South Asian Journal of Management Sciences
Vol. 2, No.1 , (Spring 2008) 1-15

Asian diversities: A snapshot of inter-and-intra differences on collectivism and purchasing endeavors

Kritika Kongsompong*

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the potential difference in consumption behavior among customers in five Asian settings: Thailand, Singapore, Taiwan, India, and China. Of particular interest, the research investigates the relationship between the amount of social influences that occurs in purchasing endeavors and people's orientation toward collectivism. Samples of university students from the five Asian countries are employed, thus controlling for age, occupational and social class factors. After elimination of missing data, the sample consisted of 797 respondents: 118 Thais, 194 Chinese, 181 Indians, 124 Singaporeans, and 180 Taiwanese. ANOVA and Scheffe tests are administered to test the hypotheses. The findings confirm Hofstede's study in 2001 is still applicable to observe the general view of cultural values. Moreover, the results indicate that, regardless of the countries, men are generally less susceptible to social influence than women. As for social influence, this study indicates that collectivism/individualism dimension may only be partially applied in an international setting when trying to predict the level of social influence. As for gender difference, the results show that regardless of the countries, women are more collectivist than men and therefore, more susceptible to social influence in buying behavior than their counterparts. Thus, the relationship between collectivism and social influence is still highly complex in a cross-national context, and should be subject to further research.

Key Words: Cross cultural; Collectivism; Social influence; Consumer behavior; Gender differences
JEL Classification: Z10; Z13

* Corresponding authors email: kritika.kongsompong@sasin.edu
* The material presented by the author does not necessarily portray the view point of the editors and the management of Iqra University, Karachi.

SAJMS 2008, Published by Iqra University
Defence View, Shaheed-e-Millat Road (Ext.), Karachi, Pakistan.

INTRODUCTION

The topic that is highly of research interest in current years concerns various factors that may effect purchasing decisions. Typical buying decisions are subject to influences from a variety of sources: biological, personal, commercial, public and personal reasons. The relative impact of these sources will vary based on several factors, some personal to the consumer, others related to the product/service and the nature of buying situation. Since buying behavior is likely to be effected by several sources, particularly the cultural variables, research related to cultural diversities is highly of interest among international marketers trying to make a competitive position in the target markets. Thus marketing efforts should also focus on understanding the nature and impact of these influences since they can affect virtually all aspects of the marketing endeavors.

The study reported here examines the relative importance of collectivism as a source of cultural influence in consumer purchasing decisions across five Asian countries: Thailand, Singapore, Taiwan, China and India. The three main hypotheses developed relate to: (1) gender difference in orientation to collectivism; (2) gender difference in level of social influence in purchasing decision; (3) the differences in the level of collectivism to characterize the five countries; (4) the differences in the level of collectivism as pertain to susceptible to social influence.

Theoretical Framework

Collectivism and individualism:

Individualism and collectivism relate to basic beliefs that people hold with respect to their interaction with others and the world around them. Classic studies by Hofstede (1980, 1991, 2001) provided insights on fundamental cultural differences that serve to differentiate the national cultures of the world. In his work, individualist is the polar opposite of collectivist, and thus has the opposite characteristics from those of collectivist continuum. Since series of studies by Hofstede, there appeared to be a considerable literature on collectivism/ individualism that delved deeply into the construct. Thus, the robustness of the collectivism/individualism construct has been repeatedly demonstrated by linking with various other constructs related to consumer behavior.

From above discussions, individualists and collectivists seem to consistently behave differently on purchasing decision. In particular, collectivists are more conformed to social norms, pay greater attention to the group acceptance, and more likely to avoid conflicts with the group members than most individualists (Redding 1982; McCracken 1986). Although, there is no a priori evidence in relating collectivist/individualist constructs to social influence, this research is attempted to confirm that collectivists are likely to be more susceptible to social influence that their counterpart.

Social Influences:

According to the Fishbein's behavioral intentions model (1969 and 1975), a person forms intentions to behave or not behave in a certain way, and these intentions are based on the person's attitude toward the behavior as well as his or her perception of the opinions of significant others. Congruent with this notion, Lee (1991) argue that although the basic framework of the Fishbein behavioral intentions model has been generally accepted for Americans, there are questions concerning the validity of the independence of attitudinal components and social influence components among people in Asian cultures. Americans' individualist nature is clearly manifested by their resentment of conformity (Hui, 1986). Most Koreans, on the other hand, feel strong social pressure to comply with group norms regardless of their own private view (Yau, 1994 and Lee, 1991).

