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Abstract

My research is interested in examining product perceptions and the importance of national identity on the marketability on a variety of foreign and domestic consumer products. I am also interested in determining whether the process of globalization has weakened an individual’s sense of national identity and whether that changes their preference for purchasing a foreign and/or domestic product. Primarily, my research question asks whether nationalism influences a product’s marketability. My hypothesis suggests that individual perceptions are heavily influenced by a sense of nationalism and ultimately affects an individual’s decision whether or not to buy a foreign good. To test this hypothesis, I constructed two original surveys that were distributed to university students at two different universities in two separate countries, Wilfred Laurier University in Canada and Georgia Southern University in Georgia, US. From my surveys, I have found that despite the advance of globalization and the integration of markets, it appears that student consumers still tend to identify themselves with products and corporations that they perceived as domestic. When asked, they chose domestic products as a means for reaffirming their national identity.
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Introduction: Is Eating at McDonald’s Really American?

The last time you walked into McDonald’s and bought a Big Mac with a large drink and fries, did you think, “I just bought food from this artery-clogging, obesity creating, American, fast-food producing restaurant?” Or did you think that you were buying food from the world's largest restaurant chain, with 34,480 restaurants in 119 countries that sells its products in many shapes and forms to meet the demand of its client base? As you bought that Big Mac from McDonald’s, are you still identifying yourself with buying an “American” product, or are you just another person, like the 69 million other people in more than 100 countries each day buying a Big Mac from McDonald’s? Do you even think of McDonald’s as an international restaurant chain? Buy American. What does that mean anymore? Is buying products from Coca-Cola, Wal-Mart, General Motors, and McDonald’s still the “American” thing to do? Are we still participating in the idea of the “American Dream” if we buy products from them? Most importantly, are they all American companies that sell their products overseas, or are they multi-national corporations that sell products to people all over the world?
My research suggests that while the process of globalization is making products more accessible to individuals around the world, the way we think about these products has not. For the purpose of this research, the term ‘globalization’ refers to the process by which markets are integrating worldwide accelerating the exchange of goods and services. (Spence, 2011).

In his article, "New Approach in International Trade Analysis Due To International Factor Movements," (2013) Predrag Bjelić explains that international trade between nations is changing, and is not the same as we remember. The article also mentions that trade between nations is being measured differently than in previous years, and that we can now assume that products are not only being traded directly, but indirectly as well. In my research, I am trying to identify the way in which trade is changing our product perceptions and the way in which we identify with trade. The case of China is instructive. Despite widespread negative concerns about China, American citizens seem to have little reluctance in purchasing Chinese goods. Do perceptions of product origin really matter when it comes to international trade? Predrag claims that trade is changing and constantly developing, and my research seeks to determine to what degree that change is taking place.

Joshua Lewer and Hendrik Van den Berg (2009) examine the relationship between international trade and immigration. The authors make the claim that there is a correlation between the simultaneous growth of trade and immigration. The authors suggest that improvements in transportation, communication and logistics increase both immigration and international trade. I would suggest, as I found from my research, that migration from increased trade is bringing a renewed sense of nationalism and American identity into the up and coming generations of U.S citizens. By asking directed questions to university students, immigration and
nationalism are very tightly linked in product consumption and perceived national corporate consciousness.

In the work, *International Trade Agreements and International Migration*, Poot and Strutt,(1932) also find that migration and tourism are both directly and indirectly influenced by international trade. Migration is influenced by the expansion of trade and increases innovation and awareness of a host country. Migration of people also helps to increase tourism to a host nation. Quoted from Poot and Strutt, “migration may also induce tourism flows, partly due to friendship and kinship networks (Poot, 1932).”

With the creation of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), trade between Canada and the United States has become easier and more cost efficient. Tourism from Canada into the United States and vice versa is very prevalent. By having a high tourism rate, both nations’ citizens appear to have a growing awareness about each other’s cultures. Poot and Strutt (1932) also examine the effect of trade on migration and labor movements. Their article analyzes the effects of product outsourcing and suggests that immigrants can bring innovation and economic growth to the countries in which they settle. Poot and Strutt suggest that migration creates a greater desire for traded services and goods in host and home countries. These affects can be seen quite clearly in the United States.

