

Journal of International & Interdisciplinary Business Research

Volume 3 *Journal of International & Interdisciplinary
Business Research*

Article 10

January 2016

MINDFUL CONSUMER BEHAVIOR: A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON

Nada Nasr Bechwati

Bentley University, nnasr@bentley.edu

Annelie Mounkkaddem Baalbaki

Lebanese American University

Najoie I. Nasr

Haigazian University, najoie.nasr@haigazian.edu.lb

Imad B. Baalbaki

American University of Beirut, imad.baalbaki@aub.edu.lb

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholars.fhsu.edu/jiibr>



Part of the [Business Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nasr Bechwati, Nada; Mounkkaddem Baalbaki, Annelie; Nasr, Najoie I.; and Baalbaki, Imad B. (2016) "MINDFUL CONSUMER BEHAVIOR: A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON," *Journal of International & Interdisciplinary Business Research*: Vol. 3 , Article 10.

Available at: <http://scholars.fhsu.edu/jiibr/vol3/iss1/10>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of International & Interdisciplinary Business Research by an authorized editor of FHSU Scholars Repository.

MINDFUL CONSUMER BEHAVIOR: A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON

Nada Nasr Bechwati, Bentley University
Annelie Mounkkaddem Baalbaki, Lebanese American University
Najoie I. Nasr, Haigazian University
Imad B. Baalbaki, American University of Beirut

We compare Lebanese and American consumers on mindful consumption behavior. We define mindful consumers as individuals who, in all stages of consumer behavior, are aware of themselves, their communities and the society at large and behave in ways that contribute to the well-being of all these entities. We conducted a two-phase survey on a total of 210 consumers, 97 in the USA and 113 in Lebanon. We found significant impacts of consumers' life beliefs such as satisfaction with life, locus of control, and temporal focus and of life values on different aspects of their mindful behavior.

Keywords: sustainable consumption; ethical consumption; cultural values

INTRODUCTION

Mindful consumption is on the rise. Starting the twenty-first century, consumers seem to be more concerned than ever with how their buying decisions and consumption behaviors affect others and the environment (Shaw, Newholm and Dickinson 2006; Sheth, Sethia and Srinivas 2011). Researchers have studied this increasing concern giving it names such as green consumption, environmentalism, ethical consumption, the Fair Trade movement, and sustainability (Lang and Gabriel 2005; Willis and Schor 2012). In this paper, we introduce a more comprehensive concept, that of mindful consumption behavior, and compare two culturally different groups of consumers on mindful consumption. The ultimate purpose of this research is to better understand what drives mindful consumer behavior.

Culture is a key factor in consumer behavior. Consumer researchers have found cultural differences in behaviors related to various aspects of consumption including, but not restricted to, shopping behaviors (Michon & Chebat, 2004), reactions to communication messages (Mortimer & Grierson, 2010), and perceptions of price unfairness (Bolton, Keh, & Alba, 2010). In relation to responsible consumption, researchers studied cross-cultural differences in consumer ethics (Rawwas, Swaidan, & Oyman, 2005) and concern for the environment (Chan & Lau, 2002). Sustainable consumption has been studied across cultures both at a consumer level (Banbury, Stinerock, & Subrahmayan 2012) and at a country level (Van de Kerk & Manuel, 2008).

The purpose of this research is to compare American consumers with Lebanese consumers on mindful consumer behavior. We draw on research in sociology, psychology and social psychology to identify the underlying mechanisms, i.e., what drives consumers to behave mindfully or mindlessly. We specifically focus on the impact of important life beliefs and values on mindful consumer behavior. Given the differences between the American and Lebanese cultures, we believe that a comparison of consumers on mindful consumer behavior will help test the identified mechanisms.

MINDFUL CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

We define mindful consumers as individuals who, in all stages of consumer behavior, are aware of themselves, their communities and the society at large and behave in ways that contribute to the well-being of all these entities. The concept of well-being goes beyond instant satisfaction to involve good health, sustainability including financial sustainability, social responsibility and self-actualization.

An individual consumer mindful behavior involves an internal and an external facet. The internal facet pertains to the individual such as her/his health, financial sustainability, and happiness. The external facet is related to the environment and society at large. Hence, issues related to nutrition, exercise, medical information and treatments, budgeting and frugality are all examples of internal issues. Consuming in a socially responsible way including going green and donating for noble causes are examples of external issues. The two are not unrelated. For instance, a mindful spending might enable a consumer to have the ability to donate money to support those in need. Mindful consumer behavior can be practiced at all stages of consumption. The stages of consumer behavior include acquisition, consumption including possession and maintenance, and disposal of goods and services (Hoyer & MacInnis, 2008). At the acquisition stage, consumers can be mindful while making product and brand choices and, e.g., choose healthy food, environmentally friendly goods and be cautious about the way they invest their time and money. At the consumption stage, mindful consumers consume moderately, share, and take care of their possessions. Finally, consumers can recycle, donate and pass possessions to others at the disposal stage.