In terms of differences between men and women regarding social norms and social influences, Bem (1981) argues that women and men encode and process information using different socially-constructed cognition structures that, in turn, help determine and direct his/her perceptions. As a result, both men and women tend to make decisions that reflect biases inherent in their perception and actions (Nisbett, 1998). The analysis above, therefore, sufficiently supports that gender schemas can be considered as normative guides that cause actions or behaviors displayed by both genders.

Collectivism and social influence in purchasing decision:

Since individualism and collectivism have been identified as orientations taken with respect to a person's or group's relationship to others (Hofstede 1980; Triandis 1984, 1995; Bellah et al. 1985), many researchers have consistently reported significant differences between in-group and out-group behaviors in collectivist cultures as compared to individualist cultures (e.g., Gudykunst et al., 1987; Leung & Bond, 1984). The results consistently indicate that a person's self-definition as a member of a group determines how s/he acts in social situations. For example, collectivists have very strong ties to the collective, such as family, country, and so forth. Social behavior is seen as a function of in-group norms to a greater extent among the people in collectivist than individualist cultures (Davidson et al., 1976). Self, according to the collectivists, is defined from the view of others, and the behavior is often regulated by group norms (Triandis, 1995). Collectivists, therefore, instinctively obey in-group authorities and are willing to fight to maintain integrity of the in-group, whereas they distrust and are unwilling to cooperate with members of out-groups (Triandis, 1995).

An important goal among collectivists is to fulfill their duties and obligations. Triandis (1995) pointed out that collectivists usually have few in-groups, whereas individualists have many. Thus, the social obligations of collectivists are quite focused, whereas those of individualists are fluid and may be converted to obligations to the larger society rather than to specific in-group settings. Consistent with this observation, Oyserman et al. (1998) found that collectivism increased obligation to the in-group particularly at the occasion that in-group membership is made salient.

Individualists, in contrast, have flexible ties to social groups, and their behavior is often

guided by self-interest (Triandis et al., 1988, Triandis, 1995). This means when group and an individualistic person's goals are in conflict, personal goals often have primacy. Individualism, therefore, can be broadly characterized as the tendency to regard the individual's well being over that of the group, and personal goals are usually prioritized over group goals. Given the importance of group conformity and harmonious relationships among collectivists (vs. individualists), collectivists are expected to be more responsive to group pressure than their counterparts.

Intra-Cultural Behavioral Differences:

The concept of intra-cultural diversity unveils that very few national cultures are homogeneous, and that different subcultures within a country may reflect the substantial differences among its people in terms of characteristics and behaviors (Lenartowicz and Roth, 2001). Before this discovery, many researchers have tended to overlook the fact that few cultures are identical in daily behavior. Lenartowics and Roth (2001) argued that individual's values vary within a culture. Findings pertaining to consumer behavior in a particular culture, therefore, may not be generalized to everyone in the national culture (Burton and White, 1987; Lenartowicz and Roth, 1999 and 2001). Thus results of studies pertaining to cultures suggest that it is important to consider cultural variation within a country when examining the behavior of subjects in each country.

Gender Differences:

Earlier pieces of research on gender differences began to appear in 1960, with the work predominantly proposing that males and females differ in the extent to which they develop self-concepts that are separated from or connected with others. Recently, Markus and Kitayama (1991) found that the male agentic role is characterized by concern for the self, while the female communal role typically embraced concern for both the self and others. As a support of this research, Meyers-Levy (1988) determined that because of their attention to both self and others, females are expected to respond favorably to both agentic and communal advertising appeals. Therefore, females are more likely to engage in a more detailed and deeper engagement than males. Men, on the other hand, due to their agentic role, do not incorporate collective concerns, thus tend to be more sensitive to personally relevant information than do women.

More recent social researchers, however, have recognized the important of cultural traditions assigned to dominance and assertiveness by males, and submission and passivity by females, may significantly contribute to observed gender differences. As an example, self-concept research moved from investigation of gender schematicity toward a concept of self as either 'separate' from or 'connected' with others (e.g., Markus, 1993; and Josephs, 1992). The relationship between gender and self-concept also appears to vary with social class, religion and ethnicity (e.g., Collins, 1997; and Crawford, 1997).

