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A. Introduction

1. Research rationale and objectives

Academic researchers in marketing have discovered the importance of culture and cultural dimensions in different aspects of consumer behavior. They have found that ignoring cultural influences is one of the main reasons why so many solutions and plans (e.g., in marketing, economics, politics, etc.) in a country do not work in others. The effects and implications of cultural dimensions are demonstrated through tens, if not hundreds, of studies; the objective was in all cases to provide solutions in dealing with differences in thinking, feeling, and behaving of people around the world, and structure their mind-sets in an easily understood way. One weakness of most such studies is they trust the research instruments and findings of old surveys (e.g., Hofstede’s, Schwartz’s), developed to investigate and compare organizational or work-related behaviors across nations, as the basis for analyses of consumer behaviors among individuals; in respect to, both, situation and measurement level, they do not match together. Thus, replication of such dimensional rankings in marketing studies could easily fail. A new measuring instrument needs to be developed considering analysis level, study applications, behavior, context, population and “the spirit of the times”; individual-level measurement of cultural dimensions could a reliable substitute. Present study aims, among others, to validate a newly-developed scale of consumer culture — individual-level cultural dimensions in purchase-consumption situation inspired by Hofstede’s proposed dimensions (latest version of 2008). Based on several psychological, social and cultural studies, the researcher tries to find roots of each dimension in a different task-context, namely purchase and consumption. Following the unipolar approach in measurement, the key descriptors and items are implicitly adapted to purchase situation and are further analyzed at individual-level.

Next, having an applicable-reliable scale for consumer culture, the plausible effects of the dimensions on three selected consumer-behaviors are analyzed. We decided to focus,

---

1 Also known as “Zeitgeist” or the fashion of the day (Hofstede, 2001).
2 Since Hofstede’s original country-level dimensions are validated through hundreds of studies.
3 Only of the poles are suggested for individual-level analyses (see Bathae 2011 a, b).
among others, on anticipated regret since, unlike satisfaction (or even dissatisfaction), this aspect is rather neglected in consumer-behavioral studies — especially in service purchase context, which is here interested. Regret, in general, is a complex concept which has both cognition and emotion aspects. Although there is a growing literature on experienced aspect of regret (e.g. Landman, 1993; Gilovich and Medvec, 1994, 1995; Zeelenberg, 1999 a; Seilheimer, 2001), only few studies were found to be interested in its role on what (or how) consumers expect for future, named anticipated regret, in purchase situations (e.g., Zeelenberg, 1999 b; Wunderle⁴, 2006; Connolly and Zeelenberg, 2002). Thus, studying the effects of cultural dimensions on consumer anticipated-regret could have numerous benefits, ideas and interesting findings for the marketing world.

In addition to anticipated-regret, two other purchase behaviors are selected: variety-seeking, and quality-consciousness. Variety-seeking — a hedonic, emotion-based behavior — and quality-consciousness — a utilitarian cognition-based aspect of consumer decisions — could easily reflect both affective and cognitive reactions of consumers to cultural dimensions in purchase-consumption context; analyzing the effects of consumer culture on hedonic and utilitarian behaviors of consumers was another objective of this research. Our study approach is analogous, in spirit, to the recent studies on the role of cognitive-affective concepts in purchase-consumption behaviors (e.g. Shih and Schau, 2011; Zeelenberg et al., 1998 a); both utilitarian (quality-consciousness) and hedonic (variety-seeking) consequences and background effects of anticipated regret (as a cognitive-affective concept) are definitely interested. In other words, the plausible interactions among the three selected behaviors of consumers — anticipated-regret, variety-seeking and quality-consciousness of a consumer — are also analyzed.

Still, there was another main reason behind performing this study, as in many other culture-oriented and cross-cultural researches, namely comparison of two cultures or countries. Although, in some countries (e.g. USA, Canada) numerous researches are

---

performed in this field, several nations are still behaviorally unknown for marketers; this may end in financial disasters for brands entering such markets. The fact intensifies the necessity of cultural investigations in other countries; the two countries of Iran and Germany are focused in this research. Iran is among the culturally undiscovered markets with an ever increasing demand; an attractive choice for export-oriented industries and brands. Even, German consumers — especially those living in the former East-Germany, where the data was gathered — have several unknown aspects in their purchase behaviors, that need to be analyzed; the study could be a milestone in this regard. Examining consumer culture at individual-level, performing the studies in two different countries, and testing the hypotheses in two non-identical markets would offer great opportunity to further our knowledge in both fields of consumer-behavior and international marketing. In addition to nationality, the role of demographic profile (age and gender) in consumer purchase behaviors was also analyzed in this work to recognize the possible effects of context.

2. Research questions

Designing a new scale inspired by Hofstede (1980) and Hofstede et al. (2010), considering psychological approaches toward individual behaviors, and testing the scale in two culturally-different countries, was a continuous step-by-step process. Aim was, among others, answering this question:

“Is the developed scale valid, reliable and responsive to be trusted as a measurement instrument in further individual-level cross-cultural studies?”

Later, applying a conceptual model based on plausible causes of cultural backgrounds, the researcher tried to benefit from the instrument designing creative questions related to consumer purchase behaviors. The three behavioral variables of anticipated-regret, consumer variety-seeking and consumer quality-consciousness were decided to be, both,
fundamental and attractive and were, thus, included in the study to answer the following questions:

“Which cultural dimensions have effects on consumer anticipated-regret, consumer variety-seeking and consumer quality-consciousness? What would be the possible effects directions?”

In addition to culture, the role of other contextual elements is interested as an influential factor; the researcher analyzed the role nationality plays in respect to each selected purchase behaviors. Since the study is focused at individual-level, possible differences in consumer culture among Iranians and Germans is not named among main research questions; reminding the existence of such variations due to nationality differences would not be a new finding. Although the nationality effects on some of the interested cultural-dimensions were reviewed comparing the two samples of Iran and Germany, the next thought-provoking question was:

“Does nationality has effects on consumer anticipated-regret, consumer variety-seeking and consumer quality-consciousness?”

A powerful influencer on individual-level purchase-behaviors is demographic profile of the consumer; age and gender are defined as contextual elements to reply the following questions:

“Does age and gender have effects on consumer anticipated-regret, consumer variety-seeking and consumer quality-consciousness?”

Finally, the existence of plausible interactions among the three selected variables of consumer-behaviors could be named among the most interested questions of this work. No previous studies have focused on the dual effects of anticipated regret on hedonic and utilitarian behaviors of consumers. Therefore the final question would be:

“Is there any interactions among anticipated-regret, quality-consciousness and variety-seeking of consumers when making purchase decisions?”
3. **Scope of the study**

The research was performed in three complementary attempts, each performed simultaneously in Iran and Germany. The first attempt (2010), was a pre-test of the model investigating the general concept in the two countries; results signalized need for improvement in, both, scale and conceptual model (see Bathaee, 2010 a). In the second attempt — again two surveys in Iran and Germany — the measurement instrument was developed based on deep psychological and social concepts inspired by Hofstede et al. (2010), Matsumoto and Juang (2004), de Mooij (2004) and Triandis, (1972); results were satisfactory. Reliability and validity of the scale were confirmed, though few modifications were reminded (see Bathaee, 2010 b). The last attempt was performed, applying the qualified scale focused on the final version of interested consumer-behavioral variables (see Bathaee, 2012). In general, six separate surveys were performed, in three complementary steps, managed from 2010 to 2014 in the two countries.

4. **Structure of the research**

The research is presented in four parts — parts B to E. Part B is structured to present theoretical background and review literature, introducing culture as the core element of the research. The first chapter is focused on culture and individual, introducing the concept and elements of culture; cultural values are later declared as a critical element. Defining cultural dimensions as a key concept, we introduce Hofstede’s dimensional model as the best-known, valid measurement framework in this field of study; following individual-level approach in measurement of Hofstede’s dimensions, its benefits and two possible analyses approaches are declared. Further, the study tries to straighten out the relation between cultural dimensions and context as the next key concept; introducing the interested contextual elements — nationality and demographic profile — we limit the subject to purchase-consumption task context. The second chapter is concentrated on, both, theoretical and empirical knowledge of the interested dimensions of consumer
culture; reviewing literature and previous findings helps to draw a rather complete picture of the role each cultural dimension would play in purchase context.

Part C is focused on the design and development of hypotheses; with a glance on psychology of purchase, we develop hypotheses to shape the framework of this study. In addition to introduce the three selected consumer behavioral variables — variety-seeking, quality-consciousness and anticipated regret — in this part, hypotheses are divided into two separate chapters. All postulations on the effects of contextual elements (nationality and demographic profile), and cultural dimensions on the three selected behavioral variables are presented as hypotheses in one chapter. Next, the postulated hedonic and utilitarian effects of anticipated-regret, as well as the interaction among the two behaviors of variety-seeking and quality-consciousness are declared as complementary hypotheses to complete the conceptual model.

In Part D, samples, scale development process, research implementation, survey methodology, and finally all analyses and results are explained. The hypotheses are tested following pan-country analyses approach to declare the results; in addition and to compare the effects in the two samples, intra-country approach is followed.

Finally, Part E is dedicated to the discussions, summarizing results, conclusions, limitations of the research and future directions.
B. Theoretical backgrounds

1. Culture and individual

1.1 The concept of culture

In an anthropological view, humans are forced to meet biological and social needs in order to survive. Ultimately, survival is dependent to the degree to which people can adapt to their specific environments. Thus, each group creates solutions to the problems posed by their environments in order to address biological needs and social motives; these solutions form the basis of culture. Culture is a solution to the problem of “how to survive”, given the problems in the environment, physical and social needs that must be addressed, and the tools available (Matsumoto, 2007). But human culture is much more than that. By creating and maintaining complex social systems, institutionalizing and improving practices, developing beliefs about the world, and communicating the meanings to other humans and subsequent generations, culture embraces several emotions, preferences, beliefs and activities shared and socially learned as a collective mental programming of the people in an environment (Triandis, 1995; Clark, 1990). People are all children of their cultures (Hofstede, 1984); in order to know, have relationships, learn from, or benefit from other individuals, we need to understand and analyze their “mental software: their culture” (Hofstede et al., 2010). According to Matsumoto and Juang (2004), culture is to behavioral studies what air is to humans — all around, but invisible. It is an abstract, complex and dynamic meaning applied to describe and explain a broad range of activities, behaviors, events and structures in lives; what give meaning to this concept and makes it observable are human behaviors — actions, thoughts, rituals, traditions and habits. It is a never static entity that helps to reinforce the behavioral similarities and differences, and explain or predict average mainstream tendencies within a society. It refers to the entire system of values, attitudes, rules and behaviors and exists on multiple levels — across individuals, groups or larger group (a business corporation, region, country) — essentially to ensure survival and success of the group and prevent potential chaos.
The concept of culture is discussed in hundreds, if not thousands, of papers and books. Kroeber and Kluckholn (1952), and later Berry et al. (1992), have described six general categories in which culture is studied: descriptive\(^5\), historical\(^6\), normative\(^7\), psychological\(^8\), structural\(^9\) and genetics\(^10\). There is still another approach toward culture: the explicative understanding of culture. In this approach — which is here interested — culture is defined as an influential hidden factor aimed to develop a structure for behaviors (Keller, 1982); a complex system of collective-shared, internalized values, norms and motives that are likely to influence cognition, affection, and motivation in meaningful ways (see Mennicken, 2000; Osgood, 1951; Oyserman et al., 2002). Following the explicative approach, Schutte and Ciarlante (1998) depicted culture as an iceberg organized into three levels: (1) behavioral practices, (2) values, beliefs, preferences and norms, (3) basic assumptions and customs, as the main elements. Cultural dependent behavioral practices are only the tip of iceberg, and a firm understanding of values, and other lower level influencers are critical to analyze any behavior. Hofstede (1991) distinguished four other manifestations of culture, depicted like the layers of an onion indicating symbols as the most superficial and values as the deepest manifestations, with heroes and rituals falling in between; cultural values are the interested subject in this research.

1.2 Components of culture: Typology of cultural values and dimensions

Values, in general, are conceptions of the desirable that guide the way individual select, act, evaluate, and explain their actions and evaluations (Kluckhohn, 1951; Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 1992). They are the core component of culture, that help individual and society establish norms, standards, ideals and separate or classify the acceptable, credited choices.

\(^5\) Which describes the different types of behaviors or activities associated with a group of people.

\(^6\) Which refers to the heritage and traditions associated with a group of people.

\(^7\) Which describes the rules and norms associated with a culture.

\(^8\) Which emphasizes on learning, problem solving and other behaviors associated with a culture.

\(^9\) Which emphasizes on the societal or organizational elements of a culture.

\(^10\) Which refers to the origin of a culture.
For an individual, values determine subjective definition of logic by showing the approved and sanctioned ways for dealing with circumstances, and direct feelings (Hofstede, 2001). Hofstede (1991, p. 6) presented a simple explanation: “values are broad tendencies to prefer certain states of affairs over others”. In other words, culture is shaped around values, and values imply judgments. There is no good or bad, unless we know the values that govern in a country or society, or even within the mind-set of an individual; this is the beginning point for cultural values.

“Cultural values” are, thus, defined as the explicit and implicit values that characterize a culture, and are imparted to societal members through everyday exposure to customs, laws, norms, scripts, and organizational practices which are shaped by, and expressing, a culture (Bourdieu, 1972; Markus and Kitayama, 1994 a, b); a cultural value accepted by the society could be easily internalized within individuals. Whether implicitly or explicitly, they represent shared abstract ideas about what is good, right, and desirable (Williams, 1970); the concept would base the norms and tell an individual what is appropriate in various situations.

All values could be declared cultural values if they could fulfill certain conditions: Kluckhohn (1951) argued that values named as cultural need to build the “generalized framework” that underlies behaviors, should constitute distinct answers to the same questions posed by “generalities of human situations”, and finally have to provide approved and punished ways for dealing with “universal circumstances” among societies. According to Hofstede (1980, 2001), cultural values must be empirically verifiable, almost independent dimensions, and constitute meaningfully ordered and differentiated cultures.

To define a valid structure for cultural values, many authors and researchers have studied different aspects of culture or introduced influential frameworks of dimensions. Some of the researchers (e.g., Hall, 1977; Triandis, 2002; Gannon 2008) have posed the underlying questions of human cultures to declare issues that confront all societies, prior to the research and tried to find the approaches followed by cultures (also see Schwartz, 1999). These researchers have each “predefined” some concepts from human every-day lives, as the origin of cultural values and thus formed the studies based on them.
On the other hand, there were researchers who had no predefined selections and introduced cultural values, at least partly, based on the results of continuous studies (e.g., Mead, 1961; Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961; Triandis, 1972; Schwartz, 1994; Hofstede, 1983, 1984); *cultural dimensions* were this way introduced. According to Matsumoto and Juang (2004) cultural dimensions are general tendencies that affect behaviors and exist both socially — among individuals within groups — and separately individually within each member of groups and are often selected as the main route to measure cultural values. Dimensions could be known as the best way to translate and predict *implicit* and abstract concepts of values in form of *explicit* similarities and variations in reactions. They group a number of phenomena which are empirically proved to occur together. Thus, dimensions are defined based on equivalence in conceptual meaning and empirical methods between different cultures, and help in discovering how (and why) cultures come to create similarities and differences; they are based on cultural underlying processes, and use meaningful (and measurable) concepts that could significantly prove cultural variability (Matsumoto and Juang, 2004).

As an example, Hofstede (1980) distinguished four (later five and now seven) general dimensions of cultural values based on an enormous database with scores of 72 countries, using hologeistic\(^{11}\) studies (i.e. data matrices to show the value of variables using techniques such as factor analysis, cluster analysis, multidimensional scaling and smallest-space analysis) to analyze and reduce data, and gain fundamental dimensions (Hofstede, 2001). These were later empirically validated, and each country could be positioned on the scale represented for each dimension. Today, Hofstede’s cultural dimensions are the most comprehensive framework of cultural values (Schwartz, 1999). According to Sivakumar and Nakata (2001), the cultural framework of Hofstede has gained the greatest attention from business scholars in recent years, and is well established in international researches. This had a number of reasons, including limited availability of alternatives, convenience, popularity, and simply habit. It can be partly credited to its large international sample, and

---

\(^{11}\) This name was introduced by Hofstede and was only found in his works.
to the fact that Hofstede was the first one, for its time, to employ relatively advanced research designs and statistical analysis tools (Taras et al. 2009). Hofstede’s framework of cultural dimensions was applied in the present research.

1.3 Levels of culture: typology of national-level vs. individual-level culture

Beyond its components, culture could be conceptualized based on its levels; in other words, we have the option of cutting the “culture cake” by level. Although culture (and its components) is present and functions in all social entities (e.g. nation, group, sub-group, individual), its roles differ based on the orientation level. Comparing culture-related studies regarding levels of analyses, three different orientation levels could be found: some studies focus on culture as collective, social phenomena related to different countries, geographical areas and ethnical groups (e.g. Hofstede, 1984). This orientation — national-level or macro-level — is based on similarities due to historical, religious, lingual or national backgrounds (Bouchet, 1995); it cannot, therefore, explain the reasons behind many culture-related phenomena (e.g. multilingual countries). There are other studies that focus on the sub-culture level considering selected social groups (e.g.

---

12 Hofstede has become known as one of the leading scholars of culture among the business academic community. Starting in the 1960’s, he and his colleagues conducted two rounds of surveys across the IBM Company’s worldwide offices. Through the lengthy analysis process, Hofstede found four cultural dimensions, which was added later and in the last version (2008) of his works increased to seven. Based on a review, 51.2% of the models applied in cross-cultural studies contain unique dimensions, such as universal–particular or affective–neutral in the model of Trompenaars (1993), hedonism and benevolence in the model of Schwartz (1994), and determinism and fate in the model offered by Maznevski and Di Stefano (1995). However, 97.5% of all reviewed measures contain at least some dimensions that are conceptually similar to those introduced by Hofstede (Taras et al., 2009).

13 Note that the present study is focused on cultural values (dimensions) as the only interested component.

14 A subculture is a group of people with a culture (whether distinct or hidden) which differentiates them from the larger culture to which they belong.
Parsons, 1977) to find better explanations for social realities as different life-styles or consumption patterns (e.g. Schouten and McAlexander, 1995).

As the final group, we have individual-level — micro-level— orientation which concentrates on the influences of culture on individual behaviors. This approach assumes that at least part of what culture is can be found at each individual as articulated mental representations. Of course, in this view all personal characteristics and behaviors cannot be traced back to culture; still it could be considered among influential factors for several attitudinal and behavioral elements (see Mennicken, 2000; Keller, 1982). Based on the micro-level orientation, culture is defined as a background phenomenon that is unconsciously adopted or internalized, and involves conforming patterns of thinking, feeling and behaving (Kroeber-Riel et al., 2009). Thus, there are theoretical reasons to expect national-level and individual-level cultures to be conceptually related (Schwartz, 1990). Also a review on the studies (e.g., Geertz, 1975; Markus, 1977; Markus and Kitayama, 1991; Marsella, et al., 1985; Schwartz, 1990; Shweder et al., 1984; Triandis et al., 1985, 1990) shows that most researchers have based their works on the fact that culture does shape attitudes, values, and concepts of individuals which, in turn, would undoubtedly affect their behaviors. As an example, Triandis (1995), introducing “subjective culture” as a synonym for individual-level culture in psychology, argues that many of the more basic cultural syndromes such as beliefs, norms, and values which manifest themselves as macro cultural dimensions have an individual analogue. According to Triandis (1995), we can link national (macro-level) and individual (micro-level) culture (also cultural dimensions as a component), since they are significantly correlated.

1.4 Focus on Individual-level culture: boundaries of the concept

The individual-level (micro-level) culture, internalized in each person, is different from related concepts and needs to be clarified. The concept is not personality. Although both personality and micro-level culture are based on individual differences in tendencies, feelings, actions and patterns of thoughts, micro-level culture, as declared, is limited to
relatively small number of universal traits of a person, which could have several variations across cultures and can be more homogenous within cultures. In other words, individual-level culture is defined as a conglomeration of attributes shared with others, and is also across generations rather stable (Matsumoto and Juang, 2004). Furthermore, it functions as a “social label” and depicts the programmed patterns each person has learned and became accustomed to (Matsumoto and Juang, 2004, p.15); it reinforces the behaviors that influence individuals; these behaviors then feedback and reflect onto the social label of culture, making it more visible, strong and accepted. Thus, we could say it functions as a cycle between social label and individual behaviors (Matsumoto and Juang, 2004); it could be even called a mirror among individual and social behaviors. But personality does not share commonality with social labeling and cyclical natures of culture.

Besides, personality is based on traits that are partly inherited and partly learned, while individual’s culture is totally learned, which means it is modified by the influence of collective programming, as well as by unique personal experiences (Hofstede et al., 2010; de Mooij, 2004; Church and Lonner, 1998). Therefore the individual-level culture, focused in this study, does not equal personality and needs to be known and analyzed separately.

Furthermore, the individual-level culture is not the individual’s nature, which is all universal and inherited; conversely to human nature, culture is not inherited and is not universal. Although the nature has given all of us so many in common, culture modifies them (Hofstede et al., 2010), makes them specific to a group (macro-level culture). Figure1 presents a summary of the explanations.

In fact, the borders between culture, human nature and personality are a matter of discussion among social scientists (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 6).
Finally, we should notice that individual-level culture is not lifestyle. Although lifestyle may be a useful within-country criterion, according to (de Mooij, 2004, p. 124) “it is less applicable for comparison across cultures since lifestyles are country-specific”. Increasing evidences prove that culture overrides lifestyle and it has continuing impacts on lifestyles of individuals (e.g., Tai and Tam, 1997; Eshqi and Sheth, 1985). Thus to understand behaviors of individuals by looking through their cultures, it is necessary to go beyond their lifestyle, distinguish more fundamental elements (de Mooij, 2011), and track their variations among them.

1.5 Dimensions at different levels: approaches in measurement and analysis

Prior to describe the interested cultural dimensions at individual-level, we need to clarify the selected measurement and analysis approaches in measuring the dimensions; this point

---

16 Adapted from: Hofstede et al. (2010).

17 In other words, elements that could categorize individuals into different groups based on common consequential behaviors.
had a critical role in our interpretation and conceptualization. There are two different approaches in measurement and analysis of cultural dimensions:

1.5.1 Measurement of cultural dimensions

- National-level measurement approach

The approach, which had its springboard with Triandis (1972), and then Hofstede (1980, 1984), measured cultural dimensions at the national (country, societal) level by aggregating matched responses of the participants (i.e. respondents are usually selected from employees of international companies or comparable groups from dozens of countries) and assumed less diversity within the society entities, so that each culture (or country) represented one observation in the analysis (Linville and Jones, 1980), with no attention to intra-country variations. The average priorities attributed to different values by respondents, selected from each culture, are assumed to reflect their central thrust of their shared concerns and point to the underlying, common cultural values (Schwartz, 1999); therefore it is clear to measure and analyze (i.e. simply measured by aggregating responses and measuring average value and analyzed by generalizing results for all those with same nationality). Many researchers have used national-level correlations to explain people’s behaviors or characteristics (e.g. Aaker, 2000; Hofstede, 1980; Lee, 2000; Leung, 1989; Lynn et al., 1993; Triandis 1995) and hundreds of empirical researches have trusted the approach for comparing nations. It is easily interpreted due the rankings and therefore best designed for macro-level analytical sciences. Still, this measurement approach is inconvenient because of the troubles in data gathering from dozens of countries and is seldom repeated (Hofstede, 2001). So the impacts of cultural and social changes or trends would be neglected (Schaffer and Riodan, 2003). Not to forget the generality when interpreting the results (e.g. assuming all Germans as individualists), perception errs (e.g. stereotyping, hallo effects or selective perceptions). Furthermore, the use of one company
IBM in data collection has been the focus of many criticisms of Hofstede’s country scores (McCoy, 2003). However, Hofstede and others have later conceded that is likely to be a great deal of intra-culture variation in cultural values which is not addressed through such methodology. Hofstede (2001) stated that pattern of associations (i.e. related characteristics) for values at the national-level can be different from those at the individual-level. It has been observed that individuals within a country show as much heterogeneity of cultural dimensions as countries do (Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz and Bilsky, 1990). Thus, the original country-level dimensions would cause an ecological fallacy, when applied to study individual behaviors; in other words the ecological or country-level relationships are interpreted as if they are applied to individuals (Chelminski and Coulter, 2007; Hofstede, 2001). Especially in marketing and consumer behavior studies, it is not logical to generalize the impacts of internal influencers on every consumer segment within a society. This is almost similar to one of the classical mistakes in statistics: too much attention to the sample means. Therefore using correlations and scales of cultural dimensions at national-level to interpret and compare individual behavior can lead to misinterpretations (also see Bathaee, 2011 a).

- **Individual-level measurement approach**

The modern, substitute approach labeled individual-level measurement of cultural dimensions, is based on the micro-level orientation toward culture. Since in this approach culture is viewed as fragmented across groups and individuals, it is inconsistent across its manifestations (Martin, 1992). Culture manifestations are depicted as psychological traits carried by the individuals, and thus may vary considerably even among those within close geographic proximity to one another and is partly a product of unique personal experience. This shift from macro-level to micro-level measurement of cultural dimensions makes studying culture much more complicated and related to psychology; once we acknowledge that people behave as if they use culture strategically (i.e. they adapt their behavior based on their situation), it follows that the cultures into which people are socialized, leave much
opportunity for choice and variation (DiMaggio, 1997) and cultural heterogeneity is declared totally normal. Therefore, aggregating respondents’ scores and calculating sample means does not work anymore to analyze underlying values of micro-level cultures; more complex measurement and analysis techniques would be necessary.

As the first researchers, Triandis and colleagues (1985, 1988) conceptualized and measured one cultural dimension at individual-level and found substantial differences across samples within the same country — in the case of the U.S., even within the same state. Other researchers have attempted to measure the four original Hofstede dimensions (see Dorfman and Howell, 1988), and the fifth Hofstede and Bond dimension (see Robertson and Hoffman, 1999) at the individual-level and developed scales to measure similar dimensions to those obtained using Hofstede's national-level constructs considering deep concepts and meanings behind each dimension.

The measurement approach based on micro-level orientation had a major impact in both cross-cultural and mainstream psychology. For decades, cross-cultural research has documented many differences between cultures. Now it was clear that cross-cultural is not cross-cultural per se; it is generally cross-national and more specifically, cross-city, even cross university and cross-individual. Thus the issue of defining and measuring culture is through the adoption of psychological descriptions, focusing on the subjective elements of culture in each individual. It has undoubtedly aided researchers with the ability to extract meaningful dimensions of psychological variability in cross-cultural (national) works so that differences within cultures, when observed, can be interpreted in terms of functional psychological characteristics (Matsumoto, 1999).

\[^{18}\text{Individualism-collectivism.}\]
Characteristics:
Belongs to anthropology;
Show dimensions of national culture;
Aggregating responses; items are usually weighted;
Comparisons of the mean country scores of matched samples from ten or more countries;
Only shows how the values prevailing in a national society differ from those in another society (i.e. comparison between societies at macro level).

Common misunderstandings:
- Perception errors (e.g. Stereotyping, hallow effects, etc.).

Weaknesses:
- Ecological fallacy;
- Seldom repeated; aging results are not renewed (e.g. Hofstede results belong to 1980 and are not totally valid anymore);
- Results do not reflect cultural and social changes but cultures are supposed to be static (Schaffer and Riordan, 2003);
- Data usually gathered from international organizations and not from ordinary people (e.g. Hofstede gathered all data in a single company IBM).

Strengths:
- Compact, easy to understand ranking for each country;
- Clear measurement system (gathering responses and calculating averages) and levels of analysis (Hofstede and McCrae, 2004);
- Supported by hundreds of empirical researches (Hofstede and McCrae, 2004);
- Best applied by economics, politics and sociology.

(Table continued in the next page)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual-level measurement</th>
<th>Characteristics(^\text{19}):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Belongs to psychology;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Shows dimensions of personality affected by culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cultural dimensions are treated as an individual difference variable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weaknesses:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Could not be generalized to nations or cultures;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Scales need to be adapted; is not yet established in literature;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Results should be analyzed and interpreted with caution; lack of reliable measurement tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strengths:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Helps interpret cultural differences by psychological characteristics (Matsumoto, 1999);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Great potentials for cross-cultural behavioral studies (e.g. marketing);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Easy to plan and perform;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Innovative and needs to be supported through further studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Best applied by psychology, management science and sociology at micro level (i.e. social psychology).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table B-1**: Summary of approaches in measurement of cultural dimensions

Examining cultural dimensions at the individual-psychological level appears to offer great potentials in furthering our knowledge of cross-national behavior and management. It may increase our understanding of the linkage between cultures and subcultures and also enables the examination of whether individuals whose cultural attitudes are different than the dominant culture (e.g. minorities) behave differently than individuals who inhabit cultures that are consistent with their particular attitudes (Culpepper and Watts, 1999). Furthermore, when we accept culture as a psychological characteristic of an individual with great influences on behaviors, it sounds logical to find solutions for behavioral

---

\(^{19}\) See Bathae, (2011 a, b).
changes through cultural adjustments and acculturation. It is also more convenient to design and perform a reliable individual-level measurement of dimensions since it does not need data from dozens of countries\(^\text{20}\), and can be easily planned for a comparison between two countries, subcultures, or groups of individuals. Besides, it is still regarded as innovative approach due to low number of studies and possible initiatives, especially in dynamic sciences as marketing.

However, due to the lack of reliable general questionnaires, measurement tools need to be designed and adapted based on study interests, subject and aims. The tools are best applied in sciences with deep social approaches and micro-level orientations toward culture. A summary of the explained details on the two measurement approaches is presented in Table B-1. Regarding the mentioned benefits of the modern approach, Bochner and Hesketh (1994) strongly suggest using individualized measures of cultural dimensions, especially when culture is an independent variable predicting any individually measured dependent variable — which is applied in this research.

