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Two studies examined the extent to which a core dimension of cultural variability, individualism–collectivism (Hofstede, 1980, 1983; Triandis, 1990), is reflected in the types of persuasive appeals that tend to be used and that tend to be effective in different countries. Study 1 demonstrated that magazine advertisements in the United States, an individualistic culture, employed appeals to individual benefits and preferences, personal success, and independence to a greater extent than did advertisements in Korea, a collectivistic culture. Korean advertisements employed appeals emphasizing ingroup benefits, harmony, and family integrity to a greater extent than did U.S. ads. Study 2, a controlled experiment conducted in the two countries, demonstrated that in the U.S. advertisements emphasizing individualistic benefits were more persuasive, and ads emphasizing family or ingroup benefits were less persuasive than they were in Korea. In both studies, however, product characteristics played a role in moderating these overall differences: Cultural differences emerged strongly in Studies 1 and 2 for advertised products that tend to be purchased and used with others, but were much less evident for products that are typically purchased and used individually. © 1994 Academic Press, Inc.
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this dimension have been employed in several social science domains (cf. Triandis, McCusker, & Hui, 1990), and the individualism–collectivism dimension has come to be regarded as "central to an understanding of cultural values, of work values, of social systems, as well as in the studies of morality, the structure of constitutions, and cultural patterns" (Triandis, Brislin, & Hui, 1988). Several recent studies have suggested that individualism and collectivism are contrasting cultural syndromes that are associated with a broad pattern of differences in individuals' social perceptions and social behavior, including differences in the definition of self and its perceived relation to ingroups and outgroups (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), in the endorsement of values relevant to individual vs group goals (Triandis et al., 1990), and in the pattern and style of social interactions (cf. Triandis, 1990).

However, little is known about the implications of these cultural differences for another social process that is fundamental to every culture: persuasion. Persuasive communications transmit and reflect the values of a culture. Persuasive messages are used to obtain the compliance that achieves the personal, political, and economic ends valued in the culture. Although social influence has always been a central arena of research in social psychology, little is understood about what differences exist in the types of persuasive appeals used in different cultures (see Burgoon, Dillard, Doran, & Miller, 1982; Glenn, Witmeyer, & Stevenson, 1977). Even less is known about the effectiveness of different appeal types in different cultures.

What types of persuasive appeals are prevalent in individualistic versus collectivistic cultures? And how do members of these different cultures differ in the extent to which they are persuaded by these appeals? This paper presents an exploration of these questions.

Our studies focused on cross-cultural differences in advertising, a form of persuasive communication that is highly prevalent in many societies, both individualist and collectivist. The studies examined how this core dimension of cultural variability is reflected in the types of advertising appeals employed in two countries (the United States and Korea) that have been shown to differ greatly on the individualism–collectivism dimension (Hofstede, 1980, 1983). The research also investigated the relative effectiveness of individualistic and collectivistic advertising appeals in the United States and Korea. Moreover, the research looks beyond overall cultural differences in advertising content and persuasiveness to identify factors that may moderate these differences.

**Individualism and Collectivism**

Individualism–collectivism is perhaps the broadest and most widely used dimension of cultural variability for cultural comparison (Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey, 1988). Hofstede (1980) described individualism–collectivism as the relationship between the individual and the collectivity that
prevails in a given society. In individualistic cultures, individuals tend to prefer independent relationships to others and to subordinate ingroup goals to their personal goals. In collectivistic cultures, on the other hand, individuals are more likely to have interdependent relationships to their ingroups and to subordinate their personal goals to their ingroup goals. Individualistic cultures are associated with emphases on independence, achievement, freedom, high levels of competition, and pleasure. Collectivistic cultures are associated with emphases on interdependence, harmony, family security, social hierarchies, cooperation, and low levels of competition (see Triandis, 1989, 1990; Triandis et al., 1990, for supporting evidence and discussions of the antecedents and consequences of individualism and collectivism).

Individualistic and collectivistic cultures are characterized by important differences in members' social perceptions and social behavior. Members of these cultures have very different construals of the self, of others, and of the interdependence of the two (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). The self is defined in terms of ingroup memberships (e.g., family and ethnic identity) to a greater extent in collectivistic cultures than individualistic cultures. Moreover, there is evidence suggesting that members of collectivistic cultures perceive their ingroups to be more homogeneous than their outgroups, whereas the reverse is true among persons in individualistic societies (Triandis et al., 1990). These cultural differences in the perceived relation of the self to others have been shown to have many other cognitive, emotional, and behavioral consequences (see Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

The individualistic cultural pattern is found in most northern and western regions of Europe and in North America, whereas the collectivistic cultural pattern is common in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Pacific (Hofstede, 1980, 1983). In the present studies, the United States and Korea were selected to represent individualistic and collectivistic cultures, respectively. These countries were selected based on Hofstede's (1980, 1983) studies of individualism–collectivism in over 50 countries, which indicated that the United States is highly individualistic with a score of 91 on a 100-point individualism scale, whereas Korea is clearly on the collectivistic side with a score of 18.

**Persuasion and Culture**

We expected that advertisements in the United States and Korea would reflect their indigenous individualistic or collectivistic cultural orientation. We also expected that the persuasiveness of certain types of ad appeals would differ in these two cultures. There are several reasons to hypothesize a link between these cultural patterns and persuasion processes.

First, previous content analyses of advertising have demonstrated differences between countries in the prevalence of various types of ad con-
tent, including emotional content, informative content, comparative content, and the use of humor (e.g., Hong, Muderrisoglu, & Zinkhan, 1987; Madden, Caballero, & Matsukubo, 1986; Martenson, 1987; Miracle, 1987; Renforth & Raveed, 1983; Tansey, Hyman, & Zinkhan, 1990; Weinberger & Spotts, 1989; Zandpour, Chang, & Catalano, 1992), although ads have not always been found to reflect their indigenous cultures (e.g., Marquez, 1975; Mueller, 1987). The roles of individualism and collectivism have not been investigated in these content analyses, although the findings have suggested that cultural factors often influence the types of ads employed in different countries.

