.27664	.00190	.03557	.05330	.818
RIGHTS	.05630	2.74923	.05630	.04296	1.31071	.257
TRUST	.07796	2.84025	.07796	.04438	1.75674	.190
INDIV	.01414	1.56028	.01414	.02438	.58012	.449
FRIEND	.01724	2.86972	.01724	.04484	.38439	.537
WEALTH	.04534	.00318	.04534	.00005	911.24189	.000
TECHC	.00048	.00142	.00048	.00002	21.40212	.000
STAB	.00796	.00419	.00796	.00007	121.70852	.000
EDUC	.06674	.00724	.06674	.00011	589.77798	.000
INDUS	.12499	.00105	.12499	.00002	7587.51126	.000
WETHIC	.00967	.00160	.00967	.00002	387.80429	.000
ATTRAC	.12345	.00191	.12345	.00003	4133.42904	.000
QUAL	.00146	.00163	.00146	.00003	57.28155	.000
WORK	.01872	.00173	.01872	.00003	692.29773	.000
INNOV	.12283	.00339	.12283	.00005	2319.32718	.000
VARIET	.28187	.00543	.28187	.00008	3320.39406	.000
DURAB	.02556	.00147	.02556	.00002	1111.20129	.000
TECH	.00528	.00245	.00528	.00004	138.06722	.000
RELIAB	.00022	.00102	.00022	.00002	13.88579	.000
VALUE	.00675	.00248	.00675	.00004	174.05739	.000
SATIS	.00093	.00051	.00093	.00001	117.59902	.000
PROUD	.09187	.00172	.09187	.00003	3421.08359	.000
RATE	.00672	.00034	.00672	.00001	1258.45724	.000
LIKE	.08084	2.82413	.08084	.04413	1.83195	.181
ALIGN	.31845	1.51159	.31845	.02365	13.46523	.000
TIES	.03666	.00096	.03666	.00002	2439.52328	.000
IMMIG	.08340	.00486	.08340	.00008	1097.49465	.000
INVEST	.01178	.00326	.01178	.00005	231.55554	.000
INVER	.00912	.00654	.00912	.00010	89.27967	.000
IMPORT	.08544	.00134	.08544	.00002	4085.00265	.000
KNOW	52.99714	.00339	52.99714	.00005	999581.596	.000
FIND	30.64430	.03292	30.64430	.00051	59581.3238	.000
BUY	.00000	.00000	.00000	.00000	.	.

Chile - Group Effect

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

EFFECT .. GROUP

Univariate F-tests with (1,64) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
POLIT	4.19726	11.95148	4.19726	.18674	22.47624	.000
LIFE	3.51510	16.16256	3.51510	.25254	13.91898	.000
ROLE	2.88632	17.63819	2.88632	.27560	10.47300	.002
ENVIRO	3.28686	19.41506	3.28686	.30336	10.83484	.002
RIGHTS	3.74347	17.34893	3.74347	.27108	13.80962	.000
TRUST	.28322	.00452	.28322	.00007	4008.85504	.000
INDIV	.20672	.00445	.20672	.00007	2973.21807	.000
FRIEND	.04471	.00087	.04471	.00001	3300.06844	.000
WEALTH	.06914	.00135	.06914	.00002	3273.17315	.000
TECHC	.00162	.00109	.00162	.00002	94.92265	.000
STAB	.00002	.00035	.00002	.00001	3.77685	.056
EDUC	.00614	.00391	.00614	.00006	100.50060	.000
INDUS	.10337	.00154	.10337	.00002	4289.98470	.000
WETHIC	.00239	.00249	.00239	.00004	61.50676	.000
ATTRAC	.00188	.00208	.00188	.00003	57.85604	.000
QUAL	.05071	.00170	.05071	.00003	1910.58148	.000
WORK	.00988	.00117	.00988	.00002	540.90760	.000
INNOV	.00301	.00264	.00301	.00004	72.93957	.000
VARIET	.17079	.00335	.17079	.00005	3261.85858	.000
DURAB	.00466	.00180	.00466	.00003	165.29490	.000
TECH	.00441	.00228	.00441	.00004	123.56562	.000
RELIAB	.05935	.00101	.05935	.00002	3778.42721	.000
VALUE	.02881	.00266	.02881	.00004	692.04619	.000
SATIS	.08735	.00163	.08735	.00003	3420.41534	.000
PROUD	.02086	.00211	.02086	.00003	632.17555	.000
RATE	.00276	.00060	.00276	.00001	292.96820	.000
LIKE	.01225	.00285	.01225	.00004	275.12736	.000
ALIGN	.10402	.00856	.10402	.00013	777.90127	.000
TIES	.00002	.00124	.00002	.00002	1.25875	.266
IMMIG	.01594	.00317	.01594	.00005	321.64597	.000
INVEST	.00179	.00282	.00179	.00004	40.67153	.000
INVFR	.00867	.00554	.00867	.00009	100.18142	.000
IMPORT	.02351	.00173	.02351	.00003	868.04075	.000
KNOW	43.32988	2.89548	43.32988	.04524	957.73777	.000
FIND	44.95691	2.67734	44.95691	.04183	1074.66611	.000
BUY	.00000	.00000	.00000	.00000	.	.