### 1.5.2 Analysis of cultural dimensions

When we follow individual-level measurement approach, the data gathered could be analyzed at two different levels of aggregation: Pan-country and intra country (Craig and Douglas, 2000). Pan-country analysis involves using combined data from all countries being studied, each respondent is considered as a unit of analysis (Chelminski and Coulter, 2007).

Pan-country approach is used to determine whether the hypothesized relationships hold across countries and all individuals. However, statistically significant relationships in pan

---

\(^\text{20}\) As an example, for Hofstede national-level rankings, in total, more than 116,000 responses from 72 countries in 20 languages were collected. His initial analysis was limited to 40 countries who had 50 or more respondents to the survey; later he was able to add three multi-country regions and ten additional individual nations to the dataset (Hofstede, 1980).
country analysis do not necessarily guarantee that relationships remain proved in each country under study; nationality could also play a role.

Pan-country analysis is suggested to be followed by intra-country analysis, within each country separately (see Craig and Douglas, 2000); this is an explorative approach to compare the relationships between countries. In many cross-cultural studies the analyses begin with the pan-country and subsequently intra-country analysis is performed. In other words, pan country analysis focus on the similarities between individuals, whereas intra-country analysis points to the differences and tries to find the reasons hidden in culture. A summary of the mentioned characteristics is presented in table B-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis level</th>
<th>Characteristics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pan-country level | - Assesses whether a phenomenon or relationship can be found which holds across all individuals from different countries; mainly applied to support hypotheses;  
- Provides evidence that cultural dimensions at individual-level have influence on behavior (or prove a relation in between) of all respondents, no matter which nationality;  
- Focuses on the similarities among cultures and individuals. |
| Intra-country level | - Compare how a phenomenon or relationship exists or influences individuals from different countries; mainly interested in explorative, innovative studies;  
- Examines the consistency of measures and their properties across countries;  
- Focuses on the differences among cultures and individuals. |

Table B-2: Classifications of cultural values analysis

---

21 Sources: Craig and Douglas (2000); Chelminski and Coulter (2007).
We should always keep in mind that both methods (pan and intra-country) compare only the culture internalized by individuals selected as respondents, and not the dominant general culture within society; for comparing society or national cultures the only option is still national-level measurement.

1.6  Hofstede’s dimensional model: framework of independent variables

Hofstede (1980, 1984) suggested a set of dimensions that is known as one of the best, and was proved to be among the most valid options; the ability of his framework to capture more than the one well-known dimension — individualism-collectivism — contributed to its popularity (Sivakumar and Nakata, 2001). The suggested model was selected as the base of cultural dimensions in the present study, for several reasons:

Hofstede proposed a model that can be used and adapted for analysis of consumption data — which is interested in this research. According to de Mooij (2004), most studies interested in cultural dimensions in marketing and advertising context have utilized Hofstede’s model and dimensions. Due to the limitation to five (or seven in 2008 version) dimensions, the model has relatively little overlap and significant coverage in most countries of the world; “Hofstede’s dimensions have become key variables or explanatory features in a wide variety of researches” (de Mooij, 2004, p. 42).

The Hofstede’s model is among the few options that define values based on the “desired” concept (see Bathaee, 2011 b). The questions are designed by asking about behavioral preferences and the preferred actual state of being (and not the ideals or desirable values); they are near to real life situations, are less abstract, and relate to actual preferences and behaviors which is more logical and interested in marketing researches (de Mooij, 2011).

At national-level of analysis, Hofstede’s scale proves more consistency than other scales;

---

22 Kirkman et al.’s (2006) study reported that of 64 papers reviewed, where cultural values were examined at the individual level, only 12 papers explored values other than individualism-collectivism.

23 “The models by Hofstede and Schwartz are the only models that provide country scores that can be used for analysis of consumption data” (de Mooij, 2004, p. 39).
“together with national wealth, Hofstede’s dimensions can explain more than half of the differences in consumer behavior” (de Mooij, 2004, p. 41). Furthermore, several replications of Hofstede’s model on varied matched or non-matched samples in different fields prove his data could be still known valid (de Mooij, 2004). Sondergaard (1994; cited in: de Mooij, 2004, p. 36) showed that the differences predicted by Hofstede’s dimensions in 1980s were largely confirmed. There are remarkably few non-confirmations. Hofstede (2001) described over 200 external comparative studies, based on his model, that have supported his indices. The model could be named as the most robust framework and is increasingly used as a conceptual structure outside the original setting; the dimensions could classify and declare cultural impacts on various topics.

Despite all the strengths declared, investigations of the psychometric properties of Hofstede’s scales have few shortcomings (e.g., McSweeney, 2002; Spector et al., 2001). The fact that the measures are primarily for aggregate, or national-level analysis, is among its greatest weaknesses; thus, his original scale is not appropriate for individual-level analysis (Bond, 2002). However, recent psychological, social and marketing studies proved that Hofstede’s dimensions could, and need to, be adapted for individual-level analysis and this problem could be solved.

Furthermore, the dimensional model was developed for organizational behavior; finding “the relationship between cultural dimensions and consumer behavior needs some additional analytical skills” (de Mooij, 2004, p. 45). Separated adaptations to purchase-consumption context are critical. Besides, the assumption of uni-dimensionality was among the main weaknesses of his scale (Gouveia et al., 2003); this weakness was recently suggested by Hofstede et al. (2010) to be removed in individual-level analyses (also see Bathae, 2011 b).

Considering the mentioned pros and cons, Hofstede’s model of cultural dimensions was decided to be the best choice for fundament of the present research; evaluations proved the

---

24 The commonly used measures to compare national wealth are GDP and GNP (de Mooij, 2004).
25 This is also the solution we have found in the present research.
26 The implicit adaptations of the model to consumer behaviors are the basis of this research.
27 Which is followed in this study.
power of his structure regarding our subject and purpose. The second expansion of Hofstede’s model, presented in 2008 — which includes long-term orientation and restraint — was selected as the base structure of the present research. Hofstede’s model contains the following dimensions, each reviewed later in details:

- **Individualism and collectivism** is based on the degree to which individuals are supposed to look after themselves or remain integrated into groups, usually around the family (Hofstede, 1991).

- **Masculinity-femininity** concentrates on the “conception of self” in respect to “ego enhancement” compared to “harmony enhancement” interests (Hofstede, 1998, p.18). It studies the significance of status, power, success, competitiveness, and things, compared to the role of helping others, preserving the environment, quality of life and not drawing attention to oneself in personal decision makings (Hofstede, 1998).

- **Uncertainty avoidance** addresses the manner in which a society faces uncertainty and is defined as the extent to which a person “feels threatened by uncertain or unknown situations” (Hofstede, 2001, p.161).

- **Power distance** considers the general human inequality in areas such as prestige, wealth, power, social status, and the class system. The level of “expectation and acceptance of unequally distributed power” is focused by this dimension (Hofstede 2001, p. 98).

- **Time orientation** is focused on the orientation toward the future and compares it to the orientation toward the present and the past in decision making processes (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 239).

- **Indulgence-restraint** stands for the tendency to allow free gratification of desires, enjoying life and having fun, compared to the conviction that such gratification needs to be controlled and regulated by strict norms (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 281).
1.7 Cultural dimensions, behaviors and context

One relevant point about cultural dimensions — which could be emphasized through individual-level approach — is context specification. Mowday and Sutton (1993, p. 198) characterize context as “stimuli and phenomena that surround, and thus exist, in the environment external to the individual, most often at a different level of analysis”. Thus, context could be described as consisting of constraints versus opportunities for behavior; it may serve as a main effect, or interact with personal variables to affect behaviors (Johns, 2006).

According to Johns (2006), context affects, both, subtle and powerful on individual behaviors; a small change in context could often matter greatly. Context could also change the causal direction between key variables in social studies. On the other hand, according to McCrae et al. (1998; cited in: Matsumoto and Juang, 2004, p. 331) culture is “undeniably relevant in the development of characteristics and adaptations that guide the expression of personality in thoughts, feelings, and behaviors”. Culture defines context to us and provides differential meanings to its components — including who is involved, what is happening, where it is occurring and the like — and therefore plays a substantial role in shaping behavioral manifestations and actions that individual will have, to achieve goals (Matsumoto and Juang, 2004). In other words, context and culture are two inseparable concepts, and each could have considerable direct or indirect influences on the other. Although the significant relation between context and culture has be underappreciated in many studies, based on Johns (2006) context is considered among the main study variables in many of the recent cultural studies. Also Matsumoto and Juang (2004) suggest the concept of temporary culture, which considers situational factors and is recently added to the interested cultural milieus.

Knowing that cultural dimensions are context-specific, one may have great dimensional tendencies at home or with close friends, and change his behaviors or interests to the
opposite at work or purchase situation\textsuperscript{28} (Matsumoto and Juang, 2004); therefore, the concept needs to be limited in advance.

One important point is that context in the modern approach can refer to several concepts: body or brain processes (e.g. integration stages\textsuperscript{29}, or consciousness), psychological processes (e.g. meta-cognitive feelings\textsuperscript{30}), immediate physical surrounding, task context (e.g. purchase situation), social context (e.g. social group or other people around\textsuperscript{31}), phase of life (e.g. seniority), socio-cultural environment (e.g. cultural values\textsuperscript{32}) or even time (e.g. temporal situation\textsuperscript{33}) could serve as context (Mesquita et al., 2010; van de Vijver and Matsumoto, 2011). In other words, context is no more limited to the physical environment; it is in our minds.

Apart from cultural dimensions, a recent thinking suggests that behavioral patterns of individuals develop over time and are subject to contextual influences (e.g. Srivastava et al., 2003). Following this approach, we believe that mental states and behaviors are not entities but events constructed out of a more basic set of processes; processes, unlike entities, are shaped by context (Gendron and Barrett, 2009). Thus, “human behaviors and mental events emerge from moment-by-moment interaction with the environment rather than proceeding in autonomous, context-free fashion” (Mesquita et al., 2010, p.5). Clearly both cognition and emotion are highly context sensitive (Mesquita et al., 2010) and so

\textsuperscript{28} This point motivates researchers to design new studies, concentrate on different situations and gives a reason for rejecting to apply research instruments already prepared, by Hofstede or others — which are mainly focused on organizational behaviors; also in this research, the necessity of developing a context-based measurement instrument was felt.

\textsuperscript{29} Sporns (2010).

\textsuperscript{30} It means subjective experiences that arise from things coming to mind when a person is processing new information (Schwarz, 2010). People usually assume that any though or feeling that come to mind while thinking about something else is a source of information, (Higgins, 1998); they pay attention to it in their decision making processes.

\textsuperscript{31} Mesquita (2010), Bouton (2010).

\textsuperscript{32} Kitayama and Imada(2010).

\textsuperscript{33} Bouton (2010).
behavioral studies without including contextual elements would not function. Thus, in our study — which is focused on purchase-consumption context — not only the cultural dimensions internalized in each consumer, but also his (her) purchase-consumption behaviors are conceptualized to be context-specific. Including contextual factors in a study will enhance its validity and help rule out the influences of biases and inequivalences in the research and could lead to improved evaluations of results (van de Vijver and Matsumoto, 2011). It is obvious that as a researcher, we cannot focus on all of the named aspects of context. However, paying attention to one or more items in the research could be possible and may offer enhanced explanations for the findings; our interested contextual elements are introduced:

**1.7.1 Task as a contextual element**

Task or the nature of the decision an individual is supposed to make has, in several ways, influences on his behaviors and intentions. Based on Landman (1993) justifiability, desirability, importance, number of viable options, availability of information, and characteristics of decision outcomes could be named among context-specific issues related to the a task which could all have influences on behavior.

Considering the substantial effect of task as a contextual element, the present research is limited to a single decision-making task context; this way no differences could be observed and a single predefined scenario is followed in the study. Reporting results for consumers within a single simulated task context could help the researcher focus on the role of other interested factors.

**1.7.2 Nationality as a contextual element**

Nationality, as an explicit indicator of physical surrounding, and an implicit indicator of socio-cultural context, was selected to be focused in this research; it could separate

---

34 Purchase of product-service in restaurant.
individuals into groups based on both (implicit and explicit) aspects of context. Several studies — related to cultural influences on emotional, cognitive and behavioral variables of consumers (e.g. Hofstede et al., 2010; de Mooij, 2004, 2010; Mesquita et al., 2010) in different situations (e.g. pre-purchase, consumption, post-purchase) — described and proved the role of nationality in cultural differences (also see Bathaee, 2011a). Thus, the factor was included in our study as a single influential contextual element.

1.7.3 Demographic profile as a contextual element

As previously declared, based on the modern approach toward context, demographic profile of individuals (e.g. age and gender) could be studied as contextual elements; a focus on the new approach shows several variations in the meaning. According to Landman (1993, p. 156) although gender could be regarded as a personal and internal factor (not contextual) and is a biological matter, still: “it is inevitably a social construction as well” which “has taken on at least some of the coloring assigned it by one’s social norms — in the eyes of the world, and often in the eyes of the self too”. The same could be applied to other factors such as age, which is also interested in the present research. In other words, the socio-cultural environment constructs individual’s approach toward his gender and age, which would later influence his behaviors and also decisions, since cognition (and emotion) of individuals are influenced by their approach toward their demographic characteristics. According to Smith and Collins (2010, p. 140) “even when we try to free up our cognition from the constraints of the immediate situation, cognition is still shaped by elements of our social context: our personal self-identities (gender, occupation, nationality, etc.)”. Thinking oneself as a member of a group (e.g. by age or gender) makes a difference in the way one thinks and acts (Smith and Collins, 2010). In other words, our behaviors could be dependent to the way one regards his own demographic profile; this own “regard” is context-specific. We believe that even the way we “feel” about our age and gender could be context-specific.
The Influences of age on emotions have been also confirmed (see Mesquita, 2010). We have included the demographic profile (age and gender) among our interested contextual elements; the effects of these contextual elements on purchase-consumption behaviors are focused. The general association between demographic profile of a consumer, and his (her) internalized cultural dimensions are measured and reported; still, no complementary hypothesis were developed since the subject deserves further studies on sociology and psychology of age and gender — which is not the interested field of study. Also, the hypotheses on the demographic effects on consumer behaviors are, therefore, only focused on the existence (and not the direction) of effects.

1.8 Positioning

In this chapter, the concept of culture was presented; introducing cultural dimensions among elements of the study, two approaches in measurement — individual-level and national-level — and analysis — pan-country and intra-country — of dimensions are explained. In the present research, the Individual-level approach is focused; also Hofstede’s dimensional framework (2008 version) with seven separate dimensions is the base model of independent variables. Regarding the critical role of context in formation of both cultural and consumer-behavioral dimensions, three contextual factors (nationality, age and gender) are decided to be studies as other independent variables; the study is confined to a selected scenario-based task in purchase-consumption situation. Following the introduction to the conceptual boundaries in this chapter, we shift the selected individual-level cultural dimensions (Hofstede’s framework) to our interested task context, namely purchase-consumption situation. Thus, each dimension is conceptualized in the marketing world, and its possible (or confirmed) direct effects on consumer behaviors are revealed.
2. Cultural dimensions in purchase-consumption context: direct Effects

Cultural dimension play undeniable roles in almost all domains of management because they influence choice; they influence how consumers process information (Schmitt et al., 1994). In some domains, like marketing, this role may be complicated, fine still substantial. In fact national wealth and income level could be regarded among the most influential variables (De Mooij, 2004); also dozens of variables rooted in disciplines as economics, sociology and ecology are influential in attitudinal or behavioral reactions by consumers. Yet, when analyzing consumer decisions and reactions, most ways end to psychological traits of consumers, where cultural dimensions are magnificent players. How people behave and what motivates them is largely a matter of culture. How they relate to each other in buying process, whether their decisions are individual or group decisions, how their emotions drive market choices are among all influenced by the culture to which they belong. As the result, theories of consumer behavior are not culture-free (De Mooij, 1998).

Numerous studies (e.g., McCort and Malhotra, 1993; Aaker and Schmitt, 1997; McCracken, 1988) followed the psychological and anthropological approaches to empirically confirm the direct effects of cultural dimensions, at national-level, on mental processes; other researchers (e.g., Taylor et al., 1997; Aaker and Maheswaran, 1997; Lee and Green, 1991) examined the effects of culture on consumers, in respect to affective responses and reactions. Behavioral effects of cultural dimensions, at national-level, was among the most interested subjects; significant evidences based on cross-cultural studies (e.g., Arnould, 1989; Stewart, 1985; Dawar et al., 1996; Shim and Gehrt 1996; Sood and Nasu, 1995) proved the role cultural dimensions, at national-level, could play in different manifestations of consumer-purchase behavior. Still, the individual-level culture was

---

35 There might be some “culture-free” theories in economics, marketing and consumer-behavior; theories that are defined to be general and the role of situational or cultural factors are ignored. But considering the undeniable influence of culture in human studies, these theories could be revised, or at least re-examined, bringing culture into attention.
rather ignored. We could hardly find relevant studies focused on the impacts of individual-level culture on consumer purchase behaviors. Accepting that each individual is the carrier of culture — it is learned and formed through the society and environment — and considering the influences of context in culture — as explained, in this study purchase-consumption context — we approve that some mental processes (e.g., cognition, perception, memory, attribution, information processing and decision making), affective responses (e.g., emotions, feelings, and moods), and social behaviors (or physical actions) of a consumer could be influenced by his internalized culture. These mental processes will systematically vary as a function of the manner in which the self is culturally constituted (Semin and Zwier, 1997). Thus, we suggest that the internalized culture at individual-level (consumer culture) would be shifted based on the context, and will later directly affect the overt behaviors of consumers (e.g., product acquisition, usage, shopping and buying behavior, complaining behavior, brand loyalty and diffusion of innovations).

In this chapter, we discuss the proposed shift of each dimension suggested by Hofstede, due to the context (purchase-consumption); thus, theoretical aspect of each dimension is introduced declaring the informative backgrounds. In addition, the empirical context-based aspects, confirmed or postulated in previous valid studies are added to draw a complete picture of each dimension — now shifted into purchase context.

2.1 Individualism and collectivism (IND and COL)

2.1.1 Theoretical aspects: background and definition

Individualism-collectivism was Hofstede’s interpretation of a broad survey written by a sociologist (Alex Inkeles) and a psychologist (David Levinson). Inkeles and Levinson

---

Although some indirect effects are also investigated and found plausible in previous studies (see Bathaeae, 2011b), the present research is focused on the direct effects of cultural dimensions on consumer-purchase behaviors.
(1969), found the concept of self among the main three common basic problems worldwide which could have great consequences for the functioning of individuals and societies. The “self” in the social processes and environments is what individualism and collectivism are dealing with and the way people experience “the self” differs with culture (Markus and Kitayama, 1991). The dimension points to the solution a society, or an individual, has found for a universal dilemma\(^\text{37}\): finding the “desirable strength” of the relationships among each individual and groups with which he or she identifies. Hence, the dimension refers to the degree to which a culture encourages, fosters, facilitates and values the needs and wishes of an individual over those of a group (Matsumoto and Juang, 2004).

According to Hofstede et al. (2010) analyses have confirmed that a person can score either high on both individualist and collectivist, high on one dimension and low on the other, or low on both. So when we compare individuals (and not countries), individualism and collectivism should be treated as two separate dimensions; level of analysis plays a decisive role here.

Since individualism-collectivism — as a single dimension in macro-level studies — is probably the most-interested\(^\text{38}\), well-known\(^\text{39}\) and most-defined cultural dimension, we categorized the relevant concepts and facets to draw a rather complete picture.

---

\(^{37}\) It is called dilemma since each option has its own positive and negative sides; It is a choice between, almost, undesirable alternatives and there would be no possibility for a person to escape from this choice.

\(^{38}\) Individualism-collectivism, conversely to some other dimensions such as masculinity, could divide the world map into the wealthy and the poor; at country-level it was proved to correlate significantly with national wealth (Hofstede, 1998); this could be one reason for more interest in this dimension.

\(^{39}\) The reason could be that, according to Hofstede et al. (2010), individualist societies and people, not only practice individualism but also consider it superior to other dimensions or forms of mental software. For example most Americans (which have the highest number of cross-cultural studies) feel that individualism is at the root of their country’s greatness.
2.1.1.1 In-group and out-group

One of the most meaningful (especially for individual-level studies) declarations for the individualism and collectivism refers to the concept labeled by Sumner (1906; cited in: Park and Rothbat, 1982) which was later confirmed by other researchers\(^{40}\): the concept of *in-group* and *out-group*. Triandis defines in-group as “groups of individuals about whose welfare a person is concerned, with whom that person is willing to cooperate without demanding equitable returns, and separation from which leads to anxiety” (Triandis, 1995, p. 9). Individualism and collectivism are, thus, related to differences in self-in-group versus self-out-group relationships (Triandis et al., 1988). In-group relationships are characterized by some degree of familiarity, intimacy and trust (as among family members, close friends, etc.), whereas out-group relationships are just the opposite and lack the named characteristics. According to Matsumoto and Juang (2004), high levels of individualism have negative consequences for commitments to in-group; in exchange for it, the number of groups to which individuals simply belong (out-groups) could be greater. Collectivistic expect their in-group to look after them, and in exchange, feel they owe loyalty to the group.

2.1.1.2 Exclusionism and universalism

To declare individualism and collectivism, Hofstede et al. (2010) refer to the concepts of exclusionism and universalism; a dimension labeled by Minkov\(^{41}\) (2007) for the first time. Exclusionism is defined as the cultural tendency to treat people on the basis of their group affiliation and to reserve favors, services, privileges all for the family, friends, and in-

\(^{40}\) Examples are Triandis et al. (1988), Matsumoto and Juang (2004), Hofstede et al. (2010) and de Mooij (2011).

\(^{41}\) Minkov is a co-author of the book “cultures and organizations, software of the mind” which is here named as a main source and two of his proposed cultural dimensions are added in Hofstede’s new version of cultural value survey (VSM or value survey model 2008).
group members. In other words, exclusionism, which implicitly means differing value standards for in-group and out-group members, is more practiced among collectivists. Universalism refers to the opposite cultural tendency and is focused on treating people primarily on the basis of who they are as individuals, and disregarding group membership. Hofstede et al. (2010). The two concepts are significantly related to the in-group and out-group concepts, and are therefore defined as characteristics of individualists and collectivists (see Hofstede et al., 2010, pp. 98-99). People with high individualistic tendency, are more Universalists than those with collectivistic tendency, which are more exclusionists. This would implicitly confirm “differing value standards”, for in-group and out-group members, is more practiced among collectivists, whereas “same value standards” are supposed to apply for everyone — universalism — among individualists.

2.1.1.3 Behavioral characteristics

In addition, researchers have compared the characteristics of individualistic and collectivistic cultures to better declare the differences. Hofstede et al. (2010) explain that while within collectivistic society personal opinion does not exist and opinions are predetermined by the group, in individualistic societies even children are encouraged to develop opinions of their own, otherwise they are considered to have a weak character. Besides, according to Matsumoto and Juang (2004), individualism points to the need to be unique, autonomous and in the first position, whereas collectivism refers to the need for belonging to a group and affiliation by other group members. Collectivism also indicates to the need for (or even interest in) suppression of own feelings, thoughts, interests or behaviors, and downplaying interpersonal differences to keep coordination and maintain

---

42 According to Hofstede et al. (2010) Iran is among countries with high exclusionism and the culture is more hostile to out-group members.

43 “The Minkov’s dimension of exclusionism versus universalism turned out to be strongly negatively correlated with Hofstede’s dimension of IDV (individualism-collectivism)” (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 99).
harmony; consensus-building, moderation, conformity to group norms and sanctions for nonconformity are among main associations of the dimension. Power of the group is what leads collectivists in most decisions; but for individualists, neither practically nor psychologically, is the healthy person supposed to be dependent on the group (Hofstede et al., 2010). Whereas in highly individualistic cultures people want consistency between their attitude and behaviors, in highly collectivistic cultures situational factors can have great influences and the discrepancy on attitudes and behaviors is likely larger (de Mooij, 2011).

Based on the above theoretical details, in this research individualism is interpreted as *focus on the priority of self and the emphasis of individual needs, wishes, desires and values, over that of others*. Furthermore the following domains have been selected as the most appropriate, based on the definition and the core element — independency of individuals — of individualism (see also Appendix 1):

- Priority of self and self sufficiency
- Independence
- Priority of personal goals and plans
- Importance of privacy

Collectivism is interpreted as *focus on the two concepts of in-group and out-group*. For collectivism, the core element is the importance of group mutual obligations that binds the members together. Based on this interpretation, the main interested domains for this dimension are as follows (see also Appendix 1):

- Importance of harmony and coordination with others
- The duties one has toward other group members; feeling responsible toward others
- Attention to suggestions and advices of in-group members
Note that according to Hofstede et al., (2010) the vast majority of people in our world live in societies in which the interest of group prevails over that of the individual\textsuperscript{44}. However few researches have focused on this dimension and, compared to individualism, a lack of literature and empirical researches is obvious.

\subsection*{2.1.2 Empirical aspects: direct effects on consumer behavior}

The main direct effects of individualism and collectivism on consumer behaviors, all confirmed in previous studies, are summarized as follows:

- Purchase and consumption, similar to any other behaviors, are driven by needs, motives and drives which could be seen as cognitive psychological concepts that steer behaviors and cannot be viewed as purely internal; they are, more or less, strongly related to social environments (de Mooij, 2011). For example, the motivation to seek pleasure, enjoyment and convenience in life, which are characteristics of high-individualism cultures, could be reflected in many aspects of consumer behavior such as “fun shopping” (de Mooij, 2011, p. 48). Nicholls et al. (2000) empirically supported this effect; they showed Chileans (with high–collectivism) go for shopping specific items and plan to buy in advance, whereas Americans (with high-individualism) are more recreational shoppers.

- The dimension has direct effects on consumers’ emotions, and later their behaviors. “Emotions are affective responses that are learned; this aspect makes them culture-bound” (de Mooij, 2011, p. 172). Furthermore, how people express their emotions and how they judge the expression are all learned behaviors (de Mooij, 2011). Although some elements of emotions are universal, others differ cross culturally (Mesquite and Frijda, 1992, cited in: de Mooij, 2011). For example, higher levels of individualism could result in more “ego-focused” emotions (e.g., anger and pride), whereas high

\textsuperscript{44} Based on this fact, an instrument validated in collectivistic cultures would be interested by researchers; collectivism was therefore included in our survey. This way, both individualist- and collectivist mindsets could be analyzed prior to measuring followed cultural influences on consumer behaviors.
collectivism could cause for more “other-focused” emotions (e.g., sympathy and shame) which could all have their impacts on purchase decision makings, attention to advertising and evaluation of choices after the purchase (de Mooij, 2011). When it comes to consumer psychology, there is a lack of empirical comparative materials, but cross-cultural scientists postulate that ego-focused emotions would, for example, end in higher rates of impulsive, recreational and hedonic purchases while other-focused emotions could increase the consumer interest in brand consciousness, and the influence of reference-group on evaluation and selection of products.

- In respect to the importance of consumer psychology in decision making and behaviors, we need to declare another related concept, namely face; it could play a main role in our story, especially within collectivistic cultures. According to Hofstede et al. (2010) “face” describes the proper relationship with one’s social environment, which is as essential to a collectivist as the front part of his head. Thus, it could be considered in many purchase and consumption decisions within collectivist cultures. However, there is a lack of empirical material in respect to the importance of “face keeping” for consumers; it is usually included among theoretical explanations and behavioral arguments. The counterpart for this concept is “self-respect” and is related to individualists; it simply means: being as you are and act as you want.

- Definition of in-group and out-group — which is named by researchers as the main concepts related to individualism and collectivism — has also impacts on consumer behavior. When collectivism is at higher levels, the distinction between in-group and out-group is sharper, which could cause in deeper interaction between group members (de Mooij, 2004), decrease their freedom to decide (Oyserman et al., 2002), strengthen

---

45 To keep the face, one consumer may decide for a brand or product, spread word of mouth for it, switch to another product option or market, choose another post-purchase behavior style, or any other possible detail related to consumer behavior, instead of his own. It functions exactly similar to wearing a mask and changing your attitudes, values, emotions and behavior to another individual, simply to gain respect of others.

46 Examples are Triandis (1995), Matsumoto and Juang (2004), and Hofstede et al. (2010).
the role of social norms over unique tastes and beliefs (Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey, 1988), and ask for high conformity in product-brand selections (e.g., Vuitton) just because “everyone has it”. As an example, Thomas, (2002), demonstrated that in Japan, one in three women and one in six men own a Vuitton (branded luxury products), and teenager girls want this brand because just because “everyone has it”.

- Persons in countries with high-individualism have also a different lifestyle from those in collectivistic countries. Hofstede et al., (2010) explain that consumers in individualist cultures try to behave based on a self-supporting life style. This life style, which is self-sufficiency oriented, may have impacts on all decision making processes, whereas those with high-collectivist tendencies usually depend on others in most decision-making steps.

- According to de Mooij (2010), the number of influencers in decision making is also directly correlated with individualism and collectivism. Whereas in individualistic cultures (and for high individualistic consumers) few people will influence decision making and product-brand selections — which is an individual activity — in collectivistic cultures (and for collectivistic consumers) the number of influencers that consumers refer to, are more. According to de Mooij (2010), whereas in Individualistic cultures few other people will influence the purchase process, in Japan (with high collectivistic culture), the numbers of decision influencers for housewives usual purchases are an average group of eight.

