10

The Globalization of Consumption Patterns: An Empirical Investigation

Abdolreza Eshghi, Jagdish N. Sheth

INTRODUCTION

The notion that industrialization and technological change have ramifications for all aspects of social life is not a new one—it can be traced back to philosophers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[1] In the period after World War II, however, a stronger case of "convergence hypothesis" has been advanced, asserting that industrialism and the logic of modern technology forces a common culture on those who employ it. In the early 1960s, Kerr, Dunlop, Harbison, and Myers suggested that "the power of industrialism is destined to be the ever-lasting thread of the future. It is leveling the differences between continents, and between ways of life."[2]

Cultural differences across national boundaries are disappearing as a result of a trend toward uniformity: i.e., a widespread sharing of beliefs, values, and tastes, cross-cutting groups and categories. According to Wilenski, forces such as "popular education and mass literacy, high rate of social and residential mobility, and the emergence of national markets and a national politics both making use of nationwide media of masscommunication and entertainment" help create cultural standardization through changing values, attitudes, and life-style of individual members of the society.[3] Later in the 1960s, Robert D. Buzzell confirmed the emergence of global markets in a landmark article by pointing out that barriers to standardization are constantly falling, giving way to more advanced ways of doing things.[4] Finally, in 1983, Theodore Levitt, in an essay in the *Harvard Business Review*, commented that "gone are accustomed differences in national or regional preference.... The globalization of markets is at hand."[5]

Accepting the convergence hypothesis, however, does not imply that national, regional, or even local differences have disappeared altogether. To the

contrary, research evidence indicates that such differences exist and that they will persist in the future. As Wind and Douglas state, "Membership in a common culture or society does not necessarily imply similar response pattern."[6] This notion is well documented in the consumer behavior literature by Levy, Martineau, Nicosia, and Engel and Blackwell, among others.[7] The point is that despite these differences, there are similarities both within and across national boundaries. As Levitt suggests, "A market segment in one country is seldom unique; it has close cousins everywhere precisely because technology has homogenized the globe."[8] Furthermore, in the area of cross-cultural consumer behavior, several researchers, including Engledow, Thorelli and Becker, Urban and Douglas, have demonstrated that life-style influences transcend national and cultural boundaries, and therefore, despite observable differences of consumer behavior from one country to another, one can also identify similarities both within and between countries.[9]

Perhaps one reason why differences exist both within and across countries is that forces of technology in a society undergoing the process of industrialization will not affect the individual members of the society in a similar way. Some people will be more receptive to change while others may resist it.[10] Therefore, broadly speaking, individual members of the society may belong to one of two groups: (a) those who have adopted values and attitudes consistent with the process of industrialization, i.e., the moderns; and (b) those who have, to some extent, resisted the change, i.e., the traditionals. On the basis of the belief that common influences should produce greater uniformity, one may suggest that common life-style patterns as a manifestation of modernizing influences at the societal level produce uniformity in consumption patterns at the individual level across national boundaries. National and cultural influences on consumption patterns are less significant when compared with influences exerted by a modern life-style pattern. Hence, from an operational point of view, one would expect between-group differences of consumption patterns in a given country to be larger than within-group differences across countries.

This line of reasoning may be appealing, but unfortunately no one has yet produced an empirical base to support or refute the argument. Therefore, the purpose of this chapter is to provide some empirical data to investigate the validity of such arguments. The specific hypothesis to be tested is: life-style contrast will account for more variance in consumption pattern than the nation contrast.

METHOD

Data

The data for this study were provided by the Leo Burnett Advertising Co. of Chicago, Illinois. National samples that reflected broad characteristics

tions were selected from France, Brazil, Japan, and the United States to ate in large-scale life-style studies. A model of life-styles that has for the art guided Leo Burnett's life-style studies is composed of four dimensions: ivities (how people spend their time at work and leisure), (b) interests (what portant to them in their immediate surroundings), (c) opinions (how they bout themselves and the larger world), and (d) basic characteristics (the ographic parameters that describe their environment). These dimensions are ally measured with AIOs (activities, interests, and opinions), using a Likert- scale.[11]

In all four countries, the populations from which Leo Burnett's samples were wn generally consisted of male adults of 18 to 65 years of age. The average mple size is 1,321, ranging from 400 in Brazil to 1,899 for Japan. The total mber of respondents is 5,285, which represents, on the average, 81 percent those who were initially contacted. In most cases, incentives of some sort were ovided to those returning completed questionnaires. In all four surveys, presentative national samples were used.

