COUNTRY OF ORIGIN STEREOTYPING AND CONSUMER ETHNOCENTRISM IN THE INDONESIAN AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

Filipus Rahmat Winata[1] & Dahlia Darmayanti[2]

ABSTRACT

To identify consumer stereotypical image in the Indonesian automobile Industry toward three countries of origin which are Japan, Germany, and America and to measure consumer ethnocentrism and preference toward Completely Build Up (CBU) imported car and locally manufactured/assembly car.

Research method will employ quantitative data collection method using two administered questionnaires with bipolar pairings evaluation via convenience sampling. Total respondents will be 300 peoples whom had purchased a new first hand passenger car in the last 24 months. Data analysis is conducted using SPSS software version 16 through descriptive analysis, independent t-test, and factor analysis. CETSCALE method will be applied to measure the consumer ethnocentrism.

There is a significant difference in the each country's product evaluation. However the differences might not be affected from country bias due to the multi attribute evaluation scheme implemented (Johansshon, 1985 and Akaah and Yaprak, 1993). In addition, differences also occur among the brand knowledgeable and less brand knowledgeable consumer and so does regarding demographics diversity although only some are significant. Consumer ethnocentrism scale enables to generate three factors from the 12 ethnocentrism variable measurers.

Country of origin stereotyping does exist in the Indonesian automobile industry. Japanese car which is the market leader in the market today in term of sales has the most favorable evaluation in service and engineering, fuel economical and as providing good value for money products. While Germany car still remains as producing luxurious car which strong in performance, power, reliability, comfort, and great pride of ownership though American car is the least being evaluated. Indonesia consumer seems to be reasonably ethnocentric, CBU imported products are perceived as slightly in better quality and prestige but obviously more expensive, however Indonesia consumers are somewhat still prefer to purchase locally manufactured/assembly car.

Keywords: *country of origin, automotive, consumer ethnocentrism*

[1, 2] BINUS BUSINESS SCHOOL, BINUS UNIVERSITY, JWC Campus, Jl. Hang Lekir I No. 6, Kebayoran Baru, South Jakarta 12120, fwinata@jwc.binus.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

Background

As one of international marketing issue emerging toward global brand particularly if penetrating into a certain country as a foreign brand, stereotyping toward country of origin would likely to occur due to perception of a specific product image and/or country image, and a country of origin effects on evaluating a product. The stereotypical image may occur toward a country's products, specific brands, or whatever the consumer deems appropriate to group competing products by, to make evaluation easier (Lawrence, 1992).

Automobile industry is one example of the phenomenon in country of origin stereotypes; there are approximately 40 car brands from more than 10 countries of origin that exist in the global market. As a matter of fact, country of origin stereotyping does exist in New Zealand automobile industry (Lawrence, 1992). In Indonesia, the industry is somehow relatively attractive and the products are highly demanded due to the ineffective public transportation. Indonesian automobile industry was the third largest market in South East Asia in 2005 after Thailand and slightly Malaysia (http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Southeast_Asia/GG01Ae01.html). Even though the number of car assembler in Indonesia today might has decreased since there are numbers of brands that is no longer in the market today such as Daewoo, Fiat, and Timor ,however there are manufacturers might have expanded their factories and increase production capacity. Under the circumstances where there are numbers of foreign car producers that produced or manufactured cars in Indonesia competing with imported cars, it enables to test the local ethnocentrism between the imported cars classified as foreign products and locally manufactured cars as the local products. Japan, Germany, and USA are the three major car producers which relatively dominating today market and also as the oldest contender country of origin of car producer since the beginning of the Indonesian automobile industry. However there are also several new players in the market such as Korean with KIA, French with Peugeot and Renault, and recently China under the brand Chery which as the minority.

Stereotype definition

Stereotype is a simplified and/or standardized conception or image with specific meaning, often held in common by people about another group. It can be conventional or oversimplified conception, opinion, or image, based on the assumption that there are attributes that members of groups hold in common as a parameter to create such a perception toward an object, positively or negatively. Bannister and Saunders (1978) mentioned country stereotypes as generalized image created by variables such as representative products, economic and political maturity historical events and relationship, and traditions, industrialism and the degree of technological virtuosity will have effects upon consumer attitudes additional to those emanating from the significant elements of product. Moreover, they also state that country have image too. Perhaps, these kinds of matter would probably to be a challenge for marketers in charged to take high consideration on the issue to correctly position their product and implement accurate marketing strategies to the market such as setting promotion based on the how the product is being perceived.

Scope

Two distinct researches will be conducted in this study, the first research is on Indonesian consumer stereotyping toward three countries in automobile industry as the products home

country which are Japan, USA, and Germany as the most countries that influence and dominate car industry in Indonesia. The second one will be the research to measure Indonesian ethnocentrism toward car manufactured in Indonesia and car manufactured overseas as country of manufacturing (COM) under foreign brand since the Indonesian car brand was no longer exist in the market and due to the high volume of local production that might significantly played role in the industry. The evaluation will be based on recent new car market toward passenger car that is available and provided by the authorized car dealer in Indonesia. It will be conducted in Jakarta or possible more specific places in the area and for demographics concern; data required is regarding gender, age, occupation, and income level. In addition, the respondents should be those who have purchased a "new" car in the last 24 months.

Aims and benefits

The objective of my study would likely to refer to the original study purpose by Lawrence (1992) with some addition due to the additional research conducted.

- To identify attitude of new car purchasers (first hand car purchase) toward automobiles especially passenger car "made in" three different countries: Japan, Germany, and USA as the home country of the product.
- To figure out if there is any significant differences in the stereotypical image toward the three countries of origins regarding distinct demographics and brand knowledge of respondents.
- To provide marketers of motor vehicles with information that will have practical application for gaining a greater understanding of the new car buyer, his or her preference, and image perception regarding the product's country of origin.
- To measure Indonesian ethnocentrism among car "made in" Indonesia and car "made in" foreign country or completely build up (CBU) under foreign brand in term of country of manufacturing (COM).
- The benefits will be to assist business decision making in Indonesian automobile industry to settle on the appropriate assessment to the market by taking consideration on the stereotypical image constructed by the market toward the product related.
- To improve decision making regarding market positioning and segmenting toward the industry.
- To escort businesses in becoming market-oriented corporation.

THEORITICAL FOUNDATION

Country of origin

Country of origin (COO) has been defined distinctly in previous literatures from diverse point of views. Johansson et al. (1985) and Azsormer and Cavusgil define COO as the country where corporate headquarters of the company marketing the product or brand is located. Typically, this is the home country for a company and it is inherent in certain brands. Panasonic implies Japanese origins and Mercedes Benz imply Germany origins for instance. Correspondingly, Saeed (1994) points out that COO means the country that a manufacturer's product or brand is associated with; traditionally this country is called the home country, align the outlook by Bilkey and Nes 1982, Cattin et al 1982, Han and Terpstra 1988, Lee and

Schaninger 1996, Papadopoulos 1993, and White 1979. Saeed (1994) also indicates that country of manufacturing (COM) represents the last location or country of manufacturing or assembling one product. With the hybridization of country of manufacture, design, assembly and brand name. In light of this, the COO paradigm has undergone several shifts so that the brand name, as well as country of origin of brand (COB) is taking on a relevance of its own (Neelam Kinra, 2006). For the clarity to my study, I will define country of origin as country of branding (COB) or the home country of the product and country of manufacturing (COM) as stated by Saeed (1994).

Country of origin bias and country of origin effect on product evaluation

Country of origin bias

Consumers often seem to rely very heavily on country of origin (COO) cues to evaluate products (Kotabe and Helsen, 2008). COO has furthermore, been used as a foremost and primary cue by consumers in evaluating new products under several condition, depending on their expertise (Maheswaran, 1994), with minimal consideration given to other product related attribute. On the other hand, according to Philip R. Cateora and John L. Graham, Country of origin effect (COE) defined as any influence that the country of manufacture, assembly, or design on a consumer's positive or negative perception of product. It is also defined as intangible barriers to enter new markets in the form of negative consumer bias toward imported products (Wang and Lamb, 1983). Stereotypical image may comes up the surface once consumer attempt to perceive a country positively or negatively using variable cues, by evaluating product quality, brands, design, and value for money toward the country base on consumer's personal experience on the product or might be biased from the country of origin itself. Reierson (1966) examined whether or not preconceived notions consumers have about foreign products are really national stereotypes rather than opinions about specific products. The results indicated a clear stereotyping and reveal an attitude of national stereotypes rather than opinions on specific products. Schooler and Wildt (1969) noticed that American consumers were biased against Japanese products because of their national origin. In this case, country bias might be defined as a negative prejudice or a national stereotypes attitude and related to nationalism (Lawrence, 1992) due to the negative evaluation on foreign products. Regarding the country bias, "the capability in explaining consumer bias in favor of domestic products is dependent on the specific country of origin and the particular product category. Nevertheless, the observed variability in product preferences is linked to consumer ethnocentrism" (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2004**)**. Country bias mentioned to be misleading regarding Kaynak and Cavusgil (1983) findings toward the Canadian which stated that "consumer's perceptions of quality towards products of foreign origin tend to be product specific".

