

LUXURY BRANDS AND SELF-IDENTITY VALUES: EXPLORING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MATERIALISTIC AND VANITY-RELATED CONSUMER ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR

INTRODUCTION

Although there is a lot of research dedicated to luxury brands and the management of luxury brands, little is yet known about how best to market and monitor them (Vigneron & Johnson, 1999, 2004; Wiedmann et al. 2009). Against a background of dynamic growth in the global luxury market, it is critical for luxury researchers and marketers to understand the reasons why consumers buy luxury, what they believe luxury is, and how their perception of luxury value affects their buying behavior. Regarded as a common denominator that can be used to define consumption across cultures (Bourdieu, 1984; Dubois & Paternault, 1997), luxury is a key factor in differentiating a brand in a product category, (Allèrès, 1991; Kapferer, 1997) as well as a central driver of consumer preference and usage (Dubois & Duquesne, 1993).

Past research efforts in the luxury product market have analyzed the consumption behaviors of affluent consumers (e.g., Veblen 1899; Stanley, 1988; Hirschman, 1988), studies on luxury brand types (e.g., Dubois & Duquesne, 1993; Andrus et al., 1986), the determinants of the acquisition of luxury products (e.g., Mason, 1992; Dubois & Laurent, 1993; Dubois & Duquesne, 1993), the cross-cultural comparison of attitudes toward the luxury concept (Dubois & Laurent, 1996; Dubois & Paternault, 1997), and the comparison of motivations between Asian and Western societies (Wong & Ahuvia, 1998; Wang & Waller, 2006). However, there is currently little agreement about the dimensions of luxury product value as perceived by customers. With regard to consumer buying motives, the notion of “to impress others” still more or less serves as a strategic principle for the marketing management of luxury brands (Berry, 1994; Dittmar, 1994; Corneo & Jeanne, 1997; Vigneron & Johnson, 1999, 2004; O’Cass & Frost, 2002). According to the theory of impression management, consumers are highly affected by the internal drive to create a favorable social image from their purchase behavior outcomes (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Mandrik, 1996; Sallot, 2002). However, from a broader perspective in exploring customer perceptions of and motives for purchasing luxury, it is not sufficient to explain the whole picture of luxury market consumption with socially oriented motives (e.g., Hansen, 1998; Wong & Ahuvia, 1998; Vigneron & Johnson, 1999, 2004; Wong et al., 1999; Gentry et al., 2001; Puntoni, 2001; Roth, 2001; Miquel et al., 2002; Coulter, Price, & Feick, 2003). A personally oriented type of consumption should also be considered in the marketing management of luxury brands.

In the line of studies dedicated to analyze links between consumers’ personality traits and their marketplace behaviors, much of the work has focused on consumer characteristics like involvement and materialism and related effects on individual’s purchase and consumption of specific types of products (Belk 1985; Richins & Dawson 1992, Mittal 1988, 1989; Laurent & Kapferer 1985; Zaichkowsky 1985, 1986; O Cass 2000a). With regard to the consumption of products that possess a high social and image dimension, e.g., fashion clothing and luxury items in general, many consumers appear to utilize material possessions to portray images that display success and status. Given that materialistic values represent an important influence on consumer behavior, it is important for both marketing researchers and practitioners to explore individual difference variables that characterize consumption and direct possession related behavior (Belk 1984, 1985; Richins 1987; Richins & Dawson 1992). An important personality construct that affects materialistic orientation and usage of products to portray image is gaining prominence in

the psychology and consumer behavior literature: consumer vanity. It describes a person's definition of one's self-identity in terms of the perception of social achievements and physical appearances (Durvasula et al. 2001).

In this paper, we establish a multidimensional framework of vanity-related consumer attitudes and explore the relationships between the vanity scales and the materialism construct as a general basis for market segmentation purposes in luxury brand management.

REVIEW OF KEY CONSTRUCTS

The Consumer Vanity Literature

The phrase "vanity" has been used in many different contexts in the literature (Netemeyer et al. 1995). To develop a broad definition of consumer vanity in the context of luxury brands, it is necessary to examine the relevant literature ranging from marketing aspects (e.g., consumer behavior) to sociology, psychology and even philosophy (e.g., Cash & Brown 1987; Solomon 1985, 1992; Lasch 1978; Lyman 1978). Even though a specific formal definition cannot be found, two aspects of vanity emerge: (a) physical appearance aspects, and (b) achievement aspects, both referring to a concern for and a positive perception of the physical appearance and the personal achievements (Netemeyer et al. 1995). The concern-related components of consumer vanity (the concern for physical appearance and for social achievements) are considered as *personal values* in present research supportive of Richins and Dawson's (1992) approach towards the construct of materialism (Wang & Waller 2006). In contrast to this, the perception-related components of consumer vanity (the positive view and perception of physical appearance and social achievements) are contemplated as *self-concept* (Wang & Waller 2006).

The Materialism Literature


In the area of consumer behavior, the topic of materialism has been widely researched since the late 1950s. But as researchers have interpreted materialism from different perspectives, theorists have not yet agreed on a single definition (Richins & Dawson 1992). Nevertheless, possessions as a "symbol of success" and their acquisition play a central role in the definitions of materialism (Daun 1983; Bredemeier & Campbell 1960; Wackman et al. 1972; Heilbroner 1956; Rassuli & Hollander 1986; Du Bois 1955). More specifically, materialism can be described as the degree to which individuals principally find possessions to play a central role in one's life. A growing body of research suggests that people engage in consumption behaviors that indicate to others that they are successful (e.g., Belk 1985; Mason 1981; Richins & Dawson 1992). Therefore, materialistic oriented consumers rely heavily on external cues, favoring those possessions that are worn or consumed in public places (Richins & Dawson 1992; O'Cass & Muller 1999). This can be associated with the understanding of (materialistic) individuals that possessions serve as a signal or source of communication to others for portraying and managing impressions of who they are and what their status or position is (Douglas & Isherwood 1979; Belk 1985). Recently, the body itself has been viewed as an object of materialism where it takes on the quality of possession or ownership (Belk 1988; Richins 1991).