The data collection procedures varied by country due to the nature of the pulation and the availability of survey research services. The procedures used nsisted of consumer mail panels in the United States, personal interviews with lf-completed questionnaires in France and Japan, and personal interviews in azil. Separate questionnaires were used for each country and were, for the most rt, originated by Leo Burnett with the close cooperation of Leo Burnett searchers in each country. Questionnaires were originally developed in English, and later translated and retranslated to arrive at a culturally equivalent version to suit the spoken language in each country.[12] Furthermore, questionnaires aried in length and content. On the average, each questionnaire consisted of bout 250 activities, interests, and opinion (AIOs) items, 25 demographic measures, use and ownership data on about 50 product categories, and information on the respondent's media habits, including TV, newspaper, magazine, radio, and cinema.[13]

Components of a Modern Life-style

It was necessary, for the purpose of this study, to construct a common measure of life-styles across the four countries included in the analysis. A review of the literature in the area of social psychology had indicated that such a common measure can be constructed by reference to the theory of individual modernity, which has been discussed elsewhere and will not be elaborated here.[14] Suffice it to say that individual modernity refers to a set of attitudes and ways of feeling and acting required for effective participation in a modern society.[15] Such attitudes and values can be exemplified by readiness for new experiences, democratic orientation, faith in science and technology, emphasis on the nuclear family, value for urban life, and so on.

To construct a measure of modern life-style, each country's questionnaire

was carefully screened and those items that represented a major value of moder-
nity and at the same time were common across the four countries were selected
to form the component of a modern life-style. This resulted in an initial pool of
18 items, which were then item-analyzed to determine the set of items to be in-
cluded in the final version of the scale. Through successive iterations, 12 items
from the original pool of 18 were retained to form the components of a modern
life-style, which are shown in Table 10.1.[16]

Modern and Traditional Life-style Groups

The life-style measure as constructed in this study was used to classify all
respondents, regardless of their national identity, into modern and traditional
groups. An average life-style score was computed as follows: (a) each respon-
dent's score on every item in the measure was standardized within a given coun-
try; (b) a total life-style score was computed by summing each respondent's
scores on all items; (c) an average life-style score was then computed by divid-
ing the total score by the number of items in the measure. To insure maximum
variability it was decided that only those respondents who were most modern
in their life-style pattern, i.e., those who responded to all or most of the items
in a modern way, should be classified as modern, and those who responded to
all or most of the items in a traditional way should be classified as traditional.
This resulted in classifying the top 20 percent of respondents in the modern group
and the bottom 20 percent in the traditional group.

Test of Hypothesis

The Hypothesis of this study stated that life-style contrast will account for
more variance in consumption behavior than the national contrast. An appropriate
method to test this hypothesis is an analysis of variance design.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables in this analysis consist of six consumption varia-
bles in dichotomous form (users versus nonusers, and owners versus nonowners
of stereo equipment, soft drinks, fruit juices, alcoholic beverages, automobiles,
and deodorants).[18] Each of these variables is used as a dependent variable in a
separate analysis of variance design with two independent variables.

Independent Variables

The first independent variable is the nominal level variable life-style with
levels: modern versus traditional. The second independent variable is the coun-
try variable at four levels: United States, Japan, France, and Brazil. A[illegible]

BLE 10.1. Value of Modernity and Corresponding Items the Scale of Modern Life-styles