Research Questions

My primary research question asks whether nationalism influences a product’s marketability. Secondarily, my research examines the way in which trade is changing our perceptions about countries and their products. Do perceptions about countries really matter when it comes to support for international trade, and consequently, foreign products? Has the
influx of foreign goods influenced the notion that American products are in jeopardy of losing their competitive marketability? Has the process of globalization strengthened or weakened a person’s sense of national identity? Is there a correlation between immigration, outsourcing, and support—or nonsupport—for an international product?

This research seeks to determine whether the process of globalization that has fostered the migration of people across borders and increased international trade, is bringing with it a renewed sense of national identity, particularly among a younger generation.

**Is NAFTA trading more than just goods across the Canadian-American border?**

Canada and the United States have become the largest trading partners in the world, creating an economy that is largely interwoven with each other. With the creation of the North American Free Trade Agreement, it has further increased the trade relationship between the two countries. NAFTA removes important trade restrictions between the two nations, reducing trade tariffs and sanctions. By having NAFTA in place, the trading of goods is easier and more cost efficient for companies. However, not just goods and services are crossing the border between Canada and the United States. Cultural identities and stereotypes are also flowing between these nations as well.

What influence does the trading of goods across the border have on the cultural and national identity of Americans and Canadians? Does the trading of these goods have an impact on the perceptions of the cultural values of these two nations? Is there a correlation between personal perceptions of Americans and Canadians and their willingness to buy products from each other? Do individual attitudes and perceptions about a country affect the marketability of domestic and foreign products? As this research will demonstrate, there is a correlation between
the perceptions of individuals toward a nation and the marketability of products that the country produces.

My research included the distribution of two different surveys, one for Georgia Southern University students in Statesboro, Georgia, and the other for college students attending Wilfrid Laurier University in Waterloo, Canada. This survey sets out to determine if individual attitudes and perceptions affect the marketability of domestic and foreign products. As this survey will demonstrate, there is a correlation between the perceptions of individuals toward a nation and the products that nation produces.

Perceptions of Cultural Attitudes

As part of this survey’s methodology students were asked ten questions relating to how Americans and Canadians perceived each other. We were interested in examining whether cultural attitudes might affect a decision to buy each other’s products. For the purpose of this research, ‘culture’ is understood as the behaviors, beliefs, value system, and attitudes of a group of people that are transmitted from generation to generation.

The first few questions targeted cultural values and characteristics of students from both the United States and Canada. The first question asked respondents to provide five cultural characteristics that they believed Americans share as a whole. In the survey given to American students, there was a variety of answers. Some common characteristics included individualistic, independent, religious, educated, diverse, opinionated, and lazy. There were also answers that reported a love of fast food, pop culture, sports, theme parks, and shopping malls. A few Americans also thought their culture was over-fed, ungrateful, entitled, greedy, and materialistic. However, compared to the answers that Canadian students gave, the American students were
slightly more negative toward their own culture than some Canadian students were about American culture.

For Canadians students, Americans were considered to be patriotic, opinionated, ignorant, proud, independent, religious, capitalistic, entitled, and opportunistic. These traits were similarly indicated by American students. However, the answers given by US students also indicated a sense of disillusionment with their own culture.

In the second question, the survey asked students to identify five common cultural characteristics that they believed Canadians share with one another. This question was used to create a comparison with the similar question asked of US students about their cultural characteristics. The data suggested that there is a distinct difference between how Americans view themselves and how Americans view Canadians. In the survey, American students gave characteristics of Canadians that indicated the impression that Canadians are polite, open-minded, realistic, practical, fair, honest, trust-worthy, compassionate, and religious. There were also answers that indicated American stereotypes of Canadians, such as Canadians enjoy the wilderness, value healthcare, and want to help the less fortunate.