Researchers have examined aspects of mindful consumer behavior but not the construct in totality. Consumer researchers have studied health-related issues such as fitness, nutrition and processing of medical information (see, e.g., Bolton et al., 2008; Hong & Lee, 2008). Researchers also have investigated spending wisely, materialism and frugality (see, e.g., Burroughs & Rindfleisch, 2002). In addition, a growing body of research has focused on consumers' care for the environment and their social responsibility (see, e.g., Booker, 1976; D'Astous & Legendre, 2009). Sirgy and Lee (2004) tied consumer well-being to different stages of consumer behavior.

Recently, research in macromarketing has examined how the field of marketing can contribute to quality of life. The focus, however, has been on what marketers can do to improve consumers' quality of life such as which products to offer and which markets to target (see, e.g., Lee & Sirgy, 2004). Instead of addressing the quality of life issue from a firm's perspective, our research on mindful consumer behavior focuses on the active role that consumers can play in making a better life for themselves and others through making responsible decisions.

CULTURES: AMERICAN VS. LEBANESE

The United States of America and Lebanon vary significantly on a variety of geographic, economic, and cultural dimensions. The United States of America is one of the world's largest nations by total area. The US population is around 317 million and is very diverse in terms of ethnic backgrounds. While the vast majority of the Americans are Christians, other religions such as Judaism, Buddhism, and Islam are followed too. The US is a developed country with a capitalist mixed economy and highly advanced technology. The GDP per capita is approximately \$50,000 (American Intelligence Agency, 2015).

Lebanon is a relatively small country in the Middle East with an area 0.7 times that of the state of Connecticut. The population of around 4.2 million mainly consists of Muslims and Christians with a vast majority living in urban areas. The country went through a two-decade long civil war and is relatively marked by political instability. The economy follows a *laissez-faire* model with high reliance on services. The GDP per capita is around \$15,600. Lebanon has a literacy rate of 89.6% with a high proportion of the population proficient in two or even three languages (American Intelligence Agency, 2015).

The American culture is considered individualistic with a high level of competitiveness. While quite heterogeneous, Americans tend to have high work ethics and believe in the rule of law (Crunden, 1996). The Lebanese culture is more collectivist with very strong family ties and high importance given to socialization. The "independence" of young adults nurtured in the USA is considered an anomaly in Lebanon where families provide a system of emotional and material support (Kazarian, 2005). Unlike its American counterpart, the Lebanese workplace is characterized by favoritism (called *wasta*) with high disregard to competency (Yahchouchi, 2009). On the Sustainable Society Index designed by Van de Kerk and Manuel (2008), the USA was ranked 61 while Lebanon came 114th with lower ranks indicating higher levels of sustainability.

HYPOTHESES

To understand what drives mindful consumer behavior, we draw on research in sociology, psychology and social psychology. We argue that consumers' tendency to behave mindfully depends on their life beliefs and values.

More specifically, we focus on one's (1) temporal focus, (2) perception of locus of control, (3) satisfaction with life and (4) perceptions of life values including (5) materialism.

Temporal Focus

Temporal focus is "the attention individuals devote to thinking about the past, present, and future" (Shipp, Edwards, & Schrurer-Lambert, 2009). The concept is important because it affects how people incorporate perceptions about past experiences, current situations, and future expectations into their attitudes, cognitions and behavior (Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999). Mindful behavior usually involves thinking about the future and the consequences of one's actions such as over-eating or consuming a particular product. Strathman, Gleicher, Boninger, and Edwards (1994) demonstrated that the extent to which people consider distant vs. immediate consequences of potential behaviors impact these behaviors. Hence, we expect the following:

Proposition 1: Individuals who tend to focus on the future behave more mindfully as consumers than individuals who tend to focus on the present or the past. This is particularly true for dimensions of mindful behavior related to environment.

Researchers studying the temporal focus of Americans have reported a tendency to focus on the future (Guo, Ji, Spina, & Zhang, 2012). Research on orientation of Arab college students, including Lebanese, revealed a tendency to concentrate on the present (Dedoussis, 2004). In addition, the concern of Lebanese with day-to-day activities given the political instability and lack of economic security in the country is expected to lead to a higher focus on the present than Americans. Hence, we hypothesize:

H_{1a}: Lebanese will focus more on the present than Americans do.

H_{1b}: Americans will be more mindful on consumption issues related to the environment than Lebanese do.