ernity Value		*Life-style Items Included in the Scale**
diness for New Experience		
U.S.:	(+)	I like to buy new and different things.
Japan:	(+)	I always buy newest products.
France:	(+)	More novelties welcome.
Brazil:	(+)	When I see a new product, I'll buy it.
U.S.:	(+)	The new styles turn me on.
Japan:	(+)	I am sensitive to fashion.
France:	(+)	I am one of the first to adopt a new fashion.
Brazil:	(+)	I like everything that is modern.
U.S.:	(−)	I have old-fashioned tastes and habits.
Japan:	(−)	I hate men's long hair.
France:	(−)	I have old-fashioned tastes and habits.
Brazil:	(−)	Men should wear short hair.
eakening of Family Ties		
U.S.:	(−)	I am a homebody.
Japan:	(−)	My family is my life purpose.
France:	(−)	I like to spend my time at home.
Brazil:	(−)	I would rather spend my time at home.
Democratic Orientation		
U.S.:	(−)	Movies should be censored
Japan:	(+)	If pornography was made legal, sex morals would not digress.
France:	(−)	There should be censorship of press and TV.
Brazil:	(−)	Movies that present nudes should be censored.
U.S.:	(+)	ERA should be added to the constitution.
Japan:	(−)	It would be a problem if women became stronger.
France:	(+)	I am in sympathy with women's lib.
Brazil:	(−)	It is silly for women to study too much.
U.S.:	(−)	Women's place is at home.
Japan:	(−)	Women should not have jobs outside.
France:	(−)	Women's place is in the kitchen.
Brazil:	(−)	Women's place is at home.
U.S.:	(+)	Women are capable of combining their career with marriage and children.
Japan:	(−)	It is impossible for women to combine work and marriage.

TABLE 10.1. *(Continued)*

Modernity Value		*Life-style Items Included in the Scale**
France:	(−)	It is too hard when a mother works.
Brazil:	(−)	It is difficult to have a successful marriage when the wife has a job.
Value for Urban Life		
U.S.:	(−)	A small town is the best place to live.
Japan:	(−)	It is best to live in the provinces.
France:	(−)	Life in the country is better.
Brazil:	(−)	If I could, I'd live on a ranch.
Nuclear Family		
U.S.:	(−)	All couples should have at least one child.
Japan:	(−)	Marriage without children is incomplete.
France:	(−)	It is scandalous to get married and not want a child.
Brazil:	(+)	People who avoid children are right.
Personal Efficacy		
U.S.:	(+)	I expect to be a top executive within the next 10 years.
Japan:	(+)	I have a goal to accomplish within the next 5 years.
France:	(+)	I hope to have a job with more responsibilities in the future.
Brazil:	(+)	I have a splendid future.
U.S.:	(−)	My opinion on things does not count in today's world.
Japan:	(−)	My attitude doesn't count in today's world.
France:	(−)	People like me can't influence what is happening in today's world.
Brazil:	(−)	My opinion on things doesn't count in today's world.

*A plus sign (+) indicates that agreement with the statement is regarded as a modern response and a minus sign (−) indicates that agreement with the statement is regarded as a traditional response. Which end of the response continuum should be regarded as modern and which as traditional was determined with reference to modernity literature.

Source: Compiled by the author.

the data are in essence dichotomous (users versus nonusers and owners versus nonowners), ANOVA is an adequate analytical technique. The work of Lunn, as discussed by Pressly and Tuller, suggests that the use of such data can result in a minimal loss of power in the analysis of variance.[19]

The analysis consisted of a six 4×2 factorial fixed-effect design. The design resulted in unequal cell sizes, which indicates that the two explanatory variables (modern life-style and country) themselves are related. Under such conditions, Iverson and Norpoth suggest that it is more difficult to investi-

of independent variables on the dependent variable.[20] This is because a independent variable influences the dependent variable directly and in- through the other independent variable.

The number of observations in the various cells differs in this study, as in Table 10.2. Since neither the cell entries nor the percentages for the life-style levels are equal in the four countries, the two explanatory varia- may well be correlated. To determine whether the observed differences in es amount to a statistically significant difference, a chi-square test was per- The data in Table 10.2 gave a chi-square value of 10.52, which is sig- at the .05 level with three degrees of freedom. Therefore, the two ex- tory variables are correlated.

One way to analyze these data, given the conditions of this study, is to per- the analysis in two steps, as suggested by Iverson and Norpoth.[21] In the step, one of the independent variables, life-style, is introduced into the anal- and then the second independent variable, country, is entered after life-style been allowed to explain as much of the total sum of squares as it can. The of squares for interaction will be found after adjusting for the independent ables. In the second step, we turn the analysis around and let the country able enter first and then allow the life-style variable to explain as much as of the remaining variation. The sum of squares for interaction will be found fore.

Since country and life-style are correlated, the results of the two steps are ected to be different. By entering the country variable after the life-style vari- e, we get an estimate of the effect of national differences on the dependent iables (in this case, various consumption variables) that would be observa- if the four countries were equal in life-style. By the same logic, when the style variable is introduced after the country variable, we get an estimate of effect of life-style on the dependent variable with the country variable held stant. Furthermore, by examining various sums of squares obtained in the steps discussed above, we get an estimate of the part of sum of square that shared by the two independent variables. We now turn to the results obtained m this analysis.