Furthermore, researchers in the field of communication have argued that the persuasive styles employed by speakers may vary from culture to culture (Burgoon et al., 1982), and that the effectiveness of those strategies may vary, as well (Bronfenbrenner, 1964; Wedge, 1968). For example, research by Glenn et al. (1977) suggested that Americans prefer a persuasive style based on inductive reasoning, Soviets tend to rely on deductive logic and axiomatic principles, and members of the Arab culture tend to use an affective or intuitive style of persuasive communication. As Glenn et al. (1977) argued, it is reasonable to assume that those who are attempting to persuade others will “select approaches consistent with their own past experiences within the cultures to which they belong, and that they are selected, in part, on the basis of their ability to handle a style congruent with the culture” (p. 53).

Research on individualism and collectivism has also suggested a link between culture and attitudinal processes. When asked to endorse attitude statements or to rate the personal importance of values linked to family integrity, welfare of the ingroup, and the importance of personal goals, subjects' ratings tend to correspond with the orientation of their particular culture. In collectivistic cultures, members are less likely to emphasize hedonism and more likely to emphasize ingroup obligations than in individualistic societies (Triandis, Bontempo, Betancourt, Bond, Leung, Brenes, Georgas, Hui, Marin, Setiadi, Sinha, Verma, Spangenberg, Touzard, & de Montmollin, 1986; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988; Triandis et al., 1990). Such differences in culturally endorsed attitudes and values may be reflected in the tendency to use, and to accept, persuasive appeals that emphasize these different values.

Finally, research has shown that perceived social norms, roles, and values are major determinants of behavioral intentions in collectivist cultures, whereas individual likes and dislikes as well as perceived costs and benefits are weighted more heavily by individualists (Davidson, Jaccard, Triandis, Morales, & Diaz-Guerrero, 1976). This suggests that persuasive appeals that emphasize social norms and roles versus individual preferences and benefits may be more effective in changing behavioral intentions in collectivistic versus individualistic cultures.
Based on these findings, we expected that different types of advertising appeals would tend to be employed and to be effective in the U.S. and Korea. Specifically, appeals emphasizing family expectations, relations with ingroups, and group benefits—i.e., collectivistic appeals—would be more prevalent in Korean advertising, whereas messages emphasizing a concern with individual benefits, personal success, and independence—i.e., individualistic appeals—would be more prevalent in American advertising. We also expected that ads emphasizing these culturally relevant values would be more persuasive than ads emphasizing other values.

Moderating Factors

Although cultural orientation may be reflected in the prevalence and effectiveness of different types of appeals overall, these cultural differences may be moderated by other factors.

Product characteristics. Products differ in the goals that are associated with them and, therefore, in the types of benefits that are sought from them. As a result, appeals addressing different types of benefits are effective for different types of products (Shavitt, 1990).

Shared versus personal product categories appeared to be potentially important in moderating differences between individualistic and collectivistic cultures. Shared products were defined as ones for which the decision making process involved in purchase and the pattern of product usage are likely to include family members or friends (e.g., home appliances, groceries, and furniture). Personal products, conversely, were defined as ones for which the purchase decision and product usage are usually done by an individual (e.g., fashion apparel, cosmetics, personal care products).

How would these product characteristics moderate cultural differences in the content and persuasiveness of appeals? Shared products, which offer benefits both for the individual and for the group, could plausibly be advertised both in terms of individualistic and collectivistic appeals. For such products, cultural differences in the value placed on individual versus collective benefits could be manifested in the types of appeals that are typically employed and that are persuasive. In contrast, personal products, which offer primarily personal benefits and are typically used individually, are not likely to be convincingly promoted in terms of group-oriented or collectivistic appeals. Instead, they are likely to be promoted in terms of individual benefits, even in cultures where group benefits are highly valued. Thus, the nature of the product may constrain the degree to which cultural differences in individualism–collectivism are likely to be manifested in advertising (see Shavitt, Lowrey, & Han, 1992, for a similar point about how products constrain individual differences in advertising effectiveness).

Involvement. The concept of involvement has played a central role in
theory and research on advertising and persuasion. Involvement has been defined and operationalized in a variety of ways (see Greenwald & Leavitt, 1984; Johnson & Eagly, 1989). The present research focused on involvement as the extent to which the information in a message is potentially important or personally relevant to outcomes desired by the message recipient (e.g., Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). Persuasion processes under conditions of high involvement differ from those under low involvement. Many studies have shown that involvement can moderate the effects of other message factors, including message content, on attitude change (e.g., Kahle & Homer, 1985; Petty & Cacioppo, 1979; Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983).

Involvement could also moderate cultural differences in persuasion. Under high involvement conditions, when an ad presents information that is relevant to an anticipated decision (Petty et al., 1983), there may be a greater tendency to evaluate the product in terms of criteria that one considers particularly important, including cultural value standards. Under low involvement, however, one may be responsive to a wider variety of benefits. The possible role of involvement in moderating cultural differences in ad persuasiveness was investigated in Study 2.

STUDY 1

The first study assessed the extent to which advertising content in the U.S. and Korea reflects its indigenous individualistic or collectivistic cultural pattern. By examining the role of product characteristics, the study also attempted to identify conditions under which these cultural differences are most likely to emerge.

Method

Sample of Advertisements

One popular news magazine and one women’s magazine in each country were chosen for the study. The periodicals selected as being representative of American news and women’s magazines were Newsweek and Redbook, respectively. The comparable magazines for Korea were Wolgan Chosun and Yosong Donga. In order to achieve sample comparability, the two magazines were selected from each country based on their similarity in format and target audience (Mueller, 1987). The time span studied was January 1987 through December 1988. Every third month’s issue was included in the sample. Two hundred product ads from each country were randomly selected from the sample.