CONCEPTUAL MODEL: DETERMINANTS OF VANITY-RELATED CONSUMER ATTITUDES

The primary goal of this paper is to establish a multidimensional framework of vanity-related consumer attitudes and the relationships between the vanity scales and the materialism concept. *Figure A1* shows the proposed conceptual model to investigate the strongly correlated

but not identical factors and origins of vanity-related consumer attitudes. Although these factors operate independently, they interact with each other and have different influences on the vanity-rooted consumer attitude and behavior. It may serve as the basis for further identification and segmentation of different types of vanity consumers across different cultures and national boundaries.

FIGURE 1: The Conceptual Model



Appearance concern as vanity-related consumer attitude – Vanity basically contains an appearance aspect, which incorporates a positive and maybe inflated view of one's physical appearance (Netemeyer et al. 1995). This leads to the fact, that a person's concern for their appearance is one of the major influence dimensions which affects the construct of consumer vanity.

Achievement concern as vanity-related consumer attitude – Furthermore, vanity also encompasses a specific achievement aspect, which regards a specific concern for one's personal achievements (Netemeyer et al. 1995). In line with the above mentioned component of appearance concern, this dimension of achievement concern regards these two components as personal values (Wang & Waller 2006).

Appearance perception as vanity-related consumer attitude – Consumer vanity additionally consists of a third component known as appearance concern, which comprehends again the described physical appearances of a person in conjunction with a perception aspect as a multidimensional construct in line with a person's self-concept (Bracken 1996).

Achievement perception as vanity-related consumer attitude – Further, vanity encompasses another dimension, the achievement perception, regarding a specific perception of the personal achievements (Wang & Waller 2006). In context with the above mentioned component of appearance perception, this last dimension of achievement perception regards these two components as a person's self concept (Wang & Waller 2006).

Materialism as vanity-related consumer attitude – Referring to an individual’s belief that possessions symbolize one’s identity and to the importance attached to possessions as objects (Richins & Dawson 1992), materialistic consumers use possessions that are worn or consumed in public places for portraying and managing impressions. Related to vanity-oriented behavior, materialism is used here to refer to individuals giving possessions a central place in life and believing them to be a sign of success and satisfaction (Fournier & Richins 1991; Richins & Dawson 1992) and as a source of happiness. Materialists use possessions to convey status, success and prestige (Douglas & Isherwood 1979) what seems to be associated with the understanding of vanity-related consumer attitudes and behavior.

This reasoning leads us to our research hypothesis:

H: Higher levels of consumer vanity attitudes will be positively related to a personal value system that is more materialistic.

METHODOLOGY

The Questionnaire, Sample and Data Collection

To measure the underlying dimensions of vanity-related consumer attitudes, we did both, using already existing and tested measures and generating further items resulting from exploratory interviews with 20 marketing researchers and 30 consumers being asked what kind of behavior they associate with consumer vanity. As a result, the questionnaire included the items of appearance concern, appearance perception, achievement concern and achievement perception of a vanity scale developed by Netemeyer et al. (1995), which have been validated by Wang and Waller (2006) for US and Chinese customers. A German version of the 21-item consumer vanity scale was created using back translation in order to achieve an equivalence of meaning (Malhotra et al. 1996). Items were rated on five-point Likert scales (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) because they are more commonly used in Germany than the seven-point scales used by Wang and Waller (2006). With regard to materialism, we relied on a German version of Richins and Dawson’s (1992) materialism scale, which consists of 18 items that were rated on a five-point Likert scale, too. The questionnaire was face validated twice using exploratory interviews (Malhotra et al. 1996) in a pre-test with 50 respondents. A total of 768 usable questionnaires were obtained in summer 2007. *Table A1* provides a description of the sample characteristics.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION


Data were analyzed in three stages: First, the various dimensions underlying vanity-related consumer attitudes were uncovered by a factor analysis using the principal component method with varimax rotation. The factor analysis produced a seven factor structure with a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of .887 that summarized 34 items with medium (>0.5) up to high factor loadings (>0.8); the factors’ Cronbach’s alpha were .701 up to .929. *Table A2* shows our proposed factor structure that is identical to those that appear in the literature: appearance concern, achievement concern, appearance perception, and achievement perception related to consumer vanity (see Netemeyer et al. 1995), and acquisition centrality, possession defining success, and the acquisition as the pursuit of happiness related to materialism (see Richins & Dawson 1992). A brief factor description is given below:

TABLE 2: Factor Description

<i>Factor 1: Consumer Vanity - Achievement Perception</i>	This factor measures the individual’s perception of the personal achievements. Individuals scoring highly on this factor consider themselves as a successful person in a professional sense. The item that best describes this factor is “ <i>I am a good example of professional success.</i> ” (.822).
<i>Factor 2: Consumer Vanity - Appearance Perception</i>	This characteristic represents the individual’s perception of his/her physical appearance; high scorers on this factor feel and state that they are very attractive. It is best described by the items, “ <i>My body is sexually appealing.</i> ” (.853), “ <i>I have the type of body that people want to look at.</i> ” (.844), and “ <i>I am a very good-looking individual.</i> ” (.840).
<i>Factor 3: Consumer Vanity - Achievement Concern</i>	High scorers on this factor show a specific concern for their personal achievements. For male and female consumers, the highest loading item was, “ <i>Achieving greater success than my peers is important to me.</i> ” (.815).
<i>Factor 4: Consumer Vanity - Appearance Concern</i>	This factor represents an individual’s concern for his/her appearance. High scorers on this trait perceive that “ <i>I am very concerned about my appearance.</i> ” (.776), “ <i>It is important that I always look good.</i> ” (.772), and “ <i>Looking my best is worth the effort.</i> ” (.771).
<i>Factor 5: Materialism - Success</i>	High scorers on this factor tend to perceive material possessions as a sign of success. The highest loading item was – with a negative loading: “ <i>I don’t place much emphasis on the amount of material objects people own as a sign of success.</i> ” (-.776).
<i>Factor 6: Materialism - Centrality</i>	This factor measures the extent to which an individual perceives material things to play a central role in his/her life. This factor is best described by the items, “ <i>I usually buy only the things I need.</i> ” (-.856) and “ <i>I enjoy spending money on things that aren’t practical.</i> ” (.779).
<i>Factor 7: Materialism - Happiness</i>	Measuring the extent to which material possessions add to individual’s happiness, this factor is best described by one item, “ <i>My life would be better if I owned certain things I don’t have.</i> ” (.830).