Locus of Control

Locus of control refers to one's perception of who controls her/his life; is it the individual, society or fate? (Smith, Trompenaars, & Dugan, 1995). Studies show that making individuals believe they can make a difference results in them behaving more actively such as voting and sharing their opinions publically (Crain, Leavans, & Abbott, 1987). Fatalistic individuals do not do much as they believe that their lives are driven by fate, i.e., predetermined (Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999). Mindful behavior involves making decisions while inherently believing that these decisions impact one's life and others'. Moreover, in his attempt to identify the socially conscious consumer, Webster (1975) found perceived consumer effectiveness to be positively related to conscious consumption behavior. Hence, we propose:

Proposition 2: Individuals who believe they are more in control of their lives are more mindful consumers than individuals who believe that their lives are mainly controlled by society or by fate.

American and Lebanese differ on their perceptions of locus of control. Americans seem to have a relatively high level of locus of control (Twenge, Zang, & Im, 2004). The Lebanese, however, are expected to exhibit a low locus of control. The political instability and the favoritism in the workplace prevailing in Lebanon, in addition to the entrenched religious beliefs and the related core concept of fate, might inhibit people's feelings that they are in control of their lives there. Accordingly, we posit:

H_{2a}: Lebanese feel a lower level of locus of control than Americans do.

H_{2b}: Lebanese show lower levels of mindful consumer behavior, particularly on dimensions related to the environment and society at-large, than Americans do.

Satisfaction with Life

Consuming mindfully, in many of its aspects, serves higher-level needs similar to the need for self-fulfillment or self-actualization. Classifying consumers as users versus non-users of environmentally compatible products, Booker (1976) found self-actualization to be a key indicator. In his famous hierarchy of needs, Maslow argues that higher needs are sought only after the more basic needs are met (Maslow, 1943). Similarly, in discussing stages of consciousness, Barrett (2006) presents the spiral of dynamics in which survival and other mundane goals come at the bottom and ascend to reach self-consciousness at the very top. Hence, we expect those who consume mindfully to have achieved at least a minimal level of satisfaction with life.

Proposition 3: The more satisfied consumers are with their lives, the more likely they are to behave mindfully.

Given differences in social and economic factors between the two countries, we expect Lebanese consumers to be less satisfied with their lives than their American counterparts. Veenhoven (2009) measured happiness with life across a large number of nations. On a scale going from 1(not at all happy) to 10 (very happy), the USA score was 7.4 while the Lebanese score was 5.3. Based on the above, we posit:

H₃: Lebanese feel a lower level of satisfaction with life than Americans do.

Hence, we expect, as stated in H_{2b}, Lebanese to have lower levels of mindful consumer behavior, particularly on dimensions related to the environment and society at-large, than Americans do.

Values

Values represent enduring beliefs about life and acceptable behavior (Schwartz, 1996). Values involve both the goals and the ways of behaving to obtain goals (Rokeach, 1973). Rokeach (1973) argues that values are at the roots of human behavior in general. More specifically, consumer research shows that values impact different aspects of consumer behavior including product choice (Vinson, Scott, & Lamont, 1977) and processing of promotional messages (Reynolds & Gutman, 1984). Certain values may encourage mindful consumer behavior more than others. For instance, referring to Kahle's (1983) LOV, one would expect consumers high on low-Maslow needs (e.g., security) to behave less mindfully than consumers who are higher on the hierarchy and more concerned with fulfillment. Moreover, consumers who show higher interest in "warm relationships with others" are expected to share more.

Proposition 4: Different ranking of values lead to different levels of mindful consumer behavior.

As briefly stated earlier, the American and Lebanese cultures are fundamentally different, a difference that is expected to result in varied rankings of LOV. While Hofstede's research (1991) point to the collectivist orientation among Lebanese, several researchers found the American society to be highly individualistic, with Hofstede (1985) ranking Arabs as significantly more collectivist than Americans. It is worth noting that very recent research studies point to changes in the Lebanese society toward a more individualistic orientation particularly among College students speaking more than one language (Ayyash-Abdo, 2001). The differences between the two countries in terms of the socio-political conditions, importance of extended family, and value of socialization are expected to lead to different priorities as follows:

H_{4a}: Lebanese and Americans will show significant differences in LOV with Lebanese emphasizing security and warm relationships and Americans emphasizing achievement and enjoyment.

H_{4b}: Lebanese and Americans will show different mindful behaviors with Lebanese tending to share more and Americans caring more about financial sustainability and environmental issues.

Materialism

Materialism is defined as a way of thinking that gives too much importance to material possessions rather than to spiritual or intellectual things (Merriam Webster). Researchers found that materialists place possessions and their acquisition at the center of their lives (Daun, 1983). One of the reasons for the central role of possessions is that

possessions and their acquisitions are seen by materialistic people as essential to their satisfaction and well-being in life (Belk, 1985). Moreover, materialists tend to judge their own and others' success by the volume and value of possessions accumulated (Rassuli & Hollander, 1986). Interestingly, some of the typical materialistic behavior coincide with aspects of mindful consumption behavior particularly those related to concern for financial sustainability.