Coding of Advertisements

A manual for coding the ads was developed from theory-based factors identified by previous research on individualism-collectivism (Hofstede, 1980; Hui, 1984; Triandis et al. 1986, 1988). The individualistic classification included, (1) appeals about individuality or independence, (2) reflections of self-reliance with hedonism or competition, (3) emphasis on self-improvement or self-realization, and (4) emphasis on the benefits of the product to the consumer (you). The collectivistic classification included, (1) appeals about family integrity, (2) focus on group integrity or group well-being, (3) concerns about others or support
of society, (4) focus on interdependent relationships with others, and (5) focus on group goals. A fuller description of the coding scheme is presented in Appendix A.1

The advertisements of each country were evaluated by four judges. For each country's ads, coding was performed by two native speakers from that country (Americans for U.S. ads and Koreans for Korean ads). In addition, two bilingual coders coded both the U.S. and Korean ads. These bilingual coders were native Koreans, who lived in the United States for several years and were fluent in English. Coders were ignorant of the purposes of the study, and independently rated the degree of individualistic or collectivistic content for each of the ads on two 3-point scales [1 = not at all individualistic (collectivistic), 2 = somewhat, 3 = very]. Discrepancies in coding were settled by a fifth judge for the U.S. data, and by discussion among coders for the Korean data. The average correlation between the Korean coders' ratings was $r = .80$, and the average correlation of the American coders' ratings was $r = .84$, which are within acceptable ranges suggested by Kassarjian (1977). Moreover, the bilinguals' coding was highly correlated both with Koreans' coding of Korean ads (mean $r = .85$) and with Americans' coding of U.S. ads (mean $r = .82$), suggesting that possible cross-cultural differences in interpreting the meaning of ad content did not pose a serious threat to the reliability of the coding.

Selection of Personal vs Shared Products

Personal vs. shared product categories were determined on the basis of a survey in which 24 American students and 24 Korean students rated 44 consumer products and services in terms of, (1) the decision making process involved in purchase (1 = never discuss with their family or friends whether to purchase, 5 = always discuss), and (2) usage pattern (1 = used mostly individually, 5 = used mostly with other members of family or friends). The correlations between the two mean scores across all products were high (American data, $r = .81$; Korean data, $r = .74$), and no differences were obtained between countries in the mean rating of the personal products or in the mean rating of the shared products. Thus, an average of the two items across all 48 respondents was used to classify products as personal or shared. Although many products could perhaps be classified as personal in some situations and shared in others, we believe that our classification adequately captured basic differences in the way the products tend to be purchased and used. See Appendix B for a complete listing of these products.

Results

U.S. ads were expected to be rated as more individualistic and less collectivistic than Korean ads. However, product category was expected

---

1 It should be noted that the individualistic and collectivistic classifications were generally appropriate to both U.S. and Korean ads. However, direct references to harmony with others did not appear in U.S. ads, only in a small number (<10) of Korean ads.

2 In addition to these quantitative ratings, coders also classified the primary emphasis of each advertisement into one of three categories ("individualistic," "collectivistic," or "neither"). 74% of the ads were classified as either individualistic or collectivistic. Thus, the primary emphasis of most of the ads appeared to be captured by the coding categories.

However, one difficulty with these categories is that the use of the labels "individualistic" and "collectivistic" in the coding scheme may have triggered coders' own stereotypes about Korean vs. U.S. culture. Thus, even though coders were unaware of the hypotheses of the study, it is possible that their coding reflected cultural stereotypes that were consistent with those hypotheses. Future use of this coding scheme should ideally avoid use of the terms "individualistic" and "collectivistic" and substitute culture-irrelevant terms or labels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U.S. ads&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Korean ads&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Overall&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualism ratings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal products</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared products*</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall*</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collectivism ratings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal products*</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared products*</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall*</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Ratings were made on two 3-point scales, where 1 indicated "not at all individualistic (or collectivistic)", 2 "very weak," and 3 "very.

* Mean ratings for U.S. and Korean ads differed significantly at \( p < .005 \).

<sup>b</sup> For personal products, individualism and collectivism ratings differed significantly at \( p < .005 \).

<sup>c</sup> For shared products, individualism and collectivism ratings differed significantly at \( p < .005 \).

<sup>d</sup> Individualism ratings for personal and shared products differed significantly at \( p < .005 \).

Collectivism ratings for personal and shared products differed significantly at \( p < .005 \).

To moderate these effects such that the differences between countries would be greater for shared than for personal products.

Table 1 shows the mean ratings of individualism and collectivism as a function of country and product category. An analysis of variance with country (United States vs Korea) and product type (personal vs shared) as between-subjects factors and rating type (individualism vs collectivism ratings) as a within-subject factor yielded a significant main effect of rating type \( (F(1, 396) = 72.21; p < .0001) \) indicating that, overall, ads tended to be rated higher in individualism than in collectivism. More importantly, a significant interaction of country × rating type emerged \( (F(1, 396) = 44.69; p < .0001) \) indicating as expected that the relative ratings of ads on individualism and collectivism differed for U.S. vs Korean ads. Simple main effects tests demonstrated that U.S. ads were rated significantly higher in individualism than Korean ads \( (F(1, 398) = 14.98; p < .001) \), whereas Korean ads were rated significantly higher in collectivism than U.S. ads \( (F(1, 398) = 42.86; p < .001) \).

The interaction of product category × rating type was also significant \( (F(1, 396) = 39.10; p < .0001) \), indicating that the relative ratings of ads for individualism and collectivism differed for personal vs shared products. Simple effects tests indicated that ads for personal products were rated significantly higher in individualism than ads for shared products \( (F(1, 398) = 17.78; p < .0001) \), whereas ads for shared products were rated
significantly higher in collectivism than ads for personal products \((F(1, 398) = 27.95; p < .0001)\).

However, as expected, the two-way interactions were qualified by a country \(\times\) product category \(\times\) rating type interaction \((F(1, 392) = 11.42; p < .001)\), indicating as expected that product category moderated the differences in the ratings of Korean vs U.S. ads. That is, the differences were greater for shared than for personal products. Further analysis revealed that the interaction of country \(\times\) rating type was significant within each product category, indicating that ratings of U.S. versus Korean ads differed reliably for both product types (personal products: \(F(1, 194) = 7.35; p < .01\); shared products: \(F(1, 202) = 42.76; p < .0001\)). But within-group comparisons suggested as expected that cultural differences in advertising were much more evident for shared products than for personal products. For personal products, individualism ratings were higher than collectivism ratings for both U.S. and Korean ads (U.S. ads: \(t(96) = 11.58; p < .001\); Korean ads: \(t(98) = 5.36; p < .001\)). In contrast, for shared products, individualism ratings were higher than collectivism ratings for U.S. ads \((t(102) = 7.73; p < .001)\), whereas collectivism ratings were higher than individualism ratings for Korean ads \((t(100) = 2.93; p < .005)\).