Argentina - Group Effect

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

EFFECT .. GROUP

Univariate F-tests with (1,64) D. F.

Variable	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	Sig. of F
POLIT	.00135	.00220	.00135	.00003	39.37050	.000
LIFE	.00244	.00350	.00244	.00005	44.58445	.000
ROLE	.01377	.00320	.01377	.00005	275.11815	.000
ENVIRO	.01344	.00169	.01344	.00003	508.61210	.000
RIGHTS	.19468	.00301	.19468	.00005	4136.19334	.000
TRUST	5.50948	16.33090	5.50948	.25517	21.59140	.000
INDIV	2.59910	15.98028	2.59910	.24969	10.40921	.002
FRIEND	4.69928	19.09291	4.69928	.29833	15.75212	.000
WEALTH	.27670	.00449	.27670	.00007	3942.44308	.000
TECHC	.00892	.00118	.00892	.00002	482.21388	.000
STAB	.00528	.00164	.00528	.00003	206.50453	.000
EDUC	.01647	.00382	.01647	.00006	276.08497	.000
INDUS	.14015	.00273	.14015	.00004	3282.95895	.000
WETHIC	.00001	.00311	.00001	.00005	.12951	.720
ATTRAC	.02062	.00446	.02062	.00007	295.75402	.000
QUAL	.00141	.00212	.00141	.00003	42.59563	.000
WORK	.04462	.00252	.04462	.00004	1133.18873	.000
INNOV	.06766	.00235	.06766	.00004	1838.94421	.000
VARIET	.12289	.01203	.12289	.00019	653.69264	.000
DURAB	.03369	.00085	.03369	.00001	2549.00505	.000
TECH	.05699	.00304	.05699	.00005	1201.77388	.000
RELIAB	.00086	.00166	.00086	.00003	32.96565	.000
VALUE	.04753	.00451	.04753	.00007	674.70510	.000
SATIS	.00539	.00141	.00539	.00002	244.96990	.000
PROUD	.00221	.00143	.00221	.00002	98.73116	.000
RATE	.00230	.00078	.00230	.00001	189.69347	.000
LIKE	.04122	.00405	.04122	.00006	652.15073	.000
ALIGN	.19613	.01311	.19613	.00020	957.56303	.000
TIES	.04764	2.71116	.04764	.04236	1.12457	.293
IMMIG	.03202	2.29817	.03202	.03591	.89162	.349
INVEST	.06139	2.34209	.06139	.03660	1.67758	.200
INFR	.20432	1.53351	.20432	.02396	8.52706	.005
IMPORT	.02772	2.59421	.02772	.04053	.68381	.411
KNOW	39.73589	8.28019	39.73589	.12938	307.13024	.000
FIND	8.73250	10.14790	8.73250	.15856	55.07347	.000
BUY	.00000	.00000	.00000	.00000	.	.

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