mir vol. 43, 2003/4, pp. 383–406

mir
Management International Review

Israel D. Nebenzahl/Eugene D. Jaffe/Jean-Claude Usunier

Personifying Country of Origin Research

Abstract

- The purpose of this study was to develop a multidimensional summated rating scale for the personification of country image as products source for use in cross-country COO studies.
- Scale items were derived from respondent attitudes towards people who buy products from selected countries.

Key Results

- The final 27-item scale reveals social and self-image related traits of people who buy products of a particular origin. The scale was tested for reliability and validity in five countries, Canada, France, Israel, Mexico and the United States.

Authors

Israel D. Nebenzahl, Arlene and Robert Kogod Outstanding Visiting Professor of Undergraduate Programs, Kogod School of Business, American University, Washington, DC, USA.

Eugene D. Jaffe, Professor Graduate School of Business Administration, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel.

Professor Jen-Claude Usunier, Ecole des HEC Graduate School of Business, University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland.

Manuscript received December 2001, revised July 2002.

Peterson and Jolibert (1994) identified about 187 articles published in the academic literature on the subject of country-of-origin (COO). However, Nicholas Papadopoulos[1] estimates that the number is closer to 300. The large number of articles published and presented at conferences makes for a substantial and growing literature.

COO acts as an informational cue influencing product evaluations. Influence has been found for products in general (Nagashima 1977, Wall/Heslop 1986), classes of products (Nagashima 1970, Wang 1978), specific types of products (Gaedeke 1973, Heslop/Liefeld/Wall 1987, Han/Terpstra 1988), consumer products (Schooler 1965, Lillis/Naranya 1974, Bannister/Saunders 1978, Papadopoulos/Heslop/Bamossy 1989) and for industrial products (White 1979, Chasin/Jaffe 1979, 1987, Cattin/Jolibert/Lohnes 1982).

Most of the studies reported above have inferred COO effects on product attributes as a summary construct (Johansson/Douglas/Nonaka 1985, Han 1989, Papadopoulos et al 1989) modified by knowledge (Johansson et al. 1985, Heimbach et al. 1989), purchase involvement (Hugstad/Durr 1986), purchase location, nationality (Papadopoulos et al 1987) and patriotism of the buyer (Daser/Meric 1987, Hester/ Yuen 1987, Han 1988).

Schooler and Sunoo (1969) were the first to postulate that COO was composed of more than one dimension; cognitive (perceived characteristics of the country) and affective (liking or disliking the country). Since then a number of researchers (White 1979, Cattin/Jolibert/Lohnes 1982, Jaffe/Nebenzahl 1984, Papadopoulos et al. 1989, Samiee 1994) have identified various dimensions of the COO construct. Given the findings of multi-dimensionality, it is important to surface and measure all underlying dimensions. The purpose of this paper is to identify emotive dimensions that impact COO and develop rating scales for their measurement.

Roth and Romeo (1992) classified and summarized eight studies of country image that used scaled items either grouped by mean scores or factor analytic techniques. From these studies, four common dimensions were found: Innovativeness, design, prestige and workmanship. All of these dimensions consist of production or marketing attributes and are derived from cognitive perceptions of the country and its products. The orientation on product attributes of most COO studies may be a result of a normative approach by researchers and the widespread use of borrowed scales (see Table 1) originally stemming from Nagashima's (1970) list and modified for use by subsequent researchers. Moreover, both univariate and multi-cue studies of COO have focused almost exclusively on product perceptions, using scales that described the physical characteristics of products (e.g., workmanship, durability, performance and technology) or countries (e.g., level of development, political environment). Papadopoulos et al. (1989, 1990) argue, on the other hand, that the country image construct is influenced not only by cognitive beliefs about the technical aspects of products, but also by consumers' image

(e.g., liking and trustworthiness) of the people who produce them. Klein, Ettenson, and Morris (1998) have shown that animosity toward a foreign nation will affect negatively the purchase of products by that country independently of judgments of product quality.

Reviewing the implicit domain of COO and the composition of rating scales in the studies summarized in Table 1, it is evident that product attributes dominate. Lacking in these scales are sufficient descriptors that measure emotive and social influences on consumer choice (cf. Hirschmann 1986, Holbrook 1990, Hudson/Ozanne 1988). Moreover, limiting response to product attributes in multi-item scales is normative and fails to reveal the dimensions actually considered by consumers when evaluating products made in different countries. A step in the direction of identifying emotive dimensions was made by Hooley et al. (1988) who derived rating scales from the question: "Why do you think people buy [product category] from each of the following countries?" Answers to such questions capture both cognitive and affective perceptions as well as intended or actual behavior. However, even this phrasing is limited in its ability to surface emotional and social norm concepts because the word "why" directs respondents to more rational, rather than emotional explanations. A better method is to ask respondents about the *person* who buys products made in a given country.

Chao and Rajendran (1993) employed an interpersonal survey approach to measure consumer feelings towards COO. They asked respondents to evaluate two hypothetical consumer types (a "foreman" and "professor") who were presumed to own products of different national origins. Being one of the first studies to utilize this technique, it has its limitations. First, the reference to specific hypothetical consumer types limit the potential range of responses. Second, the scales were developed and tested in only one country. A "personification" approach, that does not limit the range of responses, was first applied to COO research by Jaffe and Nebenzahl (1991). This method forms the basis for this article. In operationalizing this approach, we first surface underlying perceptual dimensions of COO. We then develop and test rating scales which measure these dimensions. An analysis of equivalence between the dimensions derived from the suggested approach and conventional rating scales previously employed in COO research is also shown.

Methodology

Stages in the Development of Rating Scales

We used a three-stage data collection and analysis model based on Spector's (1992, p. 8) methodology for the development of summated rating scales. A preliminary

Table 1. A Review of Domains and Scales in Selected Country-of-Origin Studies (In Chronological Order)

Authors	Domain	Category	Scales	Items Origin
Johannson, Douglas, and Nonaka (1985)	Product	cars	13 product attributes	automobile magazines and *Consumer Reports*
Johansson and Nebenzahl (1986)	Product	cars	10 product attributes; 3 social; 7 point Likert	Nagashima (1970)
Ofir and Lehmann (1986)	Product	ski resorts	40 adjectives led to 10 items on 5 point Thurstone type	Pre-test, expert opinion, publications
Chasin and Jaffe (1987)	Product	Industrial products	12 product and marketing attributes on 9 point Likert type	Nagashima (1970, 1977)
Johansson and Nebenzahl (1987)	Product/ Brand	cars	9 product; 3 social norms; 1 affect; 1 overall, 7-point scale items; SD	Nagashima (1970), Agarwal and Ratchford (1980)
Eroglu and Machleit (1988)	Product	beer and typewriters	6 product attributes;	borrowed
Crawford and Garland (1988)	Product	overall products	n.g.	n.g.
Hooley, Shipley, and Krieger (1988)	Product/ Brand	cars, fruits and vegetables	8 and 6 product attributes, Likert-type	Adjectives derived from open-ended questions
Han and Terpstra (1988)	Product/ Brand	TV and cars	6 product attributes; 7 point Likert	Nagashima (1970, 1977)
Thorelli, Lim, and Ye (1988)	Product/ Retail Store	AM/FM stereo cassette	3, 7-point Likert-type product attributes	n.g.
Chao (1989)	Product/ Retail Store	TV, stereo, VCR	product attributes; 6 point Likert	n.g.
Papadopoulos, Heslop, and Bamossy (1990)	Product	Consumer products in general	21 product and 11 country semantic differential items	Nagashima (1970), Darling and Kraft (1977) [product scales] "insight" [country scales]
Han (1989)	Product	TV and cars	5 product; 1 attitude; 7-point SD	n.g.
Howard (1989)	Product	cars parts, TV sets/radios clothing, food, appliances, toys	product quality attributes, 7-point SD	pre-test
Hong and Toner (1989)	Product	car, feminine hygiene, camera	product quality attributes	*Consumer Reports*
Papadopoulos, Heslop, and Beracs (1990)	Product	general consumer products	21 product attributes; 11 country attributes, 7-point SD	Nagashima (1970), Darling and Kraft (1977)