**Discussion**

The data supported the hypothesis that individualism-collectivism, a basic dimension of cultural variability, is reflected in the content of advertising in different cultures. As expected, U.S. ads were rated as more individualistic and less collectivistic than Korean ads. That is, U.S. ads were more likely than Korean ads to emphasize self-reliance, self-improvement, and personal rewards, and less likely to emphasize family well-being, ingroup goals, and interdependence.

Importantly, this overall difference was not uniform across products. Cross-cultural differences emerged for both product categories, but were greater for shared than for personal products. The ratings of U.S. and Korean ads suggested that personal products tended to be promoted more in terms of individualistic than collectivistic appeals in both countries. This was as expected, since personal products offer predominantly personal or individually experienced benefits, and thus are unlikely to be promoted with group-oriented appeals. However, shared products tended to be promoted differently in the two countries—more in terms of individualistic appeals in the United States and more in terms of collectivistic appeals in Korea. This may be because shared products, which offer both individual and collective benefits, can be convincingly promoted in terms of either type of benefit, allowing cultural differences in the value placed on these benefits to influence the types of appeals that are employed.
STUDY 2

Study 2 was conducted to investigate cultural differences in the relative effectiveness of individualistic and collectivistic appeals. In this experiment, subjects in the United States and in Korea read advertisements that employed individualistic or collectivistic appeals, and completed measures assessing the persuasiveness of those ads. Overall, we expected individualistic appeals to be more persuasive in the United States and collectivistic appeals to be more persuasive in Korea. Additionally, as in Study 1, we examined the role of personal vs shared products in moderating the hypothesized cultural differences. Cultural differences in the persuasiveness of appeals were expected to be greater for shared than for personal products, for the reasons described earlier.

The possible moderating role of ad recipients’ level of involvement was also investigated. Based on previous research we reasoned that, under high involvement, when ad information is relevant to an anticipated decision (e.g., Petty et al., 1983), one may be more likely to evaluate products in terms of criteria that are considered highly important, including cultural value standards. Under low involvement, however, one may be responsive to a wider variety of appeals, and thus cultural values may play a more limited role.

Personal and Shared Products

These were chosen from the list of products identified in the Study 1 survey. Chewing gum and running shoes were chosen as the personal products. Detergents and clothes irons were selected as the shared products. These products were chosen because (1) they were expected to be equally familiar to subjects in both countries, and (2) appeal types for these products could be readily manipulated.

Involvement

The perceived personal relevance of the ads that subjects read was manipulated. Subjects in the high involvement condition were led to anticipate purchase decisions regarding the advertised products, whereas low involvement subjects were not (see Method).

Method

Subjects

American participants were 64 persons between the ages of 18 and 27 recruited through notices placed in University of Illinois campus buildings, promising $4 for participation. Korean participants were 64 persons between the ages of 18 and 27 enrolled in introductory communication and advertising classes at a major university in Seoul.

Involvement Manipulation

Involvement was manipulated in two ways. On subjects’ initial instructions sheet, Americans in the high involvement condition were informed that the advertised products were
scheduled to be advertised in medium-sized cities throughout the Midwest, including their own city (Champaign-Urbana), whereas subjects in the low involvement condition were informed that the products were scheduled to be advertised only in foreign countries. For Koreans, involvement was manipulated with comparable statements (i.e., products to be advertised in Seoul vs foreign countries). To strengthen the involvement manipulation, all subjects in the high involvement condition were also told that they would be asked to make a purchase decision regarding the advertised products in the study. Subjects in the low involvement condition were not led to anticipate a purchase decision.

These procedures were designed to enhance or reduce the personal relevance of the advertisements. Previous research has consistently found this sort of method to be effective in manipulating outcome-relevant involvement (e.g., Kahle & Homer, 1985; Petty et al., 1983; Sanbonmatsu, Shavitt, & Sherman, 1991).

Materials

All of the advertisements were written first in English. Then, a series of double-translations with decentering (Brislin, 1980) was employed to translate the ads into the Korean versions. Many of the headlines and illustrations for both the individualistic and collectivist ads were taken from actual magazine ads, enhancing the realism of the stimulus ads. One pair of advertisements (one individualistic and one collectivistic ad) was created for each of the four products. Each ad consisted of only a headline and illustrations. Individualistic ads featured such headlines as “Treat yourself to a breath freshening experience,” and “Easy walking. Easy exercise. Easy weight loss. It’s easy when you have the right shoes.” Collectivist ads featured such headlines as, “Share the Freedent breath freshening experience,” and “Easy walking. Easy exercise. The shoes for your family.” Individualistic ads generally featured pictures of individuals, whereas collectivist ads generally featured pictures of groups of people. The product was also pictured in each ad.4

Presentation of Ads

Each subject read and responded to all four pairs of ads. The order of the four products subjects read about was counterbalanced in a pairwise balanced Latin-square design. The

---

3 This type of translation refers to “a process by which one set of materials is not translated with as little change as possible into another language. Rather material in one language is changed so that there will be a smooth, natural-sounding version in the second language . . . decentering means that the research project is not centered around any one culture or language” (Brislin, 1980, p. 433). Double-translation with decentering, in part, enables equivalency of message stimuli (meaning and familiarity) to be achieved between the two cultures.

4 A pilot study verified that these pairs of ads differed in terms of their individualism–collectivism. Ten native speakers from each country, who were blind to the hypotheses, rated the ads in their native language. They were shown pairs of ads and were asked which one they thought emphasized individualistic and which emphasized collectivistic appeals. All judges in both countries correctly classified all ads into the categories they had been designed to represent.