Country origin effect on product evaluation (car)

The study about country of origin effect to product evaluation also had been conducted through the century in various literatures across countries toward particular product category such as cars. Erickson (1984) conducted a research on the country of origin effects on the evaluation of automobile brands. Respondents were asked about their belief and attitudes toward ten automobile models and also asked to rate their familiarity_with each auto. The result indicates that country of origin effects beliefs but not attitudes. Johansson (1985) acquired a multi cue method for examining the impact of country of origin effect on product evaluation in automobile with ten car models from three "made in" different countries, Japan,

USA, and Germany. The questionnaire consists of 13 attributes to be evaluated and the result shown that country of origin effects were relatively minor when a multi attribute approach was used and it may be less significant than has generally been believed, and they may occur predominantly in relation to evaluation of specific attributes rather that overall attributes (Johansson, 1985). Similar study is also conducted by Akaah and Yaprak (1993) which supports Johansson findings. In regards to brand familiarity, "consumer tend to reach evaluations quickly and directly without much effortful external search when confronted with a familiar brand name with no further search for processing of information "(Brucks, 1985). According to Schaefer (1997), it seems reasonable to assume that consumers who are familiar with a particular brand will not rely on country of origin, or attribute information in evaluating particular brand.

Summary

In summary, country of origin stereotyping seems to be very complex with loads of literature denoting diverse opinions toward the issue. These are the key research findings according to Kotabe and Hensen (2007):

- Country of origin effects is not stable; perception change over time. (Van R. Wood, John R. Darling, and Mark Siders, 1999).
- Country of design and country of manufacturing play a role. Foreign company can attract patriotic customers by being local player such as build up an assembling manufacture in the country.
- John Hulland, Honorio S.Todino, and Donald J. Lecraw (1996) indicated that In general, consumer prefers domestic's products toward foreign products. A study conducted in the Philippines found that products made in developing countries are marketable only when they are priced far less than products offered by regional or global competitor and there is a country of origin bias against goods from developing countries.

Consumer ethnocentrism

Consumer ethnocentrism specifically refers to ethnocentric views by customers in one country (in-group) toward product from another country (out group) (Shimp and Sharma, 1987). It is also can be defined as a cognitive or perspective from customers to overrate products manufactured locally and underestimate foreign made product, rate their in-group superior to others. Ethnocentrism also mentioned as "judging other cultures relative to one's own culture" (Adorno et al, 1950). They also believe that buying foreign products are unpatriotic and improper since it would hurts domestic jobs and economy (Klein, 2002; Netemeyer et al., 1991; Sharma, Shimp, & Shin, 1995; Shimp & Sharma, 1987). Fang Liu, Jamie, JianYou, and Xiangping (2007) pointed out that the effect of consumer ethnocentrism may influence high involvement products such as cars more significantly than low involvement products such as toothpaste. Furthermore, Han (1990) and McLain (1991) denoted that income did not significantly influence for variation in consumer ethnocentrism. Brodowsky (1988) conducted a study on consumer ethnocentrism among car buyers in the US and found a strong positive relationship between high ethnocentrism and country based bias in the automobiles evaluation. Low ethnocentric consumers tend to evaluate automobiles based actual value of the products with lesser use on country of origin cue. The author also stated that understanding consumer ethnocentrism is necessary in understanding country of origin effect, though consumers in developed countries still prefer to purchase products manufactured locally (Bilkey and Nes,

1982 ; Reirsen, 1967; Samiee, 1994). These studies relating country of origin effects and consumer ethnocentrism will be applicable if domestic product alternatives are available and take into consideration in the research (John and Katrina, 1999). Phillip and John (2007) mentioned that ethnocentrism can also have country of origin effect; feelings of national pride. Indonesian consumer prefer products "made in" Indonesia for example, this might influence attitude toward imported products. Han (1988) also stated that consumer patriotism does affect cognitive evaluation of goods but affects purchase intent to a greater degree.

Automotive in Indonesia

The beginning era of Indonesian automobile industry development was started in 1964 by assembled parts and components of automobiles in Semi Knock Down (SKD) bases. In 1969, a policy was set up particularly for sedan and commercial cars in which the importation of parts and components should be in Completely Knock Down (CKD) condition. The Government put out a regulation in 1976, which is to start manufacturing parts and components in Indonesia and this proceeding would have encourage the industry to utilize on locally made components in their operation. The market plunged considerably from 398,000 units sold in 1997 to 58,000 units sold in 1998 due to the crisis. Deregulation on foreign investment, import policy, and the support from IMF are remarkable factors to work out on the situation. As a matter of fact, the market starts to proliferate in 1999 with 123,236 units sold and 307,399 units sold in 2000. The open market gives positive indication for customers to have extensive alternatives for CBU cars against locally produced which carry tough competition in the industry. The Indonesian automobiles activities including distributing, retailing, and manufacturing (assembling, parts and components manufacturing) are mostly monitored by Gaikindo, a non-profit institution responsible in the area, counting as local manufacturing, exports and imports with massive affiliations (see appendix C). On the other hand, another independent automotive association does exist in the industry with its own sole agents and distributors; they are less dominant and functioning only in CBU imported (mostly luxurious cars) cars such as Ferrari, Porsche, Toyota Harrier*, Toyota Alphard*, Nissan Elgrand, etc which are not available in authorized Nissan or Toyota sole agent/Dealer listed in Gaikindo. Indonesian automobile industry has an open market system with less importation barriers, as a matter of fact the car importation policies which are regulated by the Indonesian Ministry of industry and trade which consist of three major points:

1. Import license
   Cars which had been produced or had not been produced in Indonesia are free to import

*From September 2008, the car also has been imported and distributed to the market by car dealer as the member of Gaikindo (Toyota Astra Car Dealer)

   to Indonesia by General Importers as long as they fulfill the requirements exist in the Country, as stated in Minister of Industry and Trade Decree No. 275/1999. CBU cars are allowed to be imported by general importers, modified from the previous one which only permitted registered importers and sole agents to import.
2. Quotas
   There is no limitation or quota in the CBU or CKD importation volume; they are imported based on market demand.
3. Bans

There is also no regulation on CBU new car importation ban. However, the Decree of the Ministry of Industry and Trade No.172/2001 does proscribe on the importation of used car except truck with minimum of gross vehicle weight (GVW) of 24 tons.

Another issue regarding the area is that CBU imported cars are attached luxury goods tax while CKD locally assembled cars will not attached on that kind of tax. As a matter of fact, with massive volume on local production (8 local car assemblers producing 9 major brands), a significant volume gap does exist between the number of locally manufactured cars and CBU imported cars in the market.

Table 1. Approximate sales of passenger car in Indonesia automobile industry

SALES

Category	**Year**				
	2003	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**
Sedan	38,925	40,481	35,369	17,565	27,381
4x2	186,033	271,142	327,155	203,634	285,463
4x4	1,110	1,242	1,795	1,188	1,655
Double cabin	3,898	4,129	6,057	5,416	8,314
TOTAL	**229,966**	**316,994**	**370,376**	**227,803**	**322,813**

Table 2. Approximated production of passenger car in Indonesia automobile industry

PRODUCTION

Category	**Year**				
	2003	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**
Sedan	20,897	7,328	6,228	2,008	1,570
4x2	181,896	249,988	326,334	203,676	302,334
4x4	403	145	28	637	5,304
Double cabin	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	**203,196**	**257,461**	**332,590**	**206,321**	**309,208**

Table 3. Approximate exports of vehicle in Indonesia automobile industry

EXPORTS

CBU EXPORT (UNITS)	2,046	9,572	17,805	30,974	60,267
CKD-SET EXPORT	52,102	65,845	103,370	105,917	105,642
COMPONENTS EXPORT	0	447,420	380,371	285,124	29,0475

Table 4. Approximate imports of vehicle in Indonesia automobile industry

IMPORTS

CBU IMPORT (UNITS)	14,632	32,250	31,760	33,663	55,112

For the current situation in the market is, Japanese automobile dominate the Indonesian market in terms of sales and production volume thus far followed by the Germany car and the American car.

Table 5. Approximate sales of the three country of origin car producer in Indonesian market

Sales in unit

Country/year	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Japan	178,069	258,702	308,192	200,389	254,975
Germany	4,366	4,412	3,406	2,105	2,836
USA	2,199	3,850	3,481	2,257	3,058

HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Research questions

1. Is there any significant difference in the stereotypical image toward the three countries of origins?
2. Is there any different in product evaluation between brand knowledgeable and less brand knowledgeable respondent?
3. Is demographics contribute significant differences in product evaluation?
4. What is the consumer perception and preference toward CBU imported car and locally manufactured car?
5. What is the consumer ethnocentrism level toward those two products from two different countries of origins?

Hypotheses

Successfully implemented to test the New Zealand automobile new car market by Lawrence (1992), this research is to be expected to measures the hypotheses below as conducted by the author.

H1. There will be a significant difference in the evaluation of automobile attributes due to the country of origin bias

H2. The level of familiarity with brands of automobiles from different national origins will affect attributes evaluation

H3. Perception of automobiles from the three tested countries will differ among various demographic group identified by age, income, occupation and sex with the population of recent new car buyers

Additional research will be attached to test the ethnocentrism level using multi variables measurers of CETSCALE method referring to the study by Neelam Kinra (2006).

DATA AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Measurement Questions

Each questionnaire will be structured in manner and handed out in Indonesian language to convenience hypotheses testing. Referring to the previous study by Lawrence (1992) each will be divided into four parts:

A. Demographics
   Questions asked will be on gender, age, occupation, and income of the respondent.
B. Purchase behavior
   Questions asked are regarding country of origin of car purchase, engine size, and brand of the respondent's car purchases.
C. Country of origin Attitude
   The measurement applies 22 bi-polar adjective pairings to be evaluated for each of the three country of origin.
D. Brand familiarity
   Respondents are asked to specify four car brands from each country of origin.
E. Ethnocentrism scale
   In this part, the questions aim to measure ethnocentrism level of the Indonesian using CETSCALE methods developed by Shrimp and Sharma (1987). Nevertheless, I will use 15 variable measurers considering aspects such as nationalism and product quality generated from Neelam Kinra (2006) study in India toward foreign and local brands.