Proposition 5: Individuals' materialism impacts their likelihood to behave as mindful consumers on dimensions pertaining to financial sustainability.

The American culture is characterized as materialistic. Twitchell (2013) describes Americans as highly interested in possessions and eager for materialistic achievements (p. 22). Similarly, in a cross-cultural study on materialism, the USA ranked toward the top of the list (Ger & Belk, 1996). While not necessarily non-materialistic, we are not aware of any research study characterizing the Lebanese culture as materialistic. Strong family and social ties, relatively high levels of collectivism, and favoritism at the workplace seem to be the dominant social features of Lebanon. Hence, we hypothesize:

H_{5a}: American consumers are more materialistic than Lebanese consumers.

H_{5b}: Americans show more mindful behavior than Lebanese consumers on dimensions pertaining to financial sustainability.

METHODOLOGY

We surveyed consumers, in the USA and in Lebanon, in two phases separated by at least one month. In the first phase, we measured consumers' tendency to behave as mindful consumers on all aspects of consciousness and in all stages of consumer behavior. A month later, we measured the same consumers' temporal focus, locus of control, satisfaction with life, life values and materialism. The surveys were distributed to undergraduate students in a private university in the Northeastern region of the USA and two private universities in Beirut, Lebanon. The high English language proficiency of the Lebanese sample allowed us to use the same survey instrument across the US and Lebanese samples. A total of 210 students participated in both phases of the survey. We discarded data pertaining to individuals who participated in only one phase of the study. Of the 210 who completed both phases of the study, 97 were in the USA and 113 in Lebanon. Participating students received extra course credit.

Measures

To measure mindful consumer behavior on all aspects of mindfulness and in all stages of consumer behavior, we built on our definition and drew on several scales (see, e.g., Kotchen & Moore, 2008; Roberts, 1996; Rook & Fisher 1995; Webb, Mohr, & Harris, 2008) to design a 49-item 7-point Likert-type scale. Refer to Appendix A for a sample of the items we used to measure mindful consumer behavior.

We used published scales to measure our independent variables. Temporal focus was measured using Shipp et al.'s (2009) scale which separately assesses focuses on the past, the present, and the future. To measure locus of control, we drew on Baumeister's scale (2002). Satisfaction with life was measured using Peterson and Ekici's (2007) scale. Items from Richins and Dawson's (1992) scale were used to measure materialism. Appendix B shows the scale items used in our analysis. To assess respondents' life values, we used Kahle's (1986) List of Values (LOV). Specifically, we asked respondents to order the following nine values in order of importance: (1) Sense of belonging, (2) Excitement, (3) Fun and enjoyment in life, (4) Warm relationships with others, (5) Self-fulfillment, (6) Being well-respected, (7) Sense of accomplishment, (8) Security, and (9) Self-respected. The order of the nine values was rotated among respondents to control for any possible order effects.

Findings

Sample Profiles. Of the 97 participants in the USA, 42.3% are females and 57.7% males. Their age ranged between 17 and 37 with a median of 19.5 years. About 22% reported being non-Americans. Of the 113 participants, 48.7% are females and 51.3% males. Their age ranged between 18 and 25 with a median of 19 years. About 12%

reported being non-Lebanese. While about one-third of the participants in Lebanon declined to report their religion, 42% indicated that they were Muslims and 25% indicated being Christians.

Mindful Consumer Behavior. An exploratory factor analysis with Varimax rotation was performed on the 49 items designed to measure different aspects of mindful consumer behavior. Setting an Eigenvalue of one, the analysis revealed thirteen dimensions with 70.31% of variance explained. The thirteen dimensions are interpreted as: (1) concern for the environment, (2) making the most of one's possessions, (3) concern about the social responsibility of firms, (4) concern for one's health, (5) passing on used possessions to others, (6) consistency of consumption with one's values, (7) concern for one's financial status, (8) buying used products, (9) impact of one's behavior on others, (10) sharing possessions with family, (11) healthy eating, (12) exercising, and (13) careful acquisition. Appendix A shows the dimensions obtained and the scale items that loaded on each dimension. Only items with a loading exceeding 0.5 are shown in Appendix A and are included in the analysis.

American and Lebanese respondents were compared on each of the dimensions of mindful consumer behavior. For this purpose, independent sample t-tests were run for each dimension. As shown in Table 1, the two groups of consumers significantly varied on eight of the thirteen dimensions. Factor scores were computed using the regression method; these scores were used in the t-tests comparing the two groups of respondents.