In most cultures particularly the Asian cultures, men and women are expected to behave according to gender-role learned very early in their childhood. As discussed above, until recently, males in most society are expected to be strong and assertive. Women, on the other hand, have

been guided more by communal goals of forming affiliations and fostering harmonious relations with others and have been expected to be relatively submissive, emotional, and home oriented (Areni, 1993). Even as an increasing number of women in Asian cultures become more career oriented (Earley, 1989), pressure to adhere to social norms and group conformity is expected to be relatively high among these contemporary Asian women.

From above discussion, we can conclude that few cultures are homogeneous. Typically, most cultures contain subcultures that often have little in common with one another. Men may be drastically different from women in many aspects of daily behaviors. Needless to say, the wide variety of cultures and subcultures creates a tremendous challenge for global marketers.

General Hypotheses

Based on the above discussion, the present study is designed to test the following hypotheses: (1) in each country, men are expected to be less collectivist than women, thus (2) men are less subject to social influence than women; (3) men and women in higher collectivist countries are expected to be more susceptible to social influence in purchasing decision than the lower collectivist country; and (4) regardless of the countries and genders, those who exhibit high level of collectivism will also be more susceptible to social influence in purchasing decision.

Method

Country selection:

Since there have not been prior studies that formally link national cultures with different type of social influence, the current study employed a surrogate indicator derived from the literature. Hoftede (2001) classified countries according to the levels of individualism/collectivism exhibited by their people. Based on Hofstede's (1980 and 2001) findings, the selected countries occupied extreme positions on Hoftede's individualist scale, with Singapore and Thailand both score at 20, while Taiwan at 17 and India at 48. The study in China was not done by Hofstede (2001) but one would predict that the people in this country are likely to be collectivist as well. Hofstede's finding indicates that Singapore and Thailand exhibit the same strength on the collectivist orientation, while Taiwan is more collectivist than the other two countries. India, on the other hand, exhibits the likelihood of being the most individualist of the five countries investigated.

Research Instrument and Sample:

The instrument comprised two sets of scales. One is a 10-item (7-point likert scale) collectivism/individualism scale designed by Yamaguchi (1990c). As a quasi-experimental research another scale portrayed in the form of a buying scenario ("You need to buy some new shirts. You are considering two models/styles, one that you like, and another that is liked by the person who is with you. How likely would you be to purchase the shirt that the other person likes if that person is": mother/father, close friend, boy/girlfriend, salesperson), and classification

questions. A "Shirt" is selected for this study because this product is equally available to the members of each country being investigated. Furthermore, shirts also have functional equivalence across the samples of these countries, and shirts are a product that can be purchased regularly and conveniently in all places.

The collectivism scale measure fits the requirements of the research in two major respects. First, it focused specifically on consumer-related collectivism issues. Secondly, the scale items addressed several dimensions of collectivism, one of which is social influence, the focus of the present study. After reading the purchase situation scenario, respondents are asked the likelihood (5-point Likert scale from: 1 = very likely to 5 = very unlikely) that they would be influenced by the other person's opinion.

Questionnaires are pretested in each of the countries. English was employed in all the questionnaires, since the samples are students enrolled in international undergraduate programs within each country. To test the psychometric equivalence of these measures, the author compared the reliability statistics between the countries and checked the variances for floor or ceiling effects (Van de Vijver, 1997). Questionnaires are administered in classroom settings. The study employed samples of university students from the five countries, thus controlling for age, occupational and social class factors. After elimination of respondents for whom there are missing data, the sample consisted of 797 respondents: 118 Thais, 194 Chinese, 181 Indians, 124 Singaporeans, 180 and Taiwanese.

Reliability of Measures:

The measurement scale in this study is examined for its internal consistency by investigating the inter-item correlation matrix and a number of reliability coefficient (Churchill, 1979; Nunnally, 1994 and Robinson, 1991). Rule of thumb for corrected item-to-total correlations is that they should be 0.50 or greater (Bearden, 1989 and Shimp, 1987). Basic guideline for individual correlations in the inter-item correlation matrix may vary. Robinson and colleagues (1991) recommend the level of 0.30 or better. The most widely used internal reliability coefficient is cronbach's (1951) coefficient alpha. The acceptance level can go as low as 0.70 or 0.60 (Robinson, 1991). All of the measures used in this study have Crobach's alpha above 0.60 indicating acceptable reliability.

Analysis:

The data are first subjected to principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation to determine validity and to potentially isolate the different components of collectivism-individualism. The components of the collectivist construct are determined to be: 'harmony' (items 1,2,4,5), 'peer support' (items 3,6,7,8), and 'conflict avoidance' (item 9 and 10). Table 1 exhibits threefactors which appears to load cleanly on one factor alone (i.e., they had no cross-loadings greater than 0.4), thus providing evidence of convergent and discriminant validity.