Data collection method

A descriptive quantitative analysis method will be implemented using two Structured self administered questionnaire by convenience sampling method is appropriate to collect all the data from respondent. Using semantic differential rating scale, the bipolar adjectives pairing consist of 22 adjectives to evaluate automobiles from the three country of origin will be divided into two questionnaires with eleven pairings contain on each questionnaire which is expected to improve responds rate and respondent's consistency due to the respondent fatigue if evaluating twenty two pairings at a time. While the ethnocentrism scale will be evaluated using seven points Likert scaling method with 1 least negative and 7 most positive. The questionnaire will be distributed by convenience sampling method due to the time constraint, prior to confirm on their current car purchase decision date.

Sampling plan

Both research on the hypotheses testing and ethnocentrism measure test will have the same sampling. The sampling target is expected toward 300 respondents who had recently purchased a car at least in the last 24 months, in the assumption to have sufficient fresh knowledge regarding new cars and experienced in recent new car market. Instead of obtaining 6 months recent car purchaser as applied by Lawrence (1992), it is expected to be able to increase response rate by increasing the time of purchase span to 24 months. In addition, under the condition that automobile industry mostly introduced a new car model every 5 years and

Indonesian automobile industry and market is comparably unique to others country with no such regulation to discard cars after several years of usage, unlike in Singapore for instance. Consequently, 24 months of car purchase can still be considered of a recent car purchase. Respondents can be from discrete demographics, any gender, any occupation, any age, and any income level. Target population is those who live Jakarta and expected to have purchased new car within the last 24 months. The sampling area is in Jakarta and has been conducted upon 3 offices and 1 hospital in Jakarta. There should be no sampling frame due to the method implemented.

Data analysis method

The data will be stored and processed using SPSS software. The hypotheses test is performed by analyzing the data composed from each question in the questionnaire, by calculating the mean score using descriptive analysis and further analysis using Independent *t*-test method in SPSS software to test all three hypotheses with 5% confidential level. Consumer ethnocentrism scale (CETSCALE) which had been implemented in previous study in the Indian market by Neelam Kinra (2006) will be put on operation in my study to measure the level ethnocentrism of Indonesian toward imported cars and locally manufactured cars. The variables measurement on CETSCALE would likely to repeat from the previous study applied by the author toward the Indian market which then is adapted and somehow reduced for the present study circumstances. The preceding mean ratings obtained for the variables statement measures which then to be appointed to data reduction via an exploratory factor analysis with varimax rotation subsequently, to identify factors that could be considered as contributing to the degree of ethnocentrism in product preferences. A reliability test on internal consistency by obtaining the cronbach α would likely to be conducted toward the 15 variables prior to further process via data reduction. The variable evaluation would likely to adopt Likert rating scale, ranging from 1 (least positive) to 7 (most positive).

Response rate

300 questionnaires have been distributed via convenience sampling and 241 of them have returned back. Only 176 questionnaires are valid and possible for further process while the others remain invalid for several reasons, such as does not confirmed the purchase date or fail to correctly complete the evaluation measurement.

FINDINGS

All data from respondent have been retrieved with certain response rate which then is being analyzed using SPSS software v.16. As I mentioned earlier, there are two self administered questionnaires distributed differ in the bipolar evaluation. Therefore some of the research processes enable to be divided into two diverse files which both have the same content except for the bipolar pairings evaluation; one contains variable 1 to 11 and the other have variable 12 to 22. Subsequently in the chapter is to discuss on the results on the research including the hypotheses testing, starts to converse regarding the demographics and questions before the evaluation (first page questions on the questionnaire).

Demographics

Out of 176 respondents, most of them are male with 60% and the rest are female. Age outcome are 33,5% for the group 41 – 50 years old, 29,5% for 31 – 40 years old group, ≤ 30 years old shares 20%, and the least amount is on the ≥ 50 years old group. 29, 5% of total respondents have the income of ≤ Rp. 40million per year as the most allocation and ≥Rp.500 million per year as the least. Most of the respondents occupied as entrepreneur and employee, obviously dominant among the others. For the country of origin car purchase, apparently uneven results are obtained. 87, 5% purchase Japanese car, Germany car and American car share the same percentage, and only 1 people purchase British car, Korean car, and French car. In addition, half of the respondents purchase a car with small engine. Regarding respondent brand knowledgeable, it seems that they are very aware toward the Japanese brands with 89, 8% of them are able to mention four brands correctly. While 47.7% of the samples are capable to mention four Germany car brand correctly and the American car brand appear to be less aware with only 28, 4% of them mention four brands rightly (see Appendix D**)**

Significant difference in country of origin evaluation

The hypotheses testing allow both pairing evaluation on each questionnaire are being merged together. Data analysis is prior to determine the sum score of each respondent toward attributes evaluation on each country by previously grouping the country of origin to support further analysis. Afterwards analyses using independent *t*-test employ to confirm the hypotheses. Using the sum score, the results are each of the three countries of origins has a significant difference on product evaluation among the others, Japanese car has significant difference toward the Germany car (P = .000) and American car (P = .000), and the Germany car also being evaluated significantly different against the American (P = .000) (see Table 7)

Japanese car

As the market leader in the Industry in term of sales volume, consumers are more in favor in Japanese car by giving the most favorable evaluation among the Germany and the American especially in term of value for money and fuel efficiency. Respondents evaluate seven variables significantly positive compare to the Germany and the American which are lower price, better parts availability, more advertising, more model choice, better fuel economical, better ease of service and better brand recognizable (see Table 8 and Table 9). However, Japanese car also evaluated to be less powerful, less spacing, and little pride of ownership compare to the other two countries (see Table 8 and Table 9)**.** More advantages are attached to the Japanese as being perceived to have better technical, reliability, styling and more innovative design to the American (see Table 9) while also evaluated to be less safety and road handling to the Germany (see Tables 8). Along with the findings, Japanese car is evaluated more for women compare to the American car (see table 9) and more for lower socio-economic class and young people compare to the competitors (see Table 8 and Table 9).

Germany car

It was discussed earlier that Japanese car has the preeminent evaluation. However, Germany car as the leader in the industry in producing luxurious car does confirm a magnificent gain in certain aspects. The country is significantly more in favor in term of reliability, excellent workmanship, safety, advertising, styling, parts availability, road handling, pride of ownership; innovative design, brand recognizable, and clever use of color to the American car (see Table 10). However toward the Japanese car, Germany car is perceived to have a better

pride of ownership, power, safety, spacing, road handling, more for older people but more expensive significantly (see Table 8). Consistently with the outcome, Germany car is alleged for upper-class socio-economic along with competitors (see Table 7 and Table 8).

American car

This country of origin has significantly the least positive product evaluation. Being evaluated as inferior toward the Germany in each variable (see Table 10), however there is a positive evaluation if against the Japanese. According to customers, the American car is significantly to be more powerful, more spacing, more for man and older people, and great pride of ownership (see Table 9). On the other hand it is assumed to be more expensive, as a matter of fact the product is believed to be more for upper class socio-economic than the Japanese (see Table 9).

We can conclude that consumers are more in favor of Japanese car for producing affordable and fuel economic car with wide range of model choices. While the Germany car is perceived to have the best comfort and great reliability offerings, and the American is perceived to have the least evaluation among the competitors. Additionally, respondents denoted that Germany car has the best car quality and model, while Japanese car has the best price (see Appendix D).

H2. There will be significant difference in the evaluation among the brand knowledgeable consumers

Unlike the previous hypotheses, I prefer not to put the pairings evaluation in one file due to demographic diversity. Though same method will be implemented which is to determine the sum score, and then further to test the significant level using independent t-test prior to create a grouping to dissimilar two groups, the brand knowledgeable respondent and those with lesser knowledge.

Japanese car group

Respondent who is capable to correctly mention four Japanese car brand will be categorized as the knowledgeable group while those who did worst will be sited in the other group. No significant different among the groups overall evaluation toward the country ($p = .295$ and $p = .935$) (see Table 11). The Japanese knowledgeable group has better opinion toward Japanese car than the less knowledgeable group. Though the less knowledgeable group significantly mentioned that Japanese car has better ease of service compare to the knowledgeable group ($p = .006$) (see Table 12).

Germany car group

The grouping partition between knowledgeable and less knowledgeable is identical with the Japanese. Similar to the previous outcome, there is no significant different in the overall evaluation ($p = .563$ and $p = 0.90$**)** (see Table 11) and the knowledgeable group are more in favor of the country's product. Less knowledgeable Germany thought that Germany car are more for man and the other group reflects conversely ($p = .044$). On the other hand, Knowledgeable Germany stated that the product has a better brand recognizable ($p = .019$) and ease of service ($P = .002$) compare to the less knowledgeable group (see Table 13).

American car group

Consistently with the same grouping method as the other two countries, both group share magnificently similar opinion regarding the American car relying on the overall total sum

score on each respondent attributes evaluation. No significant differences among the group overall evaluation (p = .528 and p = .230) (see Table 11). There is one variable that being evaluated differently significant, the knowledgeable group appraise American car to have easier brand recognizable to the less knowledgeable group (p = .000) (see Table 14).

H3. Demographics and evaluation

The hypotheses proposed if there is any significant difference in the evaluation toward the demographics including gender, age, occupation, and income. The method executed will be no longer different than the one that have been realized in the H2, to split the attributes variables, compute the sum score, and work out the independent t-test.