Table 1. A Review of Domains and Scales in Selected Country-of-Origin Studies (In Chronological Order) (continued)

Authors	Domain	Category	Scales	Items Origin
Wall, Liefeld, and Heslop (1991)	Product/ Brand	shirt, wallet and telephone	indeterminate number of product attributes; risk and likelihood of purchase; bipolar rating scales	n.g.
Sauer, Young, and Unnava (1991)	Product/ Brand	TV	6 attitude attributes; 2 intention to buy; 7-point SD	n.g.
Witt and Rao (1992)	Product/ Brand	microwave and jeans	n.g.	n.g.
Tse and Gorn (1992)	Product/ Brand	stereo sound system	5 product attributes; 4 overall; 6 point Likert-type	n.g.
Wood and Darling (1992)	Product	general consumer products	19 product; 6 marketing; 6 buying and using product attributes; Likert-type	Nagashima (1970), Rierson (1966)
Roth and Romeo (1992)	Product	cars, watch, bicycle, shoes, crystal, beer	4 product dimensions, 7-point Likert	Nagashima (1970), Cattin, Jolibert, and Lohnes 19(82), Jaffe and Nebenzahl (1984)
Ettenson (1993)	Product/Brand	color TV sets	5 product attributes levels	known profiles
Smith (1993)	Regions/ Product	cloth and wine glass	8 product attributes; 2 social ,7-point SD	Schooler and Sunoo (1969)
Martin and Eroglu (1993)	Country	—	14 country attributes, 7-point Likert-type	pre-test
Johansson, Ronkainen, and Czinkota (1994)	Product	tractors	product attributes, 7-point Likert	n.g.
Strutton, True, and Rody (1995)	Product	consumers' goods	product attributes, 5-point Likert	Festervand, Lumpkin, and Lundstrom (1985)
Thakor and Pacheco (1997)	Brands	consumers' goods	brand and product attributes, 7-point Likert	Papadopoulos, Heslop, and Bamossy (1990)
Lee and Ganesh (1999)	Country, Product, Brand	Consumers' goods	15 and 11-item country, product and brand attributes, 9-point Likert	Parameswaran and Yaprak (1987), Jaffe and Nebenzahl (1984)
Okechuku and Onyemah (1999)	Product	Cars and TV sets	product attributes, 9-point Likert	Roth and Romeo (1992)
Teas and Agarwal (2000)	Product, brand, store	Calculators and watches	brand, store and country attributes, 7 and 5-point Likert	n.g.
Li, Murray, and Scott (2000)	Product	Consumers' goods	design, assembly and warranty	pre-test, devised scales
Chinen, Jun, and Hampton (2000)	Product	Consumers' goods	product attributes, 7-point Likert	Papadopoulos and Heslop(1993)

n.g. = not given

step in this research consisted of defining the concept of country image. The definition used here is a synthesis of those suggested by Roth and Romeo (1992), Samiee (1994) and Nebenzahl et al. (1997), all of whom presented general models of COO:
Consumers' perceptions about the attributes of products made-in a certain country; emotions toward the country and resulted perceptions about the social desirability of owning products made-in the country.

In the first stage of scale development, items describing dimensions of the country image concept were constructed from answers to open-ended questions by respondents in Israel, the United States and France. Combining the responses from the three countries, 64 scale items were generated. In stage 2, questionnaires comprising the initial 64 items were administered in surveys conducted in Israel, France and Mexico. Item analyses and screening were conducted on these data resulting in a multidimensional scale comprising 30 items grouped into four factors. In the final stage (stage 3), the validity of the thirty-item scale was tested by surveys administered in Israel, France, and Canada. In stages 2 and 3, an additional country not used in prior stages was added as a control for stability and comparability of the results. These research stages are described in detail below.

Stage 1: Initial Item Generation – A Qualitative Judgment Approach

There are two basic criteria for ensuring construct valid measures (Peter/ Churchill 1986). The first criterion is that the measure must be comprehensive. For example, suppose that a 13-item scale purports to measure country image, but all items relate to product characteristics and none to social norms. If research has shown that social norms (cf. Johansson/Nebenzahl 1987) are salient dimensions of country image, the 13 items may be considered to have low construct validity because they under represent the country image construct. The second criterion is that a construct valid measure should not contain superfluous items. Thus, a scale should not be pregnant with items that are unrelated to the country image construct. In reality, it is difficult to develop a measure that fully meets these criteria. According to Peter and Churchill (1986, p. 2), the degree of construct validity of a measure is largely a function of the confidence that researchers believe it represents a given construct. As shown in the literature, most country image studies have used multi-item rating scales, where the scale items were suggested by the researchers without prior resort to consumers' perceptions. Thus, these scales are normative and represent what researchers consider to be the appropriate dimensions that consumers use when evaluating products.

Accordingly, it may be concluded that existing country image rating scales do not necessarily meet the first criterion of Peter and Churchill (1986) since it is not known whether scale items cover all dimensions of the country image concept. The objective of the first stage of the present research has been therefore, to unearth the dimensions utilized by consumers and to develop scale items that measure the emotional and social norm dimensions in addition to product and market dimensions measured in the past.

To develop these scale items there is a need to surface the frame of reference and conceptual framework of consumers rather than that of researchers. We achieve this by resorting to the third person projective technique and employing open-ended questions. Open-ended questions may be used when the researcher does not know what attitudinal dimensions she/he intends to measure (Dohrenwend 1965). By allowing respondents to provide the response alternatives by themselves rather than select from a fixed set of responses, researchers can find what is salient to respondents (Schuman/Presser 1979).

While there are advantages to using open-ended questions, there are some constraints as well. One such constraint is the ability of respondents to articulate meaningful answers (Craig 1985, Stanga/Sheffield 1987). However, Geer (1988) studied responses to Michigan's Center for Political Studies over a twenty-year period and found that almost all population strata can and do respond to open-ended questions, while few were unable to answer such questions. Another problem is coder reliability.

Shimp, Samiee, and Madden (1993) examined consumers' cognitive structures for countries and their products using open-ended questions. Refining this approach, we utilized open-ended questions in the form of sentence completion and third person projective techniques of exploratory research (Dillon/Madden/Firtle 1987, pp. 136–137). Like word association tests, sentence completion is based on free association and is useful in eliciting a respondent's attitude and frame of reference towards stimuli. The third person technique is used to reveal a respondent's true feeling and beliefs by ascribing them to a third person, or by describing a third person. After extensive pre-testing, we selected the following open-ended question:

"A person who buys home electronic products made in [country name] is. . .."

where [country name] stands for one of the countries whose image was assessed in the study. By asking respondents to describe the person who buys a product made in a certain country rather than the product, a response is facilitated that is associated with personality, attitudinal, behavioral and social concepts, in addition to the product frame of reference. By replicating the open-ended question a number of times, where the only variation in the cue was the name of the country, differences in response reflect differences in respondents' attitudes towards the countries. Thus, the methodology employed facilitated the identification of perceptual dimensions that are utilized by consumers in evaluating products, which cannot be readily surfaced by asking about products directly.