- Another directly related concept to consumer behavior is the public self-consciousness which is viewed by Hofstede (2001, p. 231) as “the concern about what others think of me” and is related to individualism and collectivism. Whereas in individualistic cultures, this concept implies concern for the self as viewed by unknown others, in collectivistic cultures — where the self only exists in relation to known others — self-consciousness concerns for the way known people think about a person. This

---

47 Of course, the number of influencers and reference group vary not only with cultural dimensions but also with type of product (de Mooij, 2010).

difference could have great impacts on purchase of luxury articles, trendy cloths, public products (drinks, cars, etc) or status-enhancing brands at any income level in high collectivistic cultures. According to Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988) the Japanese rate higher on private self-consciousness than the Koreans; this may also explain the extreme dependence on foreign, status-enhancing brands in Japan, compared to the Korea (de Mooij, 2011). Although both Japan and Korea have collectivistic cultures, Korea belongs to the top 10 in Hofstede’s (2008) rankings of collectivism; Japan has the average position on the individualism-collectivism ranking. The collectivists would be less interested in status-enhancing brands since their public self-consciousness (“the way known others think of a person”) is, rather, uninfluenced by the appearance; the relation with family members or friends would be deep and long-lasting, and it would be differently judged than the relationship with unknown people.

- Individualism and collectivism have also fundamental effects on categorization systems of consumers. Based on psychological analysis, those with high levels of individualism are more “object-focused” and expect the environment to be sensitive to them, whereas high collectivistic cultures (and individuals) are relatively more sensitive to the environment and are “situation (context) centered”\(^\text{49}\). This difference underlies varied thinking styles, namely abstract — high-context — (in East) versus concrete — low-context — (in West), and holistic versus analytical (de Mooij, 2011). This difference is postulated to cause for differences in product-brand recall and recognition, assessment of marketing communications and selection processes or habits among consumers. An empirical example on consumer assessment is that the Chinese place relatively greater emphasis on the concrete product attributes, than on abstract (emotional) aspects, when evaluating products and deciding for purchase (Malhotra and McCort, 2001).

\(^{49}\) Individualism implies that judgment, reasoning, and causal inference are generally oriented toward the person rather than the situation or social context. Consequently, individualism promotes a decontextualized, as opposed to a situation-specific (Oyserman et al., 2002).
Due to the basic differences in mental processes, the sequence of consumer involvement\textsuperscript{50} is also different among cultures (and individuals), which is mainly caused by varied levels of individualism and collectivism. Whereas in individualistic cultures the sequence is “learn-feel-do\textsuperscript{51}” for high-involvement products, and is assumed to be “learn-do-feel\textsuperscript{52}” for low-involvement categories (de Mooij, 2011), Miracle (1987) argued that for the collectivistic cultures (e.g., Japanese, Korean, Chinese) the valid sequence would be “feel-do-learn”\textsuperscript{53}. If this hypothesis proves to be valid then it could demonstrate fundamental differences in advertising influences and purchase behavior between highly-individualistic and collectivistic cultures and consumers.

Individualism\textsuperscript{54} has impacts on the speed of decision making and thus impulsiveness in purchase. According to Kacen and Lee (2002), a comparison of impulsive buying behavior across five Western and Asian countries showed that individualism — which is likely more related to thrill, variety and sensation seeking — is correlated with impulsive purchase behavior among customers, whereas collectivism discourages

\begin{itemize}
\item Based on the FCB (Foote Cone Belding) planning model (which shows that decisions about product purchases can be based on either thinking or feelings, and can be either important or of little importance (involvement) to consumers) presented by Vaughn (1980), there are four sequences in the process by which the advertising can influence consumers: learn-feel-do, feel-learn-do, do-learn-feel, do-feel-learn.

\item i.e., people first should learn something about a product or brand, then form an attitude or feeling, and consequently take action (de Mooij, 2011)

\item i.e., knowledge comes first, after that purchase, and only after having used the product would one form an attitude (de Mooij, 2004; Krugman, 1965)

\item i.e., Building a relationship between the company (product or brand) and the consumer is the first step; it gives him the first positive or negative feeling. After that, action takes place (e.g., visit to the shop to purchase) and only thereafter, the consumer tries to gain information and knowledge which could be critical for the future decisions.

\item Also uncertainty avoidance (de Mooij, 2011).
\end{itemize}
impulse selection as it is practiced among individualistic cultures and encourages control of emotions and behaviors.

- In another study, Steenkamp and Burgess (2002) confirmed the correlation between individualism-collectivism and new product adoption; they calculated the percentages of product adoption in five European countries. Based on this research, belonging to the innovators\textsuperscript{55} group of consumers is correlated with individualism\textsuperscript{56}, whereas belonging to late majority group is correlated with collectivism\textsuperscript{57}.

- Several researchers (e.g., Takada and Jain, 1991) have worked on the product diffusion and defined a new variable directly related to consumer behavior: the coefficient of imitation; it represents the effect of social interaction among prior adopters and potential adopters within a social system. Based on these studies, not only innovativeness, but also the coefficient of imitation is correlated with collectivism. In high collectivistic cultures, imitation will be faster and the need for conformity, importance of in-group members and their acceptance, also frequent interpersonal (word-of-mouth) communication could be the explanation.

- Besides, the need for conformity makes high-collectivists more brand-loyal, compared to high-individualists. Purchasing products that are well-known to the in-group may help decreasing worries about in-group approval of the purchase. On the other hand, trying a new product or brand may satisfy a variety seeking motive and stimulation (Baumgartner and Steenkamp, 1996) which is, based on de Mooij (2004, p. 348-349), an aspect of individualistic cultures: “collectivistic consumers, compared with individualists, are relatively loyal”. Kale (1995; p. 447) argues that “cultures with high individualism are more prone to opt out of unsatisfactory relationships, than low individualistic cultures”; based on this argument, we could expect more frequent

\textsuperscript{55} The first adopters of an innovation.

\textsuperscript{56} And low uncertainty avoidance

\textsuperscript{57} Based on Rogers (1995) study, the innovators were calculated to 2.5\% of each society, and late majority were 34\%.
dissolution of relationships, and alliances, within high individualistic cultures compared with those from low individualistic ones.

- The *media behavior* of people and consumers is also influenced by collectivism and individualism (and other dimensions). According to Voyiadzakis (2001), the more visual orientation of collectivists makes TV more attractive media for them, whereas in high-individualistic cultures newspapers, magazines and print media are more attractive than in collectivistic cultures. How people watch TV — alone, with friends, or family — is also related with this dimension and other cultural dimensions\(^\text{58}\) (Pasquier et al., 1998). Results of a comparative project reported by Livingstone et al. (1999) confirmed the number of children and teenagers having a TV set in their own bedroom are positively related to the level of Individualism in the country.

- Collectivism plays a role in *consumer attitude — and response — to sales promotion and advertising*. According to de Mooij (2011) high-collectivism — which centers on the importance of other group members and the role their attitude plays — would make consumers embarrassed to redeem coupons or respond to sales promotion activities. Due to the importance of “face” among collectivists, they view coupons as a sign of low-class or inability to pay full price and thus would try to avoid benefits of sales promotions. Results of a comparative study, performed in three Asian countries by Huff and Alden (1998), are supportive and confirm the influence of this dimension.

---

\(^{58}\) For example heavy viewing TV is related to masculinity, high power distance and high uncertainty avoidance are related to the number of newspapers that people read per day, and the confidence in the press is related to power distance (de Mooij, 2004).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individualism</th>
<th>Collectivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• High motivation to seek pleasure &amp; convenience; interest in fun-shopping; purchase is recreational.</td>
<td>• Interest in planned shopping; purchase is to gratify needs; less interest in fun-shopping;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Higher rates of “ego-focused” emotions.</td>
<td>• Higher rates of “other-focused” emotions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lower distinction between in-group and out-group.</td>
<td>• In-group, out-group distinction; deep in-group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase freedom in decision making; low interest in conformity.</td>
<td>• Decrease freedom in decision; increase need for conformity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public self-consciousness is in respect to unknown others; less importance for “Face”, more for self-respect when purchasing public-products.</td>
<td>• Public self-consciousness is in respect to unknown others; great importance of “Face” when purchasing public-products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Object-focused” as categorization system;</td>
<td>• “Situation centered” as categorization system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consumer involvement sequence begins with “learning” and Logical reactions</td>
<td>• Consumer involvement sequence begins with “feeling” and emotional reactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faster decision making in purchase situation.</td>
<td>• Slower decision making in purchase situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More “innovators” in new product adoption curve.</td>
<td>• More “late majority” in new product adoption curve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coefficient of imitation is lower.</td>
<td>• Coefficient of imitation is higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More interest in variety seeking.</td>
<td>• More brand loyal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spending is more individual; spending is oriented toward self-care and health.</td>
<td>• Sharing the income with other in-group members is important in spending behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Voice complaint or legal actions are the favorite complaint strategy.</td>
<td>• Negative word-of-mouth is the favorite complaint strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More interested in print media.</td>
<td>• More interested in visual media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attracted to both promotional and advertising</td>
<td>• Less attracted to promotional activities; more interested in advertising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self supporting lifestyle</td>
<td>• More dependence to in-group in decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table B-3:** Effects of individualism-collectivism on consumer behavior
Even in post-purchase stage, the *complaining behavior of consumers* — with varying concept of self, perception of others and levels of social activity — would vary across cultures (and individuals) with respect to individualism and collectivism. There are evidences (e.g., Watkins and Liu, 1996) that prove the influence of individualism on complaining behavior; high-collectivistic consumers are less likely to voice complaints but more likely to engage in negative word-of-mouth, compared with high-individualistic.

There are many studies that proved the utility and benefits of individualism and collectivism in explaining behaviors of individuals in different contexts. Studying communicational (Gudykunst et al., 1992), perceptional (Lee and Boster, 1992) and psychological aspects (Oyserman et al., 2002) of individualism and collectivism would help analyzing their impacts on consumer purchase and post-purchase processes. In general, advertising, branding, consumer behavior and psychology, and any marketing or consumer related subjects could be profoundly affected by individualism and collectivism as cultural dimensions. A compact summary of the empirical findings on direct effects of individualism and collectivism is presented in Table B-3.

### 2.2 Time orientation (LTO)

The concept of time perspective was defined by Lewin (1951, p. 75), for the first time, as: “the totality of the individual’s views of his psychological future and his psychological past existing at a given time”. Later, based on the definition, “Time orientation” was born in 1973 by Hall; it refers to the emphasis of a culture (or individual) on the past, the present or the future. Psychological, sociological, and experimental evidences and studies discussed that time orientation is not an absolute concept; experiences and perceptions of time vary across cultures, religions, organizations, households, people, and situations (Lane and Kaufman, 1991). Time orientation could be an important determinant of the decisions that people make (Hofstede et al., 2010); planning (and therefore decision making) is intrinsically concerned with time (Das, 1987). Cultures and individuals would
be separated, based on their time orientation tendencies, into long-term oriented — more emphasis on the future — or short term oriented — more emphasis on the present and past.

2.2.1 Theoretical aspect: background and definition

Long-term orientation stands for fostering virtues oriented toward future — in particular persistence, perseverance and thrift in favor of future; short-term orientation stands for fostering virtues related to the past and present — in particular, respect for traditions, present obligations (and pleasures), and preservation of “face” (Hofstede et al., 2010). Time is experienced differently by people with different cultural backgrounds; differences in time orientation and perspective could be a source of confusion or irritation among cultures (Matsumoto and Juang, 2004). Hall (1973) was among the first to suggest cultural differences in time orientation and perspective.

Many definitions and theoretical approaches to the assessment of the influence of time exist across disciplines. The two prominent approaches to interpret time orientations belong to Hofstede (1980, 2001) and Hall (1973, 1984). Hall’s work focuses on distinguishing time as a polychronic (relationship-oriented perspective on time) versus monochronic (unidimensional focus on one aspect of time). The concept of Confucian dynamism, as a cultural dimension, was identified by Hofstede and Bond (1988) based on the Chinese Value Survey or CVS (Chinese Culture Connection, 1987), and anchored on Confucian values of tradition, planning for the future and harmony with others. Hofstede (2001) renamed this cultural dimension to long-term orientation (at macro-level); long-term orientation strongly correlates with recent economical growth and could also predict

---

59 “Face-keeping” — which is also known as a Chinese concept — is a long-term oriented virtue. Preservation of face means keeping the respect of the group regardless of the hardship involved in future, and enjoying a good reputation among others, under all circumstances (Hu, 1944). Thus, it would imply sacrificing present for keeping reputation (earned with difficulty in the past) in future.
future economical advances of a nation \(^{60}\) (Hofstede et al., 2010). It could be declared as an essential consideration for a global industry \(^{61}\). Hence, long-term orientation was added among recent dimensions in Hofstede’s model.

Among the key differences between short-term and long-term oriented cultures (and individuals) we could name the flexibility and adaptability, which is significantly lower in short-term oriented individuals; stability and “no change” mind-set is generally more respected in short-term oriented cultures \(^{62}\). Success would be more attributed to effort among long-term oriented individuals, compared to the short-term oriented people (Hofstede et al., 2010; Minkov, 2007). Responsible thinking about future is a consequence of long-term orientation among individuals. Religious, political and economical fundamentalism are aggressive enemies of long-term thinking; with short-term oriented thinking, people put future in the hands of God, others, or even markets and escape their share of responsibility focusing on present and past (Hofstede et al., 2010).

Following the unipolar approach, we decided for long-term orientation, as the center of attention, when studying time orientation as a cultural dimension in this research. Based on the above declarations, long-term orientation is interpreted, in this research, as the importance of future-precedence versus present-precedence for individuals in making choices and decisions.

---

\(^{60}\) As explained by Hofstede et al. (2010), the long-term oriented index was able to predict the extreme success of the eastern Asian countries in 1985; the logic of the growth of these Asian countries was later predicted to extend to eastern European economies between 1995 and 2005. The argument was mainly thrift and persistence which was showed a significant increase in all these countries.

\(^{61}\) In CVS long-term orientation survey, the top positions are occupied by china and other East-Asian countries known as Five Dragons (Japan, Hong Kong, Taiwan, South Korea, and Singapore) which had the unbelievable economic growth in the last decade (Hofstede et al., 2010).

\(^{62}\) Because of this characteristic, long-term orientation dimension of culture is strongly correlated with one of the dimensions suggested by Minkov (2007) which is now among the new dimensions in Hofstede survey model 2008: Monumentalism versus Flexhumility (renamed to restraint versus indulgence). Although it is possible that the dimension could have impacts on consumer-behavior, due to some executive limitations, was not included in the present study.
The following domains have been selected, based on the interpretation and the core element of Long-term orientation — future precedence — as the best to measure this dimension (see also Appendix1):

- Persistence and self-discipline
- Deferment of needs gratification; attending future needs
- Thrift; sparing and saving for future

In a recent study, the interested dimension (Long-term orientation) was confirmed to be associated with self-effacement\(^{63}\). This was found by Minkov (2007) in a meta-analysis of data from the World Values Survey (see Minkov, 2007). Long-term oriented individual thinks of himself as a small element within the continuity of life; thus, learning and developing ones capacities is most important. In contrast, short-term orientation correlates with self-enhancing\(^{64}\) values in which shining successful and improving one’s reputation is the most desirable thing. It can be expected that long-term oriented individuals are more aware of possible adverse real-world consequences of whatever they do during a time (since they do not focus only on present positive results), than will people from short-term oriented cultures.

2.2.2 **Empirical aspects: direct effects on consumer behavior**

A number of studies have documented different aspects, regarding this dimension, in purchase-consumption context. As an example, Manrai and Manrai (1995), focused on the time orientation, classified individuals from Western Europe cultures as low-context and those from Asia, Japan, and the Middle East as high-context. Also Levine (1997) studied perceptions of pace of life in several countries and found interesting differences. Time

---

\(^{63}\) Or ego-effacing.

\(^{64}\) Or ego-boosting.
orientation can also vary, individually, within cultures (Matsumoto and Juang, 2004). Zimbardo and Boyd (1999) argue that individual-level differences in time orientation have impacts on our behaviors; for instance, orientation toward present was proved to be related to more frequent self-reported alcohol, drug, and tobacco usage. The dimension can also have important implications for real-life situations such as business transactions, work behavior or even every-day life decision makings (Matsumoto and Juang, 2004).

- According to de Mooij (2011), time orientation would have fundamental influences on some of the main spending patterns and purchase decisions associated with price; customers with long term orientation are likely to be more price-conscious and define price as their main selection criteria. For instance, Hofstede’s national scores, for long-term orientation, was proved to explain the differences in “spending and use of cosmetics, deodorants, convenience products (such as soft drinks and processed food), and dishwashing machines” between countries (de Mooij, 2011, p. 50).

- Based on Elias (1969: cited in Hofstede et al., 2010), and Schneider and Lysgaard (1953) investing behavior of individuals is influenced by this dimension. Studies proved children of lower class families usually develop a short-term view in life and seek more immediate rewards in spending their money, than middle-class children (Hofstede et al., 2010). According to de Mooij (2011), people with high long-term orientation invest more in long-term commitments (e.g., real estate, Gold), while those with short-term orientation invest more in fields with fast, even with lower, returns (e.g., mutual funds). We postulate this dimension may also have influences on saving-spending equation; the higher the long-term orientation levels of an individual, the lower his spending and the higher the volume of saving (or investment) per year.

- As another effect of time orientation on consumer behavior, we name the role this dimension plays on consumer responses to sales promotion activities. It is proved to be positively related to consumer responses (purchases) to discounts or other long-term

---

65 Spending on the products named has a positive correlation with short-term orientation (see de Mooij, 2011, pp. 324, 322 and 319).
saving opportunities that base deep relationships between consumers and brands (de Mooij, 2011). In a comparative research, the preference level of coupons (as a long-term oriented promotion) to sweepstakes (as a short-term oriented promotion) in Thailand and Malaysia was measured; results confirmed that Thai consumers — with higher levels of long-term orientation — prefer coupons as the promotional activity. Malaysians respond least favorably to coupons (Huff and Alden, 1998).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-term orientation</th>
<th>Short-term orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conspicuous consumption is taboo.</td>
<td>Interest in market trends and conspicuous consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High response to discounts and promotional activities.</td>
<td>Low response to discounts and promotional activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More interest in saving, investing.</td>
<td>More interest in spending, purchase and consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in long-term commitments in investment and purchase.</td>
<td>Immediate rewards are interested in investment and purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High price consciousness in purchase decisions.</td>
<td>Lower focus on price in making purchase decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-4: Effects of Time orientation on consumer behavior

According to Hofstede et al., (2010), time orientation has impacts on *purchase and consumption patterns*. A research in China (Chinese students) proved that in long-term oriented cultures, conspicuous consumption is a taboo; everything should be done with moderation. This is known as a main element of Confucius teachings and is practiced among long-term oriented individuals and consumers. Based on this rule, purchase of many show-oriented products (e.g., luxury, fashion, cosmetics) and brands would be
limited. For short-term oriented cultures, sensitivity to social trends in consumption is high and people try to “keep up with the Joneses”\(^ {66}\).

A summary of the discussed direct effects of time orientation on consumers is presented in the above Table (B-4).

2.3 Masculinity (MAS)

2.3.1 Theoretical aspect: background and definition

Masculinity is, classically, applied for a society in which men are supposed to be tough and focused on material success; women are supposed to be tender and concerned with the quality of life. In the bipolar approach — which is interested in macro-level analyses, and not in the present study — the opposite pole, femininity, stands for a society in which both men and women are supposed to be modest, tender and concerned with the quality of life (Hofstede, 1991); this definition is focused on the dimension based on social differences and is “society specific” (Hofstede, 1991, p. 11).

However, compared to other dimensions, masculinity has a distinguishing characteristic; it could be differently interpreted based on psychological aspects. In other words masculinity, also, stands for a society (or individual) that is focused on success, competitiveness, ambition, rigidness, strive for material outcomes, and growth — whereas femininity stands for a society (or individual) which is focused on modesty, tenderness, non-material qualities, caring for others or environment, and preservation (de Mooij, 1998; Hofstede, 1991). Based on this interpretation gender is no more a separating factor; the mental model of the society, or individual, is the differentiator.

---

\(^ {66}\) Of course since respecting traditions and trying to be seen as a stable individual is among the main norms in short-term oriented cultures, there is a potential tension between these two sets of norms (tradition orientation and keeping stable versus immediate need gratification and sensitivity to social trends in consumption and spending) that leads to a wide variety of individual unstructured decisions and behaviors (Hofstede et al., 2010).
The mental health model\(^{67}\) of masculine cultures and individuals is that “success must be shown and the successful must shine” — which is opposed to the mental health model of feminine cultures in which “people must be liked and those who shine too much are disliked” (Hofstede, 1998, pp. 68-69). Based on this mentality, masculine individuals, unconsciously, try to oversell themselves, think on the superlatives, and prefer to demonstrate outstanding qualities. In masculine cultures, people tend to ego-boosting goals and behaviors. Feminine individuals, on the other hand, usually prefer to undersell themselves; ego-effacing goals and behaviors, and modesty are valued and emphasized in feminine cultures and among feminine individuals (Hofstede et al., 2010; Hofstede, 1980). Characteristics such as performance orientation, competitiveness and showing-off are entailed in this dimension, and could each have impacts on individual’s usual behaviors (de Mooij, 2011) and could be translated into business and economical terms in modern societies.

Based on motivational theories (e.g., Maslow’s and McClelland’s), each individual has a need for (or motive of) achievement, status and power in all activities and situations; this motive is directly related to cultural dimension of masculinity. For a highly masculine individual (or society) “winning is not everything, it is the only thing” — for a feminine one “it is good to win, but it is not everything” (Lasch, 1980, p.117). Hofstede et al. (2010) declare, in general, that the main goals and motivational factors for the masculinity-oriented individual are earning, recognition, advancement and challenge — for the feminine person, having relationship with others, desirability of living area, and security have the top priority in everyday life. As a summary we could declare that, unlike other cultural value, masculinity (also femininity) enjoys a dual nature which is closely knit together:

- **Systematic differences and gaps between goals, interests, decisions and behaviors of men and women in different countries:** According to Hofstede (1980, 1991, and 1998)

---

\(^{67}\) A concept related to psychological well-being; it declares the healthy behaviors or thoughts. Syndromes of behavior or thought which lead to distress and problem (for the individual or society) could be declared through this model, and are regarded as disorder,
in “masculine” countries (unlike feminine countries) we can find wide gaps between men and women because of the distinctions of gender roles; in this point, biological distinction is the differentiator (male versus female).

- **Variations of behaviors or responses between competitiveness for masculinity (and cooperativeness for femininity):** In masculine countries (or for masculine individuals) for both men and women, success, competitiveness and ambition are more important — in feminine cultures (or for feminine individuals) male and female inhabitants are more cooperative, modest and nurturing (Best and Williams, 1998). In this approach, the differentiator is the self-orientation (ego-boosting versus ego effacing) and the culturally determined roles of each individual, in the society, are focused.

In the present study, the second nature is the base for masculinity interpretation; thus, masculinity is defined as the focus of individual (both men and women) on success, competitiveness and recognition in decision makings. For this dimension, the following domains have been selected based on the interpretation and the core element — success is principal and must be shown (see also Appendix 1):

- The importance of success and advancement
- The role of ambitions
- Recognition of success and advancement

Beyond the definition, masculinity (and femininity) was fundamentally suggested by anthropologists as the society’s specific answer to a general problem with which any human society has to cope: the conception of self. According to Inkeles and Levinson (1969) the concept of self could be split into two dimensions; one of them is the root of masculinity (and femininity) dimension\(^{68}\). Although this dimension is just as important an anthropological distinction as individualism-collectivism (and is closely relevant), it was neglected in many cross-cultural studies, and is sometimes regarded as the “taboo

\(^{68}\) The other one, which is related to the individual’s position in society and his dependency to others, is the root of individualism-collectivism as a cultural dimension. In other words differentiating oneself from others is the basic aspect of individualism-collectivism whereas masculinity-femininity adds to it in the sense that people want to distinguish themselves (de Mooij, 2010).
dimension” or offensive variable (Hofstede, 1998, p. 13). This could have been caused by religious, social and even political misunderstandings and incorrect judgments of the definition; of note is that mainly in masculine cultures (e.g., USA) it could be regarded as a “politically incorrect” dimension (Hofstede, 1998, p. 13). The masculinity-femininity differences are sometimes hidden behind other influencers such as national wealth or income level; though, conversely to individualism-collectivism, masculinity and femininity did not correlate with national wealth or economic development and therefore did not oppose the West to the East. Although like other dimensions it has similar patterns in countries with a shared history, the ancient roots of masculinity (and femininity) as a cultural value is not known. Therefore, we can find few studies focused on the analysis, implications and outcomes of this dimension. The historical roots of masculinity (and femininity) differences, they are unlikely to disappear in the future (Hofstede, 1998); our previous study on the subject proved the top priority of this dimension, to be focused on in cross-cultural studies.

2.3.2 Empirical aspects: direct effects on consumer behavior

Some direct effects of the dimension on consumer behaviors are here summarized:

- De Mooij (2011) explains the importance of masculinity dimension in purchase of most products and brands, especially those serve as luxury articles or are, somehow, identified as symbols of success and status. Although income has its influences, studies

---

69 Omitting the dimension, because of these misunderstands, means throwing the baby away with the bath water (Hofstede, 1998).

70 Therefore some authors from USA tend to classify feminine goals as collectivist and cover it behind the individualism-collectivism dimension (Hofstede et al., 2010).

71 De Mooij (2011) suggests using the terms “gender of nations” or “tough versus tender”.

72 The association with wealth serves as an implicit justification that one pole must be better than the other. But for this dimension, this does not work; there are just as many poor as there are wealthy masculine, or feminine, countries and individuals. (Hofstede et al., 2010)

73 See Bathaee (2011 a).
prove that sales of luxury brands and articles are highly correlated with high levels of masculinity (de Mooij, 2011). The need for appearance, in all purchase and consumption related situations, could be strongest for high-masculinity cultures and individuals (de Mooij, 2011); individuals with high-masculinity level consume to show — those with high-femininity level consume to use. Thus, *status-purchases* are in general more frequent in masculine cultures. Also, Stockmann (1991, cited in: de Mooij, 2004, p. 267) reports a significant relationship between masculinity and *brand loyalty in purchase of luxury products* (cars) in six European countries.

- Based on a psychological study, masculine cultures (and individuals) are more *field-independent*\(^74\) in decision making process — feminine cultures tend to be more *field-dependent*\(^75\) (Hofstede et al., 2010; de Mooij and Hofstede, 2002; de Mooij, 2011). Since field-independent people tend to have better analytical skills, the decision making process would be rather more systematic, logical, fast and determined; it is postulated that for field-independent persons, the role of external factors (e.g., music, light, fragrance, number of people in the shopping center, position of the product on the shelves) in purchase would be limited.

- Another influential point about this dimension is the *need for classification* between self and others; high-masculinity level could result individuals consider themselves, and anything relevant, better than others — the need is much weaker when femininity is at higher level (de Mooij, 2011). It is expected to have fundamental impacts in product or brand selection among consumers; when consumers tend to classify themselves, class-based consumption of products, categories or brands, and even class-

---

\(^74\) Field-independent persons rely on internal frames of reference, in judgments and decisions; they perceive an object separately from the environment (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 163; de Mooij, 2011, p. 234).

\(^75\) Field-dependent people rely on their clues from the environment when making decisions; they are influenced in their perception by characteristics of the social and physical environment (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 163; de Mooij, 2011, p. 234).
based selection of shopping centers could consequently take place, since “class” is a sensitive, fundamental and complex concept.

- Steenkamp et al. (1999) found a relationship between innovativeness — new product adoption — and this cultural dimension. The explanation is that emphasis on achievement, success and ambition, which are all caused by high level of masculinity, would attract consumers to new and different options; aim is to be distinguished from others. Also Gilbert et al. (2003) proved the role of masculinity (also femininity), as an essential component, in purchasing new technology-based products applying the concept of psychological gender.

- According to de Mooij (2011), masculinity would be also influential in complaint behavior of consumers. Higher level of masculinity is assumed to make people want to get the most out of life; this would explain excessive usage of litigation, taking more legal actions among consumers, in masculine cultures like United States.

- According to de Mooij (2010, 2011), masculinity-femininity explains the roles of males and females in buying and, thus, influences the decision making process. Whereas in masculine cultures, head of family would make most decisions, in feminine cultures basic decisions are shared between partners; there is a correlation between masculinity and involvement of family members in decisions and selections. According to de Mooij (2011, p.88), low level masculinity is significantly correlated with the proportion of men who spend time on shopping activities and get involved in purchase decision making.

- Masculinity is proved to be correlated with the type of products or brands people decide for; it is postulated that also the variety of products would be correlated to the dimension. Based on the Eurodata, de Mooij (2010) explains that in respect to car purchase, masculinity (and femininity) influences the types of cars that are more appealing and interested in countries. In masculine cultures technology, demonstration of material success, driving aggressively are the priorities, and people
prefer cars with big, powerful engines — within feminine cultures safety to protect the family, caring, and saving the environment are among top priorities when purchasing a car.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculinity</th>
<th>Femininity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher interest in status-orientation in purchase.</td>
<td>Lower interest in status-orientation and luxury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field-independent decision making; low influence of environment factors in consumer behavior.</td>
<td>Field-dependent decision making; high influence of external factors in consumer behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconscious classification of options; class-based consumption.</td>
<td>Less interest in product-brand classification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High consumer innovativeness.</td>
<td>Low new products adoption; less emphasis in achievement-orientation in purchase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher post-purchase complaint rates.</td>
<td>Lower declaration of dissatisfaction; less post-purchase complaint rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low involvement of all family members in decision making; high dominance of a member in purchase.</td>
<td>High involvement of family members in decision making; low dominance of a member in purchase.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-5: Effects of Masculinity on consumer behavior
Summary of the above mentioned effects is presented in Table 4. Although present study is concentrated on masculinity and femininity effects are not interested, both dimensions are included in the table (B-5) for comparison.