American students did not use positive adjectives, such as honest and polite, to describe their own culture. For Canadian students, many said their culture is polite, kind, accepting, peaceful, proud, relaxed, patriotic, and friendly. Canadian students also reported that they enjoy playing hockey and lacrosse and drinking beer. From the surveys, it seems both Americans and Canadians gave relatively the same cultural characteristics of Canadians, which reflects a more altruistic and friendly nation than the United States.

The next question in both surveys asked respondents to provide five values that they believed Americans share as a whole. The answers received from American students reported
that religion, honesty, pride, imagination, respect, fairness, ambitiousness, resilience, freedom, equality, honor, and loyalty are all important. One respondent cited God, family, and country. For Canadian students, American values consisted of fair play, honesty, freedom, rights, money, patriotism, liberty, family, courage, and military. From the responses given, it seems that Canadian students also view American values in a better light than American culture.

The same question asked American students to identify what they believed to be cultural Canadian values. Americans said that Canadians value politeness, health, cleanliness, honesty, privacy, patriotism, compassion, open-mindedness, generosity, and peace. These answers were similar to those provided by Canadian students who indicated their values to include hard work, diversity, intelligence, resourcefulness, empathy, justice, honesty, kindness, equality, tolerance, and peace.

From the first two questions in the survey it appeared that both American and Canadian students viewed each other’s values and cultures similarly. As Poot suggested this may in part be a consequence of the expansion of NAFTA trading that has included a high tourism rate between Canada and the United States. It appears that students from both nations have some idea about each other’s cultures.

**Perceptions of Business Etiquette**

In the next part of the survey American and Canadian students were asked to choose from five given adjectives that they believed most closely reflected American behavior in a business setting. Comparisons of their responses are reported below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Responses</th>
<th>Canadian Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competent 23%</td>
<td>Competent 12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lazy 7%          Lazy 12%
Ambitious 46%    Ambitious 50%
Ruthless 38%    Ruthless 75%
Independent 38% Independent 50%
Confident 30%    Confident 25%
Educated 15%     Educated 12%
Efficient 15%    Efficient 12%
Cooperative 0%   Cooperative 0%
Determined 30%   Determined 50%
Flexible 0%      Flexible 0%
Competitive 84%  Competitive 75%
Honest 0%        Honest 0%
Diligent 0%      Diligent 0%
Organized 7%     Organized 0%
Open-minded 15%  Open-minded 12%
Patient 0%       Patient 0%
Punctual 23%     Punctual 0%
Resourceful 38%  Resourceful 25%
Responsible 0%   Responsible 0%
Persuasive 23%   Persuasive 12%
Imaginative 0%   Imaginative 0%
Friendly 0%      Friendly 0%
Energetic 15%    Energetic 12%
Courteous 0%     Courteous 0%
Curious 0%       Curious 0%
Opinionated 46%  Opinionated 62%

For the most part, the perceptions of Americans and Canadians are almost the same in response to the way they believe Americans act and behave in a business setting. The most chosen adjectives in the list on both surveys are competitive, ambitious, and opinionated.

Adjectives that scored zero percent on both surveys are friendly, honest, flexible, cooperative, diligent, patient, imaginative, responsible, courteous, and curious.