Gender

No significant differences among the groups toward the overall three country evaluation (see Table 15 and Table 16). Female and male shares somehow a comparable attitude to the Japanese car, whereas male seems to be in favor toward the American and Germany car contrast to the female group. Female thinks that Japanese car has better spacing than male (p = .008), moreover the group also suggest that all the three products are more for women (p = .006 (American car), p =.090 (Germany car), p = .344 (Japanese car)). In addition, males evaluate Germany car to have better reliability compare to female (p = .054) (see Table 17).

Age

The older group with age more than 40 years old somehow shares equal evaluation in all three countries overall attributes evaluation with the younger group, however there is a significant difference in the V12-22 toward the Japanese car (p = .018) (see Table 19). The younger group evaluate 4 Japanese attributes significantly better than the older group, while the older group mentioned Japanese parts availability to be better than the other group (p = 0.30) **.**Toward the Germany car, older group think that the country to have good safety (p = .027), though the younger group are more in favor in the Germany technical (p = .047) and clever use of color (p = .049) **.**On the other hand, American safety is evaluated to be significantly more positive by the older group (p = .039) (see Table 20).

Income

Overall evaluation outcome demonstrate several significant differences toward the higher income group (for income ≥ Rp.100million / year) and the lower income group (for income ≤ Rp. 100 million/year) especially in the second half variables upon the American car (p = .032) and slightly upon the Japanese car (p = .050) (see Table 22). In addition, there is a significant difference on 6 Japanese variables, 3 Germany variables, and 6 American variables evaluation among the group (see Table 23). All in all, the lower income group has a better assessment concerning the three country's product and considering the price, all country's product assumed to be in lower price according to the higher income group (see Table 23).

Occupation

Due to the frequencies consistency, it is appropriate to test attributes evaluation among the employee and the entrepreneurship. No significant differences in the overall attribute evaluation among the group except for the second half Japanese car attributes (p = .013) (see Table 25). The employee group significantly evaluates Japanese fuel economical, spacing, pride of ownership, brand recognizable, and clever use of color superior to the entrepreneur.

Furthermore, the group also in favor of American car road handling, Germany car spacing and pride of ownership compare to the entrepreneur (see Table 26). In contrast, the entrepreneur assumes American car to be more efficiency against the employee (p = 0, 03) (see Table 26).

Consumer ethnocentrism

The Cronbach α of 0,884 (see Appendix E) is retrieved from the test, however there are three variables that need to be revised or removed since the item if deleted score exceed the Cronbach α. I have decided still not to remove the question in purpose to obtain the mean score without getting them involve in further analysis via data reduction. The mean score of all the variables is 4.46, the highest mean is in the variable three with 5.43 and the lowest mean is in the variable twelve with 3.07 (see Appendix F). According to consumers, CBU imported car has somewhat better prestige and quality but obviously more expensive. Nevertheless customers still somewhat prefer to buy locally manufactured car with all price and quality consideration. Through the data reduction by factor analysis, the outcome occurs to have three factors contributing concerning the twelve ethnocentrism measurement variables (see Appendix F). As well, the total cumulative variance of total factors is 66.85% which occupied the minimum standard of 60%.

Table 6. Total variance of factor loading

Factor 1	Country and product nationalism	40.17%
Factor 2	Influences of access and advertising	15.57%
Factor 3	Foreign product's price	11.11%
TOTAL variance		66.85%

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Conclusion

Align with the previous study toward the New Zealand market, country of origin stereotyping does exist in the Indonesian automobile industry. Consumers have their own distinct view regarding each of the country of origins in producing cars. H1 proposed if the differences in the evaluation are cause by country bias. While the outcome might be less affected by country bias due to the multi attributes evaluation applied in the research, with the supports from Johansson (1985) and Akaah and Yaprak (1993) finding regarding country of origin effect on product evaluation using multi product attributes cue. In addition, there is also a difference upon the brand familiarity of the country's products regarding the attributes evaluation although only few of them are significantly unique and so does toward the demographic variant. Indonesian consumers seem to be reasonably in favor to purchase locally manufactured car even though with low quality product but cheaper price certainly. In consequence, the average mean rating toward all the variable measurement is 4, 46 which indicate to be reasonably ethnocentric, does not perform a favorably preferences toward

imported product compared to the previous study by Neelam Kinra (2006) upon the Indian market.

Limitation

The scope of the study appear to be narrow, the data may be generalized only toward the people who purchased a new passenger car in the previous one year merely in the offices and hospital in the area of distribution, cannot represent larger area such as Jakarta. The method of convenience sampling results in uneven data gathering outcome. The imbalanced upshot might affect the evaluation to be less objective and accurate due to less knowledge and experience in the others country's products that is utilized in evaluating their attributes beyond its own country of origin of recent purchase and furthermore might increase country bias in the evaluation process. Moreover, time constrain does restrict the study to improve.

Managerial Implication

Marketers assign to be able to accurately observe the positive image perception toward its products, which then is to determine the exact promotional strategies or message to trigger customer attraction. Furthermore, it is also possible to recognize competitor's weakness in particular attributes evaluation and capitalize it to vie against the competitors. Each country of origin seems to have its own strength and weakness in particular attributes. Therefore marketers should set up and optimized an appropriate positioning strategy of the products base on how it is being perceived by customers. He or she perhaps should find ways of how to improve the negative attributes evaluated. BMW sales plunged in 2006 due to the increasing oil prices, as a Germany car which perceived to have less fuel economical compared to the Japanese car, it would be an undertaking for the Germany car sellers in how to keep or to fascinate customers not to prefer on Japanese car in term of fuel economical matters. Knowledgeable and less knowledgeable consumer has its own ways of evaluating particular product (Schaefer, 1995). It has been discussed if the American car brand familiarity was relatively low against the other two competitors hence it is appropriate to suggest the American car practices to increase its market brand awareness to possess reliable and objective market opinion, perhaps by enhancing promotion and advertising sector. The outcome with reasonably ethnocentric Indonesian customer and a possibly positive consumption of locally manufactured car with apparent lower price but slightly lower quality, the author may put forward the Indonesian ATPM to start or keep manufacturing any potential cars that are able to be manufactured in Indonesia. In addition, the ATPM may also get bigger profit unless the luxury tax is no longer attached against the CBU imported car. These researches outcome are supposed to be the opinions and expectations from the customer's point of view. In conclusion, the result proposed to be highly considered in the business decision making process to be able to enhance the country's product image in the future and also to surpass the business in term of sales and market share among the competitors in the industry.

Future Recommendation

The author suggests conducting the research to extent the research scope, possibly to have an equal outcome therefore to be able to be generalized in larger scope. Equal country origin of car purchase is also expected by the author in the purpose to obtain reliable and less country bias respondents evaluation due to respondent's equivalent knowledge and experience assumption. In addition, it is also possible to have more country of origin to take part in the

study to attain broader information regarding the industry. It is also expected to expand the research time period and also to conduct the research periodically due to the changing stereotypical image overtime (Van R. Wood, John R. Darling, and Mark Siders, 1999).

REFERENCE

Aaker, D. A., Day, G. S. & Kumar, V. (2002). *Essential of Marketing Research, 2nd edition.* USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Al-Suliati, K. L. & Baker, M. J. (1998). Country of origin effects: a literature review. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning,* Vol. 16 No.3, 150-199.

Cateora, Philip R. & Graham, John L. (2007). *International Marketing, 13th edition.* USA: McGraw-Hill.

Guerin, B. (2005). *Full speed ahead for Indonesia's auto industry.* Retrieved September 15th 2008, : http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Southeast_Asia/GG01Ae01.html,

Kinra, N. (2006). The effect of country of origin on foreign brand names in the Indian market. *Journal of Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, Vol.24 No. 1, pp. 15-30.

Kotabe, M. & Helsen, K. (2007). *Global Marketing Management,* 4th edition. USA: John Wiley and sons, Inc.

Kurniawan, A. (2008). *Astra Optimistis Pimpin 52% Market Share Roda Empat*. Retrieved September 10th, 2008: *http://autos.okezone.com/index.php/ReadStory/2008/01/30/52/79621/astra-optimistis-pimpin-52-market-share-roda-empat.*

Lawrence. C., Marr,N.E., & Prendergast, G.P. (1992). Country of origin stereotyping: a case study in the New Zealand motor vehicle Industry. *Asia Pacific International Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 37-51.

Lin, L.Y. & Chen, C. S. (2006). The influence of the Country of origin image, product knowledge and product involvement on consumer purchase decision: an empirical study of insurance and catering services in Taiwan. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 23 No. 5, pp. 248-65.

Liu, F., Murphy, J., Liu. J., & Li, X. (2007). English and Chinese? The role of consumer ethnocentrism and country of origin in Chinese attitudes towards store signs. *Australasian Marketing Journal,* Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 5- 10.

Luhuloma, J. (2008). Selama 40 Tahun Berkiprah di Indonesia. *Kompas*. Retrieved from: http://cetak.kompas.com/read/xml/2008/10/30/02283996/selama.40.tahun.berkiprah.di .indonesia

Presiden Resmikan Perluasan Pabrik Daihatsu (2007). Retrieved September 10th 2008, http://www.antara.co.id/arc/2007/11/6/presiden-resmikan-perluasan-pabrik-daihatsu/

Schaefer, A. (1995). *Consumer knowledge and country of origin effects*. *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 56-72.

Setiono, M. (2000). Indonesia. *Department of Industry and Trade,* Jakarta Selatan.

Uyanto, S,S. (2009). *Pedoman Analisis Data*, Edisi 3. Indonesia: Graha Ilmu.

Watson, J.J. & Wright, K. (1999) Consumer ethnocentrism and attitudes toward domestic and foreign products. *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 34 No. 9/19, pp. 1149-1166.