To examine the hypothesized relationship between consumer vanity attitudes and materialistic values, after EFA and reliability analysis, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using the LISREL 8 software was conducted.

FIGURE 2: Confirmatory Factor Loadings and Structural Relations



As shown in *Figure 2*, the hypothesized seven-factor measurement model representing the four correlated components of the vanity construct and the three materialism components appears to fit the data reasonably well. The results suggest that the hypothesized measurement model had a reasonable fit with the German data and supports significant relations between consumer vanity traits and materialism.

In the next step, the seven factor structure scores for each respondent were saved and consequently used in stage two for clustering them into market segments. We used both hierarchical and non-hierarchical clustering techniques: An initial hierarchical clustering procedure was employed to obtain a candidate number of clusters and seed points for a k-means cluster analysis. To identify the right number of clusters, the respondents were partitioned by the hierarchical procedure first. Because it produces tight minimum variance clusters and is regarded as one of the best of the hierarchical clustering techniques (Wishart 1987), Ward’s method of minimum variance was chosen to check the cluster differences in each stage of combinations and to maximize homogeneity within and heterogeneity between clusters. The results strongly suggested the presence of five clusters. This five-cluster solution was validated using non-hierarchical k-means clustering. Overall, following the typical criteria for effective segments that consist of consumers with homogeneous needs, attitudes, and responses to marketing variables (McCarthy 1982), are distinctive from one another (Weinstein 1987), are large enough to be managerial useful (McCarthy 1982), and provide operational data that are practical, usable, and readily translatable into strategy (Weinstein 1987) the five-cluster solution as shown in *Table A3* most favorably met the above criteria and produced the most interpretable and stable result.

With regard to classification accuracy once the clusters are identified, we also used discriminant analysis to check the cluster groupings (Churchill 1999; Hair et al. 1998). Using the categorical dependent variable a priori–defined five-cluster solution, the result of discriminant analysis (*Table A4*) revealed significant differences between the group characteristics. The classification results were used to determine how successfully the discriminant function could work. Overall, 97.7% of the cases were assigned to their correct groups, validating the results of cluster analysis for useful classification of segments based on their consumer-related attitudes.

Comparisons among the five clusters were conducted on a variety of descriptive variables including demographic and socio-economic characteristics. *Table A1* provides a thumbnail sketch of the characteristics that differentiate each cluster, based on tests of statistical significance. Based on the variables from which they derived, the five clusters were labeled as follows:

TABLE 3: Cluster Profiles

Cluster	Characteristic
Cluster 1: The extroverted Hedonists (22.7% of the sample, n=174)	48.3% male, 51.7% female, mean age: 34.5 Comparing the five clusters, typical consumers in this cluster show highest mean scores for <i>Materialism – Centrality</i> , <i>ConsVan – Achievement Perception</i> , and <i>ConsVan – Appearance Concern</i> ; ratings for <i>Materialism – Happiness</i> are lowest for this group. More precisely, typical consumers in this cluster had the most positive attitude towards “ <i>Buying things gives me a lot of pleasure</i> ”, “ <i>I am an accomplished person</i> ”, and “ <i>I enjoy spending money on things that aren’t practical</i> ”; whereas “ <i>I have all the things I really need to enjoy life</i> ” and “ <i>My life would be better if I owned certain things I don’t have</i> ” show lowest mean scores.
Cluster 2: The unpretentious Satisfied (17.5% of the sample, n=134)	44.8% male, 55.2% female, mean age: 42.0 Taken as a whole, means for all factors were lower than mean scores recorded by other groups. Comparing the mean scores within this cluster, this segment shows highest mean ratings for <i>ConsVan – Achievement Perception</i> followed by <i>Materialism – Centrality</i> , and <i>ConsVan –</i>

Appearance Concern; ratings for *ConsVan – Achievement Concern* are lowest for this group. Members of this group agree to “I wouldn’t be any happier if I owned nicer things” and are less likely than others to perceive “*Professional achievements are an obsession with me*” and “*I’d be happier if I could afford to buy more things*”.

<p>Cluster 3: The Admiration Seekers (17.5% of the sample, n=134)</p>	<p>74.6% male, 25.4% female, mean age: 30.8 Members of this segment are more likely than other groups to agree to <i>ConsVan – Achievement Concern</i> and <i>Materialism – Happiness</i>. In particular, they had the most positive perception of “<i>I want my achievements to be recognized by others</i>” of all groups. Lowest mean scores in this group are reported for <i>ConsVan – Appearance Concern</i> and <i>Materialism – Centrality</i>.</p>
<p>Cluster 4: The self-confident Successful (16.2% of the sample, n=124)</p>	<p>40.3% male, 59.7% female, mean age: 37.6 This cluster shows highest mean scores of all groups for <i>ConsVan – Achievement Perception</i> as members in this segment strongly perceive “<i>I am an accomplished person</i>” and “<i>In a professional sense, I am a very successful person</i>”. Besides, they state to be concerned about their appearance and perceive the <i>Happiness</i> aspect of <i>Materialism</i> to be most important (“<i>Buying things gives me a lot of pleasure</i>”). Due to their perception of being more successful than others, members in this group are not concerned about this aspect: <i>ConsVan – Achievement Concern</i> shows the lowest mean scores.</p>
<p>Cluster 5: The glamorous Materialists (16.9% of the sample, n=130)</p>	<p>35.4% male, 64.6% female, mean age: 32.4 Typical consumers in this cluster perceive the factor <i>Materialism – Centrality</i> to be most important, followed by <i>ConsVan – Appearance Concern</i> and <i>Materialism – Happiness</i>, while <i>ConsVan – Achievement Concern</i> shows the lowest mean scores for this group. Comparing all groups, members in this cluster are more likely than others to state “<i>Buying things gives me a lot of pleasure</i>”, “<i>It sometimes bothers me quite a bit that I can’t afford to buy all the things I’d like</i>”, and “<i>I enjoy spending money on things that aren’t practical</i>”.</p>

Even though we have just made a very first step in view of identifying market segments along the dimensions of the consumer vanity construct, our integrative framework and the empirical results seem to be worth focusing in further research as well as in managerial practice.