In the next part of the survey American and Canadian students were asked to choose five given adjectives that they believed most closely reflected Canadian behavior in a business setting. Comparisons of their responses are reported below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Responses</th>
<th>Canadian Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competent 53%</td>
<td>Competent 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy 0%</td>
<td>Lazy 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious 0%</td>
<td>Ambitious 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthless 0%</td>
<td>Ruthless 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent 7%</td>
<td>Independent 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident 0%</td>
<td>Confident 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated 15%</td>
<td>Educated 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient 23%</td>
<td>Efficient 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative 0%</td>
<td>Cooperative 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determined 15%</td>
<td>Determined 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible 38%</td>
<td>Flexible 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive 7%</td>
<td>Competitive 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest 53%</td>
<td>Honest 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diligent 0%</td>
<td>Diligent 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized 30%</td>
<td>Organized 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-minded 46%</td>
<td>Open-minded 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient 23%</td>
<td>Patient 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctual 7%</td>
<td>Punctual 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourceful 30%</td>
<td>Resourceful 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible 7%</td>
<td>Responsible 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive 0%</td>
<td>Persuasive 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative 7%</td>
<td>Imaginative 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly 30%</td>
<td>Friendly 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic 23%</td>
<td>Energetic 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteous 38%</td>
<td>Courteous 12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curious 7%</td>
<td>Curious 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinionated 0%</td>
<td>Opinionated 12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the adjectives used to describe Canadians in a business setting, there is a more even distribution of adjectives used than for Americans in a business setting. For Canadians describing Canadians, the only two adjectives that had slightly higher scores are educated and resourceful, with 50%. For Americans describing Canadians, there is roughly the same thing. Competent and honest had the highest two scores, with 53%.
Desirability of Domestic and Foreign Products

The next part in the survey asks how likely Americans were to purchase goods made in Canada. 7% said that they would “not be likely at all.” 23% said they would be “somewhat likely.” 53% said they would be “very likely,” and 15% were in between “somewhat likely” and “very likely.” When Canadian students were asked whether they were likely to buy American products, 12% said “not likely,” 37% said “somewhat likely,” 12% said “very likely,” and 37% were between “somewhat likely” and “very likely.” It appears that American students are more likely to purchase Canadian products than it would be for Canadian students to purchase American products. However, this is not by a large margin, and it seems that both Americans and Canadians are apathetic towards buying each other’s products, as most responses indicated that both American and Canadian students were “somewhat likely” to purchase each other’s products, and there was no real strong aversion or support for purchasing each other’s products either.

The next questions asked both American and Canadian students to indicate how often they purchase American products. Both questions received roughly the same answer. For both American and Canadian students, the response was most with “sometimes” they purchase products from the other country. A few outliers were between “never” and “sometimes” and between “sometimes” and “always.” It seems that neither Canadian nor American students are averse to buying one another’s products.

However, when given the choice whether American and Canadian students would purchase each other’s products instead of products made in their own country, the scores indicate that it is “not likely at all” to “somewhat likely.” While American and Canadian students are willing to buy products from each other’s countries, it seems that they are less willing if given
the choice to buy products from their own country. While there is not really strong aversion to buying products produced in Canada or the United States, there is a very strong support for purchasing domestic products.

The last question in the survey asked American students to list three adjectives that come to mind when they think of Canadian products. Some of the adjectives received were expensive, durable, efficient, good quality, dependable, and innovative. When Canadian students were asked the same question about American products, the responses received were well-made, expensive, over-priced, reliable, durable, unhealthy, and well-built.

**Putting It All Together**

The comparison between the cultural perceptions of Americans and Canadians are shown in the way each other’s products are described. American products are described as “unhealthy.” In a cultural value shared by Americans, over-fed and a love of fast food is used to describe Americans, which relates to products made in the United States as also being “unhealthy.” Other adjectives used to describe American culture are materialistic and opportunistic, which corresponds to the descriptions of American products as over-priced and expensive. Canadian products are described as innovative, and, in the survey, Canadians are seen as more innovative in a business setting than Americans are. Canadian products are also seen as durable and dependable. Adjectives used to describe Canadians in the survey are honest, friendly, and polite. It seems there is a rather direct correlation between the way a culture is perceived and way the products made in that culture are perceived.

Through the questions in the survey, it seems that as a whole, the survey indicates that both American and Canadian students think less highly of American culture and values than
Canadian culture and values. Both American and Canadians find Americans less cooperative, friendly, and flexible than Canadians in the work place, and Americans much more opinionated and competitive in the workplace than Canadians. Canadians are viewed to be more friendly, honest and polite in both the workplace and the in their culture by both Americans and Canadians.