Table 1:

Factors Analysis of Collectivism Scale

Items	Harmony	Group Support	Conflict Avoidance
(1) I sacrifice self-interest for my group.	.745		
(2) I act as fellow group members would prefer.	.731		
(4) I maintain harmony in my group	.505		
(5) I respect the majority's wish.	.577		
(3) I stick with my group even through difficulties.		.696	
(6) I support my group, whether they are right or wrong.		.635	
(7) I respect desisions made by my group.		.541	
(8) I remain in my group if they need me, even if I'm dissatisfied with them.		.721	
(9) I avoid arguments with my group, even when I strongly disagree w/ other members.			.826
(10) I make an effort to avoid disagreement with my group members.			.802
Eigen Value	2.77	1.47	1.03
% of Variance Accounted for	27.71	14.66	10.33
Cronbach's alpha (a)	.61	.60	.67

Note: Only factor loadings>0.40 shown

Relevant factors and total scale results are then subject to analysis of variance across thefive countries to determined whether:

(1) Thai and Singaporean respondents reported to be less collectivist than the Taiwanese and Indian respondents; and (2) Thai and Singaporean respondents reported less social influence in their buying decisions than the Taiwanese and Indian respondents. China has not been formally tested by Hofstede (2001), however for the purpose of hypothesis testing China would be very similar to Taiwan since the two countries have very close proximity and Taiwan is considered as one the Republic of China.

Findings

Three clean factors emerged from the analysis of the collectivism scale accounting more than 70% of the total variance. Cronbach's alpha ranged from 0.60 to 0.70 meeting (or very close to) the reliability test for exploratory/human behavior research (Nunnally, 1994 and Robinson, 1991). Of a particular interest to the present study is the confirmation that Hofstede's study in 2001 is generalizable after five years has passed. The collectivist means of each country sample is run separately to investigate their current status and to compare with Hofstede's findings. The results in Table 2 show that the average of each country sample is significantly different from each other whereas the ranking of the countries have been changed. Thus, Hofstede's study in 2001 is still applicable to observe the general view of cultural values, yet the strengths of collectivist values within Asian countries may need to be updated.

Table 2:

Collectivist mean for each countries

Country	Collectivist Mean	Std. Dev.
Thailand	5.11	(0.53)
China	5.30	(0.83)
India	5.36	(0.69)
Singapore	5.06	(0.62)
Taiwan	4.91	(0.65)

Note: Using ANOVA, sum of squares = 1231.04, df = 5, mean square = 175.86, F-value = 212.41, Sig. = 0.00

To test the hypothesis across the five Asian nations, ANOVA is primarily employed to determine if differences exist across these nations on the basis of the three collectivist factors, plus the sum of all collectivist items. Significant differences are found indicating the existence of pronounced differences across the five countries and within individual countries. Table 3 shows the level of the social influences between men and women in each country. The findings are consistent with hypotheses (1 and 2): Men in each country have means that are significantly lower than those of women for the collectivist measures, furthermore, men from these five countries are shown to have means that are significantly lower than women on the scope of social influence.

Table 3:

Level of collectivism and social influence: Female vs. Male

Harmony

Country	Female Mean (Std. Dev.)	Male Mean (Std. Dev.)
Thailand	5.59[a] (0.75)	5.39[b] (0.55)
China	5.60[a] (0.80)	5.32[b] (0.84)
India	5.81[a] (0.82)	5.58[b] (0.79)
Singapore	5.39[a] (0.76)	5.24[b] (0.74)
Taiwan	4.80[a] (0.77)	4.65[b] (0.70)

Group Support

Country	Female Mean (Std. Dev.)	Male Mean (Std. Dev.)
Thailand	5.34[a] (0.64)	4.90[b] (0.61)
China	5.55[a] (0.95)	5.31[b] (0.93)
India	5.31[a] (0.85)	5.12[b] (0.94)
Singapore	5.21[a] (0.68)	5.00[b] (0.71)
Taiwan	5.25[a] (0.78)	4.91[b] (0.68)

Conflict Avoidance

Country	Female Mean (Std. Dev.)	Male Mean (Std. Dev.)
Thailand	5.07[a] (1.12)	4.39[b] (1.42)
China	5.31[a] (1.26)	5.02[b] (1.46)
India	5.13[a] (1.33)	4.96[b] (1.05)
Singapore	4.77[a] (1.15)	4.57[b] (1.23)
Taiwan	5.24[a] (1.24)	4.96[b] (1.14)