Table 1
Comparison of Mean Factor Scores – Dimensions of Mindful Consumption Behavior

Dimension	t	p-value
Concern for the environment	4.006	.000
Making the most of one's possessions	-.119	.906
Concern about the social responsibility of firms	2.914	.004
Concern for one's health	.414	.680
Passing on used possessions to others	-1.784	.076
Consistency of consumption with one's values	3.895	.000
Concern for one's financial status	2.305	.022
Impact of one's behavior on others	4.484	.000
Buying used products	.838	.403
Sharing possessions with family	-3.469	.001
Healthy eating	-.750	.462
Exercising	-1.64	.103

Careful Acquisition	4.137	.000
---------------------	-------	------

As shown in Table 1, our results reveal that Americans reported significantly higher levels of concern for the environment, concern about the social responsibility of firms, consistency of consumption with one’s values, concern with financial status, impact of their behavior on others, and careful buying than Lebanese did. Lebanese consumers, however, reported higher levels of sharing possessions with family and passing on used possessions to others than Americans did. The two groups did not differ on their making the most of their possessions, concern for their health, healthy eating and exercising. Overall, these findings lend support to the differences in mindful consumer behavior we posited in H_{1b}, H_{2b}, H_{4b} and H_{5b}.

Temporal Focus. American and Lebanese respondents did not differ significantly in their levels of focus on the past or the future. However, Lebanese respondents reported a significantly higher focus on the present than American respondents did (M_{Lebanese} = 5.580 vs. M_{Americans} = 5.319; t(207) = -2.004; p = .046). This finding lends support to H_{1a}.

Locus of Control. As expected in H_{2a}, Americans reported a higher level of locus of control than Lebanese did (M_{Americans} = 3.02 vs. M_{Lebanese} = 2.54; t(207) = 2.887; p = .004).

Satisfaction with Life. As expected, Americans reported a marginally significant higher level of satisfaction with life than Lebanese did (M_{Americans} = 5.204 vs. M_{Lebanese} = 4.889; t(207) = ; p = .062). This finding lends support to H₃.

Values. List of Values (LOV): There were clear discrepancies between two groups of respondents’ LOV. Table 2 shows the median rankings reported by the groups on each of the nine values. Results of Mann-Whitney U tests comparing the distributions for each value are also reported in Table 2. Significant differences between American and Lebanese consumers were found in five of the nine values. While Lebanese seem to give priority to security and being well-respected, Americans place greater importance on having warm relationships with others, excitement, and fun and enjoyment. The two groups’ distributions did not differ on sense of belonging, self-fulfillment, sense of accomplishment and self-respect. These findings lend mixed support to our expectations stated in H_{4a}. While, as expected, Lebanese reported a higher priority for security and Americans seem to relatively value enjoyment more, the two groups did not differ on sense of accomplishment. Interestingly, the finding pertaining to the relative importance of warm relationships is opposite to our expectations.

Table 2
Cross-cultural Comparison of List of Values (LOV)

Value	Median for Americans	Median for Lebanese	p-value (Mann-Whitney U Test for distributions)
Sense of Belonging	4.00	5.00	.479
Excitement	7.00	8.00	.044*
Fun and Enjoyment	4.00	6.00	.000*
Warm Relationships with Others	4.00	6.00	.000*

Self-fulfillment	4.00	4.00	.111
Being well-respected	5.00	4.00	.002*
Sense of accomplishment	5.00	5.00	.848
Security	8.00	5.00	.000*
Self-respect	4.00	3.00	.120

*significant

Materialism. As expected in H_{5a}, Americans reported a higher level of materialism than Lebanese ($M_{\text{Americans}} = 4.332$ vs. $M_{\text{Lebanese}} = 3.995$; $t(207) = 2.60$; $p = .01$).

DISCUSSION

Our findings provide insights on what drives mindful consumer behavior. In a cross-cultural study, we show that life beliefs and values are key indicators of consumers' tendency to behave mindfully. While cause-effect relationships are hard to establish in the absence of laboratory experiments, our findings are quite informative. We compared groups of consumers belonging to two drastically different cultures, confirmed expected disparities in a set of beliefs and values, and found significant differences in various aspects of mindful consumer behavior.

Our study revealed differences between American and Lebanese consumers on dimensions of mindful behavior pertaining to others, other entities or other individuals. In effect, statistically significant differences between the two groups were found in external factors such as concern for the environment and impact on others. No such differences were found in individual/internal issues such as concern for one's health, healthy eating, and exercising. Given the cross-cultural nature of our research, the differences detected are more social (vs. individual) in nature. The fact that most internal dimensions did not vary across drastically different cultures is, however, intriguing. Our research implies that a distinct set of belief and values than the ones we examined seem to explain differences in behaviors pertaining to the internal facet of mindful behavior. The identification of this distinct set is worth further investigations. A possible explanation to the lack of differences in internal facets of mindful behavior between the two groups is the similarity between the two groups of participants. Both groups were college students very close in age. Additionally, the Lebanese respondent pool came from two private universities following the American liberal system of education bringing a commonality to this young age group.

