

### 6.6.1 Psychographic Segments

The statements testing effectiveness and believability were only asked of those who opposed the North American Free Trade agreement. Only 12 of the Enthusiastic Advocates, and 54 of the Dispassionate Supporters opposed the agreement, sample sizes which are too small to discuss the results. Therefore, the believability and impact of the statements are only discussed for the Concerned Pragmatists, the Old-fashioned Opponents, and the Resolute Antagonists.

#### *Concerned Pragmatists*

The Concerned Pragmatists reacted well to the statements, with each statement found to be effective by a majority of the segment. Seventy-four percent found the statement regarding the NAFTA and environmental standards to be effective. Fifty-five percent, the lowest rating for all the statements, found the statement that the NAFTA clarified the rules of the existing FTA to be effective.

In terms of believability and effectiveness, the optimal statements for the Concerned Pragmatists are:

*"The NAFTA is beneficial because the three countries have recognized that they should not lower their environmental standards to attract investment." (74% much more/somewhat more likely to support, 47% very/somewhat believable); and "Free trade will help build the Mexican economy" (64% impact, 60% believability).*

#### *Old-fashioned Opponents*

Similar to the Concerned Pragmatists, the impact of the each the statements is quite high, with very little variability among them. In terms of believability, the statements received fairly low ratings ranging from 51 percent (free trade will help build the Mexican economy) to 32 percent (3 way trade agreement that include Mexico would be good for Canada). The

12