All Collectivist

Country	Female Mean (Std. Dev.)	Male Mean (Std. Dev.)
Thailand	5.27[a] (0.53)	5.11[b] (0.51)
China	5.51[a] (0.83)	5.28[b] (0.83)
India	5.42[a] (0.79)	5.31[b] (0.63)
Singapore	5.18[a] (0.62)	5.03[b] (0.63)
Taiwan	5.12[a] (0.65)	4.86[b] (0.64)

Social Influence

Country	Female Mean (Std. Dev.)	Male Mean (Std. Dev.)
Thailand	4.41[a] (1.26)	4.29[b] (0.87)
China	4.86[a] (1.56)	4.71[b] (1.24)
India	5.27[a] (1.02)	4.99[b] (1.03)
Singapore	4.28[a] (0.94)	4.17[b] (1.28)
Taiwan	3.23[a] (0.87)	2.91[b] (0.96)

Note: Using ANOVA, means for 'a' are significantly different from 'b'

The results in the third hypotheses largely confirm that men and women in higher collectivist countries are expected to be more susceptible to social influence in purchasing decision than the lower collectivist country. Table 4 exhibits this hypothesis by relating the level of different social influences to each country's collectivist score. Subjects in high collectivist countries are consistently more susceptible to social influence than the lower collectivist countries. For example, in regards to parental influence, India is ranked as the most collectivist and appears to be effected by parental influence significantly more than other countries. On the other hand, Taiwan is ranked as the least collectivist and exhibits its susceptible to parental influence in the hypothesized direction. As for other social influences, except for boy/girlfriend and salesperson, the directions of the means are acceptable.

Table 4:

Level of different social influences in relation to the country's collectivist score

Country Collectivist Mean (Std. Dev.) F = 234.38 Sig. = 0.00	**Parent** Mean (Std. Dev.) F = 105.79 Sig. = 0.00	**A Friend** Mean (Std. Dev.) F = 91.78 Sig. = 0.00	**B/G Friend** Mean (Std. Dev.) F = 80.79 Sig. = 0.00	**Salesperson** Mean (Std. Dev.) F = 170.56 Sig. = 0.00	**All S/I** Mean (Std. Dev.) F = 123.98 Sig. = 0.00
Thailand **5.11** (0.53)	**4.31** (1.51)	**4.86** (1.22)	**1.64** (0.44)	**3.13** (1.48)	**4.30** (0.97)
China **5.30** (0.83)	**4.93** (1.85)	**5.12** (1.24)	**1.76** (0.44)	**3.62** (1.92)	**4.74** (1.20)
India* **5.36** (0.69)	**5.98*** (1.24)	**5.80*** (1.14)	**1.63*** (0.60)	**3.97*** (1.61)	**5.16*** (1.03)
Singapore **5.06** (0.62)	**3.71** (1.75)	**4.64** (1.37)	**1.71** (0.51)	**3.26** (1.41)	**4.18** (1.13)
Taiwan **4.91** (0.65)	**3.11** (1.43)	**2.58** (1.11)	**0.88** (0.43)	**3.94** (1.63)	**3.07** (0.90)

Note: Using ANOVA, means for Indian subjects are significantly larger than subjects from other countries.

The fourth hypothesis related to differences in the impact of social influence to the level of collectivists, regardless of the countries and genders. In this case, the dependent variables are the data related to levels of social influence that respondents reported as subject to parents, friends, boy/girlfriends, and salespeople. The independent variables are all the countries combined and labeled as high or low collectivist. In order to investigate the relationship between social influence and the strength of collectivism, respondents are categorized into "high" or "low" subgroups based on the subgroup analysis technique employed by Kohli (1989). This process requires an examination of the frequency distribution of the collectivist scales, and eliminating

the (approximate) middle 10% of the cases. This median split is used to classify each case as "high" or "low" for each variable. ANOVA is then employed to determine the differences between the two subgroups. Table 5 displays the results for this hypothesis. As predicted, the high collectivist are more susceptible to social influence than the low collectivist ($F = 250.89$, $p < 0.00$)

Table 5:
Sub-group analysis: High vs. Low

Collectivist Component	Sample size (n)	Mean (Std. Dev.)
Low Collectivist	275	3.20[a] (1.31)
High Collectivist	375	4.80[b] (1.10)

Note: Using ANOVA, means for 'a' are significantly different from 'b'.