The integrity of conclusions derived from the answers to open-ended questions depends on the skills of coders. Responses may be so vague that they are misclassified (Collins/Kalton 1980). In recognition of the key role that proper coding plays in the analysis of open-ended questions, a procedure was devised to ensure that the coding process is free of coder bias while providing meaningful codes that best represent the meaning of completed sentences. In the first step, using a subsample of 100 questionnaires, two marketing research experts who have extensive experience in the use of open-ended questionnaires independently designed a coding scheme. Next, using the Delphi method (Levistone/Turoff 1975), the two coding schemes were revised until the two experts agreed on a final version. To further reduce coder bias, the coding was replicated twice by two research assistants who coded the questionnaires independently. Whenever a significant discrepancy was found between the codes assigned by the two assistants, one of the authors decided which code best fit the response. Inter-coder reliability was satisfactory with a *kappa* of 0.86 (Cohen 1960, 1968).

Data Collection

To test the reliability of the research instrument, data were collected initially in Israel. An area sample was taken in a metropolitan residential area, representative of the urban population (see Exhibit 1). Questionnaires were self-administered in the presence of a trained market researcher. Respondents were asked to describe a person who buys home electronic products made in Germany, Japan and South Korea. These countries were selected because they all produce the object product lines and represent different levels of market penetration in the respondent countries. One and a half lines were provided for the response. In addition to the open-ended questions, the questionnaire included three thirteen-item rating scales, one for each country under investigation and questions asking respondents to estimate the changes in the value of products when production is shifted between countries. The questionnaire ended with demographic questions. The sampling parameters for this stage are shown in Exhibit 1.

Results of the open-ended questions confirmed that these questions facilitate responses along broader dimensions than just product-market attributes. Following are some typical responses with their respective dimensions: ". . . getting a reliable product" (product reliability); ". . . getting high quality at a reasonable price" (product value: price-quality relationship); ". . . making a good choice" (correctness of decision); ". . . an idiot" (intelligence of choice); ". . . a gambler" (risk of purchase); ". . . a rich person" (social strata); ". . . following the crowd" (social norm). Since consumers in different countries may perceive country image along different dimensions, data were collected in similar fashion to that of Israel in two additional countries, France and the United States. The Hebrew ques-

Exhibit 1. Sampling Procedures

Country	Survey Stage	Year	Sample Method	Sample Size
Israel	1	1988	Area	859
France	1	1990	Quota	442
USA	1	1990	Area	1.046
Israel	2	1992	Area	239
Mexico	2	1991	Quota	240
France	2	1992	Quota	279
Israel	3	1994	Area	443
France	3	1994	Quota	361
Canada	3	1997	Area	291

Grand Total N = 4,200

tionnaire utilized in Israel was translated into English and back translated from English into Hebrew. After the English version was finalized, it was translated into French and back translated from French into English.

Derived Scale Items

At the end of stage 1, 2,347 valid questionnaires were collected from the three countries. In each country sampled, all responses to open-ended questions were sorted by content. Statements similar in content but different in wording were grouped together and for each group the wording of the statement most frequently used was selected to represent the group. In order to assure the validity of the developed instrument for cross country studies, and maintain its consistency and uniformity, all representative items were translated from Hebrew and French into English and merged into one list. By this procedure, all concepts mentioned, regardless of sample location and response frequency, were included among the items to be statistically tested in the following stages. This resulted in a list of sixty-four items shown in Appendix I. The sixty-four items are divided into two groups. In the first group, fourteen seven-point Likert items followed the statement: "Home electronic products made in [country name] are. . ." The second group, comprising the remaining fifty items are similarly scaled, but follow the statement: "A person who buys home electronic products made in [country name] is . . ..". As shown in the appendix, the 64 items are not specific to the household electronic products mentioned in the questions. Therefore, the items may be generalized over a wide range of product types.

Stage 2: Purification of the Scale

Data Collection

In stage 2, questionnaires were administered in surveys conducted in Israel, France and Mexico. Mexico replaced the United States in this stage in order to collect the data in a less developed country as compared to France and Israel. The purpose of this stage was to purify the 64 items derived in stage 1. The questionnaires, as before, consisted of open-ended questions, rating scales and demographic questions, but the open-ended personification question of the former stage was replaced by the following sentence completion question: "Products made in [country name] are . . ." This question was replicated four times for Japan, Germany, South Korea and the respondent's home country. By asking respondents to describe products rather than persons, these questions focus attention on product features. These questions were intended as a validity check of the open-ended questions utilized in developing the scale items. Responses to these open-ended questions did not provide additional items similar to those found in prior scales, which, as documented earlier, had emphasized product attributes. Following the coding of these answers, no new scale items were found in addition to the original 64.

The second part of the questionnaire comprised the 64 rating items developed in the prior stage. A 7-point Likert scale was used. Positive/negative scale ends were randomized to reduce halo effect. To reduce fatigue, each respondent was asked to respond to two of the countries listed above, which were rotated among questionnaires. The questionnaire concluded with demographic questions. The sampling and data collection procedures for Israel and France were the same as in stage 1, while a quota sample was taken of Mexican consumers (see Exhibit 1). Following the procedure of Stage one, the English version of the questionnaire was translated into Hebrew, French and Spanish and back translated into English.

Results of Stage Two

In most country image studies, respondents were asked to rate more than one country. It is important, therefore, that any developed scale be valid for multiple country ratings. As noted earlier, in this stage each respondent rated two countries. To eliminate possible bias caused by order of rating, the ratings of both countries were included in screening the 64 items for those that would remain in the scale being developed. We eliminated records in which respondents skipped or assigned the same score, usually the number 4 – the middle of the scale that represents "no opinion. To ease interpretation, negative items were rotated so that for all items higher values represent more positive (less negative) attitudes. Fi-

nally, the data collected in the three countries were merged into a single file. The resulted data set includes 537 country ratings by French respondents, 450 by Mexican respondents and 469 by Israeli respondents.

Item Screening

The two screening methods suggested by Spector (1992), factor analysis and Cronbach's α, were used in reducing the number of scale items. Principal components factor analyses with varimax rotation were run on the data collected in each country separately and on all countries combined. In all runs, the number of factors with eigenvalues greater than one exceeded ten and included most variables. Stipulating a minimum of four-percent contribution to the explained variance or three variables per factor further reduced the number of factors. In all cases, the first four factors accounted for more than fifty percent of the variance. Next, the same factor analyses were run again, but this time limiting the number of rotated factors to four. Once the factor structures were determined, items with rotated factor loadings smaller than 0.5 were eliminated from further analysis. Finally, a reliability analysis was conducted for the remaining items of each factor by country, eliminating items that had item-to-corrected-total correlations smaller than 0.5.

The screening process resulted in four independently developed lists of items that best fit the four-factor structure of the data, by country and for all countries combined. The union of the four lists comprised potential scale items. The next step compared the factor structures for each of the three countries. Only those items that were found in similar factors for at least two of the three countries were included for further consideration. Similar factors are those composed of basically the same variables. Eight items did not meet this criterion. As a final check of the factor structure stability of the remaining thirty items, factor analyses of these items only were run by country and for all countries combined. In addition, Cronbach's α values were estimated for all scales and factors within scales. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 2.