ABLE 10.2. Number of Observations in Each Cell and Raw Percentages

	U.S.	*Japan*	*France*	*Brazil*	*Total*
raditional	193	190	105	38	526
	(38.7%)	(36.1%)	(20.0%)	(7.2%)	(100%)
Modern	207	134	118	42	501
	(41.3%)	(26.7%)	(23.6%)	(8.4%)	(100%)

Source: Compiled by the author.

RESULTS

Table 10.3 shows consumption patterns of users in percentages in var product categories by life-style and country. As can be seen from the tabl fairly substantial difference exists between various groups. To determine wh these differences are significant, we turn to analysis of variance tables for product category.

Table 10.4 shows the result of the two-step analysis of variance for dorant. As can be seen from the table, life-style and country both have sign cant effects on the dependent variable. When life-style is introduced first, *F*-ratio of 48.44 is significant at the .001 level. But when the life-style var is left to pick up after the country variable, the sum of squares drops from to 4.49 and the correcponding *F*-value drops to 30.39, which is still signif at the .001 level.

Table 10.4 also shows that when the country variable is introduced firs sum of squares amounts to 91.36, but when the country variable is entere ter the life-style variable, its sum of squares drops to 88.69 with a corres ing *F*-value of 199.80. As pointed out earlier, by entering the country v after life-style, one gets an estimate of the effect of national differences of deodorant that would be observable if the four countries were equal modern life-style. When the level of country variable is held constant, rect effect of life-style on the use of deodorant is reduced greatly, but eliminated. In both cases, the reduction in the sum of squares from wh variable is entered first to when it is entered second equals 2.67. This is the of the sum of squares that is shared by the country variable and life-style var

Furthermore, Table 10.4 shows the interaction of country and life-s be significant at the .031 level. This means that life-style has greater inf on deodorant usage in some countries and less influence in others. Specif the percentage of deodorant users in modern groups in Japan and Franc stantially higher than in traditional groups (almost double) in these co whereas the difference in the United States and Brazil is not as gre

When all the effects are taken together, the overall R^2 amounts to which indicates the percentage of variance accounted for by the independe ables. It is also obvious from Table 10.4 that most of the 39 percen explained is due to the country variable rather than the life-style variab relationship between the country variable and deodorant usage is not o nificant but also strong, since E^2 (modern life-style) = .03, which indicat relationship between the life-style variable and deodorant usage.

Table 10.5 presents the results of analysis of variance of stereo c In this case, as can be seen from the table, both main effects are sig the .001 level, while the interaction effect is significant at the .013 le fore, when the life-style variable is allowed to enter after the countr its sum of squares is reduced. The reduction in the life-style sum of sq when it is introduced first is more severe in this case than with deo

BLE 10.3. Percentage of Users in Each Product Category Modern Life-style and Country

ntry	*Traditional*	*Modern*	*Means*
	Deodorant		
S.	.89	.94	.91
pan	.18	.39	.27
nce	.23	.41	.33
zil	.71	.88	.80
Means	.50	.67	.58
	Stereo Equipment		
	.90	.83	.85
pan	.16	.28	.21
nce	.14	.25	.20
Means	.22	.42	.32
	Automobile		
U.S.	.57	.86	.72
Japan	.53	.53	.53
France	.81	.85	.83
Brazil	.37	.45	.41
Means	.59	.74	.66
	Soft Drinks		
U.S.	.76	.88	.82
pan	.81	.90	.85
rance	.21	.61	.42
Brazil	.74	.93	.84
Means	.67	.83	.75
	Fruit Juice		
U.S.	.41	.54	.48
Japan	.70	.88	.77
France	.48	.87	.68
Brazil	.29	.40	.35
Means	.52	.70	.61
	Alcoholic Beverages		
U.S.	.19	.33	.26
Japan	.55	.63	.59
France	.41	.63	.59
Brazil	.26	.45	.36
Means	.38	.49	.43

Source: Compiled by the author.