CONCLUSION

As stated above, research shows that individuals who are more materialistic and have vanity-related tendencies use possessions and luxury brands as a sign of success, derive happiness from them and are placing possessions and status in a central place in life. High materialist and vain consumers are strongly concerned for their achievements and appearance and put a strong emphasis on the messages their possessions send to others about them as the owner. Our results support the predicted relationships suggesting that the model provides a reasonable framework to understand individual’s brand purchase and consumption behavior that is linked to consumer vanity and materialism.

Of course, our results should be further developed in different ways. For instance, future research should employ nationally representative samples in more countries to enhance the generalizability of the research findings with regard to cross-cultural group segments in different product categories. Especially an extension of the research might examine how consumer vanity develops in less-developed countries (LDCs) and its influence on consumer behavior. To the extent that consumers in LDCs are truly embracing Western consumer culture, they may try to emulate Western consumption values, resulting in a similar or even a more pronounced level of vanity. In the case of China, which is arguably the largest consumer market in the world, there is some evidence to suggest that as the country grows more prosperous, Chinese consumers become more vanity oriented (e.g., Sin & Yau 2004). Clearly, more research in other LDCs is needed to

generate more knowledge on this issue. As more and more firms expand their business worldwide, particularly entering LDCs that are developing consumer cultures, such research should be interesting and useful to both consumer researchers and marketing managers.

Despite the limitations and necessary steps in future research, the primary contribution of our research lies in exploring the relationship between consumer vanity and materialistic tendencies as a general basis for the identification of different segments of consumers. Referring to appearance concern, appearance perception, achievement concern, achievement perception, and the materialistic dimensions, marketers might be able to base marketing strategies and advertising campaigns on our conceptualization and empirically verified model to improve purchase value for different consumer segments. From a managerial perspective, our results synthesize cognitive and emotional components and already might lead to the opportunity of a better understanding of the conditions and drivers of luxury consumption in light of a brand-oriented luxury strategy (cf. Kapferer & Bastien 2009). This is both useful from a market segmentation point of view and from a market positioning point of view and will of course enlarge the efficiency of marketing communication efforts for products and brands, which should consider and address simultaneously or separately the individual needs of vanity-based purchase behavior.

REFERENCES

- Akaah, I. P., Yaprak, A. (1993): Assessing the Influence of Country of Origin on Product Evaluations: an Application of Conjoint Methodology, *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 1993, Vol. 5, pp. 39-53.
- Alder, N. J. (1983): Cross-National Management Research: The Ostrich and the Trend, *Academy of Management Review*, 1983, Vol. 8, pp. 226-232.
- Allen, M. W. (2001): A Practical Method for Uncovering the Direct and Indirect Relationships between Human Values and Consumer Purchase, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 2001, Vol. 18, pp. 102-120.
- Allèrès, D. (1991). Spécificités et stratégies marketing des différents univers du luxe. *Revue Française du Marketing*, 133(2/3), 71-97.
- Ammerman, R. T. (1988): Fear of negative evaluation, in: M. Hersen & A. S. Bellack (Eds.), *Dictionary of behavioral assessment techniques*, pp. 214-215, New York.
- Andrus, D. M./Silver E./Johnson D. E. (1986). "Status Brand Management and Gift Purchase: A Discriminant Analysis." *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 3, 1, 5-13.
- Belk, R. W. (1985): Materialism: traits aspects of living in the material world, *Journal of Consumer Research* 12 (3): pp. 265-280.
- Belk, R. W. (1988): Possessions and the Extended Self, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15, 2, pp. 139-168.
- Berry, C. J. (1994). *The idea of luxury: A conceptual and historical investigation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bhat, S., Reddy, S. K. (1998): Symbolic and Functional Positioning of Brands, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 1998, Vol. 15, pp. 32-43.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social judgment of taste*. Nice, R. (trans). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bracken, B. A. (1996): *Handbook of self-concept: Developmental, social, and clinical considerations*, New York: Wiley.
- Bredemeier, H. C./Campbell, D. T. (1960): *Social problems in America: Costs and casualties in an acquisitive society*, Wiley, New York, NY.
- Campbell, C. (1987): *The romantic ethic and the spirit of modern consumerism*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
- Cash, T.F. and Brown, T.A. (1987): Body Image in Anorexia Nervosa and Bulimia Nervosa: A Review of the Literature, *Behavior Modification*, 11 (October), pp. 487-521.
- Chao, P. (1993): Partitioning Country of Origin Effects: Consumer Evaluations of a Hybrid Product, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 1993, Vol. 24, pp. 291-306.
- Corneo, G., & Jeanne, O. (1997). Conspicuous consumption, snobbism and conformism. *Journal of Public Economics*, 66(1), 55-71.
- Coulter, R. A., Price, L. L., & Feick, L. (2003). Rethinking the origins of involvement and brand commitment. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30(2), 151-182.
- Daun, A. (1983): The materialistic lifestyle: Some socio-psychological aspects, in: *Consumer behavior and environmental quality*, Uusitalo, L. (ed.), St Martins, New York, NY, pp. 6-16.
- Davis, H. L., Douglas, S. P., Silk, A. J. (1981): Measure Unreliability: A Hidden Threat to Cross-National Marketing Research?, *Journal of Marketing*, 1981, Vol. 45, pp. 98-108.
- Dawar, N., Parker, P., Price, L.J. (1996), 'A cross-cultural study of interpersonal information exchange, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp. 497-516.
- De Mooij, M. (2001): Convergence and Divergence in Consumer Behavior, *World Advertising Research Center*, 2001 October, pp. 30-33.
- Dibley, A., Baker, S. (2001): Uncovering the Links between Brand Choice and Personal Values among Young British and Spanish Girls, *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, 2001, Vol. 1, pp. 77-93.
- Dittmar, H. (1994). Material possessions as stereotypes: Material images of different socio-economic groups. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 15(4), 561-585.