Considering first the thirty selected items as comprising a single scale, we note in the second row of Table 2 that all Cronbach's α values are at an acceptable level. Yet, a detailed review of the item to corrected-total correlations (not shown in Table 2) indicated that the three items of factor 4 should be removed from the scale in all countries and for all countries combined. Removal of these items from the scale resulted in higher Cronbach's α values shown in the third row of Table 2, all of which are above 0.9. It can be concluded that of the thirty items, 27 can be considered as comprising an additive scale.

Turning next to the factor structures, it is noted that they are practically the same in the three countries. These factors explain more than fifty percent of the variance, and with the exception of the fourth factor in Mexico, all have relati-

Table 2. Percent Variance explained, Rotated Factor Loadings and internal Consistency of Thirty-items Four-Factors Solution on Stage 2 Data

	All Countries Combined	France	Israel	Mexico
Variance explained by first 4 factors	56.6	60.1	59.1	51.2
Cronbach's α of the 30 items scale[e]	0.924	0.930	0.914	0.883
Cronbach's α of 27 items included in factors 1–3	0.934	0.944	0.939	0.908
Factor 1:				
Eigenvalue	10.09	11.07	10.82	8.31
Percent of variance	33.7	36.9	36.1	27.7
Cronbach's α	0.908	0.915	0.918	0.883
"Quality and Satisfaction Seeker"				
Is getting a good deal	0.750	0.779	0.738	0.653
Is making the best choice	0.737	0.734	0.690	0.747
Is correct in choosing the product	0.723	0.760	0.721	0.589
Will be satisfied	0.702	0.729	0.664	0.699
Products I like	0.666	0.697	0.729	0.602
Cares about quality	0.661	0.611	0.634	0.714
High quality products	0.645	0.611	0.684	0.664
Demands high quality	0.629	0.559[a]	0.646	0.634
Products my friends would buy	0.592	0.497	0.654	0.663
Products I'll be proud to show my friends	0.572	0.544	0.691	0.507
Is knowledgeable about the product	0.557	0.616	0.463	0.563
Factor 2:				
Eigenvalue	3.32	2.91	3.52	0.389
Percent of variance	11.1	9.7	11.7	13.0
Cronbach's α	0.903	0.906	0.905	0.893
"Underdog"				
Is stingy	0.739	0.701	0.766	0.759
Is unthinking, rash, naive	0.722	0.721	0.695	0.751
Is stupid, foolish	0.715	0.671	0.746	0.758
Is a gambler	0.703	0.645	0.752	0.731
Is a poor person	0.694	0.694	0.703	0.623
is a low class person	0.688	0.621	0.745	0.665
(Table 2 cont'd)				
Is getting ripped off	0.671	0.700	0.572	0.690
Is mistaken in choosing the product	0.645	0.657	0.624	0.628
Doesn't care about quality	0.604	0.605	0.619	0.547
Is not knowledgeable about the product	0.562	0.516	0.558	0.559
Will be dissatisfied	0.513	0.530	0.460[b]	0.512
Factor 3				
Eigenvalue	1.82	2.18	1.87	1.83
Percent of variance	6.1	7.3	6.2	6.1
Cronbach's α	0.830	0.868	0.849	0.740
"Economic Value Seeker"				
Expensive products	0.781	0.797	0.744	0.750
Inexpensive products	0.774	0.770	0.756	0.691
Is buying a good but expensive product	0.703	0.791	0.657	0.685
Is paying top price for top quality	0.639	0.733	0.624	0.551
Looks for established brand names	0.534	0.564	0.604	0.426[c]
Factor 4:				
Eigenvalue	1.74	1.84	1.50	1.32
Percent of variance	5.8	6.2	5.0	4.4
Cronbach's α	0.763	0.833	0.780	0.438
"Chauvinist"				
Wants to help the domestic economy	0.854	0.892	0.858	0.701
Prefers domestic products	0.851	0.874	0.847	0.587
Is a local chauvinist	0.683	0.782	0.679	0.265[d]

Notes
[a] This item has loadings greater than 0.5 in two factors. Its loading in factor 3 = 0.584.
[b] This item has loading of 0.543 in factor 1.
[c] This item has loading of 0.508 in factor 1.
[d] This item has loading of 0.514 in factor 2.
[e] α could be marginally higher if the first two items of factor 4 were removed.

vely high Cronbach's α values. The first factor, explaining from 28 to 37 percent of the variance, can be interpreted as representing the personality of a *Quality and Satisfaction Seeker*. The second factor, explaining between 10 to 13 percent of the variance, represents the personality of an *Underdog*. Factor 3, explaining about six percent of the variance, represents the personality of an *Economic Value Seeker*, while the last factor, explaining about five percent of the variance, represents a *Chauvinist*. Given that there are practically no local Mexican brands of home electronics, it can be understood why the last factor is not reliable in that country.

To conclude, the outcome of this stage resulted in a cross country developed personification additive scale comprising 27 items grouped into three distinct factors. Three additional items, not included in the 27-item summated scale, measure the degree of chauvinism, a concept applicable only in countries where meaningful production of the research products takes place. In such countries these items may be added to compose a 30-item summated valid rating scale.

Stage 3: Scale Reliability Validation

Data Collection

The purpose of stage 3 was to test the reliability of the 27-item scale derived in stage 2, using the same object countries, Germany, Japan and South Korea. Stage three was conducted during 1994 in Israel and France, two countries included in all earlier stages, and in 1997 in Canada, a country not included earlier. The English version of the 30-item scale questionnaire was administered in Canada, resulting in 291 useable questionnaires (See Exhibit 1). Israel and France were included in stage 3 to test the stability of the scale over time. Canada was added to test the stability of the scale in a country that had no impact on the original selection of scale items. The sampling method was the same as that used in previous stages.

Scale Validation

Following the procedure suggested by Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1998), multi-step confirmatory factor analyses were utilized to validate the scale derived in the previous stage by testing the equivalence of results across countries and over time. LISREL 8 was used to analyze the covariances and means of items. These analyses revealed that item means rather than item covariances cause the rejection of the invariance of the joint covariances and means assumption. Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1998) received similar results in their study of the CETSCALE that measures ethnocentrism (Shimp/Sharma 1987). These results indicate that the

structure of the scale is consistent. However, the scale will yield different means for a given country when evaluated by consumers residing in different countries. These conclusions are in line with past studies of country image that show that the home country of consumers affects their evaluation of imported products (Peterson/Jolibert 1995).

The remaining confirmatory analyses steps show that the best fit of the data across countries and over time is found for a model in which the overall 27-item scale is a composite of three subscales defined by the three factors identified by the exploratory factor analysis of stage 2 data. It can be concluded that, while the invariance of the joint covariances and means assumption was not confirmed, the remaining analyses indicate that the result is a reliable interval scale.