Winoto, S. (2008). *Mercedes-Benz remains market leader in its class*. Retrieved on October, 15th, 2008 from: http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2008/02/20/mercedesbenz-remains-market-leader-its-class.html.

APPENDIX D. Demographic output

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Gender	176	1	2	1.40	.492
Age	176	1	4	2.48	.997
Income level	176	1	4	2.31	1.062
Occupation	176	1	6	2.48	.785
Country of origin of car purchase	176	1	6	1.23	.729
Engine size of car purchase	176	1	4	1.69	.833
Identify Japanese car brand	176	0	4	3.84	.543
Identify Germany car brand	176	0	4	3.16	1.064
Identify America car brand	176	0	4	2.74	1.141
The best car quality	176	1	3	1.84	.546
the best car model	176	1	3	1.70	.679
the best car price	176	1	3	1.20	.505
Valid N (listwise)	176				

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	male	105	59.7	59.7	59.7
	female	71	40.3	40.3	100.0
	Total	176	100.0	100.0	

Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	<= 30 years old	35	19.9	19.9	19.9
	31 - 40 years old	52	29.5	29.5	49.4
	41 - 50 years old	59	33.5	33.5	83.0
	>= 51 years old	30	17.0	17.0	100.0
	Total	176	100.0	100.0	

Income level

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	<= Rp. 40 Million / year	52	29.5	29.5	29.5
	Rp. 41 Million - 100 million / year	46	26.1	26.1	55.7
	Rp. 101 Million - 500 million / year	50	28.4	28.4	84.1
	>= 500 million / year	28	15.9	15.9	100.0
	Total	176	100.0	100.0	

Occupation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	government official	1	.6	.6	.6
	employee	109	61.9	61.9	62.5
	enterpreneur	56	31.8	31.8	94.3
	Professional	4	2.3	2.3	96.6
	housewife	3	1.7	1.7	98.3
	Student	3	1.7	1.7	100.0

Occupation

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
government official	1	.6	.6	.6
employee	109	61.9	61.9	62.5
enterpreneur	56	31.8	31.8	94.3
Professional	4	2.3	2.3	96.6
housewife	3	1.7	1.7	98.3
Student	3	1.7	1.7	100.0
Total	176	100.0	100.0	

Country of origin of car purchase

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Japan	154	87.5	87.5	87.5
	Germany	12	6.8	6.8	94.3
	America	6	3.4	3.4	97.7
	UK	1	.6	.6	98.3
	Korea	2	1.1	1.1	99.4
	France	1	.6	.6	100.0

Country of origin of car purchase

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Japan	154	87.5	87.5	87.5
	Germany	12	6.8	6.8	94.3
	America	6	3.4	3.4	97.7
	UK	1	.6	.6	98.3
	Korea	2	1.1	1.1	99.4
	France	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	176	100.0	100.0	

Engine size of car purchase

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	<= 1500 cc	90	51.1	51.1	51.1
	1600cc - 2000cc	56	31.8	31.8	83.0
	2100cc - 2500cc	24	13.6	13.6	96.6
	>= 2600	6	3.4	3.4	100.0
	Total	176	100.0	100.0	

Identify Japanese car brand

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Zero brand	1	.6	.6	.6
	One brand	1	.6	.6	1.1
	Two brands	5	2.8	2.8	4.0
	Three brands	11	6.2	6.2	10.2
	Four brands	158	89.8	89.8	100.0
	Total	176	100.0	100.0	

Identify Germany car brand

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Zero brand	8	4.5	4.5	4.5
	One brand	8	4.5	4.5	9.1
	Two brands	15	8.5	8.5	17.6
	Three brands	61	34.7	34.7	52.3

	Four brands	84	47.7	47.7	100.0
	Total	176	100.0	100.0	

Identify America car brand

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Zero brand	10	5.7	5.7	5.7
	One brand	17	9.7	9.7	15.3
	Two brands	32	18.2	18.2	33.5
	Three brands	67	38.1	38.1	71.6
	Four brands	50	28.4	28.4	100.0
	Total	176	100.0	100.0	

The best car quality

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Japan	43	24.4	24.4	24.4
	Germany	119	67.6	67.6	92.0

	America	14	8.0	8.0	100.0
	Total	176	100.0	100.0	

the best car model

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Japan	74	42.0	42.0	42.0
	Germany	80	45.5	45.5	87.5
	America	22	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	176	100.0	100.0	

the best car price

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent

Valid	Japan	148	84.1	84.1	84.1
	Germany	20	11.4	11.4	95.5
	America	8	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	176	100.0	100.0	

APPENDIX E. Reliability test

Cronbach α

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.884	.887	15

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
It is more prestigios to buy imported car	59.23	165.013	.240	.655	**.891**
CBU imported car has better quality than locally manufactured car	59.40	165.903	.232	.771	**.890**

CBU imported car is more expensive than locally manufactured car	58.27	156.754	.517	.731	.878
I prefer to buy locally manufactured car with all price and quality consideration	59.13	165.361	.287	.684	**.887**
Access to buy CBU imported car is limited	58.73	158.271	.541	.723	.877
CBU imported car is not widely advertised	59.10	155.472	.617	.776	.874
Indonesia should only purchase car that is manufactured locally	59.50	149.155	.673	.642	.871
car dealers only import cars that is not produced or manufactured in Indonesai	59.73	159.444	.394	.615	.884
Buying locally manufactured car is good for labor	58.13	157.154	.610	.681	.875
Indonesia should not buy imported cars because it hurts Indonesian business	59.87	147.913	.765	.887	.867
Car importation must not be allowed	60.13	153.430	.742	.777	.870
CBU imported car should not be sold in Indonesia	60.03	152.171	.691	.824	.871
Buying locally manufactured car is the best choice	58.50	151.017	.642	.789	.872

CBU imported car should be taxed heavily	58.73	146.547	.679	.816	.870
Indonesia consumer who purchase CBU imported cars are putting the Indonesia to unemployment	59.57	149.426	.656	.878	.871

APPENDIX F. Ethnocentrism means rating and factor analysis

Mean rating ethnocentrism

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
It is more prestigios to buy imported car	176	1	7	4.45	1.552
CBU imported car has better quality than locally manufactured car	176	1	7	4.70	1.580
CBU imported car is more expensive than locally manufactured car	176	1	7	5.32	1.270
I prefer to buy locally manufactured car with all price and quality consideration	176	1	7	4.56	1.437
Access to buy CBU imported car is limited	176	1	7	4.72	1.325
CBU imported car is not widely advertised	176	1	7	4.86	1.416
Indonesia should only purchase car that is manufactured locally	176	1	7	4.41	1.784
car dealers only import cars that is not produced or manufactured in Indonesai	176	1	7	4.62	1.686
Buying locally manufactured car is good for labor	176	1	7	5.43	1.290

Indonesia should not buy imported cars because it hurts Indonesian business	176	1	7	3.97	1.777
Car importation must not be allowed	176	1	7	3.07	1.747
CBU imported car should not be sold in Indonesia	176	1	7	3.10	1.781
Buying locally manufactured car is the best choice	176	1	7	4.66	1.500
CBU imported car should be taxed heavily	176	1	7	4.86	1.752
Indonesia consumer who purchase CBU imported cars are putting the Indonesia to unemployment	176	1	7	4.11	1.709
Valid N (listwise)	176				

Factor analysis

	1	2	3
CBU imported car is more expensive than locally manufactured car		0.82	
Access to buy CBU imported car is limited			0.56
CBU imported car is not widely advertised		0.70	
Indonesia should only purchase car that is manufactured locally	0.70		
Car dealers only import cars that is not produced or manufactured in Indonesia			0.73
Buying locally manufactured car is good for labour	0.49		
Indonesia should not buy imported cars because it hurts Indonesian business	0.82		
Car importation must not be allowed	0.87		
CBU imported car should not be sold in Indonesia	0.90		
Buying locally manufactured car is the best choice	0.72		
CBU imported car should be taxed heavily		0.55	
Indonesia consumer who purchase CBU imported cars are putting the Indonesia to unemployment	0.77		

Hypotheses output Tables

Table 7. H1 Sum score v1-v22

Group Statistics				
Country group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error

					Mean
Sum score of evaluation	Japanese car	89	64.5	12.866	1.364
	American car	89	81.8	14.565	1.544

Independent sample test Japanese car and American car

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for equality of means		
		F	Sig	t	df	Sig. (2 tailed)
Sum score of evaluation	Equal variances assumed	2.296	0.131	-8.444	176.000	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-8.444	173.359	0.000

Group Statistics

	Country group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Sum score of evaluation	Japanese car	89	64.5	12.866	1.364
	Germany car	89	73.3	14.827	1.572

Independent sample test Japanese car and Germany car

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for equality of means		
		F	Sig	t	df	Sig. (2 tailed)
Sum score of evaluation	Equal variances assumed	1.690	0.195	-4.260	176.000	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.260	172.572	0.000

Group Statistics

	Country group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Sum score of evaluation	Germany car	89	73.3	14.827	1.572
	American car	89	81.8	14.565	1.544