- Djursaa M., Kragh S.U. (1998): Central and Peripheral Consumption Contexts: the Uneven Globalisation of Consumer Behavior, *International Business Review*, 1998, Vol. 7, pp. 23-38.
- Douglas, M., Isherwood, B. (1979): *The World of Goods*, Basic, New York, NY.
- Douglas, S. P., Craig, C. S. (1992): Advances in International Marketing, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 1992, Vol. 9, pp. 291-318.
- Du Bois, C. (1955): The dominant value profile of American culture, *American Anthropologist*, 57, 6, pp. 1232-1239.
- Dubois, B., & Duquesne, P. (1993). The market for luxury goods: Income versus culture. *European Journal of Marketing*, 27(1), 35-44.
- Dubois, B., & Paternault, C. (1997). Does luxury have a home country? An investigation of country images in Europe. *Marketing & Research Today*, 25 (May), 79-85.
- Durvasula, S., Lysonskil, S., Watson, J. (2001): Does Vanity Describe Other Cultures? A Cross-Cultural Examination of the Vanity Scale, *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, Vol. 35, No. I , 2001, pp. 180-199.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Ekwulugo, F. (2003): Branding in Cross-Cultural Marketing, In: Rugimbana R., Nwankwo, S. (Eds.) *Cross-Cultural Marketing. Italy: Torquay, Devon: Thomson Learning*, 2003, pp. 92-107.
- Ferrandi, J-M., Valette-Florence, P., Prime, N., Usunier, J-C. (2000): Linking Personal Values and Time Orientations: The Case of the Attitude towards Cellular Phone in France and Germany, *Convegno 'Le Tendenze del Marketing in Europa'*, Università Ca Foscari Venezia, 2000, November, pp. 1-18.
- Friend, R. M., & Gilbert, J. (1973): Threat and fear of negative evaluation as determinants of locus of social comparison, *Journal of Personality*, 41, pp. 328-340.
- Gentry, J. W., Putrevu, S., Shultz, C., & Commuri, S. (2001). How now Ralph Lauren? The separation of brand and product in a counterfeit culture. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 28, 258-265.
- Grunert K.G., Grunert S.C., Sørensen E. (1995): Means-end Chains and Laddering: -an Inventory of Problems and Agenda for Research, MAPP, Working Paper 34, 1995, pp. 1-23.
- Hansen, F. (1998). From lifestyle to value systems to simplicity. In Alba, J., & Hutchinson, J. (Eds.), *Advances in consumer research* (Vol. 25, pp. 181-195). Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Harter, S. (1990): Self and identity development, in: S. S. Feldman & G. R. Elliott (Eds.), *At the threshold: The developing adolescent*, 352-387, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Heilbroner, R. L. (1956): *The quest for wealth: A study of acquisitive man*, Simon and Schuster, New York, NY.
- Hirschman, E. C. (1988). Upper class WASPs as consumers: A humanistic inquiry. In Hirschman, E. (Ed.), *Research in Consumer Behavior* (Vol. 3, pp. 115-148). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Hofstede F.T., Steenkamp E.M., Wedel M. (1999): International Market Segmentation Based on Consumer-Product Relations, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 1999, Vol. 36, pp. 1-17.
- Hofstede, G. (1980): *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1997): *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*, New York: McGraw Hill.
- Hulland, J. S. (1999): The Effects of Country-of-Brand and Brand Name on Product Evaluation and Consideration: A Cross-Country Comparison, *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 1999, Vol. 11, pp. 23-40.
- Jackson, L.A. (1992): *Physical appearance and gender: Sociobiological and sociocultural perspectives*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Kahle, Lynn R. (1983): *Social Values and Social Change: Adaptation to Life in America*, New York, NY: Praeger.
- Kapferer, J.-N. (1997): Managing luxury brands, *Journal of Brand Management*, 4, 4, 251-260.
- Kapferer, J.-N., Bastien, V. (2009): *The Luxury Strategy*, London, Kogan Page.
- Knight, G. A., Spreng, R. A., Yaprak, A. (2003): Cross-National Development and Validation of an International Business Measurement Scale: the COISCALE, *International Business Review*, 2003, Vol. 12, pp. 581-599.