Under Thurstone's principle of simple structure, configural invariance requires that items should exhibit the same configuration of salient and nonsalient factor loadings across different countries, while the loading magnitudes do not have to be equal (Steenkamp/Baumgartner 1998). The confirmatory factor analysis of configural invariance discussed above tested the hypothesis that all nonsalient factor loadings are equal to zero, a more stringent test than required. To further explore configural invariance, we replicated on stage 3 data the exploratory principal component factor analyses with varimax rotation for each country and on all countries combined. Data analyzed included the 27 items of the scale and the three chauvinist items, a total of thirty variables. In all cases, five factors with eigenvalues greater than one resulted. In all runs, one factor included only two items, "expensive products" and "inexpensive products" that were included in the "*Economic Value Seeker*" factor in stage 2. Given these results, the factor analyses were repeated, forcing a four-factor solution. Results are presented in Table 3. To facilitate comparison, this table follows the format of Table 2, with factors and variables listed in the same order. Almost all items in all countries have rotated factor loadings greater than 0.5 in their assigned factor. With the exception of one item, "looks for established brand names" that shifted from the "*Economic Value Seeker*" factor to the "*Quality and Satisfaction Seeker*" factor, all items in the French, Israeli and all countries combined are found in the same factors as in stage 2. The "expensive products" and "inexpensive products" are found in the "*Economic Value Seeker*" factor, exhibiting high loadings, verifying that forcing a four-factor solution is justified. It can be concluded that when replicated in the same countries, configural invariance is confirmed even after a period of three years has elapsed between the two replications.

The Canadian data show similar internal consistency as with the French and Israeli data. As shown in Table 3, both the variance explained and Cronbach's α were similar to those of France and Israel and all countries combined. Two items, "is paying top price for top quality" and "looks for established brand names" have higher loading values in factor 1 than in factor 3. The second of these items is consistent with what was found in this stage for France and Israel. These findings but-

Table 3. Percent Variance explained, Rotated Factor Loadings and internal Consistency of Thirty-items Four-Factors Exploratory Solution on Stage 3 Data

	All Countries Combined	France	Israel	Canada
Variance explained by first 4 factors	56.5	52.0	58.3	59.8
Cronbach's α of the 30 items scale[d]	0.899	0.889	0.899	0.918
Cronbach's α of 27 items excluding the three *chauvinist* variables	0.925	0.904	0.931	0.935
Factor 1:	1	1	1	1
Eigenvalue	9.58	7.84	10.19	10.50
Percent of variance	31.9	26.2	34.0	35.0
Cronbach's α	0.911	0.892	0.910	0.922
"Quality and Satisfaction Seeker"				
Is getting a good deal	0.752	0.713	0.744	0.679
Is making the best choice	0.762	0.722	0.775	0.729
Is correct in choosing the product	0.778	0.768	0.771	0.721
Will be satisfied	0.739	0.707	0.700	0.790
Products I like	0.687	0.660	0.708	0.709
Cares about quality	0.657	0.571	0.619	0.726
High quality products	0.708	0.705	0.584	0.773
Demands high quality	0.666	0.569	0.617	0.727
Products my friends would buy	0.642	0.654	0.628	0.599
Products I'll be proud to show my friends	0.621	0.615	0.578	0.649
Is knowledgeable about the product	0.573	0.543	0.522	0.625
Factor 2:	2	2	2	2
Eigenvalue	3.69	4.05	3.63	3.38
Percent of variance	12.3	13.5	12.1	11.3
Cronbach's α	0.895	0.880	0.896	0.902
"Underdog"				
Is stingy	0.634	0.617	0.731	0.588
Is unthinking, rash, naive	0.743	0.724	0.631	0.841
Is stupid, foolish	0.739	0.696	0.717	0.790
Is a gambler	0.608	0.590	0.583	0.573
Is a poor person	0.658	0.590	0.677	0.694
is a low class person	0.662	0.566	0.696	0.759
Is getting ripped off	0.735	0.729	0.622	0.718
Is mistaken in choosing the product	0.703	0.705	0.696	0.691
Doesn't care about quality	0.643	0.599	0.701	0.586
Is not knowledgeable about the product	0.575	0.644	0.603	0.411
Will be dissatisfied	0.654	0.706	0.685	0.574
Factor 3:	3	3	3	3
Eigenvalue	2.00	2.22	2.11	2.56
Percent of variance	6.7	7.4	7.0	8.5
Cronbach's α	0.795	0.711	0.855	0.821
"Economic Value Seeker"				
Expensive products	0.773	0.604	0.840	0.831
Inexpensive products	0.814	0.656	0.832	0.834
Is buying a good but expensive product	0.599	0.579	0.742	0.604
Is paying top price for top quality	0.480[a]	0.500	0.658	0.475[b]
Looks for established brand names	0.375[c]	0.305[d]	0.446[e]	0.388[f]
Factor 4:	4	4	4	4
Eigenvalue	1.67	1.48	1.53	1.49
Percent of variance	5.6	4.9	5.1	5.0
Cronbach's α	0.734	0.746	0.786	0.665
"Chauvinist"				
Wants to help the domestic economy	0.867	0.795	0.819	0.886
Prefers domestic products	0.850	0.759	0.828	0.883
Is a local chauvinist	0.624	0.699	0.738	0.312[g]

[a] This item has loading of 0.647 in factor 1.
[b] This item has loading of 0.684 in factor 1.
[c] This item has loading of 0.509 in factor 1.
[d] This item has loading of 0.487 in factor 1.
[e] This item has loading value of 0.458 in factor 1.
[f] This item has loading value of 0.565 in factor 1.
[g] This item has loading value of –0.550 in factor 2.

tress the configural invariance of the 27-item scale across countries and over time. The item, "is a local chauvinist", has a high negative loading in factor 2, and a low loading in factor 4. Apparently, "chauvinist" has a different meaning in Canada than in France and Israel. This result corroborates our earlier conclusion that the three-item *chauvinist* scale is unreliable for the measurement of this concept.

The Cronbach's α values (all above 0.9) shown in the third row of Table 3 confirm that the 27-item scale is reliable with internal consistency. As should be expected, the corresponding Cronbach's α values for each factor are somewhat lower and decline with the corresponding reduction in the number of variables per factor. With the exception of factor 4, comprising the three-item chauvinist scale, all are reasonably high. These results lend further credence to the 27-item scale.

Application of the Scale

To demonstrate how the scale may be applied in cross-country studies, we analyzed the French and Israeli ratings of Japan and South Korea during stages 2 and

Table 4. Application Example

	Stage 2		Stage 3				
	Scale	Std Dev	Scale	Std Dev	Change	t	α<
French respondents' ratings of Japan	N = 135		N = 123				
27 items scale	4.96	0.78	4.56	0.97	–0.40	–3.65	0.001
F1: Satisfaction Seeker	4.71	0.94	4.27	1.25	–0.44	–3.20	0.01
F2: Underdog	5.46	0.91	5.00	1.16	–0.46	–3.54	0.001
F3: Economic Value Seeker	4.40	1.11	4.18	1.07	–0.22	–1.61	ns
South Korea	N = 107		N = 115				
27 items scale	3.51	0.88	3.76	0.78	0.25	2.23	0.05
F1: Satisfaction Seeker	3.32	1.02	3.47	1.04	0.15	1.07	ns
F2: Underdog	4.23	1.14	4.47	1.08	0.24	1.60	ns
F3: Economic Value Seeker	2.34	0.90	2.82	1.20	0.48	3.33	0.001
Israeli respondents' ratings of Japan	N = 127		N = 109				
27 items scale	5.65	0.60	5.34	0.70	–0.31	–3.64	0.001
F1: Satisfaction Seeker	5.49	0.76	5.13	0.98	–0.36	–3.16	0.01
F2: Underdog	6.18	0.75	5.89	0.78	–0.29	–2.89	0.01
F3: Economic Value Seeker	4.83	1.12	4.61	1.30	–0.22	–1.39	ns
South Korea	N = 105		N = 104				
27 items scale	3.96	0.87	4.20	0.80	0.24	2.06	0.05
F1: Satisfaction Seeker	3.63	0.98	3.93	0.99	0.30	2.19	0.05
F2: Underdog	4.81	1.25	5.01	0.99	0.20	1.27	ns
F3: Economic Value Seeker	2.77	1.05	3.00	1.16	0.23	1.49	ns

3 of the study. Table 4 shows the means of the items comprising the overall 27-item scale and each of its three factors.