Independent sample test Germany car and American car

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for equality of means		
		F	Sig	t	df	Sig. (2 tailed)
Sum score of	Equal variances assumed	0.023	0.879	-3.871	176.000	0.000

evaluation					
	Equal variances not assumed		-3.871	175.944	0.000

H1 SPECIFIC ATRIBUTES OUTCOME V1-V22

TABLE 8. Specific attributes Japanese car and Germany car

Variables	Country group	Mean
Price	Japanese car	2.95
	Germany car	5.70
Power	Japanese car	4.32
	Germany car	5.28
Parts availability	Japanese car	2.40
	Germany car	3.87
Safety	Japanese car	3.32
	Germany car	2.75
Advertising	Japanese car	2.45
	Germany car	4.09
Model choice	Japanese car	2.59
	Germany car	3.99
Fuel Economical	Japanese car	2.36
	Germany car	4.83
Spacing	Japanese car	3.37
	Germany car	2.99
Road handling	Japanese car	2.96
	Germany car	2.30
Ease of service	Japanese car	2.17
	Germany car	3.73
Pride of ownership	Japanese car	3.34
	Germany car	2.10
Brand recognizable	Japanese car	2.16
	Germany car	3.21
Age preference	Japanese car	2.92
	Germany car	4.21
Socio economic class	Japanese car	4.13
	Germany car	1.98

Independent sample test Japanese car and Germany car

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for equality of means		
		F	Sig	t	df	Sig. (2 tailed)
Price	Equal variances assumed	0.010	0.922	-13.495	172	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-13.495	170.761	0.000
Power	Equal variances assumed	0.602	0.439	-4.004	172	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.004	166.679	0.000
Parts availability	Equal variances assumed	0.086	0.769	-6.917	172	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-6.917	168.705	0.000
Safety	Equal variances assumed	5.573	0.019	2.335	172	0.021
	Equal variances not assumed			2.335	161.528	0.021
Advertising	Equal variances assumed	0.205	0.651	-7.506	172	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-7.506	171.920	0.000
Model choice	Equal variances assumed	0.070	0.791	-6.558	172	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-6.558	171.903	0.000
Fuel Economical	Equal variances assumed	34.056	0.000	-12.061	176	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-12.061	138.223	0.000
Spacing	Equal variances assumed	0.021	0.885	2.114	176	0.036
	Equal variances not assumed			2.114	174.681	0.036
Road handling	Equal variances assumed	2.166	0.143	3.443	176	0.001
	Equal variances not assumed			3.443	169.029	0.001
Ease of service	Equal variances assumed	18.914	0.000	-8.007	176	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-8.007	161.570	0.000
Pride of ownership	Equal variances assumed	5.637	0.019	6.682	176	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			6.682	174.126	0.000
Brand recognizable	Equal variances assumed	27.916	0.000	-4.803	176	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.803	146.239	0.000
Age preference	Equal variances assumed	31.410	0.000	-6.060	176	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-6.060	149.239	0.000
Socio economic class	Equal variances assumed	6.336	0.013	-6.060	176	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			11.743	175.821	0.000

TABLE 9. Specific attributes Japanese car and American car

Variables	Country group	Mean

Price	Japanese car	2.95
	American car	5.40
Reliability	Japanese car	2.95
	American car	3.63
Power	Japanese car	4.32
	American car	4.85
Parts availability	Japanese car	2.40
	American car	4.29
Advertising	Japanese car	2.45
	American car	4.57
Model choice	Japanese car	2.59
	American car	4.39
Styling	Japanese car	3.02
	American car	3.75
Gender preference	Japanese car	3.89
	American car	3.38
Fuel economical	Japanese car	2.36
	American car	4.97
Spacing	Japanese car	3.37
	American car	2.99
Technical	Japanese car	2.58
	American car	2.96
Ease of service	Japanese car	2.17
	American car	4.13
Pride of ownership	Japanese car	3.34
	American car	2.89
Brand recognizable	Japanese car	2.16
	American car	4.15
Clever use of colour	Japanese car	2.48
	American car	3.46
Innovative design	Japanese car	2.73
	American car	3.43
Age preference	Japanese car	2.92
	American car	4.34
Socio economic class	Japanese car	4.13
	American car	2.82

Independent sample test Japanese car and American car

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for equality of means		
		F	Sig	t	df	Sig. (2 tailed)
Price	Equal variances assumed	2.956	0.087	-11.212	172	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-11.212	165.068	0.000
Reliability	Equal variances assumed	19.310	0.000	-2.747	172	0.007
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.747	157.874	0.007
Power	Equal variances assumed	11.658	0.001	-2.066	172	0.040
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.066	157.611	0.040
Parts availability	Equal variances assumed	0.405	0.525	-8.423	172	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-8.423	171.849	0.000
Advertising	Equal variances assumed	2.613	0.108	-9.451	172	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-9.451	171.082	0.000
Model choice	Equal variances assumed	2.986	0.086	-8.184	172	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-8.184	171.760	0.000
Styling	Equal variances assumed	5.138	0.025	-3.405	172	0.001
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.405	167.012	0.001
Gender preference	Equal variances assumed	30.153	0.000	2.676	172	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			2.676	140.886	0.000
Fuel economical	Equal variances assumed	39.713	0.000	-13.158	176	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-13.158	142.004	0.000
Spacing	Equal variances assumed	0.299	0.585	2.082	176	0.039
	Equal variances not assumed			2.082	173.719	0.039
Technical	Equal variances assumed	9.774	0.002	-2.029	176	0.044
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.029	152.669	0.044
Ease of service	Equal variances assumed	21.948	0.000	-10.032	176	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-10.032	160.976	0.000
Pride of ownership	Equal variances assumed	1.093	0.297	2.391	176	0.018
	Equal variances not assumed			2.391	175.173	0.018
Brand recognizable	Equal variances assumed	14.188	0.000	-10.180	176	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-10.180	160.979	0.000
Clever use of colour	Equal variances assumed	9.223	0.003	-5.676	176	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.676	166.373	0.000
Innovative design	Equal variances assumed	2.542	0.113	-3.494	176	0.001
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.494	174.563	0.001
Age preference	Equal variances assumed	16.310	0.000	-6.978	176	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-6.978	155.376	0.000

Socio economic class	Equal variances assumed	0.624	0.431	6.722	176	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			6.722	174.608	0.000

TABLE 10. Specific attributes Germany car and American car

Variables	Country group	Mean
Reliability	Germany car	2.84
	American car	3.63
Workmanship	Germany car	2.83
	American car	3.43
Advertising	Germany car	4.09
	American car	4.57
Styling	Germany car	3.09
	American car	3.75
Road handling	Germany car	2.30
	American car	2.70
Pride of ownership	Germany car	2.10
	American car	2.89
Brand recognizable	Germany car	3.21
	American car	4.15
clever use of colour	Germany car	2.72
	American car	3.46
innovative design	Germany car	2.74
	American car	3.43
Socio economic class	Germany car	1.98
	American car	2.82

Independent sample test Germany car and American car

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for equality of means		
		F	Sig	t	df	Sig. (2 tailed)
Reliability	Equal variances assumed	2.650	0.105	-2.884	172	0.004
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.884	171.624	0.004
Workmanship	Equal variances assumed	0.002	0.965	-2.251	172	0.026
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.251	171.724	0.026
Advertising	Equal variances assumed	1.353	0.246	-2.124	172	0.035
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.124	171.541	0.035
Styling	Equal variances assumed	0.017	0.896	-2.786	172	0.006

	Equal variances not assumed			-2.786	171.716	0.006
Road handling	Equal variances assumed	0.555	0.457	-2.089	176	0.038
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.089	168.146	0.038
Pride of ownership	Equal variances assumed	2.021	0.157	-4.411	176	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.411	175.781	0.000
Brand recognizable	Equal variances assumed	3.073	0.081	-3.867	176	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.867	171.064	0.000
clever use of colour	Equal variances assumed	8.627	0.004	-4.289	176	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.289	167.065	0.000
innovative design	Equal variances assumed	0.144	0.705	-3.202	176	0.002
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.202	175.493	0.002
Socio economic class	Equal variances assumed	9.515	0.002	-4.371	176	0.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.371	173.486	0.000

Table 11. H2 sum score v1-v22

Japanese knowledgeable group

Group Statistics

	Brand knowledgeable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Sum score of evaluation	Knowledgeable Japanese brand	76	33.67	9.294	1.066
	Less knowledgeable Japanese brand	11	36.36	7.433	2.241
Sum score of evaluation	Knowledgeable Japanese brand	82	31.18	6.471	0.715
	Less knowledgeable Japanese brand	7	31.43	7.435	2.81

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Sum score of evaluation	Equal variances assumed	0.048	0.826	-0.918	85	0.361
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.085	14.936	0.295
Sum score of evaluation	Equal variances assumed	0.129	0.72	-0.095	87	0.924
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.085	6.799	0.935

Germany knowledgeable group

Group Statistics

	Brand knowledgeable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Sum score of evaluation	Knowledgeable Germany brand	49	41.45	9.553	1.365
	Less knowledgeable Germany brand	38	40.11	11.507	1.867
Sum score of evaluation	Knowledgeable Germany brand	35	31.34	9.11	1.54
	Less knowledgeable Germany brand	54	34.69	8.746	1.19

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Sum score of evaluation	Equal variances assumed	0.65	0.422	0.595	85	0.553
	Equal variances not assumed			0.581	71.396	0.563
Sum score of evaluation	Equal variances assumed	0.087	0.769	-1.733	87	0.087
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.717	70.59	0.09

American knowledgeable group

Group Statistics

	Brand knowledgeable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Sum score of evaluation	Knowledgeable American brand	28	45	9.695	1.832
	Less knowledgeable American brand	59	43.54	10.657	1.387
Sum score of evaluation	Knowledgeable American brand	22	36.77	9.278	1.978
	Less knowledgeable American brand	67	39.49	8.271	1.01

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means

		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Sum score of evaluation	Equal variances assumed	0.109	0.742	0.613	85	0.541
	Equal variances not assumed			0.634	57.966	0.528
Sum score of evaluation	Equal variances assumed	0.528	0.469	-1.298	87	0.198
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.224	32.68	0.23