- Kropp, F., Jones, M., Rose, G., Shoham, A., Florenthal, B., Cho, B. (1999): Group Identities: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Values and Groups Influences, *Journal of Euromarketing*, 1999, Vol. 8, pp. 117-131.
- Lasch, Christopher (1978): *The Culture of Narcissism*, New York: Norton.
- Lee, J. A., Kacen, J. J. (1999): The Relationship between Independent and Interdependent Self-Concepts and Reasons for Purchase, *Journal of Euromarketing*, 1999, Vol. 8, pp. 83-99.
- Levitt, T. (1983): The globalization of markets, *Harvard Business Review*, 61, pp. 92-102.
- Liefeld, J. P., Wall, M., Heslop, L. A. (1999): Cross-Cultural Comparison of Consumer Information Processing Styles, *Journal of Euromarketing*, 1999, Vol. 8, pp. 29-43.
- Lindridge A., Dibb S. (2003): Is "Culture" a Justifiable Variable for Market Segmentation? A Cross-Cultural Example, *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, 2003, Vol. 2, pp. 269-286.
- Lyman, Stanford M. (1978): *The Seven Deadly Sins: Society and Evil*, New York: St. Martin's.
- Malhotra, Naresh K.; Agarwal, James; Peterson, Mark (1996), Methodological issues in cross-cultural marketing research: A state-of-the-art review, *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 13, No. 5, 1996, pp. 7-43.
- Mandrik, Carter A. 1996. Consumer heuristics: The tradeoff between processing effort and brand value choice. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 23, 301-307.
- Mason, R. M. (1981): *Conspicuous consumption: A study of exceptional consumer behavior*, Gower Publishing Company, Farnborough, UK.
- McCort D.J., Malhotra N., *Culture and Consumer Behavior* (1993): Toward an Understanding of Cross-Cultural Consumer Behavior in International Marketing, *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 1993, Vol. 6, pp. 91-128.
- McCracken, G. (1986): Culture and consumption: A theoretical account of the structure and movement of the cultural meaning of consumer goods. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13, pp. 71-84.
- Metwally, M. M. (1993): An Analysis of Australian Exports to Middle Eastern Countries, *Middle East Business and Economic Review*, 1993, Vol. 5, pp. 19-37.
- Miquel, S., Caplliurer, E. M., & Aldas-Manzano, J. (2002). The effect of personal involvement to buy store brands. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 11(1), 6-18.
- Netemeyer, R.G.; Burton, S.; Lichtenstein, D.R. (1995): Trait Aspects of Vanity: Measurement and Relevance to Consumer Behavior, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 21, No. 4. (Mar., 1995), pp. 612-626.
- O'Cass, A., & Frost, H. (2002). Status brands: Examining the effects of non-product brand associations on status and conspicuous consumption. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 11(2), 7-88.
- O'Cass, A./Muller, T. (1999): A study of Australian materialistic values, product involvement and self-image/product-image congruency relationships for fashion clothing, *Proceedings of The Ninth Biennial World Marketing Congress*, Academy of Marketing Science.
- Oyserman, D., & Markus, H. R. (1993): The sociocultural self, in: J. M. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on the self*, 4, 187-220, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Papadopoulous, N., Heslop, L. (1990): National Stereotypes and Product Evaluations in a Socialist Country, *International Marketing Review*, 1990, Vol. 7, pp. 32-48.
- Parameswaran, R., Yaprak, A. (1987): A Cross-National Comparison of Consumer Research Measures, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 1987, Vol. 18, pp. 35-49.
- Puntoni, S. (2001). Self-identity and purchase intention: An extension of the theory of planned behavior. *European Advances in Consumer Research*, 5, 130-134.
- Rassuli, K. M./Hollander, S. C. (1986): Desire — Induced, innate, insatiable?, *Journal of Macro Marketing*, 6, 2, pp. 4-24.
- Richins, M.L., Dawson, S. (1992): A Consumer Values Orientation for Materialism and Its Measurement: Scale Development and Validation, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19 (December), 303-316.
- Richins, Marsha L. (1991): Social Comparison and the Idealized Images of Advertising, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18 (June), pp. 71-83.
- Roth, M. C. (1995): The effects of culture and socioeconomics on the performance of global brand image strategies, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 32, pp. 163-175.

- Sallot, Lynne M. (2002). What the public thinks about public relations: An impression management experiment. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79(1), 150-172.
- Samiee S., Jeoung I. (1994): Cross-Cultural Research in Advertising: an Assessment of Methodologies, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 1994, Vol. 22, pp. 205-217.
- Samli, A. C. (1994): Towards a Model of International Consume Behavior: Key Considerations and Research Avenues, *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 1994, Vol. 7, pp. 63-85.
- Shimp, T. A., Sharma, S. (1987): Consumer Ethnocentrism: Construction and Validation of CET-SCALE, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 1987, Vol. 24, pp. 280-289.
- Sin, L.Y. M., & Yau, O. H. M. (2004): Female role orientation of Chinese women: Conceptualization and scale development. *Psychology & Marketing*, 21, pp. 1033-1058.
- Smith, R. E., & Sarason, I. G. (1975). Social anxiety and the evaluation of negative interpersonal feedback, *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 43, p. 429.
- Solomon, M. R. (1985): *The Psychology of Fashion*, Lexington, MA: Heath.
- Solomon, M.R. (1992): *Consumer Behavior: Buying, Having, and Being*, Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sood J., Nasu Y. (1995): Religiosity and Nationality: an Explanatory Study of Their Effect on Consumer Behavior in Japan and the United States, *Journal of Business Research*, 1995, Vol. 34, pp. 1-10.
- Steenkamp, J. B. E. M., Burgess, S. M. (2002): Optimum Stimulation Level and Exploratory Consumer Behavior in an Emerging Consumer Market, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 2002, Vol. 19, pp. 131-150.
- Striegel-Moore, Ruth H., Lisa R. Silberstein, and Judith Rodin (1986): "Toward an Understanding of Risk Factors for Bulimia," *American Psychologist*, 41 (March), pp. 246-263.
- Thakor, M. V., Katsanis, L. P. (1997): A Model of Brand and Country Effects on Quality Dimensions: Issues and Implications, *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 1997, Vol. 9, pp. 37-51.
- Valette-Florence, P., Sirieix, L., Grunert, C., Nielsen, N. (1999): Means-end Chain Analysis of Fish Consumption in Denmark and France: a Multidimensional Perspective, *Journal of Euromarketing*, 1999, Vol. 8, pp. 15-27.
- Veblen, T. B. (1899). *The theory of the leisure class*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Vigneron, F./Johnson, L. W. (1999): A review and a conceptual framework of prestige-seeking consumer behavior, *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 1999, 1, 1-15.
- Vigneron, F./Johnson, L. W. (2004): Measuring perceptions of brand luxury, *Journal of Brand Management*, 11, 6, 484-506.
- Vormbrock, F., & Neuser, J. (1983). Konstruktion zweier spezifischer Trait-Fragebogen zur Erfassung von Angst in sozialen Situationen (SANB und SVSS). *Diagnostica*, 29, pp. 165-182.
- Vriens, M., Hofstede, F. T. (2000): Linking Attribute, Benefits, and Consumer Values, *Marketing Research*, Fall 2000, Vol. 12, pp. 4-10.
- Wackman, D. B./Reale, G./Ward, S. (1972): Racial differences in responses to advertising among adolescents', in: *Television in day to day life*, US Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Rockville, MD, pp. 543-551.
- Wang, P.Z., Waller, D.S. (2006): Measuring Consumer Vanity: A Cross-Cultural Validation, *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 23(8), August 2006, pp. 665-687.
- Watson, D., & Friend, R. (1969): Measurement of social-evaluative anxiety, *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 33, pp. 448-457.
- Wells, A., Clark, D. M., Salkovskis, P., Ludgate, J., Hackmann, A., & Gelder, M. (1995): Social phobia: The role of in-situation safety behaviors in maintaining anxiety and negative beliefs, *Behavior Therapy*, 26, pp. 153-161.
- Wiedmann, K.-P.; Hennigs, N.; Siebels, A. (2009): Value-based segmentation of luxury consumption behavior, in: *Psychology and Marketing*, Volume 26, Issue 7, pp. 625-651.
- Wills, J., Samli, A. C., Jacobs, L. (1991): Developing Global Products and Marketing Strategies: A Construct and a Research Agenda, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 1991, Vol. 19, pp. 1-11.