The image of Japan is consistently better than that of Korea ($p < 0.000$) both in France and in Israel during both sampling periods. Considering changes over time, there is deterioration in the image of Japan and improvement in the image of South Korea among both French and Israeli consumers. It can be concluded that the relative image advantage of Japan over South Korea has declined in both countries in recent years. Considering next some changes in subscales, both in France and in Israel, the perception of the *Economic Value Seeker* of Japanese product buyers has not changed significantly. Thus, even though consumers recognize that Japanese products provide the same value for the money, these products are less desirable on emotional and social grounds. In France, the opposite holds true for South Korea. Here, the significant improvement of the perceived product value as represented by the *Economic Value Seeke*r subscale has not rendered these products more socially desirable. In Israel, there is an improvement in the positive attitudes represented by the *Quality and Satisfaction Seeker* subscale, even though the improvement in the *Economic Value Seeker* subscale is not significant. Thus, in Israel, there is better acceptance of Korean products, but these have yet to prove themselves through more experience with them before they might pose a serious threat to Japanese leadership.These results have strategic implications for both Japan and Korea in French and Israeli markets. For Japanese exporters, a "defensive" strategy should be undertaken in both France and Israel. Because of the deterioration in country image, measures should be taken to prevent a further decine. On the other hand, Korean exporters should undertake differential strategies. In France, steps should be taken to improve social desirability of their products. In Israel, on the other hand, the quality aspects of their products should be emphasized.

Discussion and Conclusion

In this cross-country study we developed and tested a 27-item (or 30-items with the inclusion of chauvinism where appropriate) personification of country image scale. While all scale items derived from the personification open-ended question "A person who buys products made in country X is . . .", some of the items can be readily transformed to simpler product questions. For example, the completed sentence: "A person who buys home electronic products made in country X is getting high quality products," can be transformed to "Products made in country X are high quality products." Due to such simplifications, the final scale consists of two parts, items relating directly to products and items relating to the person who buys them, both employing the same rating scale.

While we identified and defined three subscales, a review of all items reveals that they cover a number of evaluative, social and emotional dimensions. Four items relate to product quality; six items relate to economic value and price-quality relationship; five items relate to the intelligence of a person or his/her choice, or degree of his/her product knowledge; three relate to liking the product and expected satisfaction from choice; three items relate to social desireability and social class; three to country of residence chauvinism; and five items relate to negative personality traits, such as "gambler", "stingy" and "naïve". The last group, personality traits, sheds new insights to consumer thinking. Making rational economic choices is considered by consumers to be normal and expected. Accordingly, positive personality traits were not included in the scale. On the other hand, making bad choices is abnormal and unexpected from typical consumers. Therefore, only persons with negative traits can be assumed to make wrong choices. Since the purchase of products made in low COO image is considered by consumers to be a mistake, negative traits were provided and remained as items in the scale.

Since the scale describes a person buying products made in a certain country, and the country is the only cue provided to respondents, all attributes reflect back to products made in that country. Thus, the scale captures not only normative, but also emotional and social dimensions that consumers attribute to these products. For example, if the person is described as a gambler, it means that the purchase of products entails a high risk. Similarly, if a respondent agrees with the negative trait statements, it means that she has strong negative emotions towards the country and/or its products.

The confirmatory and exploratory factor analyses have resulted in a reliable interval, though not a ratio scale. Accordingly, differences in scale values may be compared across countries or over time. On the other hand, due to possible differences in the scale means, one should be careful not to compare particular scores across countries where data are collected. This can be clearly seen in Table 4, where all mean ratings of both Japanese and Korean products are higher in Israel than in France. In comparing ratings between respondents of two or more countries, scale calibration may be necessary as suggested by Kumar (2000, Ch. 10). If this is the case for our rigorously developed and tested scale, no comparison between data collected in different countries should be attempted when different, less reliable scales were used.

The validity of the questionnaire developed in this study may be attested by the fact that although four languages were used, apparently little bias was introduced into the responses. Care was taken to produce a standardized version of the questionnaire by the use of English as the base for all translations. Future studies of country image may use not only the conceptual scale developed, but also the English, French, Hebrew, and Spanish versions of the corresponding questionnaire. If a standardized questionnaire, such as the one developed above, would

be adopted in country image studies, comparisons between countries and over time may be made. This would also enable the building of a data base that could be used in meta analsyes of country image effect.

As shown above, there is evidence in the literature that the COO effect is product-line specific. Therefore, the choice of a widely consumed household product line in all countries surveyed was justified. Even though the scale in this study was generated from one broad product line, none of the items are related to specific product attributes. Therefore, it would seem to have general applicability. However, in order to verify the universality of the scales to diverse household consumer product lines (e.g., clothing, food, and automobiles), additional replications of the reliability tests conducted in the third stage of the present study on different product lines are recommended.

The three *chauvinist* items were found relatively reliable in countries, such as France and Israel, where there is significant production of local brands of the studied product lines. It becomes meaningless in countries, such as Mexico, where there is no significant local production. We suggest that these items be removed from questionnaires used in countries that do not have their own locally known brands of the assessed product lines.

Most studies of country image have used Likert scales. Further research might investigate the advantages and disadvantages in employing different scale types, such as Osgood, Stapel, and ranking scales (Olsen/Olsson 2002).

Acknowledgements

1 The authors gratefully acknowledge the helpful comments of Nicolas Papadopoulos, Martin Roth and Saeed Samiee to an earlier draft of this paper. Special thanks go to Nicolas Papadopoulos for collecting the Canadian data.

Appendix A-1. 64-Item Scale

Household electronic products made in (country) are:
innovative products
products my friends would not buy
products I'll be proud to show my friends
products I dislike
high quality products
conventional products
products I hate
products I'll be ashamed to show my friends

products of reasonable quality
products I like
expensive products
products of low quality
products my friends would buy
inexpensive products

A person who buys household electronic products made in (country)

is economical, cost conscious
prefers domestic products
is a snob
is brand loyal
doesn't care about the domestic economy
is a gambler
is stingy
is making the best choice
is a poor person
is getting ripped off
follows the crowd
is getting a good deal
wants to help the domestic economy
is stupid, foolish
is a lower class person
is an expert in the product
is buying a good but inexpensive product
is unthinking, rash, naive
doesn't care about quality
is a middle class person
doesn't care about price
is getting what he pays for
will be dissatisfied
buys products made in a developed country
is a local chauvinist
is not knowledgeable about the product
will be satisfied
prefers imported products
is an average income person
is knowledgeable about the product
cares about quality
is intelligent, smart, shrewd
is spendthrift

is not concerned about brand name
is mistaken in choosing the product
is an upper class person
buys products made in a developing country
is paying top price for top quality
is a traitor, not a local patriot
is an innovator, a leader
is buying a good but expensive product
is correct in choosing the product
doesn't care where the product is made-in
is original and free
trusts the product quality
is a rich person
looks for established brand names
is compromising quality for a low price
is a risk avoider
demands high quality

References

Agarwal, M. K./Ratchford, B. T., Estimating Demand Functions for Product characteristics: The Case of Automobiles, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 7, 3, 1980, pp. 249–273.