TABLE 10.4. Analysis of Variance of Deodorant

Source of Variation	*Sum of Squares*	*Degree of Freedom*	F-*Ratio*	*Significa*
Modern life-style	7.16	1	48.44	.001
Country after modern life-style	88.69	3	199.80	.001
Interaction	1.32	3	2.97	.031
Residual	147.08	994	0.14	
Total	244.25	1001	0.24	
Country	91.36	3	205.82	.00
Modern life-style after country	4.49	1	30.39	.00
Interaction	1.32	3	2.97	.03
Residual	147.08	994	0.14	
Total	244.25	1001	0.24	

Note: E^2 (modern life-style) = .03, E^2 (country) = .37, R^2 = .39.
Source: Compiled by the author.

the numbers in Table 10.5 indicate, the life-style sum of squares is reduced 7.57 to 2.48, a two-thirds reduction. The difference between the two squares, as discussed before, is the part of sum of squares that is shared by independent variables. It appears that life-style has a far greater influence ownership of stereo equipment in Brazil than in other countries. The inde dent variables taken together account for 26 percent of variation in the d is also obvious that the country variable explains much of the variation more strongly related to ownership of stereo equipment than the life variable.

Table 10.6 presents the results of analysis of variance for automobile ship. Again, life-style and country variable influence automobile owners nificantly. The interaction of country and life-style is also significant at level. The life-style variable is less affected when it is entered second country variable, meaning that a smaller part of the sum of squares by the two independent variables than in previous cases. The presence o nificant interaction effect indicates that life-style has differential impact tomobile ownership, depending on which country one lives in. An exam of the means reported in Table 10.3 reveals that it makes a greater di for automobile ownership when one belongs to the traditional group in t States than in the other countries included in this study. Apparently, the dent variables account for only 10 percent of the variation in the de country variable is still responsible for much of the variation expla

TABLE 10.5. Analysis of Variance of Stereo Equipment

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance
Modern life-style	7.57	1	46.87	.001
Country after modern life-style	33.82	3	69.76	.001
Interaction	1.76	3	3.63	.013
Residual	118.29	732	0.16	
Total	161.44	739	0.21	
Country	38.91	3	80.27	.001
Modern life-style after country	2.48	1	15.35	.001
Interaction	1.76	3	3.63	.013
Residual	118.29	732	0.16	
Total	161.44	739	0.21	

Note: E^2 (modern life-style) = .05, E^2 (country) = .24, R^2 = .26.
Source: Compiled by the author.

TABLE 10.6. Analysis of Variance of Automobile Ownership

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance
Modern life-style	5.41	1	27.23	.001
Country after modern life-style	16.45	3	27.58	.001
Interaction	4.09	3	6.86	.001
Residual	195.58	984	0.19	
Total	221.53	991	0.22	
Country	17.57	3	29.48	.001
Modern life-style after country	4.28	1	21.55	.001
Interaction	4.09	3	6.86	.001
Residual	195.58	984	0.19	
Total	221.52	991	0.22	

Note: E^2 (modern life-style) = .02, E^2 (country) = .08, R^2 = .10.
Source: Compiled by the author.

The results of analysis of variance of soft drinks are reported in Table 10.7. As in the previous case, both main and interaction effects are significant at the .001 level. It appears that life-style has greater influence on consumption of soft drinks in France (quite substantial) and Brazil than in the United States and Japan (see means reported in Table 10.3). The overall $R^2 = .19$. Again, most of the 19 percent variance explained is due to the country variable rather than the life-style variable.

When the fruit juice variable was analyzed, the results shown in Table 10.8 were obtained. This case is very similar to previous cases where both main effects and the interaction effects were significant. Modern life-style's influence is greater in France than in Japan, the United States, and Brazil. The overall R^2 is .13, with the country variable explaining most of the variation in the data.

Finally, Table 10.9 reports the results of analysis of variance of alcoholic beverages. In this case, main effects are significant at the .001 level, while the interaction effect is not significant. The independent variables apparently do not account for much of the variance in the consumption of alcoholic beverages, as evidenced by a relatively small R^2. But, again, most of the 10 percent variance explained is due to the country rather than the life-style variable.

DISCUSSION

The results of ANOVA indicated that life-style influences are significant in explaining consumption behavior, but the effect is not very strong. The data suggest that national and cultural influences continue to determine the consumption patterns across the four countries examined. But is must be emphasized that the inclusion of national identity as an independent variable in the analysis does not eliminate the effect of modern life-style. Therefore, one may argue that the effect of modern life-style is there, but it is not strong enough to influence consumption behavior at this time.