- Wong, N. Y., & Ahuvia, A. C. (1998). Personal taste and family face: Luxury consumption in Confucian and Western societies. *Psychology & Marketing* 15(5): 423-432.
- Wong, N., Rindfleisch, A., Burroughs, J. E. (2003): Do Reverse-Worded Items Confound Measures in Cross-cultural consumer research? The Case of the Material Values Scale, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2003, Vol. 30, pp. 72-90.
- Yaprak A. (2003): Measurement Problems in Cross-National Consumer Research: the State-of-the-Art and Future Research Directions, *Handbook of Research in International Marketing*, Edited by Jain, Subhash C., USA, University of Connecticut, 2003.
- Yavas, U., Verhage, B. J., Green, R. T. (1992): Global Consumer Segmentation versus Local Market Orientation, *Management International Review*, 1992, Vol. 32, pp. 265-272.

APPENDIX

TABLE A1: Sample and Cluster Characteristics

Variable	n	%	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Cluster 5	F	Significance
<i>Gender</i>								13.252	.000
Male	384	50.0%	48.3%	44.8%	74.6%	40.3%	35.4%		
Female	384	50.0%	51.7%	55.2%	25.4%	59.7%	64.6%		
<i>Age</i>								14.404	.000
≤ 19	16	2.1%	0%	3%	3%	3.2%	3.1%		
20-29	378	49.2%	58.1%	30%	61.4%	37%	53.8%		
30-39	118	15.3%	10%	12%	16.5%	14.4%	18.3%		
40-49	94	12.2%	11.1%	13.5%	10.5%	17.6%	12.1%		
≥ 50	162	21.3%	18.9%	42%	9%	27.2%	12%		
<i>Marital status</i>								6.342	.000
Single	456	59.5%	60.5%	44.8%	74.6%	48.4%	69.2%		
Married	240	31.3%	32.6%	40.3%	19.4%	40.3%	23.1%		
Widowed	10	1.3%	0%	3%	0%	3.2%	1.5%		
Divorced	60	7.8%	7%	11.9%	6%	8.1%	6.2%		
<i>Education</i>								13.219	.000
Not graduated from high school	64	8.4%	3.4%	26.9%	6.2%	3.2%	4.7%		
Lower secondary school	166	21.8%	16.1%	23.9%	21.5%	19.4%	29.7%		
Intermediate secondary school	72	9.4%	10.3%	7.5%	10.8%	8.1%	9.4%		
A-levels	288	37.8%	44.8%	25.4%	41.5%	38.7%	39.1%		
University degree	170	22.3%	25.3%	16.4%	20%	29%	17.2%		
No answer	2	0.3%	0%	0%	0%	1.6%	0%		
<i>Occupation</i>								3.756	.005
full time employed	306	40.8%	42.4%	44.6%	35.4%	49.2%	31.3%		
part time employed	62	8.3%	5.9%	7.7%	4.6%	4.9%	17.2%		
retired	28	3.7%	4.7%	10.8%	0%	3.3%	1.6%		
housewife/househusband	16	2.1%	0%	7.7%	0%	3.3%	0%		
apprenticeship	38	5.1%	1.2%	7.7%	6.2%	1.6%	10.9%		
student	282	37.6%	45.9%	16.9%	52.3%	36.1%	34.4%		
unemployed at the moment	18	2.4%	0%	4.6%	1.5%	1.6%	4.7%		
<i>Household income</i>								2.415	.048
< 500 €	52	6.9%	3.6%	9%	13.6%	4.9%	4.7%		
500 < 1000 €	152	20.2%	21.4%	11.9%	24.2%	21.3%	20.3%		
1000 < 2000 €	176	23.3%	25%	23.9%	19.7%	21.3%	34.4%		
2000 < 3000 €	104	13.8%	8.3%	14.9%	10.6%	19.7%	12.5%		
3000 < 4000 €	92	12.2%	9.5%	13.4%	12.1%	16.4%	9.4%		
4000 < 5000 €	52	6.9%	10.7%	7.5%	9.1%	4.9%	3.1%		
> 5000 €	38	5%	14.3%	4.5%	1.5%	0%	3.1%		
No answer	88	11.7%	7.1%	14.9%	9.1%	11.5%	12.5%		

TABLE A2: Factor Loadings and Cluster Means

KMO-Test: .887

	Factor Loadings	Cluster 1 Means	Cluster 2 Means	Cluster 3 Means	Cluster 4 Means	Cluster 5 Means	F-value	Sig
ConsVan – Achievement Perception	$\alpha=.861$	3.70	2.81	3.36	3.67	2.57	56.703	.000
In a professional sense. I am a very successful person.	.813	3.94	2.85	3.58	3.97	2.72	73.543	.000