2.4 Uncertainty avoidance (UA)

2.4.1 Theoretical aspect: background and definition

Individuals have to face the fact that they do not know what will happen tomorrow; the future is uncertain, but we have to live with it anyway. This fact sparkled introduction of uncertainty avoidance as another cultural dimension; it is defined as the extent to which
members of a culture avoid ambiguous or unknown situations. Uncertainty avoidance, has originated from Inkeles and Levinson’s research (1969) on the main problems of human beings in dealing with dilemmas and conflicts; it was primitively concerned with the ways of controlling aggression and levels of flexibility or rigidness in behaviors (Hofstede, 1998).

We should remember that uncertainty is a subjective feeling and is totally relative to the person and the context; it is acquired and learned. Based on Hofstede et al., (2010, pp. 189-190) “The feeling of uncertainty and ways of coping with it belongs to the cultural heritage of societies”. People in strong uncertainty avoidance cultures tend to be rule and structure-oriented, less flexible, less optimistic and more neurotic in personality; they reward more the accuracy and mainly believe “what is different is dangerous”. On the other hand, individuals with weak uncertainty avoidance (or strong uncertainty acceptance) tend to more flexibility, believe in relativism, define vague objectives, reward the originality and find that “what is different is curious” (Hofstede et al., 2010, pp.201-209).

Our interpretation of uncertainty avoidance in the present study is the importance of familiarity and avoidance of uncertain situations and decisions for individual. Following this interpretation, and the core element in definition of uncertainty avoidance — ambiguity is threatening and must be avoided — three domains have been selected for this dimension (see also Appendix1):

- The importance of familiarity (with things and situations)
- Fear and anxiety of ambiguous situations
- Avoidance of risk and ambiguous situations

Based on d’Iribarne (1989, cited in: Hofstede et al., 2010) we conclude that though the need for rules is common in both uncertainty avoiding and uncertainty accepting societies, it is different in nature. While in a society (or for an Individual) with strong uncertainty avoidance need for rules and regulations is emotional (people feel comfortable when
everything is structured), in weak uncertainty avoidance countries it is simply because of *strict necessity*, and people show an emotional horror or dislike the formal rules.

One final point here is that uncertainty avoidance should not be confused with risk avoidance\(^{76}\), since uncertainty has no probability attached to it, has no object and is quite unfamiliar\(^{77}\). When the uncertainty situation gets familiar, known or probable it is a risk and people could accept it as a routine.

### 2.4.2 Empirical aspects: direct effects on consumer behavior

The most interesting effects of this dimension on consumer behaviors all supported in previous studies are as follows:

- According to de Mooij (2011), uncertainty avoidance may influence individual’s *preference for creativity, innovation and change*; people high on uncertainty avoidance would try to stick to routines, norms and habits. This aspect of the dimension would result in higher degrees of brand-product loyalty and, thus, could decrease innovativeness in consumer behavior.

- Another interesting effect of this dimension is on *decision making*: individuals (and cultures) with low uncertainty avoidance are among those identified to believe in *internal locus of control*; they know themselves in control of their own destiny and fully in charge of their own performances and decisions. On the other hand, those with high uncertainty avoidance, assume an *external locus of control*, tend to postpone decisions and prefer others, situation or events to shape the required decisions or actions (Stewart, 1985: cited in de Mooij, 2011). Thus, several purchase and

---

\(^{76}\) Risk is focused on something specific, or a known event. But uncertainty has no probability attached to it; it is a situation with unknown probability (Hofstede et al., 2010).

\(^{77}\) Risk and uncertainty are usually regarded as similar words in speaking language; the main difference is in their meanings and not wording. In present study we have used “risk” in item wording since it is verbally more applied; but based on the explanation above we were analyzing uncertainty avoidance.
consumption behaviors (e.g., variety seeking, switching, impulsive purchase) would be avoided or decreased.

- Samli (1995) proved the influence of uncertainty avoidance (together with individualism) in *adoption rate of new products or brands*; high uncertainty avoidance cultures (or individuals) are more cautious, until the facts about a novel product are known and, thus, the diffusion of innovation takes longer and is different from the classic model presented by Rogers\(^{78}\) (1995). Those with lower uncertainty avoidance are more optimistic and trustful and, thus, show higher adoption rates of unknown products or brands.

- Uncertainty avoidance is also proved to have significant relation with *brand loyalty* since higher levels of this dimension makes consumer need to decrease uncertainty; so, making purchase decisions on tried or known brands may help, whereas trying a new product, or brand, involves some amount of risk taking (Baumgartner and Steenkamp, 1996; de Mooij, 2004).

- According to Dawar et al. (1996) uncertainty avoidance is related to *information search* among individuals; the higher the uncertainty avoidance level, the lower the proportion of consumers who look for product information from impersonal and objective resources. People of this cultural configuration tend to seek information from trusted personal sources. Since information search is among the main stages of consumer purchase decision making (Kotler, 2011), different behaviors would be expected.

- The dimension was proved to have certain influences on *purchase of specific type or variety of products*. According to de Mooij (1998), based on a survey by Eurodata\(^{79}\)

\(^{78}\) Rogers (2003) identified five categories of (American) consumers according to the degree of acceptance of new products; the innovators (2.5% of society), early adopters (13.5% of society), early majority (34% of society), late majority (34% of society) and laggards (16% of society).

\(^{79}\) It was performed by Reader’s Digest (1991) to study lifestyles, consumer spending habits, and attitudes in 17 European countries.
(1991) and confirmed by EMS\textsuperscript{80} 95, there is a strong correlation between buying new cars (and not a second hand car) and uncertainty avoidance. Both surveys proved the significant negative correlation between this dimension and percentage of second hand cars bought. Since the respondents of EMS 95 were all among business people of high income level, the results confirmed that in this case, culture overrides income as a decision influencer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High uncertainty-avoidance</th>
<th>Low uncertainty-avoidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Lower interest for innovations; more strict about habits and routines; high loyalty level.</td>
<td>▪ Higher interest in creativity, and new options; lower loyalty level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Belief of external locus of control; postpone decision making; interest in planned behavior and purchase.</td>
<td>▪ Belief in internal locus of control; fast &amp; easy decision making; interest in impulsive decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ High pessimism, less trust in and low adoption of new product/brands.</td>
<td>▪ High optimism, more trust in and adoption of new products/brands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-6: Effects of uncertainty avoidance on consumer behavior

The above Table (B-6) presents a summary of the direct effects of uncertainty avoidance on consumer-purchase behaviors.

2.5 Power-distance

2.5.1 Theoretical aspect: background and definition

The fundamental problem which was the origin of developing the power distance dimension is the relation to authority (Inkeles and Levinson, 1969). This dimension reflects the way individuals think about (and decide to handle with) the fact that people

\textsuperscript{80} The European Media and Marketing Survey (EMS), is a continuous survey with a minimum number of respondents of 18000 in EU, Switzerland, and Norway.
are unequal. Based on Hofstede et al. (2010), power-distance informs us about dependence relationship among individuals, with those at higher levels of power. In small-power-distance countries, there is a limited dependency among power holders and others, and there is a preference for consultation or interdependency among all society members, whether subordinate or power holder. On the other hand, in large-power-distance societies a considerable dependency (and preference for such dependency) governs on all relationships among those who have the benefit of power (whether financial, social, political, scientific or etc) and subordinates.

The expectation and acceptance of unequal power distribution is the main indicator of power distance among individuals. Whereas in large-power-distance societies inequality is totally taken for granted and is sometimes “desired”, in small-power-distance societies it is known as “should be minimized factor” (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 72). Hence, in present study the interpretation of power distance is the level of acceptance and expectation of inequality for an individual. Following this definition, and the core element of this dimension — acceptance and expectation of inequality — the following domains have been selected (also see Appendix1):

- Inequality acceptance
- Inequality expectation

According to (Hofstede et al., 2010) the comparative research projects on leadership values\(^{81}\) proved that the differences in this dimension exist in the minds of both leaders (power holders) and those led (subordinates); but “often the statements obtained from those who are led and subordinated are better reflections of the value situation” (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 63). One important point here is that although individuals who have a large-power-distance mindset may usually tolerate and accept inequality better than those

\(^{81}\) Examples are: Jackofsky and Slocum (1998) and Tollgerdt-Andersson (1996) who made cross-cultural researches on leadership.
with a small-power-distance, equality is the number one ideal in collectivist societies\textsuperscript{82}, which are usually categorized among the countries with large-power-distance score (Stoetzel, 1983, cited in: Hofstede et al., 2010; Hofstede, 2001). This remark may imply the correlation between the cultural dimensions of individualism, collectivism and power distance, as with other dimensions.

\textbf{2.5.2 Empirical aspects: direct effects on consumer behavior}

The main effects of power-distance on consumer behaviors in previous researches are as follows:

- Power distance level is related to \textit{decision making style} among individuals; based on de Mooij (2011), large power distance would mean that people are used to others making decisions for them\textsuperscript{83} (external locus of control), whereas for low power distance level, the opposite is true (internal locus of control). The decision making model in most low power distance cultures is that all consumers (e.g., parents and children) engage in shopping and decision making process; in high power distance cultures, the elders and superiors would be supposed to rule the decision making process. Besides, as above explained\textsuperscript{84}, according to Stewart (1985: cited in de Mooij, 2011) in cultures with external locus of control (which is related to high power distance), people tend to \textit{postpone decisions} more and prefer events (or others) shape and do whatever

\textsuperscript{82} For individualists, freedom is the number one ideal.

\textsuperscript{83} Also Triandis (1995) reported a comparative study, between American and Soviet students in 1985, on decision making of governments. Whereas the Soviet students selected the statement “Human beings are unable to rule themselves and their government should rule them”, the American students selected the opposing statement: “Human beings should rule themselves; best government is least government”.

\textsuperscript{84} Uncertainty avoidance is also related to locus of control; thus the effect was named among effects of uncertainty avoidance on consumers.
required. We assume this could be correlated with purchase volume or variety, and other related consumer behaviors.

- Another main impact of power distance on consumer behavior could be defined as *purchase dominance*. According to Rose et al. (2002), in high power distance cultures, people (especially children or women) are taught to respect standards, norms and decisions of the dominant members\(^{85}\) in purchase situations, and maintain the dependency to superiors in decision making. On the other side, those with low power distance encourage all family members (especially children or women) to develop their own opinions, evaluate all sides of an argument, and allow each member, an active participation in decision making process\(^{86}\) (Rose et al., 2002). This — resulted from egalitarian values in small power distance cultures — could have great effects in purchase behaviors such as impulsive purchase, variety seeking and brand orientation.

- For small power distance cultures (and individuals) the need for independence and egalitarian attitudes is great (de Mooij, 2011). This is assumed to have impacts on consumers’ product-brand selection strategies; large power distance may result in more *brand-oriented purchases*, whereas smaller level of power distance may cause in an egalitarian approach toward leader and more expensive brands.

- *Status* is acquired by expressing one’s power and position — and also success\(^{87}\) — in society and therefore is related to power distance. According to de Mooij (2011, p. 47) “power distance explains differences in the importance of appearance and status”. For large-power distance countries (or individuals), one’s social status must be clear and demonstrated, so that others clearly understand the differentiation and show enough respect; global and luxury brands serve that purpose (de Mooij, 2011). Results of European media and marketing survey (EMS) in 2007 showed that the variance of

\(^{85}\) That could be the man in masculine cultures, or the person with highest income level.

\(^{86}\) This behavior could be also related to high levels of individualism and femininity (de Mooij, 2011); since the three dimensions are, usually, highly coordinated at both national and individual levels of analysis, it would be logical.

\(^{87}\) It is also related to masculinity.
buying expensive fragrances (as well as expensive briefcases or handbags) was significantly correlated with high power distance (de Mooij, 2011).

- De Mooij (2010, 2011), proved the correlation between interest to purchase and use special groups of products and power distance in 15 countries worldwide. Based on her researches, the use of cosmetics and personal care products was proved to be significantly (and negatively) correlated with power distance\(^{88}\). Her explanation was that the need to look younger gets increased when power distance level decreases\(^ {89}\). Based on this survey, power distance has also influences on the type and variety of products consumers tend to purchase from cosmetics and personal care products\(^ {90}\); other examples confirm this finding. For instance, based on data from European media and marketing survey (EMS), de Mooij (2011) declares that in case of alcoholic beverages, there is a correlation between consumption of products such as champagne, port wine, and vermouth and power distance level.

- According to Hofstede et al. (2010) power distance level can influence the evaluation system within individuals. In large-power-distance societies, power (in any form) is “seen as a basic fact of society that precedes the choice between good and evil” (Hofstede et al., 2010, p.77). Since the evaluation of brands and products are among the main topics of consumer behavior, which could directly influence the decisions, this impact should not be neglected. It is, therefore, postulated that any product that somehow signalizes power — for example is bigger, placed on higher shelves, more obvious (or sold) in more number of shops, more advertised, among the last products advertised prior to a favorite TV program — or drops a vague hint of superiority, could

\(^{88}\) It is also positively correlated with individualism.

\(^{89}\) Based on my own experiences, the older generations are more respected (and known as power-holders) in societies with high power distance level; age could be postulated to have positive correlation with power distance since it is recognized as a power in decision making processes.

\(^{90}\) A significant correlation between power distance and the use of lipstick, face powder, eye cosmetics, hair gel and deodorants.
be more attracted (through the consumer evaluation system) among consumers with large power distance, compared to those with smaller power distance level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large power-distance</th>
<th>Small power-distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ More dependence in purchase decision making; more brand-orientation.</td>
<td>▪ More independence in purchase decision making; egalitarian approach in brand selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ More purchase dominance of a member; more control over selections; less participation of other members;</td>
<td>▪ Less dominance of a member in purchase; active participation of all members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Higher interest in planned purchases.</td>
<td>▪ More variety-seeking and impulsive purchases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ More status-orientation; higher spending willingness.</td>
<td>▪ Less interest in status expression; lower spending willingness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ More need to improve appearance; more purchase of cosmetics and luxury beverages; high aesthetic-orientation in purchases.</td>
<td>▪ Lower interest in appearance, cosmetics, and luxury beverages; lower aesthetic-orientation in purchases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ More attention to “superior” products when evaluating the options.</td>
<td>▪ Less attracted by “superiority” in evaluating a process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table B-7**: Effects of power-distance on consumer behavior

Table B-7 presents is a summary of the direct influences on power distance in consumption-purchase context.

### 2.6 Restraint (REST)

This dimension was introduced in Hofstede’s expanded version of dimensional model in 2008; it was defined and named by Michael Minkov (2007) and was proved to be entirely validated in several studies. In the bipolar approach, the opposite pole is Indulgence; still, following the unipolar approach at individual-level of analysis, only Restraint is focused in this study.
2.6.1 Theoretical aspect: background and definition

Restraint reflects a conviction that basic and natural desires and enjoyment in life needs to be curbed and regulated by strict social norms — the opposite pole, Indulgence, stands for a tendency to allow, relatively free, such gratification (Minkov, 2007). The introduction of restraint (and indulgence), as a separate cultural dimension, was inspired by an Ingelhart’s (2003) overall analysis as he introduced the dimension of well-being versus survival (Minkov, 2007); in fact, his dimension was measuring the internal happiness and unhappiness, beyond ephemeral feelings and pleasures. According to (Hofstede et al., 2010, pp. 279-280), Ingelhart’s dimension was later proved to be valid and “conceptually defendable”; still, many salient details were unexplained and there is “mind-boggling diversity of items defining it”. In particular, it says nothing about the question of why some poor nations have high percentage of very happy people, while according to hundreds of studies in some rich countries people are generally unhappier in life (Hofstede et al., 2010).

Inspired by Ingelhart’s analysis, Minkov (2007) restructured the concept and considered other qualities as the core of a new cultural dimension; in addition to happiness — or subjective well-being as it is named in researches — he introduced additional items measuring the importance of leisure and the life control one has declared for himself as a value. In other words, he focused on the freedom of choice, a feeling of liberty to have pleasures, and the control one is permitted to have in his decision making.

On the Restraint pole, there is a perception that one’s actions are restrained by various social norms and prohibitions and a feeling that enjoyment of leisure activities or spending are somehow wrong and need to be restrained — at the indulgence pole, one can act as

---

91 It was previously associated with uncertainty avoidance in Hofstede’s earlier publications, but he did not find objective ways of measuring it.

92 Examples are Venezuela, El Salvador, Nigeria, Ghana, Trinidad and Puerto Rico (Hofstede et al., 2010).

93 Examples are Hong Kong, China, South Korea, Russia, Italy and Japan (Hofstede et al., 2010).
one pleases, spend money, have leisurely and fun-related activities, all ending to relatively high internal happiness (Minkov, 2007). Restraint-Indulgence, as a bipolar\textsuperscript{94} dimension, resembles, to some extent, to the construct that Triandis (2002) called as tightness-looseness. In loose societies, deviant behavior is easily tolerated and individuals feel free to act and have fewer rules, norms or regulations to respect; in tight societies (with high levels of restraint), following the more rules and norms is a “must”, and people would be punished for ignoring them. There are few alternatives for each norm and regulation in a tight culture. Restraint was selected to be focused in the present research. Based on the above explanations, restraint was interpreted as the focus of an individual on self-discipline and control of desires and pleasures, when making decision. The single interested domain in studying this dimension here is the importance of self-control in life, personal desires and pleasures.

The indulgence-restraint solves the paradox of happiness and wealth; it declares “why the poor Filipinas are happier than the rich citizens of Hong Kong” (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 286). The answer to the question would be that pleasant emotions and happiness are positively correlated with the indulgence pole. Besides, though there is a positive relationship between indulgence and national wealth, it is not strong. Thus, if the indulgence level of a poor country is higher than a rich one, it would be possible to live in a poor country and have more positive attitudes, or be generally happier in life, compared to those living in a rich country (Hofstede et al., 2010).

2.6.2 Empirical aspects: Direct effects on consumer behavior

Since this is a truly new dimension, it has not been reported so far in the academic literature and deserves more surveys (Hofstede et al., 2010). However, some aspects of the dimension— which are among the key differences of individuals — in respect to restraint (also the indulgence pole), and their plausible effects on consumer behavior are reviewed.

\textsuperscript{94} For complementary details See Bathae, 2011 (a, b).
According to Minkov (2007) and Hofstede et al. (2010), high levels of restraint would influence people to be moderate in decision making, have (or let oneself to have) few desires and wants, define a discipline for each behavior\textsuperscript{95}, and try to keep oneself generally disinterested; the opposite would be associated with higher levels of indulgence. Regarding the fact that interest and desire are known as the main influencer and the beginning point of purchase decision (or many other behaviors of consumers) in all models of consumer behavior (e.g., de Mooij, 2011; Hawkins et al., 2006) it would be logical to expect indulgence-restraint having fundamental influences on consumer behavior.

According to Hofstede et al. (2010) higher levels of restraint are significantly correlated with a feeling of pessimism and negativism; high levels of restraint and social-behavioral restrictions would foster various forms of negative feelings and having no trust. This trait could be influential in consumer decision making process; for example it would prevent (or delay) a person from attention to new options, lower his evaluation level of a product-brand, limit his purchase, and decrease his satisfaction.

Restraint is also associated with thrift\textsuperscript{96}. Although restraint is more plausible under poverty, national wealth was proved to explain only about 10 percent of country differences in this dimension (Hofstede et al., 2010). Thus, the thrift associated with high level of restraint cannot be definitely caused by poverty. Higher interest in thrift would mean lower interest in spending; this would have its impacts on consumer purchase and spending behavior.

\textsuperscript{95} Indulgence-restraint shows a negative correlation with power distance (Hofstede et al., 2010).

\textsuperscript{96} This could explain the negative correlation between indulgence-restraint and long term orientation based on world value survey (Hofstede et al., 2010).
Last but not least is the impact of restraint, as a cultural dimension, on the importance of leisure in one’s life. Indulgence-oriented cultures are generally characterized as fun-oriented, whereas restrained cultures are less interested in leisure, fun and entertainment in any form of it, and the importance of such activities and pleasures are significantly lower in such cultures (Minkov, 2007; Hofstede et al., 2010). Regarding the fact that shopping is generally a fun-oriented activity, we may conclude that purchase rates (especially for the fun-oriented ones such as luxury, fashion or even desserts) and any other fun-oriented consumer behavior (e.g., variety seeking, switching, and consumer innovativeness) would be negatively correlated with restraint level. As one example we could name the result

---

97 Indulgence-restraint is recently introduced, and there are very few studies focused on it and therefore there is no further information in respect to measurement approached in general. The complementary details regarding measurement of the dimension in the present study is included in the next chapter.

98 Restrained cultures, which are usually among the religious ones, believe in the philosophy that all life is suffering, pursuit of happiness and fun could be a waste of time and the real bliss is achievable only in the hereafter (Minkov, 2007; Hofstede et al., 2010).

99 Each average American family could gratify all his needs with only 150 products (Joachimsthaler, 2007); shopping more products or brands is mainly to have fun and pleasure and not to gratify needs.
of an analysis of obesity across 26 wealthy countries; it is proved that after controlling for GNI at purchasing power parity, indulgence is positively (and restraint is negatively) correlated with obesity (World Health Organization, 2005, cited in: Hofstede et al., 2010). Although many factors play part in obesity rates of a country, this result shows that when affordability is not an issue, more indulgent societies will be more inclined toward unrestrained consumption of, for example, junk foods — which are among fun-oriented, and not need-oriented, consumptions and purchases.

Present study is only focused on restraint effects; still, both dimensions are included in the table for comparison. Summary of the mentioned effects of restraint and indulgence is presented in Table b-8.

2.7 Positioning

This part (B) was focused on defining Hofstede’s cultural dimensions at individual-level (independent variables) and shifting the concepts to purchase-consumption context which is interested in this study; in chapter 2, we had a review on the role each selected cultural dimensions would play in consumer’s every-day purchase behavior. Note that almost little has been done to compare consumer (and purchase) behavior across cultures, and there is an ever-increasing attention toward this subject (see de Mooij, 2011).

Part C is dedicated to the three selected (dependent) constructs of purchase-consumption behaviors; in addition to an introductory review, the developed hypotheses on the effects of contextual factors and cultural-dimensions are presented. Next, having postulations on the internal relations among the three constructs, hypotheses are included.
C. Development of hypotheses: consumer culture, context and purchase

1. Introduction

Behavioral researchers have argued that purchase experience can indeed involve both utilitarian and hedonic aspects of values (e.g., Belk 1987; Babin et al. 1994; Hirschman and Holbrook 1982). Utilitarian values are described as task-related, functional, rational and in conscious pursuit of an intended consequence. Based on the definition of utilitarian values, utilitarian behaviors of consumers are more cognition-based and intended. Evaluative and judgment-based behaviors (e.g., evaluating price-quality) are mainly studied in utilitarian aspects of consumer behaviors. Alternatively, hedonic values are experiential, affective, more subjective than their utilitarian counterpart, and mainly in pursuit of fun, playfulness, and enjoyment. Based on it, hedonic behaviors could be defined as more affection-based, experiential, and fun-oriented; hedonic dimensions of consumer behaviors have been the subject of most in-store shopping, and impulsive purchase literature (see Overby and Lee 2006).

Based on this classification, researchers (e.g., Babin et al., 1994) proposed that purchase may involve both hedonic and utilitarian behaviors. Having an interest in the utilitarian-hedonic duality of consumer behaviors, the researcher selected variety-seeking (a fun-based, experiential and hedonic behavior), and quality consciousness (an evaluative utilitarian behavior) in purchase context, as two examples. The two behaviors, together with anticipated regret as the third behavioral concept, build the dependent structure of the research. We suggest they are influenced by the seven cultural dimensions of Hofstede’s model (2008) declared in previous part. Thus in this chapter, we first introduce the three selected dependent variables developing theoretical bases for the hypothetical effects of the contextual (nationality and demographic profile) and cultural dimensions in the interested task situation. Later, the interactions among the three consumer-behavioral variables are studied; hypotheses are discussed declaring the cognitive-affective consequences of anticipated regret in purchase context. Also the relation between the two
constructs of quality-consciousness and variety-seeking are analyzed. This way, the conceptual framework is completed.

2. Hypotheses on the effects of nationality, demographics and cultural dimensions on consumer purchase behaviors: variety seeking, quality-consciousness and anticipated regret

2.1 Variety-seeking: a hedonic behavior of consumer

Variety-seeking was introduced, almost simultaneously in the psychology literature by Hebb (1955) and Leuba (1955). It is an exploratory behavior of a consumer, though satisfied with the previous choice, who switches brands induced by the utility he derives from the change (Foxall, 1993; Givon, 1984). In other words, it is the general tendency of consumers to switch (brands, products or providers) for the pleasure provided by the change itself, and not because of the functional value of the alternatives. The concept is subjective and affection-based and is selected as an example of hedonic behaviors of consumer.

True variety-seeking is intrinsically motivated (Bigné et al., 2009). Thus, the concept is an important explanation that may justify why satisfied customers decide to switch providers (Bansal et al., 2005), or do not come back (Bigné et al., 2009); it declares sensation-seeking or preference for a given level of variety, surprise, and newness as the reasons (Foxal, 1993).

The central theoretical explanation for the phenomenon of variety-seeking is provided by the theory of the Optimum Stimulation Level (OSL) (Berlyne, 1960). According to Helmig (1997), each individual has its own specific optimal level of stimulation, which is relatively constant over time. In situations containing an increased level of arousal, further stimulation will be avoided. In situations where the level of stimulation is below the optimum, individuals will seek additional stimulation. A consumption situation may
provide a less-than-optimal level of stimulation for a consumer, thus lead to a state of boredom. As a consequence, the consumer will try to increase the arousal potential of the situation, for example, by exhibiting variety-seeking tendency (Helmig, 1997; Menon and Kahn, 1995).

Literature points out that variety-seeking level of an individual depends on the product or service category (Givon, 1984; Van Trijp et al., 1996); a consumer may seek variety in one category but avoid it in another. Personal factors seem, also, to influence the optimal level of stimulation of an individual and, hence, the degree of variety-seeking tendency or behavior he (she) shows (Hoyer and Ridgway, 1984). In addition, people’s ideological attitudes and their lifestyles impact their variety-seeking tendency. It has been demonstrated that venturesome, spontaneous and extrovert people will have a higher tendency to show variety-seeking behavior than risk averse, rational people (Hoyer and Ridgway, 1984) since they show more interest in seeking sensation (McAlister and Pessemier, 1982). The degree of education and the level of income are, in addition, assumed to be positively correlated with variety-seeking behavior (McAlister and Pessemier, 1982).

Although variety-seeking has been subject of many studies, the effects of cultural dimensions on this consumer-behavioral measure have been neglected. According to Hohl (2008), some of the main elements behind variety-seeking, which could cause for consumer utility and motivate individuals to change, are: prestige, hope for benefits, risk reduction and curiosity (also see Bathaee, 2011 a). These elements may all be different among individuals due to the context and have their roots in cultural values. We have therefore postulated hypotheses on the effects of nationality, demographic profile, and cultural dimensions at individual-level:

2.1.1 Nationality and variety-seeking

In respect to variety-seeking and the role of nationality, we could hardly find any researches addressing the issue directly; however few related studies were found to be
conductive. For example, Tellis et al. (2009) studied the concept of innovativeness and defined variety-seeking as an antecedent; the study proved nationality systematically affects innovativeness level, and the eagerness for new products. Furthermore, several researches (e.g. Roth, 1995; Kim and Drolet, 2003) demonstrated that variety-seeking tendency is context specific and differences could be found among countries; the finding was later confirmed by Bathaee (2011 a) in a cross-cultural study comparing Iran and Germany. The research proved significant differences in variety-seeking intention between the two selected samples. Besides, considering that variety-seeking is a hedonic concept (see Kahn and Isen, 1993; Roehm Jr. and Roehm, 2005), also referring to explanations in Mesquita et al., (2010) on context-specificity of emotions and affective reactions of individuals we suggest:

H1.1: Nationality affects consumer variety-seeking.

2.1.2 Demographic profile and variety-seeking

The effect of gender on consumer variety-seeking has been previously confirmed in separate studies (e.g. Givon, 1985; Helmig, 1997); most researchers reported that men are more likely to be variety seekers than women (see McAlister and Pessemier, 1982; Tscheulin, 1994). Still, Mitchell and walsh (2004, p. 340) defined variety-seeking among female-exclusive factors of consumer behaviors; they have criticized the opposite findings arguing that “researchers have used a student sample in which male consumers, unlike those from the general public (as used in this study) tend to have more discretionary time, be younger and more adventurous”; having more time was linked to variety-seeking by Simonson (1990).

Regarding the influences of age on variety-seeking, ample evidences could be found; the age of an individual plays an important role, since the desire for change decreases as people grow older, though this cannot be applied to all areas of life and to all purchasing situations. Previous studies (e.g. Givon, 1985; Handelsman, 1987) have confirmed the
effects of age on variety-seeking behavior in product-purchase context; still, we could not find same evidences in the service-purchase context (which is focused in this study).