It was also important to determine whether individualistic and collectivistic ads differed on important dimensions other than their individualism-collectivism, such as their comprehensibility, familiarity of arguments, or readability. To assess the comparability of the ads on these dimensions, the same ten judges from each country evaluated a randomly ordered set of the ads. For each ad, they rated (1) how technically well-written this ad was, (2) how easy it was to understand the ad, and (3) how often they had seen such a set of arguments for purchasing any product (cf. Shavitt, 1990). Their ratings were nearly identical for the individualistic and collectivistic appeals for every product in each country.
order of appeals within each pair of ads was also counterbalanced such that an individualistic ad was read first for one personal and one shared product (either for chewing gum and detergent, or for running shoes and iron), and a collectivistic appeal was read first for the other products.

**Dependent Measures**

Subjects rated their purchase intention for the advertised brand on a 4-point scale, anchored by “I definitely would/would not buy it.” They also responded to two attitude measures, each consisting of three semantic differential scales anchored at -4 and +4. The first measure assessed their attitude toward the ad (scale anchors: bad–good, negative–positive, and disliked–liked). The second assessed their overall impression of the brand (scale anchors: undesirable–desirable, unsatisfactory–satisfactory, and bad–good). Subjects also compared the persuasiveness of the two ads in the pair by responding to a six-item questionnaire, including such items as “Overall, which ad do you think is better?” “Which one appeals to you more?” and “Which ad do you think would be more successful?” Such a measure has been used successfully in previous studies to assess the relative persuasiveness of ads (Snyder & DeBono, 1985, 1987).

As a check on the classification of products as personal vs shared, subjects rated each product in terms of (1) their purchase decision process (1 = never discuss with family or friends prior to purchase, 5 = always), and (2) usage (1 = used mostly individually, 5 = used mostly with family or friends). As a check on the involvement manipulation, subjects completed three 9-point scales (1 = not at all, 9 = very much), on which they rated (1) how much they paid attention to the study, (2) how interesting the study was, and (3) how much attention they paid to the ads.

**Procedure**

Subjects participated in groups of 12 to 20. They were told that they would evaluate a series of print advertisements currently being studied by researchers at a major advertising firm. Subjects were asked to react to the ads as naturally and spontaneously as possible, the way they would as ordinary consumers. After reading the first ad for the first product, they rated their purchase intention and their attitude toward the ad and the brand. Next, subjects read the second ad for the first product and then completed the questionnaire on which they compared the persuasiveness of the two ads in the pair. In this way, they read and responded to the four pairs of ads in turn. Finally, subjects completed the manipulation checks, and were then debriefed, paid (U.S. subjects), and dismissed.

**Results**

**Manipulation Checks**

As a check on the personal–shared classification of products, subjects had rated each product in terms of the involvement of others in their (1) purchase decision and (2) product usage. An average of the two 5-point items was used, with 5 being a highly shared product. Subjects’ responses yielded a pattern consistent with a priori classifications of the products (and with the results of the same survey conducted for Study 1). Higher ratings were given to products that were classified as shared (United States, $M = 3.17$; Korea, $M = 3.39$) than those classified as personal (United States, $M = 1.89$; Korea, $M = 1.96$). An analysis of variance with product type as a within-subject variable and country as a between-subjects vari-
able indicated that this main effect for product type was significant \((F(1, 124) = 346.56; p < .0001)\). In addition, when ratings were examined for each product individually, the findings were supportive for all products.

Subjects’ levels of attention, interest, and involvement were assessed as a check on the involvement manipulation. Because the three 9-point scales were internally consistent (Cronbach’s alpha = .79), an involvement index was created by averaging the items. Subjects’ mean ratings in both countries were higher in the high involvement conditions (United States, \(M = 7.58\); Korea, \(M = 7.33\)) than the low involvement conditions (United States, \(M = 6.44\); Korea, \(M = 6.38\)). a significant main effect \((F(1, 95) = 19.17; p < .001)\). No other effects were significant.

**Persuasiveness of Appeals**

**Attitude index.** Subjects had rated their purchase intention and attitudes toward the ad and the brand in response to the first ad they read in each pair of ads for a product. Thus, half of the subjects provided these ratings to one ad for each product, and the other half responded to the other ad. These three ratings were substantially intercorrelated (mean \(r = .66\)) and were combined to yield a single attitude index. Because they were made on different scales, the ratings were transformed to z-scores before being averaged. The means of this standardized attitude index showed, as expected, that U.S. subjects were more persuaded overall when the ads presented individualistic \((M = 0.22)\) rather than collectivistic \((M = -0.20)\) appeals, whereas Koreans were more persuaded overall when the ads presented collectivistic \((M = 0.19)\) rather than individualistic \((M = -0.23)\) appeals.

Mean attitude index scores are shown in Table 2. These data were submitted to an analysis of variance with appeal type (individualistic vs collectivistic) and product type (personal vs shared) as within-subject variables and country (United States vs Korea), involvement (high vs low), and counterbalance order of products and of ads as between-subjects variables. This yielded a significant country \(\times\) appeal type interaction \((F(1, 93) = 26.24; p < .0001)\), indicating as predicted that the relative effectiveness of the two appeal types differed in the United States versus Korea. Moreover, pairwise comparisons of the effectiveness of the two appeal types within each country, as well as comparisons of the effectiveness of each appeal type in the United States vs Korea, were all significant \((p's < .05)\).

However, as expected, this effect was moderated by product type. For shared products, U.S. subjects responded more favorably to individualistic appeals than collectivistic appeals, whereas the opposite was the case for Korean subjects (see Table 2). This pattern also emerged for personal products, but less strongly. Although the country \(\times\) appeal type interaction was significant within each product category (personal products:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U.S. subjects</th>
<th>Korean subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualistic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal products</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>−.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared products</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>−.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>−.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collectivistic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal products</td>
<td>−.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared products</td>
<td>−.24</td>
<td>−.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>−.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualistic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal products</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>−.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared products</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>−.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>−.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collectivistic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal products</td>
<td>−.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared products</td>
<td>−.26</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>−.22</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualistic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal products</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>−.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared products</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>−.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collectivistic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal products</td>
<td>−.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared products</td>
<td>−.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Tabled values are the standardized scores on the attitude index (the average of standardized scores across three evaluative measures).