My achievements are highly regarded by others.	.773	3.68	3.00	3.46	3.74	2.88	35.115	.000
I am an accomplished person.	.760	4.03	3.21	3.54	4.08	2.94	58.094	.000
I am a good example of professional success.	.822	3.51	2.52	3.07	3.37	2.15	68.747	.000
Others wish they were as successful as me.	.724	3.32	2.48	3.12	3.21	2.15	48.019	.000
ConsVan – Appearance Perception	$\alpha=.929$	3.21	2.38	3.08	2.60	3.12	23.950	.000
People notice how attractive I am.	.777	3.37	2.46	3.12	2.85	3.29	23.749	.000
My looks are very appealing to others.	.827	3.40	2.63	3.19	2.87	3.37	20.965	.000
People are envious of my good looks.	.793	2.84	2.18	2.82	2.31	2.58	14.912	.000
I am a very good-looking individual.	.840	3.24	2.42	3.06	2.69	3.11	19.620	.000
My body is sexually appealing.	.853	3.22	2.31	3.16	2.53	3.23	32.599	.000
I have the type of body that people want to look at.	.844	3.18	2.30	3.15	2.37	3.12	31.856	.000
ConsVan – Achievement Concern	$\alpha=.842$	3.10	2.24	3.50	2.27	2.29	52.675	.000
Professional achievements are an obsession with me.	.706	2.69	1.84	3.19	1.79	1.75	63.236	.000
I want others to look up to me because of my accomplishments.	.728	3.06	2.18	3.52	2.08	2.52	40.906	.000
I am more concerned with professional success than most people I know.	.720	3.09	2.06	3.34	2.06	2.00	68.486	.000
Achieving greater success than my peers is important to me.	.815	2.89	2.12	3.45	1.94	1.85	66.429	.000
I want my achievements to be recognized by others.	.582	3.79	2.99	4.01	3.50	3.32	24.317	.000
ConsVan – Appearance Concern	$\alpha=.896$	3.45	2.65	3.02	3.27	3.46	17.968	.000
The way I look is extremely important to me.	.738	3.91	3.00	3.55	3.73	3.83	23.470	.000
I am very concerned about my appearance.	.776	3.95	3.10	3.46	3.82	3.91	23.548	.000
I would feel embarrassed if I was around people and did not look my best.	.725	2.80	2.07	2.45	2.63	2.71	10.020	.000
Looking my best is worth the effort.	.771	3.31	2.46	2.84	3.05	3.38	18.223	.000
It is important that I always look good.	.772	3.25	2.60	2.82	3.11	3.45	14.580	.000
Materialism – Success	$\alpha=.701$	2.96	2.56	3.15	2.68	2.94	26.926	.000
Some of the most important achievements in life include acquiring material possessions.	.579	3.08	2.06	3.03	2.58	2.91	22.839	.000
I don't place much emphasis on the amount of material objects people own as a sign of success	-.776	3.23	2.48	3.48	2.45	3.29	27.089	.000
I don't pay much attention to the material objects other people own.	-.657	2.92	2.24	3.07	2.31	3.02	25.024	.000
I put less emphasis on material things than most people I know.	-.522	2.60	3.46	3.00	3.39	2.54	32.752	.000
Materialism – Centrality	$\alpha=.759$	3.93	2.67	2.94	2.95	3.88	70.064	.000
I usually buy only the things I need	-.856	3.77	2.27	2.28	2.47	3.52	82.555	.000
I try to keep my life simple, as far as possessions are concerned.	-.589	3.87	2.51	3.27	2.50	3.65	86.587	.000
I enjoy spending money on things that aren't practical.	.779	4.02	2.96	2.82	3.05	4.08	55.866	.000
Buying things gives me a lot of pleasure.	.539	4.07	2.96	3.39	3.79	4.26	55.248	.000
Materialism – Happiness	$\alpha=.768$	2.46	2.40	3.41	3.14	3.42	73.438	.000
I have all the things I really need to enjoy life.	-.696	1.84	1.75	2.88	2.42	2.91	54.003	.000
My life would be better if I owned certain things I don't have.	.830	2.36	2.04	3.79	3.40	3.85	109.054	.000
I wouldn't be any happier if I owned nicer things.	-.548	2.90	3.67	2.72	3.00	2.25	29.683	.000
I'd be happier if I could afford to buy more things.	.825	2.40	2.01	3.82	3.27	3.88	103.904	.000
It sometimes bothers me quite a bit that I can't afford to buy all the things I'd like.	.764	2.80	2.51	3.85	3.61	4.22	70.548	.000

Means were summated from scale items.

TABLE A3: Vanity-related Attitude Segments: Mean Attitude Scores

Dimension	Cluster 1 (n=174)	Cluster 2 (n=134)	Cluster 3 (n=134)	Cluster 4 (n=124)	Cluster 5 (n=130)	F	Sig of F
ConsVan – Appearance Perception	.1930	-.3928	.2313	-.4658	.3525	21.641	.000
ConsVan – Appearance Concern	.0580	-.3049	-.4924	.5512	.2185	25.505	.000
ConsVan – Achievement Perception	.4796	-.6752	.0368	.8161	-.7622	102.871	.000
ConsVan – Achievement Concern	.3023	-.1011	.9781	-.6951	-.6455	102.972	.000
Materialism - Happiness	-.6396	-.9214	.6292	.4551	.7231	157.673	.000
Materialism - Centrality	.7985	-.5183	-.6085	-.4811	.5516	106.342	.000
Materialism - Success	.3681	-.4559	.2411	-.5296	.2338	29.408	.000

TABLE A4: Discriminant Analysis of Vanity-related Attitude Dimensions

Discriminant Function	Eigenvalue	Canonical Correlation	Wilk's Lambda	χ^2	Significance
1	1.340	.757	.062	1916.836	.000
2	1.091	.722	.145	1331.013	.000
3	.962	.700	.303	822.774	.000
4	.682	.637	.594	358.358	.000
	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3	Function 4	
Centroids (group means)					
Cluster 1	1.382	.650	-.707	.664	
Cluster 2	.111	-1.584	-.889	-.840	
Cluster 3	.539	-.616	1.849	.181	
Cluster 4	-2.024	-.106	-.262	.992	
Cluster 5	-.590	1.499	.207	-1.156	
Significant variable (structure matrix)					
ConsVan – Achievement Concern	.498	-.237	.421	.218	
Materialism - Success	.249	.245	.150	-.001	
ConsVan – Appearance Concern	-.209	.209	-.168	.145	
Materialism - Centrality	.299	.612	-.299	-.017	
ConsVan – Appearance Perception	.168	.226	.167	-.086	
Materialism - Happiness	-.434	.377	.724	-.022	
ConsVan – Achievement Perception	-.052	.059	-.031	.928	

Classification matrix revealed that 97.7 % of the cases were classified correctly.