The purpose of this first survey was to discover whether there is a correlation between cultural perceptions of Americans and Canadians and the way products are perceived by each other. While it does seem that cultural perceptions do help influence way products are perceived, it seems that cultural perceptions do not seem to make a big difference in the purchasing of products. It seems that the product and cultural perceptions that Americans and Canadians have are not tightly linked for American and Canadian students when purchasing products.

Canada and the United States are large trading partners, and with the creation of NAFTA, it has become easier and more cost efficient for these two countries to trade with one another. While these two countries have perceived cultural identities and values that are somewhat different from one another, this does not seem to affect the trading and purchasing of goods.

Buy American: What Does That Mean Anymore?
So what do Coca-Cola, Wal-Mart, General Motors, and McDonald’s have in common? Is it that they are all “American” companies? Is it that they all have deep roots in American history and in the minds and hearts of Americans? Take General Motors, for example. General Motors has a long history of being a leading company in the United States, which has helped to embed its position in American national identity. With its philosophy of “a car for every purse and purpose,” General Motors continues to diverse its cars and develop landmark innovations.

General Motors has a long history of trading globally, and GM has been a part of the international market for almost the entire time the company has been in existence. From World War II, where GM supplied the Allies with more goods than any other company, to today’s time, where GM has joint ventures in China, India and Brazil, General Motors has always been active in the global economy.

In 2008, a major economic recession and global credit crisis caused automobile sales to reduce drastically. In 2008, when GM closed its fiscal books, the company was in the red by $30.9 billion. In 2009, when GM officially filed for bankruptcy in New York, the company had $82 billion dollars in assets and $173 billion dollars in liabilities. With these numbers, GM had the largest industrial bankruptcy in history (Alix 2013). The United States government gave an unprecedented equity loan to General Motors during this time. The US Treasury bought up large amount of stock in GM, a 61 percent equity stake, which made the United States the primary owner of the company. The United States spent $50 billion to bailout GM and lost $11.2 billion in the process. U.S. Treasury started to sell off stock in the company in November of 2010, and the last remaining stock was sold in December of 2013. Treasury Department spokesman Adam Hodge said "the goal of the Treasury's investment in GM was never to make a profit, but to help
save the American auto industry." The bailout was able to save 1.5 million American jobs (Beech 2014).

After coming back from bankruptcy, GM was at the forefront in developing sales in emerging markets, such as in China and Brazil. General Motors now manufactures automobiles in 19 other countries beside the United States. General Motors is a leading producer in China, where the automobile market has exploded, and which a few years ago, has surpassed the United States as the largest market for cars. GM’s Vice President noted that Chevrolet, General Motors leading brand, has enjoyed a record-breaking first half this year due to growing popularity of its vehicles in the global market. “The continued sales growth around the world is a result of a focused effort to strengthen Chevrolet’s presence in developing markets,” Vice President Alan Batey reported (Hill 2013).

GM just recently released its plans to invest $14 billion in China over the next 5 years. The plans include adding 5 new additional plants in China, with a target of 5 million automobiles sales, as well as to design or refresh 60 new models of vehicles. GM, as the leading automobile company in China, expects this investment to increase sales and expand overseas market share. GM was one of the first companies to invest in a research and design center in China, allowing GM a competitive advantage when it comes to designing cars for the people of China. GM also has 2 foreign enterprises, 10 joint ventures, and more than 50,000 employees in China. General Motors reported success with its joint-venture partners as 3.1 million automobiles were sold in China alone (PTI 2014).

GM has outsourced many jobs that use to belong to American workers but now belong to Mexican, Chinese, and Indian workers. Workers in the auto manufacturing industry in the United States used to make $56 an hour. Now, due to globalization, GM can hire workers in Mexico,
China, and India for $7, $4.50, and $1 respectively. In response, GM has gone from employing 89,000 Americans to employing 50,000. Meanwhile, employment in Mexico, however, has increased from 9,073 to 9,235 workers. Desperate to keep jobs in the United States, the United Auto Workers have agreed to cut wages and benefits in the United States to try to keep automakers in the U.S. (Rattner 2011).