An essential contribution of this research is the introduction of the mindful consumer behavior concept. Our definition encompasses both the internal and external facets of one's behavior. It also recognizes the fact that mindful consumer behavior can, and should be, practiced in all the stages of acquisition, consumption and disposal. While researchers have examined specific dimensions of mindful behavior such as healthy nutrition or environmentally friendly behavior, we offer a more "holistic" understanding of the concept. We also design a rough measure of this newly introduced comprehensive concept and use our measure in two different markets. We believe our study constitutes an important first step towards constructing a more refined and better validated measure of the key construct of mindful consumer behavior.

Given the potentially correlational nature of our methodology, one may argue for different explanations of the differences we found in aspects of mindful behavior than the ones suggested in our propositions and hypotheses. For instance, one may argue that Lebanese consumers tend to share more possessions with family members than Americans not because of the stronger family ties but because of the less affluent economic situation. Similarly, Americans do not necessarily show more concern for the environment because they have a higher locus of control

than Lebanese; Americans probably know more than Lebanese about the consequences of certain consumption behaviors on the environment. It is worth noting, however, that it is challenging to account for and measure all potentially influential factors in one research. Moreover, the life beliefs and values examined in this research are hard to manipulate in an experimental design which might allow a more rigorous examination of causes rather than correlations.

Our study raises interesting questions for future research. Our findings emphasize the role of life values in influencing mindful consumption behavior. However, values may conflict in their mindful behavior implications where, for example, some values might call for buying the least expensive product while other values might encourage going for the most environment friendly product. Moreover, contexts impact value salience (Rokeach & Ball-Rokeach, 1989). One could argue that values which are salient in a particular context would drive one's behavior in that context. How to cope with potential conflicts in one's system of values and the role of value salience in impacting behaviors related to mindful consumption are intriguing topics for future research.

Ultimately, and perhaps most importantly, this research, among similar others, aims at getting consumers to behave in a more mindful manner. Hence, the critical question remains how to educate individuals to become mindful consumers. Schools across the U. S. apply many initiatives that promote healthy, financially responsible, and environmentally friendly behaviors. It is interesting to study how schools, specifically elementary schools, can influence students' systems of values and, consequently, their behavior as consumers. Another natural extension of this research is to case study in-depth the life beliefs and values in countries where consumers seem to behave relatively more mindfully than in other cultures or countries.

REFERENCES

- Ayyash-Abdo, H. (2001). Individualism and collectivism: The case of Lebanon. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 29(5), 503-518.
- Banbury, C., Stinerock, R., & Subrahmanyam, S. (2012). Sustainable consumption: Introspecting across multiple lived cultures. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(4), 497-503.
- Barrett, R. (2006). *Building a values-driven organization: A whole system approach to cultural transformation*. Routledge.
- Baumeister, R. F. (2002). Yielding to temptation: Self-control failure, impulsive purchasing, and consumer behavior. *Journal of consumer Research*, 28(4), 670-676.
- Belk, R. W. (1985). Materialism: Trait aspects of living in the material world. *Journal of Consumer research*, 12(3), 265-280.
- Bolton, L. E., Keh, H. T., & Alba, J. W. (2010). How do price fairness perceptions differ across culture? *Journal of Marketing Research*, 47(3), 564-576.
- Bolton, L. E., Reed, A., Volpp, K. G., & Armstrong, K. (2008). How does drug and supplement marketing affect a healthy lifestyle?. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 34(5), 713-726.
- Brooker, G. (1976). The self-actualizing socially conscious consumer. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 3(2), 107-112.
- Burroughs, J. E., & Rindfleisch, A. (2002). Materialism and well-being: A conflicting values perspective. *Journal of Consumer research*, 29(3), 348-370.
- Chan, R. Y., & Lau, L. B. (2002). Explaining green purchasing behavior: A cross-cultural study on American and Chinese consumers. *Journal of international consumer marketing*, 14(2-3), 9-40.
- Central Intelligence Agency (Ed.). (2015). *The World Factbook 2014-15*. Government Printing Office.