* Over all products, mean attitude index ratings differed significantly between individualistic and collectivistic appeals for U.S. subjects and for Korean subjects (p's < .05, 2-tailed). (Comparisons within and between product types were not conducted within level of involvement.)

* Over all products, mean attitude index ratings differed significantly between countries at p < .05, 2-tailed.

* For personal products, differences in attitude ratings between individualistic and collectivistic appeals were nonsignificant for U.S. subjects and for Korean subjects. For shared products, these differences were significant for U.S. subjects and for Korean subjects (p's < .0001, 2-tailed).

* U.S. and Korean ratings differed significantly at p < .001 (2-tailed).

\[ F(1, 124) = 4.99; \quad p < .05; \quad \text{shared products: } F(1, 125) = 39.49; \quad p < .0001, \]\n
there was a significant country × product category × appeal type interaction (\( F(1, 93) = 6.42; \quad p < .05 \)), indicating that the magnitude of the overall cultural differences in the persuasiveness of these appeals depended on what type of product was being advertised. Moreover, for
personal products, pairwise comparisons of the effectiveness of the two appeal types within each country, as well as comparisons of the effectiveness of each appeal type in the United States vs Korea, were all nonsignificant. In contrast, for shared products, these comparisons were all significant (p's < .05).

Level of involvement did not moderate how strongly subjects in the United States and Korea differed in their responses to these appeals (see Table 2). The country × involvement × appeal type interaction was nonsignificant (F(1, 93) = .55; n.s.). Moreover, the tendency for product category to moderate cultural differences in the persuasiveness of appeals was not itself moderated by subjects' level of involvement. There was no country × product type × involvement × appeal type interaction (F(1, 93) = 0.31; n.s.).

Comparative ratings. After reading a pair of ads for a product, subjects had completed a questionnaire on which they compared the persuasiveness of the two ads. Because responses on this six-item questionnaire were internally consistent (Cronbach's alpha coefficients calculated for each product ranged from .71 to .90), an index was created in which a score of 1 was assigned each time subjects favored the collectivistic ad and a 0 each time they favored the individualistic ad. Thus, for each product, a 0–6 ad comparison index was created in which higher scores indicated greater favorability toward collectivistic appeals (see Snyder & DeBono, 1985).

The means on this index suggested that U.S. subjects favored individualistic appeals (M = 2.30) more than did Koreans (M = 3.15). An analysis of variance with country, involvement, counterbalance order of products and of ads as between-subjects variables and product type as a within-subject variable indicated that this difference between countries was significant (F(1, 95) = 13.20; p < .0001). Also, comparisons of these ratings to the midpoint (3.0), to determine whether the ratings reflected a significant preference for one type of appeal, indicated that U.S. subjects significantly preferred individualistic ads (τ(63) = 4.43; p < .001), whereas Korean subjects did not show a significant preference (τ(63) = 1.01; n.s.).

These differences, however, depended on the type of product being advertised. For personal products, both U.S. subjects (M = 2.12) and Korean subjects (M = 2.36) favored individualistic ads. For shared prod-

5 Although other effects were also significant in this analysis, none of them were associated with a theoretically meaningful pattern of means. The effects of involvement × product type, country × involvement × product type, counterbalance order of products, product order × involvement, product order × involvement × country, product order × involvement × ad order, and product order × involvement × product type were statistically significant. None of these interactions involve the appeal type factor, and thus none of them have implications for our conclusions regarding the persuasiveness of individualistic versus collectivistic appeals.
ucts, U.S. subjects favored individualistic ads ($M = 2.45$) whereas Koreans favored collectivistic ads ($M = 3.95$). The main effect of product type was significant ($F(1, 95) = 21.40; p < .0001$), reflecting the fact that, across countries, comparative ratings of ads were significantly influenced by product category. More importantly, the country $\times$ product type interaction was significant ($F(1, 95) = 9.70; p < .005$), demonstrating that product category moderated the cultural differences observed in responses to these appeals. In addition, tests comparing these ratings to the midpoint ($3.0$) indicated that for personal products, the preference for individualistic ads was significant in both countries (United States, $t(62) = 4.25; p < .001$; Korea, $t(63) = 2.92; p < .01$). For shared products, U.S. subjects significantly preferred individualistic ads ($t(63) = 2.52; p < .02$) and Korean subjects significantly favored collectivistic ads ($t(63) = 4.72; p < .001$).

Level of involvement did not appear to moderate substantially the cultural differences in the persuasiveness of individualistic versus collectivistic appeals, as evidenced by a nonsignificant country $\times$ involvement interaction ($F(1, 95) = 1.15$; n.s.). Under high involvement, U.S. subjects favored individualistic appeals ($M = 2.34; t(31) = 2.66; p < .05$), whereas Koreans favored collectivistic appeals ($M = 3.56; t(31) = 2.28; p < .05$). Under low involvement, U.S. subjects still favored individualistic appeals ($M = 2.26; t(30) = 3.66; p < .01$), whereas Koreans evidenced no significant preference ($M = 2.83; t(31) = .84$; n.s.). Moreover, the country $\times$ involvement $\times$ product type interaction was nonsignificant ($F(1, 95) = 1.81$; n.s.). The only other significant effect was a country $\times$ involvement $\times$ product type $\times$ counterbalance order of products interaction ($F(3, 95) = 3.57; p < .05$), which was not theoretically interpretable.

Discussion

Members of individualistic and collectivistic societies responded differently to ads emphasizing individualistic versus collectivistic appeals. Subjects in the United States were more persuaded overall by ads emphasizing individualistic benefits; whereas subjects in Korea tended to be more persuaded by ads emphasizing collectivistic benefits. This was reflected in more favorable attitude ratings for those products advertised with culturally consistent appeals, and in a preference (significant in the United States) for culturally consistent ads when comparing them with culturally inconsistent appeals.