Following an explorative approach, we have developed hypotheses regarding the existence of an effect; the postulation is that the two interested demographic factors affect consumer variety-seeking intention in the pre-defined task context:

**H1.2.1**: Consumer’s gender has effects on the level of variety-seeking.

**H1.2.2**: Consumer’s age has effects on the level of variety-seeking.

Apart from nationality and demographics, hypotheses are developed on the impacts of cultural-dimensions and explained:

### 2.1.3 Collectivism and variety-seeking

Looking through the lens of consumer behavior, collectivistic consumers may feel obliged to choose products and brands that could be accepted and liked by others or are better choices for all. Ignoring variety seeking temptation is a behavior congruent with collectivism because it may foster the group interests and could be found expedient by most members. They are most likely to sacrifice personal interests for group's welfare and show high reliance on and short emotional distance from purchase decisions proved to be acceptable by others. Collectivists believe they should restrain their actions and impulses, ignore temptations and desires in favor of group interests (Schwartz and Bilsky, 1990). Since variety-seeking is interest in having more and different brands or varieties of actually similar products just for desires and temptations, collectivistic consumers feel it needs to be ignored. Recent researches proved that collectivists exhibit a higher level of action control (Abe et al., 1996). This may lead to ignore desire for new options and to suppress variety seeking tendencies. Besides, Variety seeking points to changing selection and purchase behavior. Since variety seeking in many collectivistic cultures is similar to being different — is mainly assumed as a negative behavior (Bellah et al., 1985; Kim and Markus, 1999; Triandis, 1995) — collectivistic consumers may be less variety seeker and more loyal to their previous selections or the options approved by others in previous
occasions; options in accordance with their social-class and status, which are in general regarded to be “good for all of us”. Thus, we postulate:

**H1.3**: Collectivism has a negative effect on consumer variety-seeking.

### 2.1.4 Uncertainty avoidance and variety seeking

Based on *Hofstede* (1984) in high uncertainty avoidance societies, uncertainty is viewed as a threat that must be controlled via conservatism, law and order, whereas countries with low uncertainty avoidance find uncertainty less threatening. As a result, people are more open to change, willing to take risks, and tolerant for diversity, ambiguity or novelty. According to *Leo et al.,* (2005) uncertainty avoider consumers are more likely to trust on their familiarity with brands, to reduce ambiguity. On the other hand, since variety seekers are interested in innovative, new options and see benefits in changing their choices (*Helmig*, 2001), it is logical that they would, consequently, belong to low-uncertainty avoidance group of customers. This postulation is also in accordance with the OSL theory, because of the attention to keep the standards and avoid any deviation from “normal and usual” (*Hofstede*, 1988) — which is among cultures with high uncertainty avoidance level. Thus, the optimum stimulus would be kept at lower levels and sensation seeking may be regarded as an unforgivable mistake; lower level of optimum stimulus and exploratory tendencies, ends to lower variety-seeking among consumers (*Raju*, 1980). We hypothesize:

**H1.4**: Uncertainty avoidance has a negative effect on consumer variety-seeking.

### 2.1.5 Masculinity and variety-seeking

Purchase is among the best ways to show others achievements and status; a largely symbolic means of demonstrating achievement is by having the latest and most novel possessions. This essentially serves as a proxy for success, reflecting a given level of status in a society; brand switching and impulse purchases are expected to occur more often in masculine cultures. Also according to Singh (2005), higher levels of masculinity
in societies are indirectly reflected in individual’s material possessions and the quantity or variety of the possessions. Individuals from such societies would therefore be more curious of new products in the marketplace (Singh, 2005) — or products unfamiliar to them — which would help them display their achievements; “show off” and “emulation”, — the two phenomena that influence individual purchase behavior—are therefore expected to be at higher lever in masculine societies, and for consumers with high level of masculinity.

OSL theory is also a good base to explain higher variety-seeking tendency among masculine cultures and individuals, since there is more emphasis on ambition seeking, pleasure and choosing “big and differentiated solutions” when masculinity is at higher level (Hofstede, 1980). Thus, optimum stimulus level or arousal seeking interest would increase and variety-seeking tendencies would be supported. We conclude the following hypothesis:

**H1.5:** Masculinity has a positive effect on consumer variety-seeking.

### 2.1.6 Long-term orientation and variety-seeking

Time orientation is defined among influencers on consumer spending behaviors, and purchase decisions in several researches (de Mooij, 2011; Hofstede, et al., 2010). Long-term oriented consumers consider their own selves responsible for future, and avoid present-precedence when deciding to purchase. As the result, focus on short-term pleasures, interests and temptations would decrease. Since variety-seekers show more interest in seeking sensation, also pleasure provided by change (see McAlister and Pessemier, 1982), and is not based on functional benefits (see Givon, 1984), Long-term orientation — which is based on thrift in favor of future and is focused on utilitarian values — would have negative impacts on their purchase-consumption desires. We logically postulate:

**H1.6:** Long-term orientation has a negative effect on consumer variety-seeking.
2.2 Quality-consciousness: a utilitarian behavior of consumer

Quality-consciousness is a rather confusing concept and has received little attention in marketing literature, compared to other quality-related concepts. The concept was first introduced by Darden and Ashton (1974) and later identified by Steenkamp (1986, cited in: Steenkamp and van Trijp, 1989, p. 12) as “a mental predisposition to respond in a consistent way to quality-related aspects which is organized through learning and influences behavior”. Quality-consciousness is an “evaluative mental process”, and is among underlying behaviors of a consumer (Steenkamp 1990); it is a motivational factor posited to lead to consistent responses with respect to quality-related aspects (Steenkamp, 1990). Based on the definition, quality-consciousness is a consumer characteristic regarded as the result of a mental process among underlying latent variables of his behavior; the concept is defined as a good example of utilitarian aspect of consumer behavior and is described as a task-oriented, functional, rational behavior of consumers that are in conscious pursuit of an intended consequence. We conceptualize quality-consciousness, as the degree to which a consumer focuses on gaining quality products or services based on his own perception (Ailawadi et al., 2001). The concept needs to be declared in line with psychological and sociological literature. Although cultural values, social variables and personal characteristics are suggested as predictors of quality-consciousness by Steenkamp and van Trijp (1989), no studies have investigated the impacts.

Quality-consciousness, as interpreted in this study, is based on two core concepts: perceived-quality and price. Following Steenkamp (1989), the concept has significant association with perceived-quality and shows a positive influence on the maximum price a consumer is willing to pay; a direct effect of quality-consciousness on maximum price was also proved by Steenkamp and van Trijp (1989). Regarding perceived-quality, there is a remarkable issue: it stresses that quality judgments are dependent on the perceptions, needs, goals and other personal variables of the consumer (Steenkamp, 1990). According to Thompson et al. (1989) perceived-quality, as a judgment, emerges in a contextual
setting, and consists of comparative, personal and situational factors; it cannot be located “inside” the consumer as a completely subjective concept or “outside” the consumer (e.g. in a product) as a subject-free objectivity.

One main point here is that “when price is the only extrinsic cue available\textsuperscript{100}, the subjects clearly perceive quality to be related positively to price” (Dodds et al., 1991, p. 316). Thus, quality-conscious consumers in this research are defined as those who accept the price-(perceived)quality association — tend to perceive price as a quality signal— and also manifest intention to pay more for a higher perceived quality.

Considering the role of context, we have developed hypotheses on the effects of nationality, and demographic profile on this behavior; later, the effects of cultural dimensions are postulated:

\subsection{2.2.1 Nationality and quality-consciousness}

In respect to cross-national differences in quality-consciousness of consumers, Bao et al. (2003) demonstrated the differences among consumers from United States and China, arguing that it could be caused by nonconformity in contextual elements. In another attempt, Lyonski et al. (1996) showed the cross-national variations in quality-consciousness, analyzing the applicability of CSI (Consumer Style Inventory) as an accepted instrument for studying mental characteristics of consumer decision making; testing the instrument in four different countries signalized variations in quality-consciousness level among the four samples. Walsh et al. (2001) continued this way testing the instrument in Germany and found interesting variations in quality-consciousness level of consumers compared to the results reached by Lyonski et al. (1996).

\textsuperscript{100} This was the case in our research since we have not indicated to any special brands or stores when asking respondents about restaurant visit.
Apart from the previous findings, when we consider quality-consciousness as a mainly cognition-based process — based on the definition presented by Steenkamp\(^{101}\) (1986) — the nationality effects (as a contextual factor) could be presumed, since several studies conceptualize cognition, evaluations of objects, judgments, and computational processes of the mind as context-specific (e.g. Smith and Collins, 2010; Mesquita et al., 2010). Thus, we logically postulate:

**H2.1**: Nationality affects quality-consciousness of consumers.

### 2.2.2 Demographic profile and quality-consciousness

The role of gender in quality-consciousness — as defined in our research\(^ {102}\) — has been interested by previous researchers (e.g. Mitchell and Walsh, 2004, Sproles and Kendall, 1986; Mokhlis and Salleh, 2009); females have been often confirmed to be more quality conscious than men. Of course, their task context and the countries selected were different from those interested in this study.

Also, studies on the role of age in quality-consciousness (e.g. McDonald, 1994) have mainly confirmed the positive effect of this factor. Still, most researches have used student samples or, in some cases, samples were selected from a single group of age (older than 45). Focused on the role of demographics in the interested task context, we postulate:

**H2.2.1**: Consumer’s gender has effects on the level of quality-consciousness.

**H2.2.2**: Consumer’s age have effects on the level of quality-consciousness.

---

\(^{101}\) It is “a mental predisposition to respond in a consistent way to quality-related aspects which is organized through learning and influences behavior” Steenkamp (1986, cited in: Steenkamp and van Trijp, 1989, p. 12)

\(^{102}\) The concept has been sometimes introduced under other names in different researches (e.g. perfectionism in Mitchell and Walsh, 2004).
2.2.3 Collectivism and quality-consciousness

According to de Mooij (2011), in collectivistic cultures, people are more price consciousness\(^\text{103}\); thus, the maximum price a consumer is ready to pay would be lower. Searching for a lower-priced option, and price bargaining are common activities in collectivistic cultures (de Mooij, 2010). Collectivistic notions of the self that emphasizes other-focused decision making, self-control and moderation would all discourage the consumer to attend desires, decide for impulse purchases and feel free to pay more in exchange for high-quality products. Besides, for a collectivist consumer, purchase means gratification of needs; this interpretation would easily reject more payment (higher level of price) for a product, when the need (e.g., need for food in hunger) could be gratified with a lower level of, both, price and quality in purchase of another option. Thus, we postulate: \( \text{H2.3: Collectivism has a negative effect on consumer quality-consciousness.} \)

2.2.4 Masculinity and quality-consciousness

Masculinity has impacts on status-purchase, unconscious classification to decide for better options, and show-off (de Mooij, 2011). Masculinity-oriented consumers prioritize demonstration of material success and quality, in any product category (de Mooij, 2010); this way, the maximum price-level consumer is ready to pay would increase. Studies have confirmed that consumer expenditure and tendency to pay (e.g., for different leisure activities) is significantly higher in masculine cultures. Lower masculinity levels are correlated with low-interest in product-brand status, and value notions — whether price or quality (see de Mooij, 2011, 2010). Considering the two associations of quality-consciousness (perceived-quality and maximum spending level) we hypothesize: \( \text{H2.4: Masculinity has a positive effect on consumer quality-consciousness.} \)

\(^{103}\) This is in personal purchases and except for status products.
2.2.5 Individualism and quality-consciousness

Individualism is associated with ego-focused purchases; an individualist consumer decides for fun, uniqueness and distinction as the priorities in purchase and would be ready to pay for it. Price comparison and bargaining are proved to be negatively affected by individualism (see de Mooij, 2011). In individualistic cultures, convenience is more important than bargaining to reach the best price; de Mooij (2011) confirmed the negative correlation between price-consciousness and individualism. The maximum price level consumer is ready to pay — in return for a qualitatative option — would increase. We, therefore, logically postulate:

H2.5: Individualism has a positive effect on consumer quality-consciousness.

2.2.6 Power-distance and quality-consciousness

Large power-distance cultures are status-oriented in purchases; demonstration of one’s success or status to others is an influential factor in their purchase behavior (see de Mooij, 2011). Remembering the core elements of quality-consciousness — maximum price-level and perceived-quality of an option — status-oriented consumers would be those who prove tendency to accept higher price-levels to reach qualified options. Thus, consumer spending willingness would be higher in large power-distance cultures (de Mooij, 2011). Besides, power-distance can influence the evaluation system of an individual; more attention to superiority, when evaluating an option, is the result of large power-distance tendencies (Hofstede et al., 2011). We, thus, postulate that a consumer with large power-distance tendency in his (her) internal culture would be more attracted to high-quality products, accepting higher price-levels, and hypothesize:

H2.6: Power-distance has a positive effect on consumer quality-consciousness.
2.2.7 Long-term oriented and quality-consciousness

Time orientation is proved to have significant effects on consumer spending patterns with respect to product price; long-term oriented consumers are likely to be more price-conscious and define price as their main selection criteria de Mooij (2011). Thus, their tendency to pay more would be decreased, when there are options with lower price-levels. Also according to Hofstede et al., (2010), the dimension has impacts on purchase and consumption patterns of individuals; whereas in short-term oriented cultures, interest in conspicuous consumption and status-oriented purchases is high, long-term oriented cultures try to be moderate. As the result, the tendency to gain options with higher price levels would be lower among long-term oriented consumers, when the need could be satisfied with a lower price-quality option. We, therefore postulate:

H2.7: Long-term orientation has a negative effect on consumer quality-consciousness.

2.2.8 Restraint and quality-consciousness

Based on Minkov (2007) and Hofstede et al. (2010), high levels of restraint would influence people to define a discipline for their behaviors and try to keep themselves disinterested; this way, consumer spending willingness and their acceptance of the higher price levels would logically decrease. Restraint is also positively correlated with thrift; a restrained consumer would limit purchases and have no trust in the suggested price for a product (brand). Also, the importance of pleasure in life would be limited when restraint dimension is at higher level (see also Minkov, 2007; Hofstede et al. 2010). Respecting all these arguments, both, consumer’s tendency to obtain high-quality products, and the maximum price level he would pay would be decreased. Therefore:

H2.8: Restraint has a negative effect on consumer quality-consciousness.
2.3 Anticipated regret

Anticipated regret, as one of the two natures of regret (experienced and anticipated), was introduced by Janis and Mann (1977) to address the main psychological effect of the various worries that beset a decision maker, before any losses actually materialize; it is interpreted as a *negative emotion* emerged from developing *mental simulations* of decisions or choices, and their consequences (Seilheimer 2001). Unlike experienced regret — which is “after” a selection was made — anticipated regret, is based on present or future orientation, and is expected “prior to” making decisions (Zeelenberg 1999a). It is simulated now to minimize our experienced-regret in future. Anticipated regret could be, therefore, named “an ambassador”; it is a function of predicted negative outcomes of the decisions, and its prerequisite is development of alternative scenarios — other than the current state (Zeelenberg and Pieters, 2006b). This concept was explicitly studied, for the first time, by economists in regret theory and its consequences on individual decision making were also analyzed (see Bell 1982).

Anticipated regret — as experienced regret — has several main elements that separate it from some linked concepts (e.g., remorse, guilt, sadness, disappointment). The main point is that it involves a feeling of responsibility, agency and control (Das and Kerr, 2010; Landman, 1993); it leads to a specific action tendency and motivational goals (Roseman et al., 1994). This would have intentional and behavioral consequences in future. Furthermore, it could be conceptually, logically and experientially a matter of *both thought and feeling* in an interdependent and co-constitutive construct; it incorporates both cognitive (e.g. remembering or imagining) and emotional aspects (e.g. sorrow or pain) at the same time, and is not reducible to a cognition based concept. It “is an experience of felt-reason or reasoned-emotion” (Landman, 1993, p. 36) and cannot be sensed without thinking (Zeelenberg, 1996). Thus, a sort of emotion-cognition management with influences on decision-making process is involved with the concept (Bathaee, 2013); a “unification of states of mind and feeling” is the prerequisite of anticipated regret (Landman, 1993, p. 45). The concept entails also a third conative facet that points to wish
for reverse, return, change in decision; the cognitive, affective and conative components are interdependent each need to be focused in order to gain a complete picture of the regret one expects. Anticipated regret functions especially well in uncertain situations (Zeelenberg and Beattie, 1997); it could be called a defensive strategy (see Landman, 1993). Also, the choice between different alternatives must be regarded; “If only one action is a serious candidate regret may not arise at all” (Sugden, 1985, p. 92). Finally, one important association of anticipated regret is context; It “is colored by external features of the decision context” (Landman, 1993, p. 180), and enjoys context-specificity. Thus, anticipated regret is not habitual and could be studied in different contexts and decision-making situations. Following, hypotheses are developed on the role of nationality, demographics and cultural dimensions in consumer anticipated regret:

2.3.1 Nationality and anticipated regret

There are contradictory orientations toward the role of nationality on anticipating — or experiencing — regret. Whereas Landman (1993) introduced nationality (as well as culture) among the contextual variables that seems likely to lead one to greater levels of regret, Cadish (2001, p. 2) maintains that regret — whether experienced or anticipated— would be beyond personal and cultural elements, and nationality would have no effects on regret one feels: “Regrets are universal; nearly everyone has them. Regrets transcend age, gender, race, culture, nationality, religion, language, social status, and geographic location”. Also Ritrov and Baron (1995) reported an experiment ignoring nationality because they thought it would have no effects on regret in general.

Although we could not find any study focused on the nationality effects on anticipated regret, according to Landman (1993) and Mesquita et al. (2010) anticipated regret as a cognition-emotion based behavior could not be conceptualized without contextual effects. Both cognitive and affects parts of the behaviors or intentions are context-specific (Mesquita, 2010; Smith and Collins, 2010) and ignoring nationality (as immediate surrounding or socio-cultural concept) would be a shortcoming. Thus, we suggest:

**H3.1** Nationality has effects on the level of anticipated regret.
2.3.2 Demographic profile and anticipated regret

Most psychological researches portray regret as a “phenomenon of old age and middle age” (Landman, 1993, p.157) and suggest a positive relation between age and regret. However, their argument is that older people had greater opportunity to have mistakes and could be more suffered from losses in the past. This reason is mainly related to the experienced regret and not the future-oriented anticipated regret; still, few evidences support the existence of age influences on the future-oriented regret (see Landman et al., 1995).

Also regarding gender influences, women are stereotypically considered as the more emotional gender and are expected to have more regret. Although most available studies of regret do not include demographic features among interested variables, or find no gender differences in its overall incidence (e.g. Shimanoff, 1985; Kinnier and Metha, 1989), there are studies (e.g. Gutmann, 1975) that suggest the opposite, declaring that in certain ages (and situations), men appear more likely to have regret feeling. Based on Landman (1993, p. 164) although “so far men’s and women’s regrets appear more similar than dissimilar in incidents and content”, still “it appears that age and gender may both play a role in certain regrets”. Since anticipated regret is associated with counterfactual thinking, it is expected to differ in the incidence of domain-specific counterfactual thought affected by gender, age and other demographic features (see Landman et al., 1995). Following this approach and having an explorative orientation, we develop hypothesis on the existence of the effects:

**H3.2.1:** Consumer’s gender has effects on the level of anticipated regret.

**H3.2.1:** Consumer’s age has effects on the level of anticipated regret.
2.3.3 Restraint and anticipated regret

Consumer restraint, as declared, is associated with lower spending tendency, leisure, fun and pleasure; in other words, hedonic behaviors of consumers would be limited (See Bathaee, 2011 a; Hofstede et al., 2010). This would consequently provide lower levels of negative emotions and therefore consumer anticipated regret would be logically decreased. Furthermore, restraint is interpreted as self-discipline and control system for individual when making decisions; knowing that anticipated regret is mainly associated with responsibility, the negative impact would be clarified. When self-control is implemented, there would be limited degree of responsibility needed for future mistakes afterwards. It would be, therefore, plausible to suggest:

H3.3 Restraint has a negative effect on the level of anticipated regret.

2.3.4 Uncertainty avoidance and anticipated regret

Anticipated regret is a negative emotion emerged aimed to minimize our experienced-regret in future; this negative emotion about unknown risks is inherent in most our decisions. Uncertainty and anticipating regret are two inseparable concepts. According to Landman (1993) anticipated regret functions especially better in uncertainty situations. Also, anticipated regret and risk aversion have been implicitly declared as two relevant concepts (see Landman, 1993; Zeelenberg, 1999; Janis and Mann, 1977). Still, no studies on the direct effects of uncertainty avoidance on consumer anticipated-regret could be found. However, Janis and Mann (1977) projected that uncertainty is negatively correlated with anticipatory regret; anticipated regret is defined as a tactic to gain knowledge (and certainty) of alternative outcomes, prior to make decisions (Landman, 1993). Considering the definition of uncertainty avoidance, high levels of the dimension signalize a fear of unknown-risky options, and high interest in safe substitutes; it would logically motivate consumer to decide for a defensive strategy to prevent future negative outcomes, and anticipated-regret would be a good choice. Anticipated regret is a self-control mechanism
a defensive strategy that could be more interested for cautious consumers. Also, according to Landman (1993), those who avoid uncertainties decide more for forward thinking expecting possible future regrets. We, therefore, postulate:

**H3.4** Uncertainty avoidance has a positive effect on the level of anticipated regret.

### 2.3.5 Individualism and anticipated regret

Individualism is associated with ego-focused attitudes and emotions (de Mooij, 2011). The need to be autonomous and the emphasis on personal decision-making — as core elements of individualism — would logically improve the internal responsibility of an individual. Individualism is involved in explaining internal locus of control; higher levels of the dimension, is significantly correlated with a belief in personal responsibility expecting that decision outcome depends on self-performance and behavior (de Mooij, 2011). Since responsibility, agency, and control are inseparable elements of anticipated regret (Das and Kerr, 2010; Landman, 1993) we postulate that higher levels of individualism would have positive effects on the level of regret a consumer anticipates, feeling more responsible for his own decisions and their consequences. Thus, we suggest:

**H3.5** Individualism has a positive effect on the level of anticipated regret.

### 2.3.6 Long-term orientation and anticipated regret

Long-term orientation is proved to make an individual think responsible about future, and decide for changes in consequence (Hofstede et al., 2010). According to Minkov (2007) long-term oriented individuals are more focused on possible adverse consequences of any actions; they expect negative impacts of their decisions, and their anticipated regret would be increased. Based on Minkov (2007), whereas those with lower level of long-term orientation are more interested in stability, no changes, and “let it remain as it is”, long-term oriented individuals value change, decide for activities, and try to “progress with
time”; this would, in its own turn, intensify the feeling of responsibility, and the need to pre-compute and justify decisions to prevent future mistakes. We logically postulate:

**H3.6** Long-term orientation has a positive effect on the level of anticipated regret.

3. **Anticipated regret, variety-seeking and quality-consciousness: hedonic and utilitarian effects**

3.1 **The role of anticipated regret in consumer decisions**

The influence of emotions on decision-making is widely acknowledged in several disciplines (e.g. *Elster*, 1998; *Janis and Mann*, 1977; *Pieters and Van Raaij*, 1988); this also applies to regret (*Zeelenberg*, 1999a). Although research on the issue originated in economics and psychology, regret is introduced as a multi-disciplinary subject interested in many other different domains such as finance, marketing, neuroscience, medicine and law (*Zeelenberg and Pieters*, 2007). Several studies have proved that anticipation of regret influences the decision making process in motivational, emotional, rational and behavioral aspects in different contexts (e.g. *Janis and Mann* 1977; *Pieters and Zeelenberg* 1999; *Zeelenberg et al.* 1998); the reason was regret aversion of individuals. *Janis and Mann* (1977, p. 219) argued that regret aversion leads to more “vigilant” decision making: “Arousal of anticipatory regret ... has the constructive effect of deterring a person from indiscriminately seizing upon a seemingly attractive opportunity without forethought about the consequences”. That is, individuals pre-compute behavior-focused counterfactuals when making decisions; the possible future — anticipated — regret will be thus made salient and would be reflected in their intentions and behaviors.

Consequences of anticipated regret was rather neglected in purchase-consumption context; in our work, apart from the role of cultural-contextual dimensions on the three interested behaviors, we analyzed the hedonic and utilitarian consequences of anticipated regret on two other behaviors (variety-seeking and quality-consciousness). In other words, the relations among the three purchase behaviors are also interested to complete our
conceptual model and be the last piece of puzzle. Aim is discovering the constructive functions of anticipated regret in both utilitarian and hedonic aspects, and the hidden interactions among the purchase behaviors.

### 3.1.1 Anticipated-regret and utilitarian consequence: effect on quality-consciousness

Knowing that perceived-quality is directly related to quality-consciousness (see Steenkamp 1990; Zaichkowsky, 1985) and regret — whether anticipated or experienced— (see Inman et al. 1997), the linkage between anticipated regret and quality-oriented behaviors could be tested. The prediction of the linkage is consistent with the literature. Studies have proved that people are motivated to avoid post-decisional regret (e.g. Loomes and Sugden 1982), anticipate it, and take it into account when making decisions about quality, price, and other product details (e.g. Ritov 1996; Larrick and Boles 1995). In a scenario based study, Simonson (1992) confirmed that anticipating a regretful decision in future makes it more likely for consumers to purchase an item that would shield them from this possible regret. In another attempt, Shapiro (1968) proved that an individual would decide for higher-priced products against the possibility of losing out — or having the feeling of regret — because of the assumed low-quality of the low-priced product. Also, Bao et al., (2003) supported the strong relation between quality-consciousness and aversion of any possible risks (in our study: risk of experiencing regret in future). Therefore, we argue that the constructive function of anticipated regret would stimulate consumers to pre-compute future outcomes of a purchase, focused on the quality; they would accept the maximum price-level to reach their perceived-quality. Thus, we hypothesize:

**H4.1** Anticipated regret has a positive effect on quality-consciousness of consumers.
3.1.2 Anticipated regret and hedonic consequence: effect on variety-seeking

The link between anticipated regret and variety-seeking intention has not been interested before; however several correlative concepts, in terms of behavioral intentions, were focused. As an example, Tsiros and Mittal (2000) found an inverse relationship between regret and repurchase intentions. Also Zeelenberg and Pieters (2004) demonstrated a positive relationship between experienced regret and switching intentions. In a recent attempt, Sanchez-Garcia et al. (2012) studied the role of variety-seeking tendencies, satisfaction and experienced regret on short-term and long-term revisit intentions; they proved the mediated role of experienced regret, as well as, variety-seeking on revisit tendencies of consumers. The study confirmed the undeniable role of regret – almost twice that of satisfaction – on long-term intentions of consumers. Still, the focus in all the named studies was on experienced — and not anticipated — regret.

In contrast to experienced regret, Shefrin and Statman (1986) proposed that anticipated regret prevents investors from selling or switching. Also, Lee et al. (2009) demonstrated that in some decision-making situations, experienced and anticipated regrets have reversal functions and opposite effects.

Aimed to examine constructive functions of anticipated regret, we postulate that the concept involves tendencies to remove, decrease or prevent future mistakes. Consumers would be so induced to make choices that lower the likelihood of “having to kick oneself”\(^\text{104}\) afterwards (Janis and Mann 1977); they would avoid risk-seeking and explorative behaviors which could end to maximizing experienced regret in future. Thus, anticipated regret could promote careful comparisons of choice alternatives, and be a strategy for self-control when attempting to resist temptation (Pieters and Zeelenberg 1999). Thus, hedonic behaviors — that are based on fun, pleasure and explorative emotions — and in our study variety-seeking — that is far from rationality in choice (Berlyne 1960) — would be negatively affected. We hypothesize:

**H4.2:** Anticipated regret has a negative effect on variety-seeking tendency.

### 3.2 Utilitarian-hedonic linkage: quality-consciousness and variety-seeking

The direct relation between quality-consciousness and variety-seeking has not been analyzed before. Still, in a study on consumer decision-making styles, Walsh et al. (2001) described consumers with high levels of quality-consciousness who at the same time showed high levels of variety-seeking. The relation between the two behaviors could be followed when we consider the utilitarian-hedonic duality of behaviors. Edwards (1990) argued that cognition-based components of attitude — including judgments — associated with an object are influential in development of emotion-based components. Thus, affective components of attitude are post-cognitive. Also, the interaction between hedonic and utilitarian aspects of purchase has been previously examined. Babin and Attaway (2000) found a significant positive correlation between the two dimensions of the purchase-value construct. Results were confirmed in another attempt by Michon and Chebat (2004). Also, Chiu et al. (2005) accepted the positive effects of utilitarian values on hedonic values of purchase.

Considering the fact that the modern consumer is more demanding than ever, having the opportunity to reach the best price, quality, and variety all together balancing the options — he (she) does not need to decide for one sacrificing the others — we postulate that quality-conscious consumers would not limit his choices when (s)he can find more (or even better) substitutes. Since quality is what they mainly pursue, and higher price levels are acceptable for them, any possibly high-qualified option could be accepted by a modern quality-conscious consumer. Following Foxal (1993), we postulate that in this case, the consumer — though satisfied with previous quality-based choice and its price — switches for the “potential” substitute pleasure and the benefit provided by change itself.

Building on the arguments, we hypothesize that:

**H4.3.** Quality-consciousness has a positive effect on variety-seeking tendency.

---

105 Especially in service purchase context (restaurant visit) which is interested in this research.
4. Positioning

The three interested dependent variables of consumer behavior are introduced in this part; concentrating on these variables, we developed postulations on the impacts of contextual (nationality and demographic profile) and cultural dimensions in purchase context. Also the internal relations between the three consumer behavior variables are studied, adding final hypotheses; thus, the conceptual model is presented as follows.