DISCUSSION

The study has achieved its objective of providing insights into the relationship between collectivism and social influence in buying situations. The two are positively related, as witnessed by the findings from five Asian nations. Further, this relationship exists within each of these nations. The findings provide evidence that largely confirms the hypotheses, as well as raising questions that invite further research.

In terms of strength of collectivism within a country, the findings clearly indicated that women are more collectivist than men. Furthermore, women are more susceptible to social influence when facing with purchasing decision. These results are expected because to be congruent with the literature, the collectivist tends to be easily influenced by significant other than individualists.

As for the differences in social influence across the nations the findings need more explanations. In all cases, with an exception of the salesperson, Taiwanese sample exhibits the lowest social influence and India the highest. This is acceptable since Taiwan appears to be the least collectivist. The results for China as compared to Taiwan, however, are more nuanced. Since China is recently open for behavioral study by outsiders, researchers have no prior data to benchmark. But literature review indicates many similarities between China and Taiwan: both speak the similar language, come from the same background, and have close proximity geographically. Taiwanese sample, nevertheless, consistently exhibits the weakest collectivism value as well as the tendency to rely on significant others when making purchasing decisions. The rational may be related to the inferior feelings among the Taiwanese towards the Mainland Chinese. Most Taiwanese take precautions that they are separated from the Mainland China, yet not accepted as an autonomous nation thru the eyes of Chinese government. To illustrate more drastically, the Olympic organizer in China would not recognize Taiwan as a nation, therefore, would not allow them to participate in the competition. Moreover, the Taiwanese seem to

consistently struggle for autonomous in order to maintain their independence and to be accepted in the global society as a competent nation. They are also highly influenced by the American values due to the assistance of the United States toward the independence from the Mainland. Other factors could also be posited.

The findings of this study necessarily need to be qualified by the facts that the data comes from only five Asian nations, and are gathered from student samples. If subsequent research from other samples and countries reaffirms these findings, then there will be more important and meaningful implications for marketers. In general, the findings suggest that marketers should give overt considerations to the collectivist orientation of a culture when devising a marketing strategy. This is not necessarily natural for marketers coming and having trained from largely individualistic societies. The gender differences to determine consumer buying preferences can be vastly different between men and women. Although Asian women are more collectivist than Asian men, does it really imply that these women would be the same as their western counterparts? This set of Asian consumer sample has clearly exhibited the differences. Perhaps a more meaningful comparison should be able to validate the differences between the Westerners and Asians with other cultural constructs. The results of this study appears that the relationship between collectivism and social influence is still a complex one in a cross-national context, and should be the subject of further research.

Managerial Implications

This research has provided marketing insights for both domestic and multinational firms. Internationally, the findings show that significant differences exist between Asian consumers in regard to collectivist values, although the consistency for social influence across countries may be questionable. Domestically, the findings also demonstrate varying levels of susceptibility to social influences and significant behavioral differences between men and women.

Knowing the level of differences between Asian customers, retail marketers are advised to formulate their strategies accordingly, particularly with regards to the differences of the genders. Moreover, since this research has established empirical evidence that consumers across Asian nations have different orientation to collectivism and social influence, retailers would also have to develop their strategies and tactics, keeping cultural and gender variations in mind.

In developing, positioning, and promoting a product, retailers are recommended to devise their strategies with regards to the behavioral differences between genders. The level of social influence in purchasing decisions may be different for men and women within and across nations. As an example, retail marketers would have to promote as much with regard to the reference groups as with to the target customers who may purchase the product. Moreover, in-store advertisements may need to stress the acceptance of the reference groups who have both direct and indirect influence upon consumer purchasing decision. Prudent practitioners, therefore, are advised to further investigate the effects of other social variables that may have significant consequences on behavioral differences among consumers across and within Asian.

REFERENCES

ALWIN, D.F. (1995), Taking time seriously: Social change, social structure, and human lives, in: Moen, P., Elder, Jr., G.H., and Luscher, K. (eds.), Examining lives in context: Perspectives on the ecology of human development, American Psychological Association, pp. 211-262 (Washington, DC.).

ARENI, C.S. AND KIECKER, P. (1993), Gender differences in motivation: some implications for manipulating task-related involvement, in: Costa, J.(ed.), Gender and consumer behavior, University of Utah Printing Service, (Salt Lake City, Utah).

BAGOZZI, R.P., AND DABHOLKAR, P.A. (1994) Consumer recycling goods and their effect on decisions to recycle: A means-end chain analysis, Psychology and Marketing, vol. 11 (July/August), pp. 313-40.