H2 specific attributes v1-v22

Table 12. Japanese knowledgeable group specific attributes

Group Statistics

	Brand knowledgeable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Ease of service	Knowledgeable Japanese brand	82	2.23	1.103	0.122
	Less knowledgeable Japanese brand	7	1.43	0.535	0.202

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Ease of service	Equal variances assumed	1.136	0.289	1.899	87	0.061
	Equal variances not assumed			3.404	11.05	0.006

Table 13. Germany knowledgeable group specific attributes

Group Statistics

	Brand knowledgeable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Gender	Knowledgeable Germany brand	49	3.86	1.339	0.191

preference	Less knowledgeable Germany brand	38	3.21	1.545	0.251
Ease of service	Knowledgeable Germany brand	35	3.14	1.264	0.214
	Less knowledgeable Germany brand	54	4.11	1.501	0.204
Brand memorize able	Knowledgeable Germany brand	35	2.69	1.586	0.268
	Less knowledgeable Germany brand	54	3.56	1.808	0.246

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Gender preference	Equal variances assumed	1.511	0.222	2.089	85	0.04
	Equal variances not assumed			2.051	73.433	0.044
Ease of service	Equal variances assumed	5.025	0.028	-3.159	87	0.002
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.277	81.096	0.002
Brand memorisable	Equal variances assumed	1.34	0.25	-2.324	87	0.022
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.39	79.31	0.019

Table 14. American knowledgeable group specific attributes

Group Statistics

	Brand knowledgeable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Brand memorize able	Knowledgeable American brand	22	3.09	1.509	0.322
	Less knowledgeable American brand	67	4.49	1.319	0.161

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)

Brand memorize able	Equal variances assumed	0.347	0.557	-4.173	87	0
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.896	32.206	0

Table 15. H3 Gender sum score v1-v11

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Sum score Japanese car	male	53	33.9	7.167	0.985
	female	34	34.2	11.583	1.986
Sum score Germany car	male	53	39.8	9.834	1.351
	female	34	42.5	11.193	1.92
Sum score American car	male	53	43.3	10.193	1.4
	female	34	45.2	10.57	1.813

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Sum score Japanese car	Equal variances assumed	6.01	0.02	-0.159	85	0.874
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.144	49.314	0.886
Sum score Germany car	Equal variances assumed	1.12	0.29	-1.2	85	0.234
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.166	63.839	0.248
Sum score American car	Equal variances assumed	0.5	0.48	-0.842	85	0.402
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.835	68.618	0.407

Table 16. H3 Gender sum score v12-v22

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Sum score Japanese car	male	52	31.8	6.411	0.889
	female	37	30.4	6.63	1.09

Sum score Germany car	male	52	33.3	8.898	1.234
	female	37	33.4	9.242	1.519
Sum score American car	male	52	38.6	8.669	1.202
	female	37	39.2	8.507	1.398

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Sum score Japanese car	Equal variances assumed	0.58	0.45	1.041	87	0.301
	Equal variances not assumed			1.035	76.069	0.304
Sum score Germany car	Equal variances assumed	0.43	0.52	-0.054	87	0.957
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.054	75.852	0.957
Sum score American car	Equal variances assumed	0.02	0.9	-0.316	87	0.753
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.317	78.576	0.752

Table 17. H3 Gender specific attributes v1-v22

Toward Japanese car, Germany car, and American car

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Gender preference (Japan)	male	53	3.81	0.921	0.127
	female	34	4	0.888	0.152
Spacing (Japan)	male	52	3.63	1.189	0.165
	female	37	3	1	0.164
Reliability (Germany)	male	53	2.55	1.576	0.216
	female	34	3.29	1.978	0.339
Gender preference (Germany)	male	53	3.36	1.402	0.193
	female	34	3.91	1.505	0.258
Gender preference (America)	male	53	3.02	1.421	0.195
	female	34	3.94	1.496	0.257

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Gender preference (Japan)	Equal variances assumed	0.894	0.347	-0.945	85	0.347
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.953	72.409	0.344
Spacing (Japan)	Equal variances assumed	3.302	0.073	2.648	87	0.01
	Equal variances not assumed			2.726	84.491	0.008
Reliability (Germany)	Equal variances assumed	4.681	0.033	-1.951	85	0.054
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.856	59.133	0.068
Gender preference (Germany)	Equal variances assumed	0.01	0.922	-1.745	85	0.085
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.718	66.824	0.09
Gender preference (America)	Equal variances assumed	0.708	0.403	-2.894	85	0.005
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.861	67.82	0.006

Table 18. H3 Age sum score v1-v11

Group Statistics

	Age grouping 1	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Sum score Japanese car	<= 40 years old	42	35.07	9.067	1.399
	>= 41 years old	45	33.02	9.094	1.356
Sum score Germany car	<= 40 years old	42	42.17	11.118	1.716
	>= 41 years old	45	39.64	9.668	1.441
Sum score American car	<= 40 years old	42	45.21	9.749	1.504
	>= 41 years old	45	42.89	10.819	1.613

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)

Sum score Japanese car	Equal variances assumed	0.156	0.694	1.052	85	0.296
	Equal variances not assumed			1.052	84.622	0.296
Sum score Germany car	Equal variances assumed	1.023	0.315	1.131	85	0.261
	Equal variances not assumed			1.126	81.477	0.264
Sum score American car	Equal variances assumed	0.415	0.521	1.051	85	0.296
	Equal variances not assumed			1.054	84.9	0.295

Table 19. H3 Age sum score v12-v22

Group Statistics

	Age grouping1	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Sum score Japanese car	<= 40 years old	45	29.6	6.486	0.967
	>= 41 years old	44	32.84	6.176	0.931
Sum score Germany car	<= 40 years old	45	32.56	9.218	1.374
	>= 41 years old	44	34.2	8.778	1.323
Sum score American car	<= 40 years old	45	38.09	8.939	1.333
	>= 41 years old	44	39.57	8.185	1.234

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Sum score Japanese car	Equal variances assumed	1.206	0.275	-2.413	87	0.018
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.415	86.94	0.018
Sum score Germany car	Equal variances assumed	0.274	0.602	-0.864	87	0.39
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.864	86.94	0.39
Sum score American car	Equal variances assumed	1.111	0.295	-0.814	87	0.418
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.815	86.632	0.418

Table 20. H3 Age v1-v22 specific attributes

Toward Japanese car, Germany car, and American car

Group Statistics

	Age grouping 1	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Parts availability (Japan)	<= 40 years old	42	2.76	1.792	0.276
	>= 41 years old	45	2.07	1.074	0.16
Fuel economical (japan)	<= 40 years old	45	2.09	0.821	0.122
	>= 41 years old	44	2.64	0.99	0.149
technical (Japan)	<= 40 years old	45	2.38	0.806	0.12
	>= 41 years old	44	2.8	1.047	0.158
Brand memorizeable (Japan)	<= 40 years old	45	1.91	0.848	0.126
	>= 41 years old	44	2.41	1.245	0.188
colour management (Japan)	<= 40 years old	45	2.18	0.747	0.111
	>= 41 years old	44	2.8	1.133	0.171
Safety (Germany)	<= 40 years old	42	3.19	2.133	0.329
	>= 41 years old	45	2.33	1.365	0.204
technical (Germany)	<= 40 years old	45	2.27	1.286	0.192
	>= 41 years old	44	2.84	1.397	0.211
colour management (Germany)	<= 40 years old	45	2.51	0.815	0.122
	>= 41 years old	44	2.93	1.149	0.173
Safety (America)	<= 40 years old	42	3.48	1.864	0.288
	>= 41 years old	45	2.71	1.502	0.224

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Parts availability (Japan)	Equal variances assumed	13.22	0	2.212	85	0.03
	Equal variances not assumed			2.176	66.195	0.033
Fuel economical (japan)	Equal variances assumed	1.55	0.216	-2.842	87	0.006
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.836	83.392	0.006
technical (Japan)	Equal variances assumed	2.429	0.123	-2.111	87	0.038
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.105	80.755	0.038
Brand	Equal variances assumed	10.12	0.002	-2.21	87	0.03

memorizeable (Japan)	Equal variances not assumed			-2.201	75.655	0.031
colour management (Japan)	Equal variances assumed	7.658	0.007	-3.043	87	0.003
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.03	74.256	0.003
Safety (Germany)	Equal variances assumed	14.05	0	2.248	85	0.027
	Equal variances not assumed			2.215	68.958	0.03
technical (Germany)	Equal variances assumed	1.329	0.252	-2.018	87	0.047
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.016	86.054	0.047
colour management (Germany)	Equal variances assumed	5.091	0.027	-1.995	87	0.049
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.988	77.41	0.05
Safety (America)	Equal variances assumed	2.926	0.091	2.115	85	0.037
	Equal variances not assumed			2.099	78.781	0.039

Table 21. H3 Income sum score v1-v11

Group Statistics

	Income grouping	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Sum score Japanese car	<= Rp. 100 million per year	47	34.6	9.497	1.385
	>= Rp101 million per year	40	33.3	8.645	1.367
Sum score Germany car	<= Rp. 100 million per year	47	40.9	10.775	1.572
	>= Rp101 million per year	40	40.8	10.098	1.597
Sum score American car	<= Rp. 100 million per year	47	44.1	10.428	1.521
	>= Rp101 million per year	40	43.9	10.33	1.633