Figure 2: The conceptual model of the study

The developed hypotheses on the seven selected cultural dimensions, the hedonic and utilitarian variables of consumer behavior and the anticipated regret are all summarized in the following table (C-1) as declared. Also the interested effects of nationality, age and gender as contextual elements on the consumer behavioral aspects, as hypothesized are included in the table. Further details on survey methodology, scales development, sampling process, analyses and results are presented in the next part.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>H1.1</td>
<td>Nationality affects consumer variety-seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>H1.2.1</td>
<td>Consumer’s gender effects on variety-seeking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>H1.2.2</td>
<td>Consumer’s age has effects on variety-seeking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>H1.3</td>
<td>Collectivism has a negative effect on consumer variety-seeking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>H1.4</td>
<td>Uncertainty avoidance has a negative effect on consumer variety-seeking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>H1.5</td>
<td>Masculinity has a positive effect on consumer variety-seeking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>H1.6</td>
<td>Long-term orientation has a negative effect on consumer variety-seeking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>H2.1</td>
<td>Nationality affects quality-consciousness of consumers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>H2.2.1</td>
<td>Consumer’s gender has effects on quality-consciousness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>H2.2.2</td>
<td>Consumer’s age has effects on quality-consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>H2.3</td>
<td>Collectivism has a negative effect on consumer quality-consciousness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>H2.4</td>
<td>Masculinity has a positive effect on consumer quality-consciousness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>H2.5</td>
<td>Individualism has a positive effect on consumer quality-consciousness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>H2.6</td>
<td>Power-distance has a positive effect on consumer quality-consciousness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>H2.7</td>
<td>Long-term orientation has a positive effect on consumer quality-consciousness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>H2.8</td>
<td>Restraint has a negative effect on consumer quality-consciousness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>H3.1</td>
<td>Nationality affects consumer anticipated regret.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>H3.2.1</td>
<td>Consumer’s gender has effects on anticipated regret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>H3.2.2</td>
<td>Consumer’s age has effects on anticipated regret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>H3.3</td>
<td>Restraint has a negative effect on the level of anticipated regret.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>H3.4</td>
<td>Uncertainty avoidance has a positive effect on the level of anticipated regret.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>H3.5</td>
<td>Individualism has a positive effect on the level of anticipated regret.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>H3.6</td>
<td>Long-term orientation has a positive effect on the level of anticipated regret.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>H4.1</td>
<td>Anticipated regret has a positive effect on consumer quality-consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>H4.2</td>
<td>Anticipated regret has a negative effect on variety-seeking tendency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>H4.3</td>
<td>Quality-consciousness has a positive effect on variety-seeking tendency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C-1: Summary of the hypotheses
D. Survey methodology and analysis of the hypotheses

1. Survey method

1.1 Comparative studies in Germany and Iran

Aimed to analyze the hypotheses in respect to the role of cultural dimensions and contextual elements — also assess the measurement instrument— the researcher performed two parallel comparative surveys in a western and an eastern (or low-and high-context\textsuperscript{106}) culture with developed and developing economies; Germany and Iran were preferred for the research regarding their accessibility\textsuperscript{107}.

According to Hofstede (1980, 2001), Iran and Germany belong to two different country clusters in respect to their cultural dimensions; also in social, economical and demographic variables the countries prove considerable variations (see table D-1).

Learned from previous trials\textsuperscript{108}, we arranged to initially test the questionnaire in Iran; the items were translated from German to Persian language by the author\textsuperscript{109}, later evaluated as a complete scale by 25 native Iranians, and were finally back-translated to German language by 5 Iranians all proficient in German Language.

Few changes in wording and sentence structure were made, suggested by the back-translators to simplify the questions. Thus, the wordings, definitions and implied meanings of each item were analyzed to be appropriate and comparable in the two surveys; besides, it was tested that the respondents’ interpretations match the intended concepts.

\textsuperscript{106} Note that Iran is classified among high-context countries but according to Hofstede et al. (2010) Iran is not totally high-context and is positioned almost in the middle of context axis.

\textsuperscript{107} The author is a native Iranian.

\textsuperscript{108} For more information see Bathae, (2011a, b).

\textsuperscript{109} The author is a native Iranian.
Five business students, experienced in survey interviewing, were asked to randomly interview individuals in public places during a 40 days period (December 2011-January 2012) in Tehran. Later, the items accepted through Iranian survey were finalized and reassessed to be retested in Germany. Within a two months period of March-April 2012, the questionnaires were completed in Greifswald, Germany; 10 business students helped us in data gathering process. Interviewers in both countries were guided to prevent any verbal or implicational manipulations; for respondents, complete confidentiality was assured. Interviews were, in most cases, performed in less than ten minutes. The sample characteristics are reported in Table D-2.

Table D-1: Demographic and economical variables for Iran and Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demographic variables of the countries</th>
<th>Macro economical index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recent results, 2012^110</td>
<td>Results from 2009-2010^112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sex ratio (male/female)</th>
<th>Median Age (years)</th>
<th>Percentage of 15-65 years old people^111 in the country:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>77.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

110 Source: CIA and Index-mundi; The world factbook, July 2012 (est)
111 Respondents’ age structure is 15 to 64 years.
112 Source: CIA world fact book, Iranian Central bank data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>characteristics</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male %</td>
<td>Female %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranian sample</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany sample</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-2: German-Iranian samples: Demographics

There was no significant difference in mean age\(^\text{113}\) and male-female ratio\(^\text{114}\) between the two samples of Iran and Germany\(^\text{115}\). However, further statistical tests proved though gender differences were not obvious (Iran: chi-square=0.005, df=1, p>0.05; Germany: chi-square=.42, df=1, p>0.05) within the two sub-samples (the Iranian and German), age differences were significant\(^\text{116}\) (Iran: t=47.3, df=194, p<0.01; Germany: t=29.9, df=190, p<0.01). The difference in age distribution was expected since Greifswald is recognized as a university-town with more than 12500 student inhabitants\(^\text{117}\) and was declared — based on a 2008 study — as the “youngest city”\(^\text{118}\) in Germany, having the highest percentage of heads of household less than 30 years of age. On the other hand, Tehran is a mega-metropolis with more than ten million residents of all ages. Since mean age differences between the two samples are less than 2 years, age incomparability could not be troublesome in our compare-means analyses. Besides, the size of the two sub-samples was

\(^{113}\) t=1.11; df=384, p>0.05

\(^{114}\) chi-square=.25; df=1, p>0.05

\(^{115}\) Using pan-country data (n=384) and grouping the data based on the nationality variable (independent samples test).

\(^{116}\) Applying intra-country data and performing two separate one-sample tests to analyze age distribution within each sample.

\(^{117}\) Total population is estimated around 55771 (Wikipedia, Based on the latest statistical reports, December 2012).

not representative of the national population\textsuperscript{119}. However, based on Matsumoto and van de Vijver (2011, p. 125) when the goal of a study is “proving the relationship between variables” (and not generalization of the findings to the whole population) “representativeness of the sample is not a concern”.

### 1.2 Structure of the questionnaire

Regarding the survey instrument, the present research was structured based on a stepped framework; it could be named the result of a two-stepped project. Since we are interested in the cultural consequences in consumer-purchase context at individual-level, we have:

**Step 1: Develop and pre-test a valid dimensional model;**

In this step, the original concepts of Hofstede’s model, designed for organizational context were shifted to general concepts, without any context specifications. In other words, the elements that made each dimension context-specific were eliminated. Later, the context-free version was restructured with *implicit* orientation toward purchase and consumption context\textsuperscript{120}. In other words, no direct question about purchase-consumption behaviors was developed; respondents were only presented a scenario — at the beginning of the survey — and were asked to take part in a study designed by marketing department about their purchase behaviors. Thus, the dimensions (and measurement items) were adapted to the aspects that could be originated from cultural dimensions, and would implicitly affect every-day purchase and decision making processes of individuals. In other words, a consumer cultural framework was developed, shifting Hofstede’s dimensions to purchase context. The framework was, first, assessed in a pre-test attempt (see Bathae, 2011 b); Modifications were suggested based on the results to improve the scale. In the present

\textsuperscript{119} Total population of Iran is 79.0 million and for Germany 81.8 million. (Source: CIA, July 2012. est).

\textsuperscript{120} According to Matsumoto et al. (1997) the individual-level items, designed to measure dimensions, are better described in general value terms, without explicit indication to purchase situation; implicit indications to the task context (purchase) were added.
study, the improved version of the instrument was applied, having new samples of consumers, aimed to analyze the consumer culture at individual-level.

**Step 2: Analyze influences of consumer culture on purchase behaviors;**
Performing the step was among our main purposes in this work; consequences of cultural dimensions in consumer every-day purchases and decision making patterns are studied through developed hypotheses.

![Research structure: two-stepped process](image)

**Figure 3:** Research structure: two-stepped process

Figure 3 is a simplified version of the above explanations. Present study benefits from the first step — pre-tested (see Bathaee, 2011, b) and improved — and, in addition, includes the second step to complete the whole model; further details of structure and scale-items in the instrument — classified into cultural and consumer behavioral parts — are as follows:

### 1.2.1 Structure of the cultural-dimensions

A concise and clear questionnaire was designed for cultural dimensions. For each interested cultural dimension (i.e., individualism, collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, power distance, masculinity, long-term orientation and restraint) a measurement scale with
(at least) three items was designed. Most items were validated and accepted in previous trial and only few items were modified or added (see Bathaee, 2011 b). There are points that need to be explained about the developed part of the questionnaire. First, in respect to the study focus (marketing and consumer purchase behavior) and the measurement-analysis level (individual level), Hofstede’s survey instrument was not applicable\textsuperscript{121}. However, dimensions are defined, and their measures are developed, based on his works and scales; the core elements and the domains are determined inspired by his orientations and explanations (Appendix 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seven dimensions of personal consumer cultural orientations</th>
<th>Main sources of all scale items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>Hofstede et al. (1980);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism</td>
<td>Hofstede et al. (2008);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power distance</td>
<td>Hofstede et al. (2010);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty avoidance</td>
<td>Matsumoto et al. (1997);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>Yoo and Donthu (2005);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term orientation</td>
<td>Minkov (2007);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restraint</td>
<td>Oyserman et al. (2002);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhyne et al. (2002).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-3: Main sources of scale items (Cultural dimensions).

From these cores and domains, a number of plausible consequences or implications are discerned as survey items, which are whether exactly worded by previous researchers (listed in table D-3) or are logically identified as close enough to be a measurement item for a dimension. This scale development technique, with adapting measurement items, has been previously used by many other cross-cultural researchers (e.g., Clugstone et al. 2000; Yoo and Donthu 2005) and was also suggested by Hofstede (1998, p. 20): “different

\textsuperscript{121} As explained Hofstede’s questionnaire is focused on organizational behavior and national-level, whereas, for the present study, the researcher needed a questionnaire with an implicit orientation toward marketing and consumer behavior at individual-level.
respondent groups may need different ways of measuring, because the issues related to the common underlying syndrome are not the same for all categories of respondents. This means for different populations, different survey items, from among those conceptually related to the dimension, may have to be chosen”.

The developed questionnaire items are designed with an *implicit orientation* toward shopping and could be applicable and relevant to purchase-consumption behavior; this type of general-implicit items could be better analyzed and indicate the fundamental tendencies of consumers in a rather similar situation — which could be decision making, selecting and consuming steps. According to Matsumoto et al. (1997), the individual-level sample items are better described in general value terms (e.g. acceptance of inequality, social responsibility, sacrifice) rather than by specific statements tied to a single action, position or situation\textsuperscript{122}.

Apart from the study focus, according to Hofstede et al. (2010, p. 179) most validated surveys on cultural dimensions are products of western minds (e.g., IBM questionnaire by Hofstede, 1980; RVS questionnaire by Rokeach, 1973). In these cases the researcher is also “a child of his society” and his culture, so the questionnaire items are based on his way of thinking; the results from non-western country respondents, therefore, could be influenced. However, the present study is developed based on both Western and Eastern mind-sets\textsuperscript{123}; thus for designing some scale items, long discussions were needed to get free from doubts in respect to respondents interpretations.

We have also tried to attend to social considerations when developing the items. Note that in the pre-test of the cultural scale few items were different in the Iranian and the German questionnaires (see Bathae, 2011 b) — the items were considered to be inappropriate for

\textsuperscript{122} Regarding the generality of the items and their implicit attention to consumer behavior subject, no further explanations are provided to define each dimension in consumer behavior and marketing. For detailed information see Bathae, (2011).

\textsuperscript{123} I am indebted to my research adviser, Prof. Dr. Hans Pechtl for his instructions during the questionnaire development phase; all the items were designed, evaluated and confirmed after long discussion sessions under his guidance.
the respondents due to their cultural backgrounds (e.g., answering to the items related to power distance, with a focus on orientation toward power-holders, were proved to be rather bothersome and improper for Iranian respondents\textsuperscript{124}) and were changed to be both socially acceptable and, at the same time, comparable. However based on the pre-test results, the researcher decided to modify the scale and the differences were omitted. Thus, the core elements and domains of the dimensions, as well as, the deep meaning and interpretation of the questions were designed to be the same for both samples; a single revised scale was applied for two separate surveys in Germany and Iran.

1.2.2 Structure of the consumer-behavioral constructs

In addition to the cultural dimensions, the questionnaire entailed consumer-behavioral variables; for each of the three behavioral constructs, items were inspired by previous works (Table D-4) and formulated based on several considerations (survey purpose, category, context, respondents, etc). Constructs were designed to be representative, simple and compact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumer-behavioral constructs</th>
<th>Main sources of all scale items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated-regret</td>
<td>Wunderle (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seilhamer (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety-seeking</td>
<td>Helmig (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bansal et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality-consciousness</td>
<td>Steenkamp (1989, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zaichkowsky (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bakewell and Mitchell (2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Table D-4}: Main sources of scale items (consumer-purchase variables)

\textsuperscript{124} This could be related to the political situation in Iran and the Middle-east; the named items were removed by milder questions with similar conceptual orientation for interviews in Germany.
This part of survey was presented to the respondents in a simulated decision-making situation; all participants were presented with the same scenario. They were requested to: “Try to vividly imagine the situation where, for any reason, you have decided for eating out in a restaurant today. What would be your thoughts, interests or tendencies?” The scenario method is usually practiced in studies focused on anticipated regret (e.g. Pieters and Zeelenberg, 1999; Zeelenberg et al., 1998). Note that we selected food-service purchase in restaurant as the decision-making context in our scenario, since (apart from some organizational considerations):

- It was recognized to be more comparable than product purchase situation between the two countries;
- The nature of the task context (e.g. desirability, importance, number of options, information access, etc.) would be better equivalent in both cultures; The context entails elements, from both product and service purchases, which would make the findings more interesting for future and complementary researches;
- Regarding the higher level of uncertainty in service purchase or consumption situations, the aversion state and uncertainty avoidance tendency — which is named among main associations of regret — could be better focused;
- The study could have several managerial implications, regarding the innumerable food-service providers all over the world.

1.3 Scale items: the development process

Apart from the structure of the survey, details on the scale items, as well as, their background elements are presented:

1.3.1 Cultural dimensions: measurement items

The following explanations declare the development of cultural part of the survey based on their measurement aspects, including core element and domains (also see Appendix1):
• **Individualism and collectivism**

In the present study, we have decided to measure individualism and collectivism as two separated variables since we study the dimensions at individual-level. The most appropriate interpretation for this approach is the one that does not declare the two (individualism and collectivism) as opposite variables, measures each separately, and could be best applied in this research. Based on the literature\(^\text{125}\) and according to our interpretation of the main domains related to individualism are *self sufficiency, independence, privacy and reaching self declared goals*. Thus, the measurement items selected for this survey are:

**Individualism:**

- “This is my motto: me first” (priority of self).
- “Everyone should only take care of himself and his family” (self sufficiency).
- “No change in goals and plans for others” (independence, self sufficiency).
- “My private life is most important” (importance of privacy)

For collectivism, the importance of in-group and out-group categorization, and the role it plays in the personal life is measured. The main domains related to collectivism are, thus, harmony *with the group, duty of a person toward the group and the role of others advices in decision makings*. Regarding the consequences and implications of each of these domains in individual’s life, also based on our previous trial (see Bathae 2011 b) following measurement items were modified and applied:

**Collectivism:**

- “Personal interests are less important than group harmony” (group harmony).
- “Feel bad to do what others would not” (hidden duty feeling toward others).
- “Others play great role in my decisions” (role of others advices in decision makings).
- “Want to feel belonged to the group” (group harmony)

\(^{125}\) Sources: Hofstede et al. (2010); Oyserman et al. (2002); Markus and Kitayama (1991); Oyserman (1993); Triandis (1995); Matsumoto et al. (1997).
Note that there is a difference between our measurement approach and the one selected by Matsumoto et al. (1997) who repeated survey items for different contact groups (family members, friends, colleagues, neighbors, strangers, etc); we have not considered interpersonal situations. In our field of study — conversely to psychology — detailed interpersonal situations and relationships are rather irrelevant\(^{126}\). Thus, we have generalized all contact groups and have avoided naming each\(^{127}\) when measuring the variables items.

- **Long-term orientation**

In previous surveys, the focused domains are persistence, thrift and preference for future (instead of past and present) in needs gratification when it comes to planning and decision making. The scale developed for this study was inspired by valid surveys trying to — explicitly and implicitly — refer to the three main domains. It compares the importance of future-precedence, versus present-precedence for individuals when making choices since respondents are implicitly pushed to purchase-consumption context. The measurement items are as follows:

- “Future success is more important than today’s fun” (implicitly\(^{128}\): thrift, needs gratification)
- “Forget about today; plan for tomorrow” (implicitly\(^{129}\): persistence, thrift)
- “Who knows tomorrow; enjoy today” (R\(^{130}\), needs gratification).

\(^{126}\) Instead of interpersonal situations and contexts, we have focused on decision making context; an implicit indication to purchase situation was added to general value terms describing the respondent that the questionnaire is focused on consumer purchase behavior.

\(^{127}\) Example of the sample items developed by of Matsumoto et al. (2004) is: “For you, how important is to maintain self-control toward 1) family, 2) friends, 3) colleagues and 4) strangers”.

\(^{128}\) Since respondents were declared about research focus (consumer purchase behavior) the question would be interpreted to their interests in having fun in shopping, money spending instead of saving for future interests.

\(^{129}\) Implicit reference to: Persistence on future plans and sacrificing today’s pleasure and saving money for tomorrow.
• **Masculinity**

Referring to the previous explanations, the present study is based on the unipolar technique toward measuring all dimensions, including masculinity, among individuals; Femininity was not added among interested dimensions due to some executive limitations. Besides, conversed to some other studies, the present survey is focused on analyzing the psychological gender (and not biological gender). Knowing that masculinity refers to an ego-boosting mind-set based on the literature (Matsumoto et al., 1997; Hofstede, 1998; Hofstede et al., 2010), this dimension could be defined and measured by *emphasis on advancement, need for recognition or differentiation*, and *ambition orientation* as its main domains; the following items are designed to focus on the named features:

- “Fight to be the best” (focus on advancement)
- “Only satisfied when I get the best” (ambition orientation).
- “Usual, ordinary things are not enough” (**R**\(^{131}\), need to be differentiated and recognized)

• **Uncertainty avoidance**

The core element of this dimension is avoidance of ambiguity. Based on the literature (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede et al., 2008, 2010) the focus in measuring uncertainty avoidance among individuals is on the importance of *familiarity* and information in decision making, level of *fear and anxiety* in ambiguous situations, and the interest in avoiding any *risks and uncertainties*. Therefore the following items were selected:

- “Try to avoid risk in life” (risk and uncertainty avoidance)
- “Don’t like situations with unclear ends” (importance of familiarity, level of anxiety in ambiguous situations).
- “No risk, no fun” (**R**\(^{132}\), fear and anxiety in ambiguous situation)

---

\(^{130}\) Reversed item.

\(^{131}\) Reversed item.

\(^{132}\) Reversed item.
• **Power distance**

According to Hofstede et al. (2010), focus in measuring this dimension is on the *acceptance of inequality* and *expectation of unequal resources or benefits*. Based on our previous study (see Bathaee 2011, b) this dimension entailed following modified items:

- “Inequality is inevitable” (acceptance of inequality, expectation of inequality).
- “Society is like a ladder; one is placed higher and one lower” (expectation of inequality).
- “It bothers me that some people are placed higher than me in society” (R\textsuperscript{133}, acceptance of inequality).
- “It is ok that some are placed higher than me in society” (acceptance of inequality).

• **Restraint**

The indulgence-restraint is introduced by Minkov (2007) and Hofstede et al. (2010) based on three domains: happiness, life control and importance of leisure and fun. In respect to some empirical considerations, we have mainly focused on the restraint pole, though some items are also formulated in a reverse form to prove the reliability of the measurement. Furthermore, the two domains of happiness and fun were not included in our measurement approach; they were rather irrelevant to our study purpose and the selected context. Although happiness (subjective well-being) has definitely impacts on consumer behavior, it deserves a separate analytical study and was recognized to be distant from our goals. Happiness, whether internal as a permanent or external as an ephemeral feeling, needs to be analyzed from both cultural and, even more, psychological aspects; including this domain in a survey measuring cultural dimensions was decided to be improper. Also the importance of leisure and fun was not included in our survey; this domain would be the most important for studies focused on entertainment, tourism or purchase of luxury products. Regarding our study purpose and the number of items measuring dimensions, life control was decided to be the only, and the main domain measuring restraint. In

\textsuperscript{133} Reversed item.
respect to purchase and consumer behavior the most important question is about the regulations, rules and norms that one individual *has internally codified for himself*; all the dos and don’ts that one defines when deciding to purchase a product or brand. Thus the items developed by Minkov (2007), for his national-level culture analysis, were adapted, mainly, in respect to individual-level measurement and were selected only if they were meaningful in purchase situation. The four measurement items were modified based on our previous results (see Bathaee 2011 b) and decided to be applicable in both Iranian and German surveys:

- “Control yourself; you shouldn’t do whatever you like” (control of life).
- “Remain humble and control yourself” (control of desires and pleasures).
- “I control desires and wishes in me” (control of desires and pleasures).
- “When I wish for something I let myself free to have, or buy it” (R\(^{134}\), control of life and desires).

A summary of the above details is presented in Appendix 1.

### 1.3.2 Consumer behavioral Constructs: measurement items

In addition to cultural dimension, details on development of consumer-purchase constructs are included:

- **Anticipated regret**

  Based on the literature and according to our interpretation, regret is perceived and measured, as a construct, based on all the three affective, cognitive and conative components and is designed in the real-life situations; the food-service purchase context, where people make decisions (cognitive component), develop feelings (affective component) and show behaviors or intentions (conative component) is selected. An additional item, indicating general regret in respect to the decision, was also added to

\(^{134}\) Reversed item.
finalize the measuring instrument. The four indicators could draw a complete picture of the anticipated regret for a decision imagined to be made. The items are as follows:

- I would hardly get angry with my choice after I have visited a restaurant ($R_{135}$, affective component).
- It happens that I regret having decided for a restaurant to eat (general regret).
- After visiting a restaurant I tell myself: “choosing this restaurant for eating out was a mistake” (cognitive component).
- After visiting restaurant I often think “if only we had gone somewhere else” (conative component).

- **Quality-consciousness**

As declared, our interpretation of this construct was based on two simultaneous and interrelated elements: acceptance of price-quality relation, and intention to pay more (for a higher quality). The questionnaire items were developed considering both elements:

- I am willing to pay more for eating in a restaurant because I believe: “the higher the price, the better the quality”
- When visiting a restaurant, I orient myself to price, in order to make sure about the quality,
- As I wish for high quality in visiting a restaurant, I would be ready to pay more.

- **Variety-seeking**

Inspired by the original items designed by Helmig (1997) in German language, and the scale presented by Bansal et al., (2005), a new scale was developed. Since the pleasure provided by the change is the main element that separates variety-seeking from related concepts (e.g. switching, innovativeness), the indicators were developed to be based on this factor. The items are:

- I enjoy visiting a restaurant I have not tried before.

135 Reversed item.
- I do not like always going to the same restaurant.
- I would unwillingly decide for visiting a restaurant not tried before.
- I enjoy changing visit among the restaurants I have tried before.

2. Analyses and results

2.1 Reliability and validity analyses

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA), Cronbach’s alpha (CA) and item-to-total correlation (ITTC) measurements were undertaken to assess the internal validity of the developed scales; for each of the constructs — whether consumer behavioral, or cultural dimensions — measures were calculated (CA separated for each sample). Items that caused CA and ITTC measures for their related variables, in each sample — whether the German, Iranian, or both together (pan-country) — drop below the acceptable thresholds of 0.5 and 0.3 could not meet the level of internal consistency and were not qualified; also EFA values (with Varimax rotation) below 0.6 were removed (see Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). Based on the above measurement considerations, three items were removed. For the construct developed for restraint, one item (REST 2) did not prove to be reliable in the German sample (ITTC ≤ 0.3); it was removed from further analyses and the construct was modified to have three items. Also for power-distance, one item (PD3) showed an unacceptable value for ITTC in the Iranian sample and was removed from the construct. Besides, for variety-seeking as a consumer-behavioral variable, one item (VS4) was omitted from further analyses; in both samples ITTC measures suggested item removal. For the three constructs, results presented (Table D-5) are focused on the measures after the modification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research items</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>EFA</th>
<th>ITTC (≥0.3)</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha (≥0.5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>TVE % Loading (≥0.6)</td>
<td>CA Pan-country n=386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualism:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- My personal life is the most important (IND1)</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.77 .55</td>
<td>.72 .78 .67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Everyone should care for himself (IND2)</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.74 .51</td>
<td>··············</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No changes of plans or aims for others (IND3)</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.65 .42</td>
<td>··············</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Me first (IND4)</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.79 .57</td>
<td>··············</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collectivism:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to feel belonged to the group (COL1)</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.66 .34</td>
<td>.55 .58 .57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Others play roles in my decisions (COL2)</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.67 .35</td>
<td>··············</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Feel bad to do what others do not (COL3)</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.61 .30</td>
<td>··············</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Personal interests are less important than group harmony (COL4)</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.67 .35</td>
<td>··············</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masculinity:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fight to be the best (MAS1)</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.77 .45</td>
<td>.69 .75 .61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Normal and usual things are enough (MAS2; R)</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.74 .57</td>
<td>··············</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Only satisfied when I have best things (MAS3)</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.84 .48</td>
<td>··············</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncertainty avoidance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Try to avoid risks in life (UA1)</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.82 .55</td>
<td>.70 .75 .63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do not like situations with unclear ends (UA2)</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.77 .48</td>
<td>··············</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No risk, no fun (UA3; R)</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.78 .49</td>
<td>··············</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-term orientation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Who knows tomorrow; enjoy today” (LTO1; R)</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.76 .48</td>
<td>.69 .64 .63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Future success important than today’s fun (LTO2)</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.76 .47</td>
<td>··············</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Forget about today; plan for tomorrow (LTO3)</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.83 .57</td>
<td>··············</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research items</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>EFA (≥0.6)</th>
<th>ITTC (≥0.3)</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha (≥0.5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>TVE %</td>
<td>loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restraint:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Control desires and wishes (REST1)</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>53.6*</td>
<td>.65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>let myself free to have/buy it</em> (REST2; R: Item Removed)</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>(.06) GE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Control yourself; shouldn’t do whatever you like” (REST3)</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.75*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Remain humble and control yourself” (REST4)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.79*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power distance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inequality is unavoidable (PD1)</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Any society is like a ladder; one is placed higher and one lower (PD2).</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>It is ok that some are placed higher than me in society (PD3), Removed</em></td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>(.16) IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It bothers me that some are placed higher in society (PD4, R).</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anticipated regret:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Would hardly get angry with my choice after I have visited a restaurant (affective, REG1, R)</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It happens that I regret having decided for a restaurant to eat (general, REG2)</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Choosing this restaurant for eating out was a mistake” (cognitive, REG3)</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “If only we had gone somewhere else” (conative, REG4)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variety-seeking:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enjoy visiting a restaurant I have not tried before (VS1)</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.86*</td>
<td>.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do not like always going to the same restaurant (VS2)</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.85*</td>
<td>.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Would unwillingly decide for visiting a restaurant not tried before (VS3, R)</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.85*</td>
<td>.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>Enjoy changing visit among the restaurants I have tried before (VS4), Item Removed</em></td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>(.20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Continued)
Table D-5: Exploratory factor analyses; * indicates the values after the item-removal, and for the valid remained items; GE: German sample; IR: Iranian sample; R: Reversed item

In EFA test using pan-country approach (n=386) results confirmed that the measurement items could be accepted and the dimensions were validated (Eigenvalue for each cultural and consumer-behavioral dimension was above the acceptance level\(^{136}\)).

2.1.1 Validity of unipolar approach toward individualism and collectivism

A separate exploratory factor analysis was conducted to examine the validity of the unipolar approach toward individualism-collectivism (table D-6). Aim was to confirm that the developed constructs could be named separate at individual-level. Factor analysis with Varimax rotation technique proved that the eight items group, exactly as designed, into two separate components and explain 50.13% of the total variance.

\(^{136}\) Eignenvalues for all variables were over 1 (IND=2.19; COL=1.70; MAS=1.8; UA=1.86; LTO=1.85; REST=1.60; PD=1.65; REG=2.77; VS= 2.18; QC=2.15)
Thus, as explained by Hofstede et al. (2010), results confirm the two dimensions behave independent to each other, at individual-level of analysis.

2.1.2 Testing validity of constructs with PCA

In addition to exploratory factor analysis (EFA), and to reassess the underlying structure for the suggested constructs (consumer-behavioral and cultural dimensions) two further analyses were conducted. First, the 10 items designed for the three consumer-purchase constructs were tested applying a reduction technique namely principal component analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation was conducted.

The technique is suggested by Fischer and Fontaine (2011) for evaluation of structural equivalence\(^{137}\) in cross-cultural and multi-dimensional studies. Based on the results (table

\(^{137}\) This technique investigates the internal structure of the items in separate groups. Structural equivalence proves that the same indicators can be used to measure the theoretical constructs within the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement items for Individualism and Collectivism</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My personal life is the most important (IND1)</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone should care for himself (IND2)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes of plans or aims for others (IND3)</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me first (IND4)</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to feel belonged to the group (COL1)</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others play roles in my decisions (COL2)</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel bad to do what others do not (COL3)</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interests are less important than group harmony (COL4)</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D-7), we could ascertain about the underlying relationships among consumer-behavioral constructs developed for the two countries; Three factors were requested, based on the conceptual model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor loadings Iran</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Factor loadings Germany</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REG1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REG2</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REG3</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REG4</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS1</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS2</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS3</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC1</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC2</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC3</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalues</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of variance</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-7: Principle component analysis

PCA was later conducted with varimax rotation to reanalyze the underlying structure for items measuring cultural dimensions; results were unfortunately not satisfactory when the request for seven factors extraction was performed based on the data gathered from German sample. Although based on the results in the Iranian sample, the cultural dimensions were extracted as designed, in the analysis of the German sample few constructs were not extracted as planned\textsuperscript{138}. A serious modification in the cultural measurement model was therefore suggested.