Bannister, J./Saunders, J., U. K. Consumers' Attitudes toward Imports: The Measurement of National Stereotype Image, *European Journal of Marketing*, 12, 8, 1978, pp. 562–570.

Cattin, P./Jolibert, A./Lohnes, C., Cross-cultural Study of 'Made in' Concepts, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 14, 1982, pp. 131–141.

Chao, P., The Impact of Country Affiliation on the Credibility of Product Attribute Claims, *Journal of Advertising Research*, 28, 2, 1989, pp. 35–41.

Chao, P./Rajendran, K. N., Consumer Profiles and Perceptions: Country-of-Origin Effects, *International Marketing Review*, 10, 2, 1993, pp. 22–31.

Chasin, J. B./Jaffe, E. D., Industrial Buyer Attitudes toward Goods Made In Eastern Europe, *Columbia Journal of World Business*, 14, 1979, pp. 74–81.

Chasin, J. B./Jaffe, E. D., Industrial Buyer Attitudes Toward Goods Made In Eastern Europe: An Update, *European Management Journal*, 5, 3, 1987, pp. 180–189.

Chinen, K./Jun, M. J./Hampton, G., Product Quality, Market Presence, and Buying Behavior: Aggregate Images of Foreign Products in the U. S., *Multinational Business Review*, 8, 1, 2000, pp. 29–38.

Churchill, Jr., G. A. A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing Constructs, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16, 1979, pp. 64–73

Cohen, J., A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20, 1960, pp. 37–46.

Cohen, J., Weighted Kappa: Nominal Scale Agreement with Provision for Scaled Disagreement or Partial Credit, *Psychological Bulletin*, 70, 1968, pp. 213–230.

Collins, M./Kalton, C., Coding Verbatim Answers to Open Questions, *Journal of the Market Research Society*, 22, 4, 1980, pp. 239–247.

Craig, S. C., The Decline of Partisanship in the United States: A Reexamination of Neutrality Hypothesis, *Political Behavior*, 7, 1985, pp. 57–78.

Crawford, J./Garland, B., German and American Perceptions of Product Quality, *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 1, 1988, pp. 63–78.

Darling, J. R./Kraft, F. B., A Competitive Profile of Products and Associated Marketing Practices of Selected European and Non-European Countries, *European Journal of Marketing*, 11, 7, 1977, pp. 5–19.

Daser, S./Meric, H., Does Patriotism Have any Marketing Value: Exploratory Findings for the 'Crafted with Pride' Campaign in the U.S.A., in Wallendorf, M./Anderson, P. (eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research*, Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research 1987.

Dillon, W. R./Madden, T. J./Firtle, N. H., *Marketing Research in a Marketing Environment*, Times Mirror/Mosby College Publishing 1987.

Dohrenwend, B. S., Some Effects of Open and Closed Questions on Respondents' Answers, *Human Organization*, 24, 1965, pp. 175–184.

Eroglu, S. A./Machleit, K., Effects of Individual and Product-Specific Variables on Utilising Country of Origin as a Product Quality Cue, *International Marketing Review*, 6, 6, 1988, pp. 27–41.

Ettenson, R., Brand Name and Country of Origin Effects in the Emerging Market Economies of Russia, Poland and Hungary, *International Marketing Review*, 10, 5, 1993, pp. 14–36.

Festervand, T. A./Lumpkin, J.r./Lundstrom, W. J., Consumers' Perceptions of Imports: An Update and Extension, *Akron Business and Economic Review*, 16, 1, 1985, pp. 31–37.

Gaedeke, R., Consumer Attitudes toward Products 'Made In' Developing Countries, *Journal of Retailing*, 49, 1973, pp. 13–24.

Geer, J. G., What Do Open-Ended Questions Measure, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 52, 1988, pp. 365–371.

Han, C. M./Terpstra, V., CIE Effects for Uni-National and Bi-National Products, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 19, 2, 1988, pp. 235–255.

Han, C. M., Country Image: Halo or Summary Construct?, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 26, May 1989, pp. 222–229.

Heimbach, A./Johansson, J./MacLachlan, D., Product Familiarity, Information Processing and Country-of-Origin Cues, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 16, 1989, pp. 460–467.

Heslop, L. A./Liefeld, J./Wall, M, An Experimental Study of the Impact of COO Information, in Turner, R. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada* 1987.

Hester, S./Yuen, M., The Influence of Country of Origin on Consumer Attitude and Buying Behavior in the United States and Canada, in Wallendorf, M./Anderson, P. (eds.), Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research 1987.

Hirschmann, E., Humanistic Inquiry in Marketing Research: Philosophy, Method and Criteria, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 23, August 1986, pp. 237–249.

Holbrook, M., The Role of Lyricism in Research on Consumer Emotions: Skylark, Have You Anything to Say to Me?, in Goldberg, M./Gorn, G./Pollay, G.(eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research*, 17, 1, New Orleans: Association for Consumer Research 1990.

Hooley, G./Shipley, D./Krieger, N., A Method for Modeling Consumer Perceptions of Country of Origin, *International Marketing Review*, 5, 1, 1988, pp. 67–76.

Hong, S./Toner, J., Are There Gender Differences in the Use of Country-of-Origin Information in the Evaluation of Products?, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 16, 1989, pp. 468–472.

Howard, D., Understanding How American Consumers Formulate their Attitudes About Foreign Products, *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 2, 1989, pp. 7–22.

Hudson, L./Ozanne, J., Alternative Ways of Seeking Knowledge in Consumer Research, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14, March 1988, pp. 508–521.

Hugstad, P./Durr, M., A Study of Country of Manufacturer Impact on Consumer Perceptions, in Malhotra, N./Hawes, J. (eds.), *Developments in Marketing Science*, Coral Gable, FL: Academy of Marketing Science 1986.

Jaffe, E. D./Nebenzahl, I. D., Alternative Questionnaire Formats for Country Image Studies, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 21, November 1984, pp. 463–471.

Jaffe, E. D./Nebenzahl, I. D., On the Measurement of Country Image: An Alternative Approach, in Sagafi-nejad, T., (ed.), *Proceedings of the Academy of International Business*, Bermuda: Academy of International Business 1991.

Johansson, J. K./Douglas, S./Nonaka, I., Assessing the Impact of Country of Origin on Product Evaluations: A New Methodological Perspective, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 22, November 1985, pp. 388–396.

Johansson, J. K./Nebenzahl, I. D., Multinational Production: Effect on Brand Value, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 17, 3, 1986, pp. 101–126.

Johansson, J. K./Nebenzahl, I. D., CIE, Social Norms, and Behavioral Intentions, in Cavusgil, T. S. (ed.), *Advances in International Marketing II*, JAI Press 1987.

Johansson, J. K./Rokainen, I./Czinkota, M., Negative Country-of-Origin Effects: The Case of the New Russia, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25, 1, 1994, pp. 157–176.

Klein, J. G./Ettenson, R./Morris, M. D., The Animosity Model of Foreign Product Purchase: An Empirical Test in the People's Republic of China, *Journal of Marketing*, 62, 1, 1998, pp. 89–100.