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Sum score Japanese car	Equal variances assumed	0.399	0.53	0.672	85	0.504
	Equal variances not assumed			0.677	84.596	0.5
Sum score Germany car	Equal variances assumed	0.042	0.84	0.072	85	0.943
	Equal variances not assumed			0.072	84.184	0.943
Sum score American	Equal variances assumed	0.01	0.92	0.092	85	0.927

car	Equal variances not assumed			0.092	83.033	0.927

Table 22. H3 Income sum score v12-v22

Group Statistics

	Income group 1	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Sum score Japanese car	<= Rp. 100 million per year	51	30	6.759	0.946
	>= Rp. 101 million per year	38	32.8	5.879	0.954
Sum score Germany car	<= Rp. 100 million per year	51	32	8.672	1.214
	>= Rp. 101 million per year	38	35.2	9.214	1.495
Sum score American car	<= Rp. 100 million per year	51	37.1	8.22	1.151
	>= Rp. 101 million per year	38	41.1	8.588	1.393

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Sum score Japanese car	Equal variances assumed	4.328	0.04	-1.986	87	0.05
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.027	84.857	0.046
Sum score Germany car	Equal variances assumed	0.231	0.63	-1.634	87	0.106
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.619	77.104	0.109
Sum score American car	Equal variances assumed	0.469	0.5	-2.195	87	0.031
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.181	77.893	0.032

Table 23. H3 Income v1-v22 specific attributes

Toward Japanese car, Germany car, and American car

Group Statistics

	Income grouping	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Power (Japan)	<= Rp. 100 million per year	47	4.64	1.405	0.205
	>= Rp101 million per year	40	3.95	1.339	0.212
Parts availability	<= Rp. 100 million per year	47	2.7	1.718	0.251

(Japan)	>= Rp101 million per year	40	2.05	1.108	0.175
Fuel economical (japan)	<= Rp. 100 million per year	51	2.06	0.881	0.123
	>= Rp. 101 million per year	38	2.76	0.883	0.143
Pride of ownership (Japan)	<= Rp. 100 million per year	51	3.08	1.262	0.177
	>= Rp. 101 million per year	38	3.68	1.276	0.207
Brand memorizeable (Japan)	<= Rp. 100 million per year	51	1.9	0.831	0.116
	>= Rp. 101 million per year	38	2.5	1.289	0.209
colour management (Japan)	<= Rp. 100 million per year	51	2.2	0.8	0.112
	>= Rp. 101 million per year	38	2.87	1.119	0.182
technical (Germany)	<= Rp. 100 million per year	51	2.25	1.278	0.179
	>= Rp. 101 million per year	38	2.95	1.394	0.226
Pride of ownership (Germany)	<= Rp. 100 million per year	51	1.88	1.032	0.145
	>= Rp. 101 million per year	38	2.39	1.285	0.208
Age preference (Germany)	<= Rp. 100 million per year	51	3.8	1.697	0.238
	>= Rp. 101 million per year	38	4.76	1.55	0.251
Advertising (America)	<= Rp. 100 million per year	47	4.28	1.57	0.229
	>= Rp101 million per year	40	4.92	1.439	0.228
Styling (America)	<= Rp. 100 million per year	47	3.4	1.424	0.208
	>= Rp101 million per year	40	4.15	1.545	0.244
Road handling (America)	<= Rp. 100 million per year	51	2.45	0.986	0.138
	>= Rp. 101 million per year	38	3.03	1.197	0.194
technical (America)	<= Rp. 100 million per year	51	2.61	1.429	0.2
	>= Rp. 101 million per year	38	3.42	1.328	0.215
Ease of service (America)	<= Rp. 100 million per year	51	3.86	1.484	0.208
	>= Rp. 101 million per year	38	4.5	1.447	0.235
Innovative design (America)	<= Rp. 100 million per year	51	3.08	1.383	0.194
	>= Rp. 101 million per year	38	3.89	1.269	0.206

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Power (Japan)	Equal variances assumed	0.107	0.744	2.327	85	0.022
	Equal variances not assumed			2.336	83.894	0.022

Parts availability (Japan)	Equal variances assumed	8.893	0.004	2.062	85	0.042
	Equal variances not assumed			2.132	79.542	0.036
Fuel economical (japan)	Equal variances assumed	0.064	0.801	-3.726	87	0
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.725	79.762	0
Pride of ownership (Japan)	Equal variances assumed	0.005	0.946	-2.229	87	0.028
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.226	79.41	0.029
Brand memorizeable (Japan)	Equal variances assumed	12.29	0.001	-2.657	87	0.009
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.499	59.241	0.015
colour management (Japan)	Equal variances assumed	3.443	0.067	-3.305	87	0.001
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.151	63.732	0.002
technical (Germany)	Equal variances assumed	3.21	0.077	-2.432	87	0.017
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.401	75.851	0.019
Pride of ownership (Germany)	Equal variances assumed	6.513	0.012	-2.085	87	0.04
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.02	69.296	0.047
Age preference (Germany)	Equal variances assumed	1.808	0.182	-2.736	87	0.008
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.773	83.395	0.007
Advertising (America)	Equal variances assumed	1.486	0.226	-1.994	85	0.049
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.008	84.51	0.048
Styling (America)	Equal variances assumed	0.105	0.747	-2.341	85	0.022
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.325	80.232	0.023
Road handling (America)	Equal variances assumed	1.546	0.217	-2.484	87	0.015
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.415	70.557	0.018
technical (America)	Equal variances assumed	0.035	0.852	-2.736	87	0.008
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.765	82.792	0.007
Ease of service (America)	Equal variances assumed	0.049	0.825	-2.025	87	0.046
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.033	80.913	0.045
Innovative design (America)	Equal variances assumed	0.035	0.851	-2.851	87	0.005
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.888	83.24	0.005

Table 24. H3 Occupation sum score v1-v11

Group Statistics				
Occupation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean

Sum score Japanese car	employee	49	35	10.037	1.434
	entrepreneur	31	32.5	7.266	1.305
Sum score Germany car	employee	49	41.9	10.158	1.451
	entrepreneur	31	39.8	10.984	1.973
Sum score American car	employee	49	45.4	9.631	1.376
	entrepreneur	31	42.5	11.991	2.154

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Sum score Japanese car	Equal variances assumed	3.3	0.07	1.224	78	0.225
	Equal variances not assumed			1.314	76.488	0.193
Sum score Germany car	Equal variances assumed	0	0.97	0.874	78	0.385
	Equal variances not assumed			0.859	60.229	0.394
Sum score American car	Equal variances assumed	1.41	0.24	1.197	78	0.235
	Equal variances not assumed			1.14	53.874	0.259

Table 25. H3 Occupation sum score v12-v22

Group Statistics

	Occupation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Sum score Japanese car	employee	60	30.2	6.661	0.86
	entrepreneur	25	33.9	5.082	1.016
Sum score Germany car	employee	60	33.1	9.579	1.237
	entrepreneur	25	34.8	8	1.6
Sum score American car	employee	60	38.5	9.188	1.186
	entrepreneur	25	39.9	7.41	1.482

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Sum score Japanese car	Equal variances assumed	5.23	0.03	-2.536	83	0.013
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.832	58.468	0.006
Sum score Germany car	Equal variances assumed	0.77	0.38	-0.78	83	0.437
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.841	53.475	0.404
Sum score American car	Equal variances assumed	5.38	0.02	-0.709	83	0.48
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.774	55.357	0.442

Table 26. H3 Occupation v1-v22 specific attributes

Toward Japanese car, Germany car, and American car

Group Statistics

	Occupation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Fuel economical (Japan)	employee	60	2.1	0.877	0.113
	entrepreneur	25	2.96	0.79	0.158
Spacing (Japan)	employee	60	3.2	1.038	0.134
	entrepreneur	25	3.76	1.128	0.226
Pride of ownership (Japan)	employee	60	3.12	1.223	0.158
	entrepreneur	25	3.76	1.234	0.247
Brand memorize able (Japan)	employee	60	2.02	1.049	0.135
	entrepreneur	25	2.56	1.158	0.232
colour management (Japan)	employee	60	2.27	0.841	0.109
	entrepreneur	25	3.08	1.152	0.23
Spacing (Germany)	employee	60	2.85	1.338	0.173
	entrepreneur	25	3.48	0.918	0.184
Pride of ownership (Germany)	employee	60	1.95	1.08	0.139
	entrepreneur	25	2.52	1.358	0.272
Fuel economical	employee	60	5.23	1.466	0.189

(America)	entrepreneur	25	4.32	1.796	0.359	
Road handling (America)	employee	60	2.53	1.081	0.14	
	entrepreneur	25	3.12	1.166	0.233	

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Fuel economical (Japan)	Equal variances assumed	3.27	0.07	-4.236	83	0
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.426	49.691	0
Spacing (Japan)	Equal variances assumed	0.35	0.56	-2.209	83	0.03
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.133	41.802	0.039
Pride of ownership (Japan)	Equal variances assumed	0.06	0.81	-2.204	83	0.03
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.196	44.602	0.033
Brand memorize able (Japan)	Equal variances assumed	2.25	0.14	-2.11	83	0.038
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.025	41.284	0.049
colour management (Japan)	Equal variances assumed	1.44	0.23	-3.629	83	0
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.194	35.142	0.003
Spacing (Germany)	Equal variances assumed	1.97	0.16	-2.149	83	0.035
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.499	64.663	0.015
Pride of ownership (Germany)	Equal variances assumed	3.99	0.05	-2.051	83	0.043
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.867	37.276	0.07
Fuel economical (America)	Equal variances assumed	2.12	0.15	2.446	83	0.017
	Equal variances not assumed			2.249	37.972	0.03
Road handling (America)	Equal variances assumed	0.05	0.82	-2.228	83	0.029
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.158	42.064	0.037