\textsuperscript{138} It was obvious in the German sample that COL and REST were highly correlated and the planned structure could not be extracted.
2.1.3 Assessment of the measurement model: pan-country and intra-country

Next, the confirmatory factor analysis was performed to detect goodness-of-fit of the constructs and to evaluate the measurement model. For this reason, constructs (the seven cultural dimensions and the three consumer-behavioral constructs) were designed into ten latent variables with the accepted items; the variables were grouped into two base models of cultural and consumer-behavioral constructs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model fit indices</th>
<th>Base models</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df $&lt;$4 (p=0)</th>
<th>RMSEA $&lt;.08^{139}$</th>
<th>GFI $\geq .8^{140}$</th>
<th>RMR $\leq .1^{141}$</th>
<th>CFI $\geq .9$</th>
<th>SRMR $\leq .10$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany; n=191</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(df=209)</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.07  Pclose: .000</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer-behavioral</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.10  Pclose: .000</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iran; n=195</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(df=32)</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.05  Pclose: .107</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer-behavioral</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.09  Pclose: .001</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N=386; Iran-Germany</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(df=209)</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.07  Pclose: .000</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer-behavioral</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.09  Pclose: .000</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table D-8:** Assessment of both Cultural and Consumer-behavioral measurement models; pan-country and intra-country approaches

---

139 Homburg and Baumgartner (1995)
140 Mohr (1997).
141 Mohr (1997); Arbuckle and Wothke (1999).
The base models were first analyzed, separately, according to pan-country approach (entire sample of 386 German and Iranian respondents) applying a completely standardized solution reached using AMOS 21; later the analyses were performed, for each of the base models, separated for German and Iranian surveys; this approach is called intra-country analyses and evaluates the models comparing the two samples. For both cultural and consumer-behavioral base models, and in pan-country, as well as the two intra-country analyses, items were loaded significantly to their corresponding factors; results supported the independence of the developed cultural and purchase-behavioral constructs and provided empirical evidence of the validity of the two base models. Table D-8 reports a summary of the analyses. In general, for both cultural and consumer-behavioral measurement model, goodness-of-fit indices were acceptable, though in some indices (e.g., CFI for cultural model; RMSEA for consumer-behavioral model) results are mediocre or slightly below the benchmark level for one or more samples, and could be improved.

2.1.4 Validity of measurement constructs: assessments and modifications

To evaluate the base models, also ascertain indicator reliability and convergent-discriminant validity of the constructs and modify the base models further analyses were performed (TableD-9).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>t-value loading</th>
<th>Regression coefficients Standardized</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Fornell-larcker-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥3.84&lt;sup&gt;142&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>≥ .4&lt;sup&gt;143&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>≥ .6&lt;sup&gt;144&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>≥ .4&lt;sup&gt;145&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>≤ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty avoidance (UA) (p ≤0.001)</td>
<td>1 ...</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 9.34</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 9.16</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term orientation (LTO) (p ≤0.001)</td>
<td>1 8.90</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ...</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 9.35</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism (IND) (p ≤0.001)</td>
<td>1 9.44</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ...</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 7.74</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 10.31</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism (COL) (p ≤0.01)</td>
<td>1 5.21</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 4.80</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 6.37</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ...</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity (MAS) (p ≤0.001)</td>
<td>1 9.13</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 8.40</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ...</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restraint (REST) (p ≤0.001)</td>
<td>1 6.33</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 7.75</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ...</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power distance (PD) (p ≤0.001)</td>
<td>1 ...</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 6.20</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 5.30</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>142</sup> Homburg (1998)
<sup>143</sup> Homburg and Baumgartner (1995)
<sup>144</sup> Homburg and Baumgartner (1995)
<sup>145</sup> Homburg and Baumgartner (1995)
As reported, average variance extracted (AVE), composite reliability (CR), and Fornel-Larcker ratios were measured; for this purpose, t-value loadings, and standardized regression coefficients\(^{150}\) of pan-country analyses, were applied for the two base models, separately.

Results suggests that, except for the collectivism (COL) and restraint (REST) other constructs have acceptable validity and reliability and could be included in the model; the construct developed for restraint was mediocre, still acceptable since results were slightly below the benchmark level. However, for collectivism serious modifications were suggested. Thus, items with unacceptable results (COL2 and COL3) were removed; the

\(^{146}\) Homburg (1998)

\(^{147}\) Homburg and Baumgartner (1995)

\(^{148}\) Homburg and Baumgartner (1995)

\(^{149}\) Homburg and Baumgartner (1995)

\(^{150}\) Measured using AMOS 21.
modified model showed an improvement in both pan-country and intra-country approaches (table D-10). Also for power-distance (PD), the construct was accepted; though the AVE was below the acceptance level, the two other measures (CR and Fornel-Larcker) suggested the construct to be confirmed as it is and so, PD remained as a mediocre dimension in the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model fit indices</th>
<th>Base models</th>
<th>Base models</th>
<th>Base models</th>
<th>Base models</th>
<th>Base models</th>
<th>Base models</th>
<th>Base models</th>
<th>Base models</th>
<th>Base models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach: Intra-country</td>
<td>Germany n=191</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iran; n=195</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach: pan-country</td>
<td>Iran-Germany; n=386</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table D-10**: Modified measurement model; Cultural dimensions *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

The Collectivism was therefore constructed based on two items (COL1, and COL4) in the rest of the analyses; the construct — also Restraint (REST) — needs to be revised and further items need to be added in future trials.

**2.2 Testing the interactions among cultural dimensions**

Applying the modified base model, correlations of cultural dimensions were analyzed; results are reported in Table D-11. As obvious, in, both, direction and significance level of the correlations, differences are obvious.

---

151 Homburg and Baumgartner (1995)
152 Mohr (1997).
153 Mohr (1997); Arbuckle and Wothke (1999).
154 Homburg and Baumgartner (1995)
The main contrast in the two samples exists in the interaction between individualism and restraint; also the correlation between individualism and, both, long-term orientation and uncertainty-avoidance proves nonconformities in the Iranian and German consumers. In addition, for both power-distance and masculinity, and their interactions with other dimensions, most variations could be found which could indicate some divergence of consumer culture when comparing the two samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/ sample</th>
<th>(UA)</th>
<th>(PD)</th>
<th>(MAS)</th>
<th>(REST)</th>
<th>(LTO)</th>
<th>(IND)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power distance (PD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity (MAS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>-.30***</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restraint (REST)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.49***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term orientation (LTO)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.42***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism (IND)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism (COL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.67***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-11: Correlation of cultural dimensions; comparing the two samples; *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Still, some interesting similarities could be found; considering the completely different economical-social environments and cultural contexts in the two samples, the conformities would be an interesting finding and an appealing subject for further studies.

2.3 Role of contextual variables: demographics and nationality

Age and gender were the two interesting demographic variables in this study. As declared, samples were incomparable regarding the age factor; still at individual-level, the
association between gender and age in both cultural and consumer-behavioral constructs were analyzed. For age factor, correlation analyses using Pearson test were applied; gender interdependencies with cultural and consumer behavioral variables were measured using t-test. Results (Table D-12) confirmed that demographics are associated with consumer culture and consumer purchase behaviors; direct effects of demographic variables in the two categories of dimensions deserve separate researches and are not interested in this study. The two samples show notable similarities in respect to age interdependencies with most variables of consumer culture in purchase situation; only in case of individualism, results presented significant dissimilarity. Whereas in the Iranian sample age factor had a significant negative correlation with individualism, in the German sample the association is significantly positive. Comparing the cultural background, as well as family-lifestyle in the high-context (Iran) and low-context (Germany) countries, Iranian consumers have higher levels of family-integration when age increases, whereas the different life-style in Germany asks for separation of family members and children when they get older. Older Iranian consumers are expected to look after the desires of other family-members (e.g., children, or even grandchildren); they are also motivated and learned to decrease their self-priority tendencies in their usual purchase experiences, which would affect their individualism in purchase context. Also for Collectivism, the dissimilarity in the results sounds logical based on the above declarations; group-conformity is higher among older-generations in high-context cultures (see de Mooij, 2011). Furthermore, the two samples demonstrate other dissimilarities in case of gender associations with Individualism and collectivism.

For consumer-behavioral variables, the two samples show similarities in age and gender interdependencies with quality-consciousness and anticipated-regret; the levels of age associations with the two variables are ignorable. Only for variety-seeking dissimilarity exists, since the Iranian sample shows a significant negative association with age factor, which sounds logical with the above explanation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables¹</th>
<th>Iran and Germany</th>
<th>Age Pearson test</th>
<th>Gender¹ (F or M¹) t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural dimensions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power distance (PD)</td>
<td>IR 0.06</td>
<td>-2.64** (M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity (MAS)</td>
<td>IR -0.25***</td>
<td>-1.77 * (M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restraint (REST)</td>
<td>IR 0.31***</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term orientation (LTO)</td>
<td>IR 0.25**</td>
<td>-1.70* (M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism (IND)</td>
<td>IR -0.29***</td>
<td>0.35 (F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty avoidance (UA)</td>
<td>IR 0.25**</td>
<td>2.09* (F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism (COL)</td>
<td>IR 0.23*</td>
<td>-1.68* (M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumer behavioral variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated-regret (REG)</td>
<td>IR 0.12</td>
<td>-2.60* (M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety-seeking (VS)</td>
<td>IR -0.18*</td>
<td>1.24 (F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality-consciousness (QC)</td>
<td>IR -0.03</td>
<td>1.00 (F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Pan-country | .00 | -0.61 (M) |
| Pan-country | .07 | -2.14* (M) |
| Pan-country | .02 | -2.36 (M) |

Table D-12: Age, gender interdependencies with cultural and consumer behavioral variables (n=386); *¹ p < .08, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
Also, based on the results, in the German sample, the utilitarian behavior (QC) is associated with gender-factor (higher for masculine consumers); the hedonic behavior (VS) is significantly associated with age among Iranian respondents. The anticipated-regret is, in both samples, higher among masculine respondents. Findings are generally in accordance with previous results (see Bathae, 2011 b), also those reported by Hofstede (2001), Hofstede et al. (2010), and de Mooij (2011). Since the role of demographics, as a contextual element, in consumer purchase behaviors were interested, detailed analyses for each separated sub-sample (only for the three consumer behavioral variables which were interested as hypotheses) were performed; however, for the acceptance or rejection of hypotheses, pan-country results were applied.

### 2.3.1 Gender, nationality and consumer-behavioral variables

When we consider both nationality and gender factor as a influencer, interesting results could be found. The patterns of variety-seeking seem quite alike in both masculine and feminine sub-groups selected from Iran and Germany; in other words, for survey respondents, whether man or woman, similar trends could be found in both Iran and Germany.

When comparing the two countries, variety-seeking level proves to be higher among German consumers and gender does not make a difference; nationality factor seems to be more influential than gender. Putting nationality, as the classification factor, aside we can conclude gender would have an ignorable role in respect to variety-seeking in both countries since the difference in men and women sub-samples are slightly.

Regarding quality-consciousness, the story differs: while quality-consciousness is almost equal among the women sub-group in both countries, German men are more quality-consciousness compared to the Iranian ones.

Thus, gender factor could be partly influential (in German sub-sample) and partly indifferent (in Iran sub-sample) in respect to this consumer behavior; in other words nationality says the last word.
Figure 4: Gender, nationality and the consumer-behavioral variables.

Regarding the anticipated-regret results could be the same; only this time, differences are more obvious among the women sub-group. Again, gender factor could be partly influential (in Iranian sub-sample) and partly indifferent (in German sub-sample); thus, we could not conclude that gender plays a role, without including nationality in our analyses.

2.3.2 Age, nationality and consumer-behavioral variables

In a further attempt, respondents were classified into two groups of younger and older than 32 years\(^{155}\). In respect to age, patterns of orientation toward the three variables look

\(^{155}\) Since the median age of the Iranian sample was 36 and that for the German sample was 27, also regarding the cumulative percent of age distributions, 32 years of age was decided to be more proper as a classification limit.
alike in both younger and older sub-groups selected from Iran and Germany. Although for quality-consciousness and variety-seeking more distances between the two country-samples, in respect to the mean values, were obvious (which may partly point to resemblance of young generation, in respect to their purchase behavior, in both countries), the patterns were, more or less, alike. In both groups of age, variety-seeking, quality-consciousness and anticipated regret were reported to be at higher levels by German respondents. For quality-consciousness in case of the younger samples and for anticipated regret in case of older samples the differences between German and Iranian results were at the lowest levels.

![Graph](image)

**Figure 5:** Age, nationality and the consumer-behavioral variables.

Results indicate, again, that age plays an almost ignorable role in respect to the three selected behavioral variables in this study; the nationality effect could be more visible in
this figure. We may also conclude that in case of variety-seeking and anticipate regret, German respondents, whether young or old in age, stay at almost same levels; the older generation of our German respondents show higher quality-consciousness compared with the younger ones. For the Iranian sample, the age factor could be easily ignored in respect to quality-consciousness, since the differences between the two groups of age are very low; variety-seeking, in this sample, is higher among younger respondents. Also, anticipated regret is reported to be, more or less, at a higher level among older respondents, in our Iranian sample. Thus, apart from the hypotheses (which were generally proved for Gender and rejected for age), our explorative approach reminded the undeniable role of nationality factor in our model.

2.3.3 Effects of nationality on cultural and consumer-purchase variables

To find evidences for the role of nationality, our two measurement models (cultural and consumer-behavioral) were analyzed separately applying their accepted items; the nationality influences on each dimension were tested applying a dummy variable. Results (see Table D-13) proved that at individual-level of analysis, the two independent samples of Iran and Germany differ in both cultural and consumer-behavioral dimensions; nationality effects on consumer are, therefore, undeniable in purchase-consumption context. To ascertain the results, a t-test was accompanied to compare values and declare variations in the average results for each sample separately.

As reported, the influences of nationality on power distance and uncertainty avoidance are not confirmed; results are in accordance with our previous findings regarding nationality effects on cultural dimensions of consumers (see Bathae, 2011 a).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Regression coefficients (standardized)</th>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>Sample means Germany (N=191)</th>
<th>Sample means Iran (N=195)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural dimensions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism (IND)</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>2.54*</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power distance (PD)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty avoidance (UA)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity (MAS)</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-1.98*</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restraint (REST)</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>-2.24*</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term orientation(LTO)</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>-8.44***</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism (COL)</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td>5.04**</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumer-behavioral variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety-seeking (VS)</td>
<td>-.22***</td>
<td>3.93***</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality-consciousness (QC)</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>2.77**</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated-regret (REG)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-13: Influences of nationality on cultural and behavioral dimensions; *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

There are unconformities between Hofstede’s rankings\(^\text{158}\) (at national-level) and present results (e.g., for power distance and uncertainty avoidance); still, this is not unusual since both measurement levels, sample specifications and analysis methodology are completely different. Besides, two of our hypotheses regarding the nationality influences on consumer behavioral variables (variety-seeking and quality-consciousness) are supported; this indicates that, apart from the macro-level variations in consumer behaviors, both hedonic and utilitarian aspects of consumer purchase-consumption patterns could be affected by

\(^{156}\) Based on AMOS 21 estimates; dummy variable used.

\(^{157}\) Results of independent sample t-tests; univariate analysis.

\(^{158}\) See Hofstede et al (2010)
nationality, at individual-level of analysis. Anticipated-regret is not influenced by
nationality, though social, economical, cultural, variations dissimilarities exist in the two
countries; this could be an interesting finding for researchers and suggests further
psychological and social studies on the possible hidden factors.

2.4 Testing the hypotheses: pan-country and intra-country analyses

Next, a structural model was built, applying identified items in both cultural and
consumer-behavioral constructs, to test the hypotheses regarding the role of consumer
culture in purchase behaviors; also the hypotheses on the utilitarian-hedonic effects of
anticipated-regret, and the effects of quality-consciousness on variety-seeking were all
included in the structural model. Following both, pan-country and intra-country
approaches, results are reported:

2.4.1 Effects of cultural dimensions on consumer-purchase variables

The analyses begins with the estimated effects of consumer culture on the selected
consumer behaviors; both pan-country and intra-country approaches were followed. This
way we had the opportunity to test the hypotheses — based on pan-country results — also
compare the two samples. As presented (table D-14) standardized regression (β), and
critical ratios (C.r) for each hypothesized effect, also the squared multiple correlations for
the three interested behavioral constructs were assessed.

Results of the pan-country (n=386) are focused to test the hypotheses since the cultural
effects are hypothesized at individual-level without indicating the nationality (nationality
was a separate factor and is not included in this structural model). As reported, the cultural
dimensions could not explain most part of the variances in related consumer behaviors;
there are definitely many other personal or contextual influencers that potentially have
impacts on both hedonic (variety-seeking), utilitarian (quality-consciousness) behaviors,
also anticipated-regret of consumers. For the three variables of purchase-consumption
behavior in pan-country analysis, the R-square result implies that cultural dimension, at least those selected for this study, would play inferior roles in demonstration of the mentioned consumer behaviors. Apart from the contextual elements analyzed in this study (nationality, age and gender), the economical, social, temporal and psychological elements could possibly have substantial effects on any consumer-behavioral variables; also, personal influencers such as life style, personality and attitudinal orientations could have the final word in consumer purchase behaviors.

Still, the effects of masculinity and individualism on consumer quality-consciousness were confirmed; also the influence of uncertainty-avoidance on consumer anticipated regret was significant and the hypothesis could be supported. For the other hypotheses, the effects were not significant, though the directions were, mainly, in accordance with our postulations. Regarding consumer variety-seeking (in pan-country analysis), both long-term orientation and uncertainty avoidance showed effects as postulated (still below significance level); result implied, that for hedonic behaviors of consumers the impacts of cultural background could be weaker, compared to the utilitarian behaviors.

In another attempt, the contextual elements (nationality, gender, and age) were added to the model to measure the simultaneous effects of context and consumer culture on the three behavioral variables; results of the R square showed a mediocre change mainly caused by gender and nationality factors.

Next, to compare the two samples of Iran and Germany, intra-country analyses were performed; results presented indicate the differences in the two samples. For the Iranian sample, the positive effects of power-distance on quality consciousness, and the influence of long-term orientation on anticipated regret were confirmed. In the German sample five hypotheses were confirmed (see table D-14); the effects of restraint and individualism on anticipated regret, also the influences of masculinity on quality consciousness were significant; the negative effect of uncertainty avoidance on variety-seeking were also proved.
Table D-14: Testing the hypotheses; pan-country and intra-country approaches;

\*1 p < .08, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

In another attempt, nationality, gender and age were added to the cultural dimensions to reassess the R-square of behavioral variables with presence of other contextual elements.
Still, conversed to our hypothesis (a negative effect) the influence of restraint on quality-consciousness was significant with positive direction in the German sample. This implies that unlike Iranian consumers, German consumers with higher level of restraint (i.e., try to control desires and wishes in purchase context) are more quality conscious (i.e., wish for high-quality options with higher price level); the quality-orientation of German consumers have been confirmed in several studies (see Bathae, 2011 b). Still, the finding indicates that, unlike Iranians, the German consumers are focused on better quality as the selection priority and are ready to accept higher price-levels for their option; for Iranian consumers, restraint had a negative effect on the interest in high-quality, high-price options, and the customer tries to postpone purchases.

Also for the postulated negative influence of long-term orientation on consumer variety-seeking, unlike Iranian consumers, the direction is opposite in the German sample. Unlike the pan-country and Iranian sample analyses, the German sample showed that consumer culture would play a superior role (R² = 28) in consumer utilitarian behavior — quality-consciousness. When comparing the two samples, for most hypotheses, the effects directions match together and are in accordance with our postulations; still, due the significance levels hypotheses are rejected.

2.4.2 Relations among consumer-behavioral constructs

Apart from the results presented, for three hypotheses on the effects among anticipated-regret, quality-consciousness and variety-seeking, we had interesting findings in both pan-country and intra-country approaches (Table D-14).

In pan-country analysis (n=386 with both German and Iranian samples), regarding the role of anticipated-regret, both negative effect on variety seeking (hedonic behavior), and the positive influence on quality-consciousness (utilitarian behavior) were significant (p-value of .06 for VS); also the positive effect of quality-consciousness was confirmed. That is — when we avoid clustering respondents based on their nationality, at individual-level — our postulations on the dual effects of consumer anticipated-regret on both hedonic and
utilitarian behaviors could be verified. Also, the positive relation between the selected utilitarian and hedonic behaviors is confirmed to be significant. However, when, following the intra-country approach, respondents are separated into two groups based on their nationality (as a contextual element), results differ. Although the effects directions remain alike, German respondents show significant utilitarian effects, whereas Iranians confirm to be hedonically affected by regret expected in purchase-consumption situation. That is, a German consumer decides to increase both price and quality of the option, when anticipating regret; an Iranian consumer would prefer to stick to limited (tried) options he expects to have regret in future. Thus — as previously confirmed when testing the role of nationality — differentiations exists in behavioral patterns of consumers in purchase-consumption situations (even when they have the same “feeling-though” of anticipated-regret) which could again confirm the role of nationality and further contextual elements.

Still, the positive relation between the selected hedonic and utilitarian behaviors remained significant in both separated samples, showing the similarity in hedonic-utilitarian behavioral management of consumers in purchase context.

The following table (D-15) is a summary of the results; as declared, the pan-country analyses were criteria for our judgments, since the hypotheses (except for those focused on the role of nationality) were postulated in general, and no further nationality classifications are mentioned in the hypotheses (apart from the nationality effects on behavioral constructs).

When following the pan-country approach — our main approach to support the hypotheses — the supported hypotheses could be here summarized: the hypotheses on the effects of nationality and gender on consumer variety seeking was supported. Regarding quality-consciousness, the study could support the hypotheses on the significant effects of nationality; also the positive effect of masculinity and individualism on this behavioral aspect of consumers was supported as hypotheses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>code</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>H1.1</td>
<td>Nationality affects consumer variety-seeking.</td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>H1.2.1</td>
<td>Consumer’s gender has effects on variety-seeking.</td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>H1.2.2</td>
<td>Consumer’s age has effects on variety-seeking.</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>H1.3</td>
<td>Collectivism has negative effect on variety-seeking.</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>H1.4</td>
<td>Uncertainty avoidance has negative effect on variety-seeking.</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>H1.5</td>
<td>Masculinity has positive effect on variety-seeking.</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>H1.6</td>
<td>Long-term orientation has a negative effect on variety-seeking.</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>H2.1</td>
<td>Nationality affects quality-consciousness of consumers.</td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>H2.2.1</td>
<td>Consumer’s gender has effects on quality-consciousness</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>H2.2.2</td>
<td>Consumer’s age has effects on quality-consciousness</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>H2.3</td>
<td>Collectivism has negative effect on quality-consciousness.</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>H2.4</td>
<td>Masculinity has positive effect on quality-consciousness.</td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>H2.5</td>
<td>Individualism has positive effect on quality-consciousness.</td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>H2.6</td>
<td>Power-distance has positive effect on quality-consciousness.</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>H2.7</td>
<td>Long-term orientation has negative effect on quality-consciousness.</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>H2.8</td>
<td>Restraint has negative effect on quality-consciousness.</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>H3.1</td>
<td>Nationality affects consumer anticipated regret.</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>H3.2.1</td>
<td>Consumer’s gender has effects on anticipated regret</td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>H3.2.2</td>
<td>Consumer’s age has effects on anticipated regret</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>H3.3</td>
<td>Restraint has negative effect on anticipated regret.</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>H3.4</td>
<td>Uncertainty avoidance has positive effect on anticipated regret.</td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>H3.5</td>
<td>Individualism has positive effect on anticipated regret.</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>H3.6</td>
<td>Long-term orientation has positive effect on anticipated regret.</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>H4.1</td>
<td>Anticipated regret has positive effect on quality-consciousness.</td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>H4.2</td>
<td>Anticipated regret has negative effect on variety-seeking.</td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>H4.3</td>
<td>Quality-consciousness has positive effect on variety-seeking.</td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-15: Summary of the results
Consumer’s gender was supported to have significant effects on consumer anticipated regret. Uncertainty-avoidance was the only cultural dimension which was proved to have significant effects on purchase anticipated-regret of consumers; the positive hypothesized effect was confirmed. Furthermore, anticipated regret was proved to have both utilitarian — positive effect on quality-consciousness — and hedonic influences — negative effect on variety-seeking. Finally, the interaction between the utilitarian and hedonic variables of quality-consciousness and variety-seeking was confirmed; quality-consciousness showed significant positive effects on variety-seeking. Other hypotheses could not be supported in one or both samples, and were thus rejected. Further discussions on the findings, also limitation of the study are presented in the next part; future directions to improve the study are also included in part E.

E. Discussions, limitations and future directions

1. Discussions

Compared with previous researches, this study contributes to the literature in several ways. First, in examining cultural influences, we used the multi-dimensionality of Hofstede’s cultural orientation. Since cross-cultural researches comparing two countries on only one cultural dimension may produce misleading and confounding results, researchers are suggested to consider the five (main) dimensions simultaneously (Yoo and Donthu, 2005); this study is among the few researches\textsuperscript{160} focused on seven aspects (dimensions) of cultural values in its measurement instrument. The — rather new — dimensions of long-term orientation and, especially, collectivism and restraint were operationalized for which could be interesting for cross-cultural researchers. Not to forget that in addition a newly developed scale, in respect to the selected consumer-behavioral variables (variety-seeking, anticipated regret and quality-consciousness in service

\textsuperscript{160} For more information see Taras et al. (2009)
purchase situation, was assessed; results proved it to be qualified for future contributions in marketing and consumer behavioral studies.

Second, we measured personal, individual-level cultural orientation. Stereotyping one person’s cultural values by his (her) national culture fails to capture personal differences (Yoo and Donthu, 2005); for this reason, individual-level analysis of cultural dimensions, and the role they all implicitly play in consumer decision making processes, would entail insights for the marketing world.

Third, assessing the developed scale — which was pre-tested and modified (see Bathaee 2011 b) — was also a success; results were, in general, satisfactory. The developed reassessed valid scale could be among the contributions of this research. Fourth, the present paper provided valuable insights into how cultural value orientations in purchase context\textsuperscript{161} could diverge among individuals, with respect to nationality and demographics; analyzing the consumer culture in a pre defined task context of service purchase could have valuable insights for marketers. Not to neglect the countries selected which could be named among differentiations of this work. Unlike many other consumer studies which are focused on a particular group of countries (e.g. USA, Canada, west-European countries, and recently China) we did not only center the research on the known developed free market of Germany; the focus was widened to the unexplored Iranian market — with culturally undiscovered consumers with an ever increasing demand.

As the main contribution, the effects of each cultural dimension on selected consumer behaviors were analyzed; results were compared in two different markets-cultures using two separate analyses approaches of pan-country and intra-country. Findings for each dimension could, certainly, be named among the most valuable contributions of the research.

Apart from the consumer culture, anticipated-regret stepped into purchase-behavior studies; the variable could be named among the central points in this study. We studied, both backgrounds and consequences of consumer anticipated regret, in this point, the

\textsuperscript{161} Note that it is not in organization situation as often reported in cross-cultural studies.
study could be called unique. We could not find any researches, especially in respect to service-purchase decision making, focused on both antecedents and consequences of this psychological variable. Being convinced that anticipated regret matters, the research could remind its role in modern purchase decisions and behaviors of consumers; the study could signalize that similar to (if not better than) other variables (e.g. satisfaction) regret can partly explain — not only post-choice (ex-post) valuations (Das and Kerr, 2010), but also — pre-choice (ex-ante) attitudes (variety-seeking and quality-consciousness). Furthermore, the positive effect of a utilitarian behavior (quality-consciousness) on a hedonic variable (variety-seeking) was confirmed; results suggest an unconscious behavioral management, both, utilitarian and hedonic consequences of anticipated regret in both samples. The double effects of anticipated regret (negative on hedonic behavior vs. positive on utilitarian decisions) were obvious as a similarity between the two unlike samples. This could confirm that anticipated regret plays a role in intellectual-emotional flexibility of decision makers, apart from contextual elements. In other words, in both countries, consumers internally adjust their affection based intentions with their cognition-based decisions when anticipating regret for their future purchases. Still, the intra-country approach proved a difference in the effects: whereas Iranians have more tendencies to hedonic reactions (variety-seeking) when anticipating regret, German customers head toward utilitarian behaviors (quality-consciousness) in the similar situation. This point could function as a stepping stone for future studies.

Finally, the present paper provided valuable insights into how nationality, as a complex contextual factor, and demographic profile could affect both consumer culture (individual-level cultural dimensions) and consumer behaviors in decision-making situation; a detailed study of age and gender influences, in two culturally-different countries could be also named among contributions of this research.

162 “Single” since the variable comprises cultural values, as well as, consumption situation and market environment, which are hardly interested in this paper.
In respect to the cultural effects on consumer behavioral — which was our main purposes — few points need to be added. Following the pan-country approach confirmed in general, the postulated effect directions; the positive hypothesized effects of Individualism and masculinity on quality-consciousness proved to be significant. Also the positive influence of uncertainty avoidance on consumer anticipated regret was confirmed. Still, in intra-country analyses, interesting divergence could be found in respect to few hypotheses. As the main difference, the positive effect of restraint on quality-consciousness in the German sample could be discussed; conversed to the postulation (and Iranian sample) no negative effects were reported. The positive effect could be translated to the interest of German consumers to utilize their restraint intention to reach a better price-quality option; Iranians, on the other hand, try to benefit from their restraint in control (decrease the level) of purchase interest — in both price and quality.