Furthermore, all the variance that was accounted for by the country variable can not be attributed to cultural and national differences, because a number of situational factors, unique to a given country environment, may influence the level of demand and availability of certain product categories. For example, government economic policy may encourage or discourage consumption or production of specific product categories, such as alcoholic beverages. Legal constraints, such as quality standards, may influence availability of certain products in a given country. Furthermore, a number of market-specific conditions may also affect the level of demand and availability of certain product categories, for instance, stage of product life cycle, degree of competition, and the like. Market structure will affect consumers' response to alternative marketing strategies and hence the level of demand for certain products. Therefore, to isolate the effect of national and cultural differences, one should select product categories that are free from the impact of these confounding variables.

TABLE 10.7. Analysis of Variance of Soft Drinks

Source of Variation	*Sum of Squares*	*Degree of Freedom*	F-*Ratio*	*Significance*
Modern life-style	6.38	1	42.42	.001
Country after modern life-style	30.06	3	66.59	.001
Interaction	3.68	3	8.15	.001
Residual	148.53	987	0.15	
Total	188.65	994	0.19	
Country	28.85	3	63.91	.001
Modern life-style after country	7.59	1	50.48	.001
Interaction	3.68	3	8.15	.001
Residual	148.53	987	0.15	
Total	188.65	994	0.19	

Note: E^2 (modern life-style) = .03, E^2 (country) = .15, R^2 = .19.
Source: Compiled by the author.

TABLE 10.8. Analysis of Variance of Fruit Juice

Source of Variation	*Sum of Squares*	*Degree of Freedom*	F-*Ratio*	*Significance*
Modern life-style	7.36	1	35.80	.001
Country after modern life-style	23.61	3	38.27	.001
Interaction	2.69	3	4.36	.005
Residual	199.70	971	0.20	
Total	233.36	978	0.23	
Country	20.94	3	33.94	.001
Modern life-style after country	10.03	1	48.80	.001
Interaction	2.69	3	4.36	.005
Residual	199.70	971	0.20	
Total	233.36	978	0.23	

Note: E^2 (modern life-style) = .03, E^2 (country) = .09, R^2 = .13.
Source: Compiled by the author.

TABLE 10.9. Analysis of Variance of Alcoholic Beverages

Source of Variation	*Sum of Squares*	*Degree of Freedom*	F-*Ratio*	*Significance*
Modern life-style	3.25	1	14.71	.001
Country after modern life-style	22.15	3	33.39	.001
Interaction	0.63	3	0.95	N.S.
Residual	218.26	987	0.22	
Total	244.29	994	0.24	
Country	20.44	3	30.82	.001
Modern life-style after country	4.96	1	22.43	.001
Interaction	0.63	3	0.95	N.S.
Residual	218.26	987	0.22	
Total	244.29	994	0.24	

Note: E^2 (modern life-style) = .01, E^2 (country) = .09, R^2 = .10.
Source: Compiled by the author.

Why life-style influences did not show a strong influence on consumption choices in this study may be explained in at least two ways. First, it is possible that our measure of modern life-style was not well explicated. Perhaps certain important dimensions of a modern life-style were not captured by the scale we developed. This implies that without further research on measurement, it would be difficult to rule out the effect of modern life-style on consumption patterns. Second, it can be argued that individual differences within the modern group produced more within-group variance than between-group variance. This argument particularly makes sense because life-style patterns transcend many social groups in society.

In sum, it appears that the hypothesis of this study cannot be supported by the data. It is evident from the analysis just performed that the life-style effect is significant, but the effect is not strong enough to wipe out the national and cultural influences, which continue to exert a significant and strong influence on consumption patterns.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Finally, it is appropriate to suggest a number of questions to be pursued in future research endeavors:

1. Are modern and traditional groups different in use and consumption of a wide variety of products and services? Inclusion of products that represent recent innovations, such as microwave ovens and personal computers, would be particularly helpful in this area.
2. What consumption styles or patterns differentiate moderns from traditionals?
3. Are moderns and traditionals different in their media habits?
4. How stable are modern and traditional groups over time? Is there a transitional group that can be identified in various countries?
5. Is the concept of modern life-style better suited to identification of consumer behavior differences and similarities in industrialized countries than developing countries?