BERGER, I.E., AND CORBIN, R.M. (1992) Perceived consumer effectiveness and faith in others as moderators of environmentally responsible behaviours, Journal of Public Policy and Marketing, vol. 11 (Fall), pp. 79-89.

BISWAS, A., LICATA, J.W., MCKEE, D., PULLIG, C., AND DAUGHTRIDGE, C. (2000) The recycling cycle: An empirical examination of consumer waste recycling and recycling shopping behaviours, Journal of Public Policy and Marketing, vol. 19 (Spring), pp. 93-105.

BURNS, R.B. (1984), The self-concept: Theory, measurement, development and behaviors. (Prentice-Hall: New York).

BUSSERI, M.A., LEFCOURT, H.M., AND KERTON, R.R. (1998) Locus of control for consumer outcomes: Predicting consumer behavior, Journal of Applied Social Psychology, vol. 28, pp. 1067-1087.

COLLINS, P.H. (1997), The Meaning of Motherhood in Black Culture and Black Mother/Daughter Relationships, In: Gergen, M.M. and Davis, S.N.(eds.), Toward a New Psychology of Gender, Routledge, pp. 325-340 (New York and London).

CRAWFORD, M. (1997), Agreeing to Differ: Feminist Epistomologies and Women's Ways of Knowing, In: Gergen, M.M. and Davis, S.N. (eds.), Toward a New Psychology of Gender, Routledge, pp. 267-284 (New York and London).

DESSART, W.C.A.M. AND KUYLEN, A.A.A. (1986) The nature, extent, causes, and consequences of problematic debt situations, Journal of Consumer Policy, vol. 9, pp. 311-334.

DIETZ, T., STERN, P.C. AND GUAGNANO, G.A. (1998) Social structural and social psychological bases of environmental concern, Environment and Behavior, vol. 30 (July), pp. 450-471.

FISHER, R.J. AND ACKERMAN, D. (1998) The effects of recognition and group need on volunteerism: A social norm perspective, Journal of Consumer Research, vol. 25 (December), pp. 262-275.

GUDYKUNST, W.B.M YANG, S.M., AND NISHIDA, T. (1987) Cultural differences in self-consciousness and self-monitoring. Communication Research, 14, 8-36.

GUDYKUNST, W.B., YOON, Y., AND NISHIDA, S. (1987) The influence of individualism-collectivism on perceptions of communication in ingroup and outgroup relationships. Communication Monographs, 54, 295-306.

HALVARI, H. (1996) Personality and educational choice of general versus vocational studies among 16 – to 19- years-olds, Psychological Reports, vol. 78, pp. 1379-1388.

HOFSTEDE, G. (1980) Culture's Consequences: National differences in thinking and organizing, (Sage Press, Beverly Hills, California).

HOFSTEDE, G. (1991) Culture and organizations: Software of the mind, (McGraw Hill , New York)

HOFSTEDE, G. (2001) Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations (2nd ed.), (Sage , Thousand Oaks, CA).

HOLLAND, J.H., HOLYOAK, K.J., NISBETT, R. AND THAGARD, P.R. (1986) Induction: Processes of inference, learning and discovery. (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA).

JOSEPHS, R. A., MARKUS, H. R. AND TAFARODI, R. W. (1992) Gender and Self-Esteem, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, vol. 63 (September), pp. 391-402.

LEE, C., AND GREEN, R.T. (1991) Cross-cultural examination of the Fishbein's behavioral intention intentions models.Journal of International Business Studies, 22(2).

MARKUS, H.R. AND KITAYAMA, S. (1991) Culture and the Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion and Motivation, Psychological Review, vol. 98 (April), pp. 224-253.

MARKUS, C. AND H.R. (1993) Gender in Thought, Belief, and Action: A Cognitive Approach, In: Beall, A.E. and Sternberg, R.J.(eds.), The Psychology of Gender, Guilford Press, pp. 55-98 (New York and London).

MARSHALL, G. (1991) A multidimensional analysis of internal health locus of control beliefs: Separating the wheat from the chaff, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, vol. 61, pp. 346-359.

MCCARTHY, J.A. AND SHRUM, L.J. (2001) The influence of individualism, collectivism, and locus of control on environmental beliefs and behavior, Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, vol. 20 no. 1, pp. 93-104.