- Crain, W. M., Leavens, D. R., & Abbot, L. (1987). Voting and not voting at the same time. *Public Choice*, 53(3), 221-229.
- Crunden, R. M. (1996). *A brief history of American culture*. ME Sharpe.
- d'Astous, A., & Legendre, A. (2009). Understanding consumers' ethical justifications: A scale for appraising consumers' reasons for not behaving ethically. *Journal of business ethics*, 87(2), 255-268.
- Daun, A. (1983). The materialistic lifestyle: Some socio-psychological aspects. *Consumer behavior and environmental quality*, 6-16.
- Dedoussis, E. (2004). A cross-cultural comparison of organizational culture: evidence from universities in the Arab world and Japan. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 11(1), 15-34.
- Ger, G., & Belk, R. W. (1996). Cross-cultural differences in materialism. *Journal of economic psychology*, 17(1), 55-77.
- Guo, T., Ji, L. J., Spina, R., & Zhang, Z. (2012). Culture, temporal focus, and values of the past and the future. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(8), 1030-1040.
- Hong, J., & Lee, A. Y. (2008). Be fit and be strong: Mastering self-regulation through regulatory fit. *Journal of consumer research*, 34(5), 682-695.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (Vol. 2). London: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (1985). The interaction between national and organizational value systems [1]. *Journal of Management Studies*, 22(4), 347-357.
- Hoyer, W. D., & MacInnis, D. J. (2008). *Consumer behavior* 5th ed. Independence, KY: South-Western Cengage Learning.
- Kahle, L. R. (1983). *Social values and social change: Adaptation to life in America*. Praeger Publishers.
- Beatty, S. E., Kahle, L. R., Homer, P., & Misra, S. (1985). Alternative measurement approaches to consumer values: The list of values and the Rokeach value survey. *Psychology & Marketing*, 2(3), 181-200.
- Kazarian, S. S. (2005). Family functioning, cultural orientation, and psychological well-being among university students in Lebanon. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 145(2), 141-154.
- Kotchen, M. J. (2006). Green markets and private provision of public goods. *Journal of Political Economy*, 114(4), 816-834.
- Lang, T., & Gabriel, Y. (2005). A brief history of consumer activism. *The ethical consumer*, 39-53.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological review*, 50(4), 370.
- Michon, R., & Chebat, J. C. (2004). Cross-cultural mall shopping values and habitats: A comparison between English- and French-speaking Canadians. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(8), 883-892.
- Mortimer, K., & Grierson, S. (2010). The relationship between culture and advertising appeals for services. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 16(3), 149-162.
- Peterson, M., & Ekici, A. (2007). Consumer attitude toward marketing and subjective quality of life in the context of a developing country. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 27(4), 350-359.

- Richins, M. L., & Dawson, S. (1992). A consumer values orientation for materialism and its measurement: Scale development and validation. *Journal of consumer research*, 19(3), 303-316.
- Rassuli, K. M., & Hollander, S. C. (1986). Desire-induced, innate, insatiable?. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 6(2), 4-24.
- Rawwas, M. Y., Swaidan, Z., & Oyman, M. (2005). Consumer ethics: A cross-cultural study of the ethical beliefs of Turkish and American consumers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 57(2), 183-195.
- Reynolds, T. J., & Gutman, J. (1988). Laddering theory, method, analysis, and interpretation. *Journal of advertising research*, 28(1), 11-31.
- Roberts, J. A. (1996). Green consumers in the 1990s: profile and implications for advertising. *Journal of business research*, 36(3), 217-231.
- Rokeach, M., & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (1989). Stability and change in American value priorities, 1968–1981. *American Psychologist*, 44(5), 775.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values* (Vol. 438). New York: Free press.
- Rook, D. W., & Fisher, R. J. (1995). Normative influences on impulsive buying behavior. *Journal of consumer research*, 22(3), 305-313.
- Schwartz, S. (2013, May). Value Priorities and Behavior: Applying. In *The psychology of values: The Ontario symposium* (Vol. 8).
- Shaw, D., Newholm, T., & Dickinson, R. (2006). Consumption as voting: an exploration of consumer empowerment. *European Journal of Marketing*, 40(9/10), 1049-1067.
- Sheth, J. N., Sethia, N. K., & Srinivas, S. (2011). Mindful consumption: a customer-centric approach to sustainability. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 39(1), 21-39.
- Shipp, A. J., Edwards, J. R., & Lambert, L. S. (2009). Conceptualization and measurement of temporal focus: The subjective experience of the past, present, and future. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 110(1), 1-22.
- Sirgy, M. J., & Lee, D. J. (2006). Macro measures of consumer well-being (CWB): a critical analysis and a research agenda. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 26(1), 27-44.
- Smith, P. B., Trompenaars, F., & Dugan, S. (1995). The Rotter locus of control scale in 43 countries: A test of cultural relativity. *International Journal of Psychology*, 30(3), 377-400.
- Strathman, A., Gleicher, F., Boninger, D. S., & Edwards, C. S. (1994). The consideration of future consequences: weighing immediate and distant outcomes of behavior. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 66(4), 742.
- Twenge, J. M., Zhang, L., & Im, C. (2004). It's beyond my control: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of increasing externality in locus of control, 1960-2002. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8(3), 308-319.
- Twitchell, J. B. (2013). *Lead us into temptation: The triumph of American materialism*. Columbia University Press.
- Van de Kerk, G., & Manuel, A. R. (2008). A comprehensive index for a sustainable society: The SSI—the Sustainable Society Index. *Ecological Economics*, 66(2), 228-242.
- Veenhoven, R. (2009, February). Comparability of happiness across nations. In *Journal of Happiness Studies: an interdisciplinary forum on subjective well-being* (pp. 211-234).