As expected, however, this cultural difference did not emerge uniformly across products. It emerged strongly for shared products on both the attitude index and the comparative measure. It also emerged, but was diminished, on the attitude index for personal products. However, when making direct comparisons of the persuasiveness of the ads for personal
products, both U.S. and Korean subjects favored individualistic appeals as expected (i.e., cultural differences did not emerge). Thus, the type of product advertised moderated cultural differences in the persuasiveness of the ads. It is not clear why comparative evaluations of the ads suggested a stronger moderating role of product category than did the absolute attitude ratings that were taken after the first ad in each pair. One possibility is that when comparing two ads for a product directly, the goals or standards that subjects typically associated with the product became more salient through the contrast between the appeals. That is, for personal products, which offer predominantly personal or individually experienced benefits, standards associated with those benefits became more salient. For shared products, which offer both personal and group benefits, standards or goals valued by the culture became more salient. Previous research has suggested that the goals associated with products are more salient when ad appeals are presented in pairs (rather than separately) prior to evaluating them, heightening the persuasiveness of appeals relevant to those goals (Shavitt, 1990).

We had reasoned that the influence of cultural value standards on product evaluations may be greater under high than low involvement. However, subjects' level of involvement did not significantly moderate cultural differences in the persuasiveness of these appeals. This suggests that cultural value standards may play a role in evaluating certain products regardless of the degree to which the advertisement is personally relevant. That is, such standards may be employed somewhat automatically in product evaluation.

Alternatively, it is possible that other standards would have been used under low involvement if the stimulus ads would have provided some alternative bases for forming evaluations. Recall that the ads in this study consisted of only a headline and illustrations, which focused largely on the individualist or collectivist benefit being touted. Had other types of reasons for purchasing the product also been presented in the ads, low involvement subjects may have been more responsive than high involvement subjects to these other benefits, and involvement may have played a greater role in moderating the cultural differences observed in the persuasiveness of appeals. More research is needed to explore this possibility.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The present research examined how individualism-collectivism, a core dimension of cultural variability, is reflected in the advertising appeals employed in the United States and Korea, countries that have been shown to differ on this dimension (Hofstede, 1980, 1983). It also investigated the relative effectiveness of ad appeals emphasizing culturally relevant values versus appeals targeting other values. On the basis of the converging pattern of results from a content analysis and an experimental investigation
conducted in two countries, it is evident that cultural differences in individualism–collectivism play an important role in persuasion processes both at the societal and the individual level, influencing the prevalence and the effectiveness of different types of advertising appeals.

Study 1, a content analysis of existing magazine advertisements, demonstrated that ads in the U.S. use individualistic appeals to a greater extent, and collectivistic appeals to a lesser extent, than do Korean advertisements. Study 2, an experiment conducted in the United States and Korea, demonstrated that the effectiveness of these types of appeals differed in the two countries. In the United States, advertisements that emphasized individualistic benefits were more persuasive, overall, than ads that emphasized family or ingroup benefits. The reverse was true in Korea.

Although cultural orientation was reflected in the prevalence and effectiveness of different types of appeals overall, the extent to which the advertised products were likely to be purchased and used individually (personal products) or with others (shared products) moderated the cultural differences observed in both studies. For shared products, there were strong differences between the United States and Korea in the prevalence and effectiveness of appeals. For personal products, however, individualistic appeals were generally favored in both countries.

This suggests that product characteristics can constrain the role of cultural differences in the prevalence and persuasiveness of advertising appeals. Personal products, which offer predominantly individually-experienced benefits, are unlikely to be convincingly promoted in terms of collectivistic benefits. Thus, such products provide little opportunity for cultural differences in individualism-collectivism to be reflected in advertising use and persuasion. Shared products, however, can be convincingly promoted both in terms of benefits to the individual and to the group, and thus provide an opportunity for these cultural differences to be manifested (for similar findings on the role of product characteristics in constraining individual differences in persuasion, see Shavitt et al. 1992).

**Limitations in the Generalizability of the Results**

Some limitations must be kept in mind in interpreting these results. First, our research involved only one country from each culture. Although the United States and Korea differ greatly in terms of individualism and collectivism, they do not necessarily represent all aspects of this dimension. Collectivism or individualism can take different forms in different countries (see Triandis et al., 1990). Thus, the present findings should be viewed as preliminary. Further research is needed including other individualistic and collectivistic countries in order to establish further the role of this dimension in persuasion processes.

In Study 1, advertisements from only two magazines in each country
were studied. Although these magazines cannot be considered representative of all advertising media in each country, it is important to keep in mind that advertisers as a rule do not produce different ads for different media vehicles. They produce campaigns, in which the same ads highlighting the same product benefits are run in several vehicles (e.g., *Newsweek*, *Harper's*, *The New Yorker*) and even in different media (e.g., magazines, billboards). Thus, if one samples across a number of media and vehicles, one will find overlap in the ads that are run (consider the ubiquitous "Joe Camel" or Absolut Vodka campaigns). It should also be noted that the titles we employed represent mainstream, mass-circulation magazines in two major categories of consumer publications—newsmagazines and women's magazines. Their advertisers include most consumer product categories, from automobiles and appliances to groceries and clothing. Thus, although our sample of magazines was small, the ads that appeared in them are broadly representative of the types of claims made for a wide range of products promoted in mass market campaigns.

In Study 2, only two products were used in each product category. However, the products we selected represent a range of items in each category. For instance, whereas detergents and irons are similar in terms of being shared products, they differ greatly in terms of cost and the length of their purchase cycle. Thus, marketers would classify them into two fundamentally different product categories (packaged goods versus durable goods). Chewing gum and athletic shoes also differ on many dimensions, although they are both personal products. Therefore, although the sample of products employed was small, we believe the products within each category are varied enough to represent a broader range of items in the marketplace.

Our studies examined only print advertisements. As such, they do not provide evidence about the generalizability of the findings to broadcast advertising in individualistic versus collectivist cultures. Unlike print ads, television ads might be especially likely to feature collectivist appeals because exposure to TV ads often takes place in family or group contexts. If that is the case, then our research on print ads may have overestimated the differences between American and Korean ads. Still, it should be noted that examinations of television commercials in the United States, Korea, and Japan and have pointed to a number of differences, some of which (e.g., the types of peer groups shown as models) appear consistent with our findings (Bu & Condry, 1991; and see Miracle, 1987, for a relevant nonempirical analysis).