MCCRAKEN, G. (1986) Advertising: Meaning or information. In M. Wallendorf, and P. Anderson (Eds.), Advances in Consumer Research (Vol. 14, pp. 121-124). (Association for Consumer Research, Utah)

MENON, T., MORRIS, M., CHIU, C.Y. AND HONG, Y.Y. (1999) Culture and the construal of agency: Attribution to individual versus group disposition, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, vol. 76, pp. 701-717.

MEYERS-LEVY, J. (1988) The Influence of Sex Roles on Judgment, Journal of Consumer Research, vol. 14 (March), pp. 522-530.

MILLER, J.G., (1984) Culture and the development of everyday social explanation, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, vol. 46, pp. 961-978.

MIZERSKI, R.W., GOLDEN, L.L., AND KERNON, J.B. (1979) The attribution process in consumer decision making, Journal of Consumer Research, vol. 6 (September), pp. 123-133.

MORRIS, M.W. AND PENG, K. (1994) Culture and cause: American and Chinese attributions for social and physical events, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, vol. 67, pp. 949-971

NUNNALLY, J., AND BERNSTEIN, I. (1994) Psychometric theory, 3rd ed., McGraw-Hill,

New York.

PARKER, K.R. (1989) Personal control in an occupational context, in: Steptoe, A. and Appels, A. (eds.) Stress, personal control, and health, Wiley, (Chicester, England).

PENG, K. AND NISBETT, R.E. (1999) Culture, dialectics, and reasoning about contradiction, American Psychologist, vol. 54, pp. 741-754.

REDDING, S.G. (1982) Cultural effects on the marketing process in Southeast Asia, Journal of the Marketing Research Society, vol. 24 no. 2, pp. 98-114.

ROBBINS, A. S., SPENCE, J. T. AND CLARK, H. (1991) Psychological determinants of health and performance: The tangled web of desirable and undesirable characteristics, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, vol. 61, pp.755-765.

ROBINSON, J.P., SHAVER, P.R. AND WRIGHTSMAN, L.S. (1991) Criteria for scale selection and evaluation, in: Robinson, J.P., Shanver, P.R. and Wrightsman, L.S. (eds.), Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes, Academic Press, (San Diego, California).

ROSS. L.D. (1977) The intuitive psychologist and his shortcomings, in: Berkowitz, L. (ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology, pp. 174-220 (New York, Academic Press).

RUNDNICK, C. AND DENI, R. (1980) Use of the internal-external control scale to predict preferences of product, Psychological Reports, vol. 47, pp. 1193-1194.

SHRUM, L.J., MCCARTY, J.A. AND LOWREY, T.M. (1995) Recycling as a marketing problem: a framework for strategy development, Psychology and Marketing, vol. 11 no. 4, pp. 393-416.

SHWEDER, R.A. AND BOURNE, E.J. (1984) Does the concept of the person vary cross-culturally?, in: Marsella, A.J. and White, G.M. (eds.), Cultural conceptions of mental health and therapy, pp. 97-137 (Reidel, New York).

SPECTOR, P.E. (1986) Perceived control by employees: A meta-analysis of studies concerning autonomy and participation at work, Human Relations, vol. 39, pp. 1005-1016.

SPECTOR, P.E. (1988) Development of the work locus of control scale, Journal of Occupational Psychology, vol. 61, pp. 335-340.

STRICKLAND, B. (1989) Internal-external control expectancies: From contingency to creativity, American Psychologist, vol. 44 no. 1, pp. 1-12.

TOKUNGA, H. (1993) The use and abuse of consumer credit: Application of psychological theory and research, Journal of Economic Psychology, vol. 14, pp. 285-316.

TRIANDIS, H.C. (1984) A theoretical framework for the more efficient construction of cultural assimilators, International Journal of Intercultural Relations, vol. 8 no. 3, pp. 301-30.

VAN DE VIVJER, F. AND LEUNG, K. (1997) Methods and data analysis for cross-cultural research. (Sage , Thousand Oaks , California).

WALLSTON, K.A. AND WALLSTON, B.S. (1981) Health locus of control scales, in: Lefcourt, H.M. (ed.), Research with the locus of control construct, vol. 1, pp. 189-243 (Academic, New York, NY).

YAMAGUCHI, S. (1994) Empirical evidence on collectivism among the Japanese, in: Kim, U., Triandis, H.C., Kagitcibasi, C., Choi, S.C. and Yoon, G. (eds.) Individualism and collectivism: and collectivism: Theory, method, and application, pp.175-188 (Sage, California).

YAU, O.H.M. (1994) Consumer Behavior in China, (Routledge: London).