Apart from the proposed framework, a compact summary of the results in respect to each separate variable is presented hereafter:

**Individualism:** The scale items were proved to be qualified for measuring individualism in marketing researches; both reliability and validity of the construct indicated satisfying results. Individualism and collectivism are confirmed as two separate dimensions. The dimension demonstrated to be positively correlated with restraint in Germany, but the Iranian sample proved opposite direction. Also the correlations between the dimension and uncertainty avoidance are opposite in the samples; unlike Iranians, the German individualist consumers prove to be more uncertainty avoidant. The divergent social, economical, and cultural backgrounds in the two countries — coded as Nationality — could be the reason behind the difference and need to be further studies. The hypothesis on the positive effect of the dimension on consumer quality-conscious was confirmed at individual level.

**Collectivism:** The items measuring this dimension could not all reach the acceptance level. The researcher had to remove two items; the modified version of the construct with two items, caused improvement in the measurement model in both samples. Development of the scale measuring this dimension needs serious improvements and restructuring to be
included in our future studies. In German sample, the negative correlation between collectivism and individualism was not significant. In other words, individuals with high individualism are not necessarily low in collectivism and the two values are roughly independent. However, the Iranian sample proved significant negative correlation between the two dimensions. Also the correlation with power distance was significant and positive in Germany, which was not the case in Iranian sample. The postulated effects on the consumer behaviors were not supported.

**Masculinity:** The items were proved to be reliable and valid; the construct was also qualified for the measurement model. The dimension was negatively correlated with restraint in the Iranian sample; the positive correlation with long-term orientation was proved to be significant in Germany. Among the hypotheses, the positive effect of masculinity on quality-consciousness was confirmed; in the intra-country analysis, the Iranian sample did not show a significant effect. Similar to collectivism, femininity could be also included in future individual-level studies, since according to de Mooij (2010, 2011) this dimension is supposed (and in some cases confirmed) to have influential consequences for consumers.

**Uncertainty avoidance:** The items measuring this dimension were confirmed to enjoy satisfactory quality in both reliability and validity; also the construct was qualified for the measurement model. The positive correlation of the dimension with both individualism and power distance were confirmed in the German sample. The negative effect of the dimension on consumer variety-seeking was not significant in the Iranian sample; thus, the hypothesis was not confirmed at individual-level. However the positive impact on consumer anticipated regret was significant; the effect was at higher level among Iranian consumers. In other word, for Iranians — unlike German consumers — risk-avoidance intention would hardly have lower effects on hedonic behaviors in purchase context.

**Long-term orientation:** This dimension was adapted to study purpose and later assessed; the developed items were proved to be both reliable and valid, and the construct was included in the model. The scale could be, therefore, further used in measurement of consumer culture. Regarding the dimension, the difference between two samples was
positive correlation with masculinity and individualism in the German sample, which was not the case among Iranian consumers. Long-term orientation was confirmed to significantly affect consumer anticipated regret in Iranian consumers; the effect was not significant among Germans.

**Power distance**: one of the four items designed for this dimension was not accepted; the modified construct was proved to be valid and reliable and was included in the measurement model. The correlation with restraint, uncertainty-avoidance and collectivism proved to be positively significant in the German sample; the Iranian sample did not approve correlations to be significant. The two samples show notable divergence in respect to this dimension; the positive effect on quality-consciousness was confirmed among Iranians. Still the hypotheses were rejected at individual-level; the German sample did not accept the hypotheses. Development of the scale measuring this dimension needs further improvements in future studies. Regarding the situation in Iran, measurement items should refer to the dimension in a more implicit way to prevent respondents from finding “safe” answers or worrying on security of the data prior to giving their answer to these questions.

**Restraint**: one item designed to measure the construct was removed to make it reliable; the modified variable with three items was confirmed in reliability test. Assessing the construct with confirmatory factor analysis proved mediocre results of FL and AVE tests; still the construct was included in the model. Development of the scale measuring this dimension needs improvements; results are interesting, but have to be applied with caution. In restraint dimension the two samples proved notable variations; the correlation with individualism, power distance and masculinity significant differences could be followed. The postulations on the effects of this dimension on consumer anticipated-regret and quality-consciousness were confirmed; however, the effects were not so significant in the Iranian sample and therefore the hypotheses at individual-level were rejected.

**Nationality and demographic profile**: regarding the role of nationality and demographics on the seven cultural dimensions no hypotheses were developed; the consumer behavioral variables were the center of our attention. Furthermore, our study was focused on individual-level analysis — and not national-level — of culture; the existence of a
variation in cultural dimensions between the two samples was presumed (see Bathae, 2011 a, b) and no further hypotheses were developed. Still, the effects were analyzed and presented for future studies. As reported, the nationality effects were obvious in almost all cultural dimensions; except for power-distance and uncertainty avoidance, a significant difference was found in the two samples of Germany and Iran. Iranian consumers showed higher levels of restraint and long-term orientation in purchase situation; this could be easily followed considering the present economical situation in the country\(^{163}\). On the other hand, German consumers showed higher levels of both collectivism and individualism; the masculinity level was also assessed to be significantly higher among Iranians in purchase context.

Apart from nationality, age and gender were assessed to be significant in the two samples; except for power distance (in both samples) and collectivism in German sample, age was confirmed to affect — in almost comparable patterns, except for MAS and IND — cultural dimensions. For each dimension, the gender effects were also supported in at least one of the two samples. In general the findings need to be further focused, following sociological approach — which is not interested in this work.

In addition to cultural influences, the internal relations among selected consumer behavioral constructs (anticipated regret, variety-seeking and quality-consciousness) are summarized as follows:

**Anticipated regret**: The scale items were proved to be highly qualified for measurement in future marketing researches; both reliability and validity of the construct indicated satisfying results. In pan-country analysis, the hypotheses were supported; the double effects of anticipated regret (negative on hedonic behavior vs. positive on utilitarian decisions) were obvious as a similarity between the two unlike samples. Based on the results, anticipated regret plays a role in intellectual-emotional flexibility of decision makers, apart from contextual elements. In other words, in both countries, consumers

\(^{163}\) Higher interest in “think on tomorrow and purchase today”, also “control your desires and do not purchase” is logical when the average inflation rate is 42%.
internally adjust their affection based intentions and their cognition-based decisions when anticipating regret for their future purchases.

In intra-country analyses, results were interesting: Iranian consumers showed lower influences of anticipated regret on their quality-consciousness (compared to the German sample). It could be explained by the challenging environment in the Iranian market. Due to the unexplained and ever-increasing prices (of the same products) the price-quality relationship is damaged; based on Gabor and Granger (1966), in this situation, price would not serve as an indicator of quality anymore, but an indicator of cost. This would easily decrease the consumer quality-consciousness since one of the pre-assumptions of the variable is acceptance of price-quality association.

The negative effects of anticipated regret on variety-seeking tendency were stronger among the Iranian; the effect was not significant in Germany. In other words, based on the German results, we may conclude that the lack of anticipated regret is not enough for a consumer to change his option seeking for variety; consumers, in the quality-oriented German market, would not decrease their variety-seeking level only because they are anxious for regret in future. Based on the results, other conditions (qualifications or characteristics) need to be fulfilled for increase of variety-seeking tendency among German consumers. In respect to the effects of anticipated-regret on variety-seeking intention in Germany, other social and economical factors need to be included in future studies. In general, as a cognition-emotion based concept, consequences of anticipated regret on both hedonic and utilitarian behaviors of consumers are no more deniable. This point could function as a stepping stone for future studies.

Results for the role of nationality, in respect to this construct, was not significant; however, comparing the German sample, Iranian sample showed higher level of anticipated regret which could be explained by the risky, unstable, and consumer-neglecting present market of Iran. Gender influences were partly confirmed (in Iranian sub-sample); also, in pan-country analysis the role of gender was proved and the masculine sub-sample showed higher levels of anticipated regret implying more
tendencies to rationality and responsibility. Age was not proved to have significant positive influences on consumer anticipated regret. However the intra-country analysis showed higher levels of anticipated regret among older Iranian consumers (comparing the younger ones); the German sub-sample could not show any considerable age-differences in this regard.

**Variety-seeking:** Three of the four scale items were accepted to be further used in analyses. The construct was verified to be significantly influenced by anticipated regret; the negative effect was not significant for the German sample in the intra-country analysis. Nationality was confirmed to play a role in respect to variety-seeking tendency; the German sub-sample maintained higher variety-seeking level in restaurant visit. This could be, for sure, caused by economical, social, psychological, market-related, as well as, cultural differences between the two samples. However, the research had also proved the role of anticipated regret in this behavioral aspect of consumers. Also the positive effect of quality-consciousness on consumer variety-seeking was confirmed.

The negative effect of age factor was not significant in Germany; still gender was proved to be influential in pan-country analyses and women showed higher interest to variety-seeking. Nationality was supported to be an undeniable factor in consumer variety-seeking intention.

**Quality-consciousness:** The developed scale was accepted through reliability and validity tests. As hypothesized, the positive influence of anticipated regret was confirmed for the complete sample of 386 respondents (pan-country analysis). However, the intra-country analysis suggested different findings: Whereas the significance level was acceptable for the German sub-sample, the Iranian results were not significant to prove the positive anticipated-regret effect. The role of nationality was, again, confirmed to be undeniable; German sample maintained higher interest in quality-consciousness, compared to the Iranian. This would be definitely logical considering the present social, and especially, economical situation in Iran. The average net salary\textsuperscript{164}, as well as, inflation rate\textsuperscript{165} as two

\textsuperscript{164} 500 $ per month in 2010 according to the Iranian government;
clear indices, point to the financial problems of Iranians. Thus, restaurant visit would be positioned among the low-priority purchases in everyday lives; as a consequence, consumers would manifest lower intention to pay more for the quality products or services. German consumers, conversely, have been proved in several studies\textsuperscript{166} (e.g. Anders, 1991; Walsh et al., 2001) to be quality-conscious; “price does not play a decisive role in German decision making (Walsh et al., 2001; p. 86). Thus, for Germans — with their reputation as quality-centered consumers — a higher tendency to pay more, in return for quality, sounds presumed.

Nationality was supported to be an influential factor on consumer quality-consciousness. Age and gender were not verified to be influential in pan-country analyses at individual level; still, in German sub-sample gender influences were significant. Separating the respondents based on their nationality and demographic profile showed strong differences which need to further analyze in separate attempts.

In general, the study has meaningful contributions to the literature and the introduced scale can be regarded as a trusted instrument in respect to analysis of consumer culture; results of the effects could be fruitful for the marketing world; in addition, to the new aspects and approaches, data gathered from a “black box market” (Iran) could be interesting for the market researchers. Iran belongs to countries with a fuzzy cultural orientation. Although it is categorized among high-context cultures compared to the western world, it is neither totally high-context nor low-context; Iran is somewhere in the middle on the axis of context. Its cultural pattern is neither completely comparable with eastern nor with western world. Thus, the acceptance of the scale, based on Iranian survey results, was a success. Furthermore, this study proved that individual consumers within

\textsuperscript{165} Based on formal statistics presented by Central Bank of Iran the inflation rate was 21.5 % (March, 2012) and ranged to 156% (May, 2012); “costs are getting crazy” (Shargh Newspaper, May 3th, 2012).

\textsuperscript{166} According to Walsh et al. (2001, p. 86) this is not likely to be because of their wealth; in general, German consumers would be “more preoccupied with other product attributes such as quality”. In nation-wide surveys, most German respondents agree that quality is the most important attribute of a product when purchasing.
one country, as well as across countries, have great cultural variability. Thus it may be a great mistake to stereotype consumers in a country as a uniform cultural group. As previously suggested by other researchers (e.g., Yoo and Donthu, 2005) individual-level analysis of consumer culture might prepare a reasonable basis of global marketing strategies. A context-based version of Hofstede scale (or other similar valid scales) could be qualified and needed (as even suggested by Hofstede) to be applied; context, sample, and cultural adaptations are critical. The scale presented here was an attempt to reach an assessed and accepted scale which could be trusted and constructive for future studies aimed to analyze and understand hidden aspects of consumer culture. Also the confirmed hypotheses on the effects of consumer culture on purchase-behavior declare the need for further attempts to prove hidden aspects of the dimensions in consumer everyday behaviors. Regarding the effects of anticipated regret, we should indicate that our findings could support our approach toward this construct. As explained by von Neumann and Morgenstern (1947) people attempt to maximize the expected utility of their action before engaging in a behavior. Results gained could confirm — consistent with the claim — that regret, as well as being a rather unpleasant state, would carry some clear benefits for the individual (Landman, 1993; Shih and Schau, 2011).) Societies capable of regret may find themselves the beneficiaries of ethical, instructional, motivational and even utilitarian rewards, among others Landman (1993). This perspective implies that consumers, whether consciously or unconsciously, utilize their anticipated regret to adjust their purchase decisions in respect to variety-seeking tendency and quality-consciousness. Anticipated regret could ask for pre-computation, preventing consumer from irrational choices in search for variety, and would stimulate him to more quality attentiveness in purchase situations; however context would always say the last word.

2. Research limitations

The use of a self-reported data is often confounded with a number of biases, such as the social-desirability bias (Alreck and Settle, 1995). Many studies of human behavior are
observational in nature (Matsumoto, 1994); thus, qualitative attempts would be more qualified, though certainly higher in complexity. Attaching a qualified research to the quantitative study results would be beneficiary for the scale and considerably insightful. Another remarkable limitation in most cross-cultural studies is the problem of culture-bound-interpretation. Although we tried to limit this problem, the researcher’s own cultural filters may have inevitably influenced the interpretation of study findings. Also the culture-bound problem of suppression or exaggeration of the responses may always be effective in cross-cultural studies.

Apart from these weaknesses, cross-cultural scales, whether at national-level or at individual-level, have limitations in validity or reliability that need to be removed through further attempts. The present study has also measurement limitations; as reported for collectivism and restraint, results were not originally satisfactory and modifications were made to make the dimension acceptable for the measurement model. Thus the literature background and scale design of the modified dimensions need to be revised and improved; results, in respect to the two variables of collectivism and restraint, should be interpreted with caution.

In respect to anticipated regret and quality-consciousness few studies could be found, since the two variables have been rather concealed by other similar constructs. For example, most researchers have preferred to concentrate on satisfaction (or dissatisfaction), or even experienced regret instead of anticipated; relative quality concepts (e.g. quality perception, price-quality schema, value consciousness) have been more interested by researchers, especially in consumer-behavioral studies. Besides, we suspect the strength of the studied effects may be category specific and would also vary dependent to individual traits. Future surveys may improve generalizability of the findings. Other contextual variables (e.g. related to the consumer culture or lifestyle) — which deserve more attention, especially in cross-country studies — were not included; nationality and demographics as the only contextual elements could not declare the background stories of consumer behavior.
3. Directions of future studies

Apart from the previous suggestions, in future attempts the measurement model tested in this study could be extended; also the causal model could be expanded adding further interesting consumer behavioral measures to test more possible impacts of each cultural dimension on consumer behavioral aspects. In addition, the model could be tested in further purchase contexts; above all, consumer every-day purchases in shopping centers could be analyzed. Other service industries (e.g., financial services, insurance, and tourist activity) could analyze their (prospective) consumers based on the cultural-dimensions at individual level.

The research model could, furthermore, investigate how socialization procedures affect the development of cultural orientation (Yoo and Donthu, 2005); an example could be analysis of measurement and developed causal model in a survey among Iranian immigrants in Germany. The model could be tested in an eastern country (e.g., China, Japan) with complete high-context orientation or a country with different cultural dimension structure (e.g., Scandinavian countries) to be reassessed and improved.

In case of purchase behavioral variables, several issues remain for refining and expanding the findings. Applying scenario method, we focused on consumer purchase intentions; however intentions do not always translate to actual behavior. Future researches should address this point by focusing on actual reactions of consumers; efforts may also discover moderating and mediating influencers that would help understand and develop the proposed model. Meta-analysis approach could be suggested to identify behavioral patterns in respect to the selected variables and in different decision-making contexts. A continuation of the study and analysis of the further antecedents or consequences of anticipated regret would be of interest. Besides, future comparative studies should shed light on the psychological or cultural elements, declaring further reasons behind the differences. According to Matsumoto & Van de Vijver (2011) differences in the structural models in the two-country comparisons ask for further thinking about the dynamics of
culture which could be responsible for increasing the influence of a construct in a country compared with another. We hope this study could advance the development of cultural orientation in marketing and integrate the knowledge of consumer behavior granting opportunities for further explorations.
| Core element | Domains | Main related consequences and implications (for individuals with high levels) | Designed survey items in this study:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>Individuals are independent of one another</td>
<td>- High attention to self needs, wishes and desires; - High concern for oneself and immediate family; - Low change or sacrifice of own goal and plans; - Having unique, personal attitudes and opinions are valued; - High interest in keeping thoughts and actions private; - Low commitment to groups.</td>
<td>- “This is my motto: me first” - “Everyone should only take care of himself and his family” - “No change in goals and plans for others” - “My private life is most important”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism</td>
<td>Groups bind and mutually obligate individuals</td>
<td>- High attention to coordination, harmony and cohesion; - High attachment to in-groups; - Minimize interpersonal difference with in-group; - Importance of conformity and consensus in decision making; - Sacrifice for the common good and maintaining harmonious relationships with close others is valued; - Change of decisions or behaviors on advice of others.</td>
<td>- “Personal interests are less important than group harmony” - “Feel bad to do what others would not” - “Others play great role in my decisions” - “Want to feel belonged to the group”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>Success is principal and must be shown.</td>
<td>- To win is the most important; trying to excel; - Competitiveness is valued; - Try to make oneself visible, recognized and differentiated</td>
<td>- “Fight to be the best” - “Only satisfied when I get the best” - “Usual, ordinary things are not enough”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power distance</td>
<td>Inequality is accepted and expected.</td>
<td>- Inequality is not liked and should be minimized (low level) Vs. inequality are expected and desired (high level); - Might prevails over right; whoever holds the power has more rights and privileges.</td>
<td>- “Inequality is inevitable” - “Society is like a ladder; one is placed higher and one lower” - “It bothers me that some people are placed higher than me in society” - “It is ok that some are placed higher than me in society”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core element</td>
<td>Domains</td>
<td>Main related consequences and implications (for individuals with high levels)</td>
<td>Designed survey items in this study:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Uncertainty avoidance | Ambiguity is threatening | - Familiarity  
- Fear and anxiety  
- Risk avoidance | - Unfamiliar situations are threats that must be fought;  
- Fear of ambiguous situations;  
- Feel uncomfortable and have stress with ambiguity Vs. feel comfortable and fun. |
| Designed survey items in this study: | - “Try to avoid risk in life”  
- “Don’t like situations with unclear ends”  
- “No risk, no fun” (R) |
| Long-term Orientation | Think on future.  
- Persistence  
- Needs gratification  
- Thrift | | - “Future success is more important than today’s fun”  
- “Forget about today; plan for tomorrow”  
- “Who knows tomorrow; enjoy today” |
| Restraint | Pursuit of satisfaction is in vain.  
- Control of life, desires and pleasures | - High control over choices and behaviors;  
- Limited freedom of actions with social norms  
- Curb desires by individual regulations  
- Leisure and fun has low importance | - “Control yourself; you shouldn’t do whatever you like”  
- “Remain humble and control yourself”  
- “I control desires and wishes in me”  
- “When I wish for something I let myself free to have, or buy it” |

**Appendix 1:** Core elements, domains, measures and developed scale items for assessment of cultural dimensions

Sources: Markus and Kitayama (1991); Oyserman (1993); Triandis (1995); Hofstede et al. (2010); Oyserman et al. (2002); Minkov (2007); Matsumoto et al. (1997).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Lehne voll ab</th>
<th>Lehne eher ab</th>
<th>Teils /teils</th>
<th>Stimme eher zu</th>
<th>Stimme voll zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ich will mit den Leuten, mit den ich zusammen lebe, so leben, dass wir uns zusammen gehörig fühlen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>In meinem Leben versuche ich, möglichst keine Risiken einzugehen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mein Privatleben ist wichtiger als jede andere Sache in der Welt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ungleichheit in der Gesellschaft ist unvermeidlich.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ich sage mir „Wer weiß, was morgen kommt. Ich geniesse den Tag!“</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>In meinem Leben kämpfe ich immer dafür, der/die Beste zu sein.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>In der Gesellschaft braucht jeder nur auf sich selbst und seine unmittelbare Familie schauen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Meiner Meinung nach ist jede Gesellschaft wie eine Leiter: Manche Leute stehen höher und andere stehen tiefer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ich beherrsche und kontrolliere meine Wünsche.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Für mich ist Erfolg in der Zukunft wichtiger, als heute Spaß zu haben.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>In vielen meiner Entscheidungen spielen Andere eine große Rolle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ich mag keine Situationen, bei denen ich nicht weiß, was dabei herauskommt oder wie sie enden.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mir genügen die normalen und durchschnittlichen Sachen im Leben.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ich bin nicht bereit, meine Ziele und Pläne wegen Andere zu ändern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Es ist in Ordnung, dass manche Personen in der Gesellschaft höher als ich gestellt sind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ich fühle mich unwohl, wenn ich etwas mache, was meine Freunde und Bekannten nicht machen würden.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Wenn ich etwas will, bin ich so frei, es mir zu holen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Für mich gilt die Devise „Zuerst komme ich“.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ich gebe mich nur mit dem Besten zufrieden.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ich sage mir „Beherrsche dich selbst. Du darfst nicht immer das tun was du willst“.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Für mich gilt die Devise „No risk, no fun“.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Meine personlichen Intressen sind mir weniger wichtig als die Harmonie in eine Gruppe in der ich bin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Es stört mich zu sehen, dass manche Leute in der Gesellschaft viel höher als andere gestellt sind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lehne voll zu</th>
<th>lehne eher ab</th>
<th>Teils /teils</th>
<th>Stimme eher zu</th>
<th>Stimme voll zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

24. Für mich gilt die Devise „Vergiss heute! Plane für morgen“

25. Ich sage mir „Sei stets bescheiden und beherrscht!“

C: Die folgenden Fragen Sind über ihre Erfahrungen mit Restaurants (oder Pizzaria, etc.):

26. **Wie häufig**, in Monat, besuchen Sie Restaurants (Pizzaria, etc.)? ....... pro Monat/ .... pro jahr

27. **Mit wie vielen Personen** gehen Sie meistens in ein Restaurant? ...... Personen

28. **Wie viel** geben Sie (pro Person) im Monat (ungefähr) für Restaurantbesuche aus?.......... Euro

D: **Nun stellen Sie sich vor Sie haben sich heute für essen in Restaurant (Pizzaria, etc.) entschieden.** Welche Gedanken, Gefühle, oder Angewohnheiten treffen für Sie am Besten zu?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lehne voll ab</th>
<th>lehne eher ab</th>
<th>Teils /teils</th>
<th>Stimme eher zu</th>
<th>Stimme voll zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

29. Es gefällt mir, in ein Restaurant zu gehen, das ich vorher noch NICHT ausprobiert habe.

30. Da ich bei einem Restaurantbesuch eine hohe Qualität will, bin ich bereit mehr zu zahlen.


32. Ich will NICHT immer in das gleiche Restaurant zum Essen gehen.

33. Ich bin bereit, mehr für Restaurantbesuche zu zahlen, weil ich glaube: „Je höher der Preis, desto besser die Qualität“.

34. Ich ärgere mich nur selten über meine Wahl, nachdem ich ein Restaurant besucht habe.

35. Ich gehe nur ungern in ein Restaurant, in dem ich noch nicht war.


37. Es geschieht schon, dass ich bedauere in das Restaurant zum Essen gegangen zu sein.

38. Es macht mir Spass, zwischen den Restaurants, die ich kenne, immer wieder zu wechseln.


E: Angaben zur Person : Alter:.......... Geschlecht: Männlich Weiblich
به نام او

باسخگوی عزیز:

الف: لطفا به توجه به دیدگاه‌ها، نظرات و واقعیت‌های زندگی خود میزان موافقت را با هر یک از عبارات زیر، با انتخاب تنها یک گزینه در هر سطر اعلام کنید.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>کاملا موافق</th>
<th>بیشتر موافق</th>
<th>درست و نادرست</th>
<th>بیشتر مخالف</th>
<th>کاملا مخالف</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. برای آینده برنامه‌های &quot;با خود می‌گویم&quot;: &quot;ریزی کن... امروز که گذشت...&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. داشتن چیزهای معمولی و در حد متوسط برایم کافی است.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. با خود می‌گویم &quot;اول خدم...&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. نباید هرچه‌گونه دوست داری انجام دهی.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. جامعه، برایم مهم نیست که بعضی از دیگران نیش می‌شود که بعضی از بیماران بالاتر از من قرار در دارند.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. در بسیاری از تصمیم‌گیری‌هایی که من دیگران نقش مهمی را پایه‌ی می‌کنند.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. به نظر من موفقیت آینده مهمتر از خوشی های امروز است.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. طوری که بیماری به جمعی از دست‌ها و اطرافیان خود بیان دهید.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ترجیح می‌دهم در زندگی ام تا جایی که من توأم، ریسک نکنم. &quot;که من توأم، ریسک نکنم&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. در جامعه، اگر مثل بله کان است؛ بعضی افراد، بالاتر از من قرار می‌گیرند و بعضی بر روی بله های باین تر از من.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. حاضر نیستم برنامه‌هایی ما، یا اهداف را به خاطر دیگران تغییر دهم.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. را. تنها وقتی راضی میشوم که بهترین داشته باشم.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. من دوست ندارم در شرایط و موقعیتهایی که بگیرم، که نتیجه و باین نامشخص دارند.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. زندگی شخصی من، مهم تر از هر چیز دیگری در دنیاست.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>کاملا موافق</td>
<td>موافق</td>
<td>نادرست</td>
<td>موافق</td>
<td>کاملا مخالف</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. اگر یادمان دوستان و آشنایانم از انجام کاری پرهیز می‌کنم، افزکر انجام آن احساس بدهد بی‌دعا می‌کنم.

16. وجود نابرابری در جامعه اجتناب ناپذیر است.

17. تمایل به مصرف می‌کنم، بهتر را در خود مهار می‌کنم.

18. به نظرم هر کس باشد فقط به فکر خود و اعضای خانواده‌ی خود باش. بدون ریسم کردن، زندگی لذت ندارد.

19. به نظرم هر کس باید فقط به فکر خود و اعضای خانواده‌ی خود باشد.

20. برای من خوده‌ای شخصی ام که اهمیت‌تر از همان‌ندگی با دوستان و خانواده‌ام است.

21. غلب با خود می‌گویم: "فردا را چه کسی دیده است...از امروز لذت ببر.

22. همیشه با خود می‌گویم: "خود را کنترل کن و در برای دیگران متوسط باش.

23. از اینکه می‌بینم بعضی افراد جامعه در سطح بسیار بالاتر از دیگران قرار می‌گیرند متاسف می‌می‌شوم.

24. همیشه برای "بهتر از دیگران بودن" تلاش می‌کنم و می‌جنگم.

25. وقتی دلم جیزی را می‌خواهد به خود اجازه میدهم هر طور شده آنرا بدست بیاورد.

ب: ادامه پرسشنامه در مصاحبه رفتارها و تجربیات شما در مراجعه به انواع رستوران (هرمکانی که شما برای صرف غذا به آنجا می‌روید، چگونه خود را سفارش می‌دهید و ساعتی را در آن می‌گذارید) است:

26. شما به طور متوسط چند بار در ماه برای صرف غذا در رستوران مراجعه می‌کنید؟ ..... باز در ماه (اگر کمتر به رستوران می‌روید .... یار درسال)

27. در معمولا همراه چند نفر به رستوران می‌روید؟ ...

28. تقیبا به طور متوسط (به ازار هر نفر) چه مبلغ‌ای را برای صرف غذا در رستوران پرداخت می‌کنید؟ ...

تمام در ماه (اگر کمتر به رستوران می‌روید .... تومان درسال)
ج: اگر کسی که به هر دلیل تصمیم گرفته اید امروز برای صرف غذا به رستوران بروید.

د: لطفاً میزان موافقت یا مخالفت با هر یک از عبارات زیر در مورد رفتارها، افکار، احساسات و تجربیات خود را با انتخاب فقط یک گزینه اعلام کنید.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>کامل</th>
<th>بیشتر</th>
<th>نادرست و درست</th>
<th>بیشتر</th>
<th>کامل</th>
<th>نادرست</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. دوست دارم به رستورانی بروم کهتا بحث امتحان نکرده ام</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. اغلب بعد از ترک رستوران، به هر دلیل، از انتخاب این رستوران برای صرف غذا عصبانی می‌شوم.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. رستوران</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. حاضرم بول بیشتری برای غذا خوردن در یک رستوران بپردازم چون فکرمیکنم هرچه قیمت غذایی بس رستوران بالاتر باشد، کیفیت آنها هم بالاتر است.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. خیلی از اوقات بعد از ترک یک رستوران از انتخاب آن مکان برای صرف غذا ممکن است.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. از اینکه برای صرف غذا به رستورانی بروم که تا به حال به آن نرفته ام خوشم نخی آید.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. برای اطمینان از کیفیت غذایی یک رستوران، قیمت اولیه بهترین نشانه است.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. اغلب بعد از ترک رستوران با خود فکر میکنم انتخاب این رستوران یک اشتباه بود.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. دوست دارم هرگز وقتی بیام به یکی از رستوران هایی بروم که قبل امتحان کرده ام</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. جون کیفیت بالاتربرایم مهم است حاضرم بول بیشتری برای صرف غذا بپردازم</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. معمولاً بعد از ترک رستوران با خود می‌گویم:‌ „کاوش به رستوران دیگری رفته بودم.“</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

سن: .................................. سال: ..................................
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