General Motors has been very successful in its expansion in overseas markets, especially in China. With the outsourcing of jobs that used to belong fully to Americans, General Motors has been able to successfully continue to expand and grow. However, many Americans have lost their jobs in response to globalization. As of right now, GM is one of the leading producers in China for automobiles. In the future, this may affect other car manufactures, seeing as GM has decided to invest a lot of capital into China, the world’s largest automobile market in the world.

So what is it about this company that the United States government was willing to give an unprecedented loan? Why do General Motors still produce advertisements with puppy dogs, farmers, and apple pie when GM invested $14 billion in China and outsourced many American jobs in the past few years?

**Survey Two – Corporate Consciousness**

In my second survey, I analyzed students' responses to determine whether they had a national corporate consciousness. The first question asked students to identify which companies they thought were American and which companies they thought were international. The list consisted of McDonald’s, Wal-Mart, Sony, General Motors, Toyota, General Electric, Apple,
Volkswagen, Samsung, Ford, Honda, BP, Coca-Cola, Nike, and Nestle.

The second question asked students to choose whether they would buy a vehicle from Toyota or a vehicle from General Motors and why.

In the third part students were presented with a number of sentences and were asked to determine which of them they thought to be true:

*McDonald’s is an American fast food chain that sells fast food overseas, or* 
*McDonald’s is an international fast food chain that sells fast food in the United States and overseas.*

*Toyota is a Japanese company that sells cars in the United States and other countries, or* 
*Toyota is an international company that sells cars in the United States and in other countries.*

Students were then asked to consider two scenarios:

*If Ford and Mitsubishi were both looking to set up a factory in Pooler, GA, employing the same amount of people, which company would students prefer to have come to Georgia.*

Finally, students were asked whether they had supported the 2008 bailout of General Motors and to explain why.

**Results**

A majority of respondents labeled General Motors as an “American” company, and chose purchasing decisions on automobiles based on the perception of GM as an American company. When asked the question of choosing to purchase a car from Toyota or GM, about half of the students who took the survey chose GM just because they said it was an American vehicle. Only
a few students chose to buy GM based on quality, while as students who chose Toyota based their decisions almost entirely on the quality of the car.

When students were asked in the survey about the recent bailout of GM, almost all students said they had no preference or didn’t have an opinion on this issue. For the United States to have invested heavily into a company using tax payers dollars, and for students to have no opinion on this issue, was a bit distressing. For the few that did have an opinion, most of them thought that the US government should have stayed out of the company and let the market decide.

When students were asked to list which companies they thought were American and which were international, the results stayed pretty consistent between the surveys. Most all students identified at least four companies as American in the survey. The most common companies circled as American were McDonald’s, Wal-Mart, Coca-Cola, General Motors, Apple and Ford. The results stayed pretty consistent between the surveys when it came for students to indentify international companies as well. The main companies circled as international were Volkswagen, Sony, Toyota, Samsung, and Honda.

Many students circled McDonald’s, for example, as an American company, but also as an international company. There seems to be dual identification with companies being American and international with some students. However, most of those same students who marked one company as American and also as international would only classify that dual identification with a few companies. Many students would say that McDonalds was an American and international company, but Wal-Mart was only an American company.

A couple students who indentified some companies as American, and then circled all the companies as international as well, did not include Wal-Mart. This was a repeated pattern,
especially interesting since Wal-Mart is one of largest international companies in the world. Wal-Mart is the largest non-governmental entity in the world and produces more money annually than many countries’ GDP production. The fact then that students would identify this giant of an international retailer as only American and identify all the other companies as international is fascinating. Only one student identified BP as an international company. The rest were not considered international.

When students were asked to choose which statement they thought was correct, about three-fourths of students identified with the first statement that McDonalds was an American company that sells fast food overseas. The other one-fourth indentified McDonalds as international.