- Vinson, D. E., Scott, J. E., & Lamont, L. M. (1977). The role of personal values in marketing and consumer behavior. *The Journal of Marketing*, 44-50.
- Webster, F. E. (1975). Determining the characteristics of the socially conscious consumer. *Journal of consumer research*, 2(3), 188-196.
- Webb, D. J., Mohr, L. A., & Harris, K. E. (2008). A re-examination of socially responsible consumption and its measurement. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(2), 91-98.
- Willis, M. M., & Schor, J. B. (2012). Does changing a light bulb lead to changing the world? Political action and the conscious consumer. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 644(1), 160-190.
- Yahchouchi, G. (2009). Employees' perceptions of Lebanese managers' leadership styles and organizational commitment. *International Journal of leadership studies*, 4(2), 127-140.
- Zimbardo, P. G., & Boyd, J. N. (2015). Putting time in perspective: A valid, reliable individual-differences metric. In *Time Perspective Theory; Review, Research and Application* (pp. 17-55). Springer International Publishing.

Appendix A

Dimensions of Mindful Consumer Behavior Identified by Factor Analysis

Concern for the environment

When I buy products, I try to consider how my use of them will affect the environment.

I recycle some of my household trash.

I try to buy only products that can be recycled.

I go out of my way to save energy.

I use a car pool, walk, bike or use public transport for the specific reason of protecting the environment.

I limit my use of energy such as electricity or natural gas specifically to reduce my impact on the environment.

Making the most of one's possessions

I repair my possessions to make full use of them.

I repair my shoes to make full use of them.

I make the best use of my possessions.

I try to stretch product re-usage to the maximum.

I throw away possessions only when they are absolutely useless.

Concern about the social responsibility of firms

I will not buy a product if the company that sells it is socially irresponsible.

When given a chance, I switch to brands where a portion of the price is donated to charity.

I regularly donate money to charity.

I make an effort to buy products from firms that support their communities.

I avoid buying products or services from companies that discriminate against certain employees.

Concern for one's health

Before I purchase products, I consider their impact on my health.

I do not buy products that can be harmful to my health.

I carefully think about my health before I buy products.

Passing on used possessions to others

I pass products to others in my family.

I pass products to needy others in my community.

I share possessions with others in my community.

I do not throw away items, I give them away.

Consistency of consumption with one's values

I avoid buying products/services that conflict with my life values.

I avoid using products/services that conflict with my life values even if they cost me less.

I avoid spending time doing things that conflict with my principles in life.

Concern for one's financial status

Before I purchase products, I consider the impact of the purchase on my financial status.

I carefully think about my financial situation before I buy products.

Buying used products

I buy second-hand clothes.

I buy second-hand furniture.

Impact of one's behavior on others

When I buy products, I try to consider how my use of them will affect my family.

When I buy products, I try to consider how my use of them will affect other people.

Sharing possessions with family

I share my car with others in my family.

I share my computer with others in my family.

I share my clothes with others in my family.

Healthy eating

I eat healthy food even if I have to pay more for it.

I eat and drink in moderation.

I tend to overeat.

I eat and drink whenever and whatever I feel like.

Exercising

I exercise regularly even if I have to pay to do it (e.g., a gym membership).

I exercise only when convenient.

Careful acquisition

I only buy what I need.

I avoid buying products that are made from endangered animals.

Appendix B

Measures of Independent Variables

Temporal Focus Source: Shipp et al. (2009)
Focus on Past $\alpha = 0.917$

I replay memories of the past in my mind.
I reflect on what has happened in the past.
I think about things from the past.
I think back to my earlier days.
Focus on Present $\alpha = 0.773$
I focus on what is currently happening in my life.
My mind is on here and now.
I think about where I am today.
I live my life in the present.
Focus on Future $\alpha = 0.895$
I think about what my future has in store.
I think about times to come.
I focus on my future.
I imagine what tomorrow will bring for me.
Locus of Control $r = .388$ ($p < .001$) Source: Baumeister (2002)
Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
Sometimes I feel that I don't have much control over the direction my life is taking.
Satisfaction with Life $\alpha = 0.850$ Source: Peterson and Ekici (2007)
In most ways my life is close to my ideal.
The conditions of my life are excellent.
I am satisfied with my life.
So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.
Materialism $\alpha = 0.71$ Source: Richins and Dawson (1992)
I admire people who own expensive homes, cars, and clothes.
Some of the most important achievements in life include acquiring material possessions.
The things I own say a lot about how well I'm doing in life.
I like to own things that impress people.
I usually buy only the things I need. (R)
I try to keep my life simple, as far as possessions are concerned. (R)
Buying things gives me a lot of pleasure.
I like a lot of luxury in my life.
I have all the things I really need to enjoy life. (R)
I'd be happier if I could afford to buy more things.
It sometimes bothers me quite a bit that I can't afford to buy all the things I'd like.