Kumar, V., *International Marketing Research*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall 2000.

Lee, D./Ganesh, G., Effects of Partitioned Country Image in the Context of Brand Image and Familiarity, *International Marketing Review*, 16, 1, 1999, pp. 18–39.

Levistone, H. A./Turoff, M., *The Delphi Method: Techniques and Applications*, New York: Addison-Wesley Publication Company 1975.

Li, Z./Murray, W./Scott, D., Global Sourcing, Multiple Country-of-Origin Facets, and Consumer Reactions, *Journal of Business Research*, 47, 1, 2000, pp. 121–133.

Lillis, C./Naranya, C, Analysis of 'Made In' Product Images – An Exploratory Study, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 5, 1, 1974, pp. 119–127.

Martin, I./Eroglu, S., Measuring a Multi-Dimensional Construct: Country Image, *Journal of Business Research*, 28, 1993, pp. 191–210.

Nagashima, A., A Comparison of Japanese and U. S. Attitudes toward Foreign Products, *Journal of Marketing*, 34, January 1970, pp. 68–74.

Nagashima, A., A Comparative 'Made In' Product Image Survey Among Japanese Businessmen, *Journal of Marketing*, 41, July 1977, pp. 95–100.

Nebenzahl, I. D./Jaffe, E. D./Lampert, S. I., Towards a Theory of Country Image Effect on Product Evaluation, *Management International Review*, 37, 1, 1997, pp. 27–49.

Ofir, C./Lehmann, D., Measuring Images of Foreign Products, *Columbia Journal of World Business*, 21, Summer 1986, pp. 105–108.

Okechuku, C./Onyemah, V., Nigerian consumer Attitudes Toward Foreign and Domestic Products, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 30, 3, 1999, pp. 611–622.

Olsen, S. O./Olsson, U., Multientity Scaling and the Consistency of Country-of-Origin Attitudes, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33, 1, 2002, pp. 149–168.

Papadopoulos, N./Heslop, L. A./Graby, F./Avlonitis, G., Does Country of Origin Matter? Some Findings about Foreign Products, *Cambridge: Marketing Science Institute Report No. 87–104*, 1987.

Papadopoulos, N./Heslop, L. A./Beracs, J., National Stereotyping and Product Evaluations: An Empirical Investigation of Consumers in a Socialist Country, *International Marketing Review*, 7, 1, 1990, pp. 32–47.

Papadopoulos, N./Heslop, L. A./Bamossy, G., A Comparative Image Analysis of Domestic versus Imported Products, unpublished working paper 1990.

Papadopoulos, N./Heslop, L. A., But Who Knows Where or When: Reflections on the Images of Countries and their Products, in Papadapoulos, N./Heslop, L. A. (eds.), *Product and Country Images*, Pennsylvania: Haworth Press 1993.

Parameswaran, R./Yaprak, A., A Cross-National Comparison of Consumer Research Measures, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 18, 1, 1987, pp. 35–49.

Peter, P./Churchill, Jr., G. A., Relationships Among Research Design Choices and Psychometric Properties of Rating Scales: A Meta Analysis, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 23, February 1986, pp. 1–10.

Peterson, R. A./Jolibert, J. P., A Quantitative Analysis of Country-of-Origin Effects, *University of Texas Marketing Department Working Paper*, Austin, TX, 1994.

Peterson, R. A./Jolibert, J. P., A Meta-Analysis of Country-of-Origin Effects, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26, 4, 1995, pp. 883–900.

Rierson, C., Are Foreign Products Seen as National Stereotypes?, *Journal of Retailing*, 42, Fall 1966, pp. 33–40.

Roth, M./Romeo, J., Matching Product Category and Country Image Perceptions: A Framework for Managing Country-of-Origin Effects, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23, 3, 1992, pp. 477–497.

Samiee, S., Customer Evaluation of Products in a Global Market, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25, 3, 1994, pp. 579–604.

Sauer, P./Young, M./Unnava, H., An Experimental Investigation of the Processes Behind the Country-of-Origin Effect, *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 3, 2, 1991, pp. 29–59.

Schooler, R., Product Bias in the Central American Common Market, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 2, 1965, pp. 394–397.

Schooler, R./Sunoo, D., Consumer Perceptions of International Products: Regional vs. National Labeling, *Social Science Quarterly*, 49, 4, 1969, pp. 886–890.

Schuman, H./Presser, S., The Open and Closed Question, *American Sociological Review*, 44, October 1979, pp. 692–712.

Shimp, T. A./Samiee, S./Madden, T. J., Countries and their Products: A Cognitive Structure Perspective, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 21, 4, 1993, pp. 323–330.

Shimp, T. A./Sharma, S., Consumer Ethnocentrism: Construction and Validation of the CETSCALE, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24, 1987, pp. 280–289.

Smith, W., Country-of-Origin Bias: A Regional Labeling Solution, *International Marketing Review*, 10, 6, 1993, pp. 4–12.

Spector, P., *Summated Rating Scale Construction*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 1992.

Stanga, J. E./Sheffield, J. F., The Myth of Zero Partisanship: Attitudes toward American Political Parties, 1964–1984, *American Journal of Political Science*, 31, 1987, pp. 829–855.

Steenkamp, J-B. E. M./Baumgartner, H., Assessing Measurement Invariance in Cross-National Consumer Research, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25, 1998, pp. 78–90.

Strutton, D./True, S. L./Rody, R. C., Russian Consumer Perceptions of Foreign and Domestic Consumer Goods: An Analysis of Country-of-Origin Stereotypes with Implications for Promotions and Positioning, *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 3, 3, 1995, pp. 76–87.

Teas, R. K./Agarwal, S., The Effects of Extrinsic Product Cues on Consumers Perceptions of Quality, Sacrifice and Value, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28, 2, 2000, pp. 278–290.

Thakor, M. K./Pacheco, B. G., Foreign Branding and its Effects on Product Perceptions and Attitudes: A Replication and Extension in a Multicultural Setting, *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 5, 1, Winter 1997, 15–30.

Thorelli, H./Lim, J./Ye, J., Relative Importance of Country of Origin, Warranty and Retail Store Image on Product Evaluations, *International Marketing Review*, 6, 1, 1989, pp. 35–46.

Tse, D./Gorn, G., An Experiment on the Salience of Country-of-Origin in the Era of Global Brands, *Journal of International Marketing*, 1, 1, 1992, pp. 257–276.

Wall, M./Heslop, L. A., Consumer Attitudes toward Canadian Made versus Imported Products, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 14, 2, 1986, pp. 105–113.

Wall, M./Liefeld, J./Heslop, L. A., Impact of Country-of-Origin Cues on Consumer Judgments in Multicue Situations: A Covariance Analysis, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 19, 2, 1991, pp. 105–113.

Wang, C. K., The Effect of Foreign Economic, Political and Cultural Environment on Consumers' Willingness to Buy Foreign Products, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Texas A and M University 1978.

White, P., Attitudes of U. S. Purchasing Managers toward Industrial Products Manufactured in Selected European Nations, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 10, 1, 1979, pp. 81–90.

Witt, J./Rao, C., An Examination of Country-of-Origin Bias in the Context of Brand Reputation, paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of International Business, Brussels 1992.

Wood, V./Darling, J., The Marketing Challenges of the Newly Independent Republics, *Journal of International Marketing*, 1, 1, 1992, pp. 77–102.