However, when asked the other similar question as to whether Toyota is a Japanese company that sells cars in the United States and other countries, or whether Toyota is an international company that sells cars in the United States and in other countries, there was a disconnect. The same amount of students, about three-fourths of students, identified with Toyota as being a Japanese company, but the disconnect came when students indentified McDonalds as being American, but Toyota as being international, or vice versa. Some students perceived one company as international but not the other. Only a few students identified both companies as being international.

Students were also asked whether they voted in the last election. Almost all students answered no. Of the few students that did vote, all of them had almost the same exact answers in the survey. For example, all of the students that voted identified McDonalds as being an American fast food chain that sells fast food overseas, Toyota as being a Japanese company that
sells cars in the United States and other countries; and chose both GM over Toyota, and Ford over Mitsubishi because they are American companies.

**Conclusion: Wow! Advertising and Marketing Really Do Work.**

So how can a company like General Motors, which invested $14 billion in China and outsourced many American jobs, still be considered American? Tim Hortons, for example, knows its client base well. In their advertising, Canada’s most well-known company uses all the values and symbolic national activities that are important to Canadians, such as hockey, to help sell its goods. It appears that advertising products a certain way is very powerful. These major corporations have it right. By being able to exploit the idea that students have about identifying products with their nationality, major corporations still use the idea of their products as being domestic and “American.” However, this research also found that students who were more politically astute and voted in the last election were able to identify more correctly whether a corporation was domestic or multinational.

Another conclusion of this research was the correlation between the perceptions of individuals toward a nation and the marketability of products that the country produces. It appears that as globalization fosters trade agreements, like NAFTA, migration and tourism have also flourished. Canadians and Americans have come to know each other better and neither Canadian nor American students were averse to buying one another’s products. While American and Canadian students were willing to buy products from each other’s countries, it seems that they were less willing if given the choice to buy products from their own country. Despite the advance of globalization and the integration of markets it appears that student consumers still
tend to identify themselves with products and corporations that they perceived as domestic. When asked, they chose domestic products as a means for reaffirming their national identity. Creating a sense of national identity in marketing a product appears to be important at least for students who demonstrated that they were more likely to purchase a product they perceived as homegrown. This is very important for future advertising for these large corporations. As long as companies, such as Wal-Mart and General Motors, give a clear distinction to their market audience as being “American” and identifying other companies as “foreign,” consumers are likely to still purchase from these companies based on their nationality.
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## Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Vote: Yes or No</th>
<th>Identified with American Companies</th>
<th>Identified with International Companies</th>
<th>Toyota or GM, Reliable</th>
<th>McDonald’s’s American or International?</th>
<th>Ford or Mitsubishi, Reliable</th>
<th>Toyota or International</th>
<th>Bailout Preference</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Toyota</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Toyota</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Toyota</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Ford-</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Ford-</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Undeclared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Ford-</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Ford-</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Ford-</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes- All except Wal-Mart</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Ford-</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Yes-helped</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Mitsubishi</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Toyota</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Toyota</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Mitsubishi</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Exercise Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Toyota</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Exercise Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Toyota</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Justice Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes- only with BP</td>
<td>Toyota</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Justice Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Toyota</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Ford-</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>General Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Mitsubishi</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Yes-save</td>
<td>History/ Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>GM-All</td>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>Toyota-quality</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Mitsubishi</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GM-quality</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Mitsubishi</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Biology/ Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Toyota-quality</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>No-market-based</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Toyota-quality</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Toyota-quality</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No-pay themselves</td>
<td>International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GM-family work</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Ford-American</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Toyota-quality</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Toyota-quality</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Ford-American</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>No-corrupt</td>
<td>International Trade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bar Chart 1:**
- Question: If given the choice, how likely are you to purchase products made in the United States?
- Answered: 8, Skipped: 0

**Bar Chart 2:**
- Question: How often do you purchase American products?
- Answered: 8, Skipped: 0
How likely would it be for you to purchase an American product over a Canadian product?

Answered: 0  Skipped: 0

If given the choice, how likely are you to purchase products made in Canada?

Answered: 13  Skipped: 0

How often do you purchase Canadian products?

Answered: 13  Skipped: 0