Data collection in our studies focused exclusively on contemporary advertising. Clearly, analyzing advertising usage and effectiveness over a longer period would provide more reliable comparisons between cultures. Another advantage of a longitudinal design would be the information it provides about whether advertising appeals within a culture have changed and whether appeals across cultures have converged (e.g., Tansey et al.,
1990). For example, as American "baby boomers" move through their child-bearing years, one might expect U.S. advertising strategies (and their persuasiveness) to reflect the resulting changes in consumers' collectivistic, family-oriented concerns. Research is needed to examine the effects of such demographic changes on cultural differences in the values reflected in advertising.

Further research is also needed to establish the generalizability of our findings to other, noncommercial forms of persuasive appeals. For example, previous studies of cultural differences in persuasive communication (e.g., Bronfenbrenner, 1964; Glenn et al., 1977; Wedge, 1968) often focused on interpersonal communication about political issues. Perhaps individualistic and collectivistic cultures also differ in the persuasive strategies that they favor in political and diplomatic arenas, as well as in commercial communications.

It should be noted that individualistic self-interest tends to be poorly correlated with Americans' social policy attitudes. Instead, there is evidence that Americans often justify their policy attitudes (e.g., attitudes toward racial policies) with symbolic arguments about shared social values (Sears & Kinder, 1971; Sears & McConahay, 1973). Among these social values, however, a strong belief in the ethic of individualism and self-reliance has been found to underlie many Americans' attitudes toward racial policies (Sniderman & Hagen, 1985). It is possible, then, that our cross-cultural findings would generalize to the public policy domain in terms of the types of values that are invoked in the policy advocacies of individualistic and collectivistic societies.

Some strengths of these studies should also be noted. First, the procedures minimized potential translation difficulties, which have posed serious problems in cross-cultural research (Brislin, 1980; Miracle, 1990). In Study 1, ads were not translated from one language to another. Instead, both native speakers and bilinguals evaluated all ads. The high correlations between the codings of bilinguals and native speakers (both Americans and Koreans) indicated that possible linguistic or cultural differences in interpretation of the ad content did not pose a serious problem in the coding. In Study 2, where translation of stimulus ads was necessary, a series of double-translations with decentering (Brislin, 1980) was employed to achieve equivalence in meaning and smooth, natural-sounding phrasing in the English and Korean versions of the ads. Thus, the studies minimized language difficulties that can be associated with cross-cultural research.

Moreover, the present research employed multiple methods (content analysis and experimental design) to investigate cultural differences in persuasion processes. Multimethod approaches are deemed highly desirable in cross-cultural research (Hui & Triandis, 1985; Triandis et al., 1990) because each method has inherent limitations. Content analysis monitors social phenomena unobtrusively as they occur (maximizing external validity), but often does not allow causal relations between variables
to be inferred (low internal validity). In contrast, experimental research limits variation to the manipulated factors so that causal relations can be established, maximizing internal validity. But such manipulations may not resemble social phenomena in their natural settings, and thus may be low in external validity (Neuman, 1989). Employing these two complementary methodologies, the present studies converged on the same individualistic and collectivistic categories of advertising appeals, and demonstrated cultural differences in both the prevalence and effectiveness of these types of appeals.

It should also be noted that previous work investigating differences in social behavior and social perceptions in individualistic and collectivistic cultures, reviewed earlier, has yielded results that parallel the present studies (see Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989, 1990, Triandis et al., 1990). The consistency of our analysis of advertising with several prior studies of self-definitions, ingroup relations, values, and behavioral intentions increases confidence in the validity of the present findings.

APPENDIX A

Scoring Criteria for Cultural Variation

1. Criteria for Classification as Individualistic Appeals

   — Appeals about individuality or independence
     "The art of being unique"
     "She's got a style all her own"

   — Reflections of self-reliance with hedonism or competition
     (mostly expressed in pictures, not in headlines)
     "Alive with pleasure!"
     "Self-esteem"

   — Emphasis on self-improvement or self-realization
     "My own natural color's come back. Only better, much better"
     "You, only better"

   — Emphasis on the benefits of the product to the consumer (you)
     "How to protect the most personal part of the environment.
      Your skin."
     "A quick return for your investment"

   — Focus on ambition
     "A leader among leaders"
     "Local hero"

   — Focus on personal goals
     "With this new look I'm ready for my new role"
     "Make your way through the crowd"

2. Criteria for Classification as Collectivistic Appeals

   — Appeals about family integrity
     "A more exhilarating way to provide for your family"
—Focus on group integrity or group well-being
  **"We have a way of bringing people closer together"
  **"Ringing out the news of business friendships that really work"
—Concerns about others or support of society
  **"We share our love with seven wonderful children"
  **"We devote ourselves to contractors"
—Focus on interdependent relationships to others
  **"Successful partnerships"
  **"Celebrating a half-century of partnership"
—Focus on group goals
  **"The dream of prosperity for all of us"
  **"Sharing is beautiful"
—References to harmony with others
  **"Your business success: Harmonization with Sunkyong"
—Focus on others’ happiness
  **"Mom’s love-Baby’s happiness"
—Paying attention to the views of others
  **"Our family agrees with the selection of home-furnishings"

**APPENDIX B**

**Selection of Product Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Shared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women's sanitary pads</td>
<td>Soft drinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetics</td>
<td>Groceries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haircare (shampoo, mousse)</td>
<td>Baby products (e.g., diapers, cereal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingerie</td>
<td>Coffee/tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun tan lotion</td>
<td>Toothpaste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeting cards</td>
<td>Laundry products/soap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift wrap</td>
<td>Over-the-counter medicines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen utensils</td>
<td>Baby clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfume</td>
<td>Batteries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watches</td>
<td>Corporate advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric shaver</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal copiers/typewriters</td>
<td>Washer/dryer/iron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry</td>
<td>Air conditioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion apparel</td>
<td>Camera/telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit cards</td>
<td>Television/VCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunglasses</td>
<td>Computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeans</td>
<td>Airline tickets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>Automobiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel/resort accommodations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home furnishings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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