These questions and others must be addressed in further theoretical and empirical cross-cultural behavior studies. As Green and Langeard put it, "International marketing at the level of sophistication currently practiced domestically in the United States will only be possible when more is known about the behavior of consumers outside this country."[22]

NOTES

1. Miles Simpson, "Universalism versus Modernity: Parson's Societal Typology Reconsidered," *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 26 (1975): 174–206.

2. John Kerr, John T. Dunlop, Frederick Harbison, and Charles A. Myers, *Industrialism and Industrial Man: The Problem of Labor and Management in Economic Growth* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960).

3. Harold L. Wilenski, "Mass Society and Mass Culture: Interdependence or Independence," *American Sociological Review* 29 (1964): 173–97.

4. Robert D. Buzzell, "Can You Standardize Multinational Marketing," *Harvard Business Review* (November–December 1968): 102.

5. Theodore Levitt, "The Globalization of Markets," *Harvard Business Review* 61 (May–June 1983): 92.

6. Yoram Wind and Susan Douglas, "Some Issues in International Consumer Research," *European Journal of Marketing* 8 (1974): 209–17.

7. S. Levy, "Social Class and Consumer Behavior," in *Perspectives in Consumer Behavior*, eds. H.H. Kassarjian and T.S. Robertson (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1968); P. Martineau, "Social Classes and Spending Behavior," *Journal of Marketing* 22 (1958): 121–30; F.M. Nicosia, *Consumer Decision Process* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966); James F. Engel and Roger D. Blackwell, *Consumer Behavior* (Chicago: Dryden Press, 1982).

8. Levitt, "Globalization, p. 94.

9. Jack C. Engledow, Hans B. Thorelli, and Helmut Becker, "The Information Seekers—A Cross-cultural Consumer Elite," in James Schlinger (ed.), *Advances in Consumer Research Proceedings*, 2 (1975): vol. 2 141–55; Christine D. Urban, "Consumer Segmentation for Multinational Product Planning," in Multinational Product Management, *Proceedings of AMA/MSI Workshop: 1976*, V1–V20; Susan P. Douglas. "Cross-national Comparisons: A Case Study of Working and Non-working Wives in the U.S. and France," *Journal of Consumer Research* 3 (June 1976): 12–20.

10. For more detailed discussion of this issue, see Jagdish N. Sheth, *"Psychology of Innovation Resistance: The Less Developed Concept (LDC) in Diffusion Research"* (faculty working paper #622. College of Commerce and Business Administration, University of Illinois, Urbana, 1979).

11. For details of Leo Burnett's life-style data base, see J.T. Plummer, "Consumer Focus in Cross-National Research," *Journal of Advertising* (Spring 1977), 5–15.

12. For details of the back-translation method, see R.W. Brislin, "Back-Translations for Cross-Cultural Research," *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 1 (1970): 185–216.

13. Abdolreza Eshghi, "Individual Modernity as a Cross-Cultural Consumer Behavior Construct," paper presented at the national meetings of the Academy of International Business, San Francisco, December 1983.

14. Ibid.

15. David H. Smith and Alex Inkeles, "The OM Scale: A Comparative Socio-psychological Measure of Individual Modernity," *Sociometry* 29 (1966): 353–57.

16. For details of scale construction, see Abdolreza Eshghi, *Modern-Traditional Differences in Consumption Patterns Across Cultures* (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate College of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1984).

17. Standardization was done by creating standardized Z scores of the raw responses. This approach takes full account of exactly where each individual's response fell on the actual continuum of alternative answers available for each question.

18. These product categories were the only items that were common across the four countries included in this analysis.

19. Raymond O. Collier, *Randomization Procedures for the Analysis of Educational Experiments* (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Cooperative Research Project No. 2593, 1965); Milton M. Pressley and William L. Tullar, "A Factor Interactive Investigation of Mail Response Rates from a Commercial Population," *Journal of Marketing Research* 14 (1977): 108–11.

20. Gudmund R. Iverson and Helmut Norpoth, *Analysis of Variance* (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1976).

21. Ibid.

22. Robert T. Green and Eric Langeard, "A Cross-National Comparison of Consumer Habits and Innovator Characteristics," *Journal of Marketing* (July 1975): 41.