Chapter 2

Review of Literature and Research Hypotheses

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter reviews the literature relevant to the study of market maven, concepts including diffusion theory, word of mouth, opinion leaders and early purchasers/adopters.

Discussion on these concepts serves as the research background for the research questions and the study’s purpose/objectives. Then the next section provides a review of theory on concepts to be employed in this research, consumer innovativeness (CIN), consumers’ need for uniqueness – creative choice counterconformity dimension (CNFU – CCC), status consumption (SC), market maven (MM) and market helping behaviour-information provided-dimension (MHB).

Discussions on theoretical background which established relationships among the concepts of envisaged model in this study are presented. Relevant research, that addressed the basis for the relationships among the constructs which were tested in this study were reviewed.

Review of literature starting with the origin and development of the theory of diffusion of innovation was done. Review of literature of associated word–of-mouth (WOM) communication theory, together with review of literature on participants involved in such communications were done. The relevant participants involved in word of mouth communications specifically considered for review of literature were, opinion leaders, early adopters/purchasers and market mavens.

2.2.1 DIFFUSION THEORY AND WOM

The concept of market maven originated from the field of diffusion of innovation study and diffusion of innovations’ one of the important channels has been WOM. Both managerial and marketing literatures posited that word of mouth communication behaviour was one of the most powerful forces in affecting consumers’ decisions (Katz and Lazarefeld, 1955; Silverman 1997, 2001; Davidow, 2003). This is because consumers depend on informal interpersonal communication sources as compared to more formal institutional sources (e.g. advertising campaigns)
Consumers often consider interpersonal sources as the most reliable sources of information (Katz and Lazarsfeld, 1955; Engel, Keggerreis and Blackwell, 1969; Price and Feick, 1984).

Researchers have found that WOM communication plays an influential role in affecting consumer decisions in a wide range of product categories, including food products (Katz and Lazarsfeld, 1955; Arndt 1967a), new cars (Kiel and Layton, 1981; Swan and Oliver, 1989), service switching (Keaveney, 1995) and in the selection of service providers (Alreck and Settle, 1995; Bansal and Voyer, 2000).

Buttle (1998) has cited that Arndt (1967) was one of the earliest researcher who reported the influence of WOM on consumer behaviour. Arndt (1967) has characterised WOM as oral, person – to – person communication between a receiver and a communicator whom the receiver perceives as non-commercial, regarding a brand, product or service. Stern (1994) has defined WOM by drawing on its distinctiveness from advertising. Stern stated that “WOM differs from advertising in its lack of boundaries, WOM involves the exchange of ephemeral oral or spoken messages between a contiguous source and a recipient who communicate directly in real life. Consumers are not assumed to create, revise and record pre-written conversational exchange about products and services. Nor do they ordinarily use poetry or song to discuss consumption. Finally, WOM communication vanishes as soon as it is uttered, for it occurs in a spontaneous manner and then disappears” (Stern, 1994, p.7).

2.2.2 DIFFUSION AND INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION

When the World Health Organisation launched a worldwide campaign to eradicate small pox, it was engaged in diffusion. When Apple launched iPod, it was diffusing a new product.

Diffusion is the process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among the members of a social system (Rogers, 2003). An innovation is an idea, practice or object perceived as new by an individual or other unit of adoption. The diffusion process typically involves both mass media and interpersonal communication channels. And in today’s world, information
technologies such as the internet and cell phones which combine aspects of mass media and interpersonal channels represent formidable tools of diffusion (Morris & Ogan, 1996).

The diffusion of innovations field accentuates interpersonal communication networks more than any other type of communication research. Since the first diffusion studies conducted about sixty years ago, the nature of diffusion was found to be fundamentally a social process involving interpersonal communication among similar individuals (Rogers & Kincaid, 1981; Rosen, 2002; Valente, 1995; 2006).

In last 55 years of research on consumer behaviour, researchers have reported consistently the importance of interpersonal communication as a significant source for influencing market place decisions (Katona and Mueller, 1955; Kiel and Layton, 1981; Price and Feick, 1984, Udell, 1996). King and Summers (1967) opined that interpersonal information exchange is widespread.

Arndt (1967) found that interpersonal communication affects market place preferences and choices. Assael and Michael (1983) reported that interpersonal sources are seen as more credible. Feick and Price (1984) posited, traditional approaches to interpersonal influence have focussed on two types of market place influencers the opinion leader and the early purchaser or adopter.

2.2.3 DIFFUSION AND OPINION LEADERS

The study of the 1940 U.S. presidential election by Lazarsfeld, Berelson and Gaudet (1948) emphasized the importance of interpersonal influence and reported that opinion leaders acted as information brokers intervening between the mass media sources and the opinion and choices of population. Subsequent study by Katz and Lazarsfeld (1955) extended to number of different areas (food and household products, movies, fashions and public affairs) and supported the existence and importance of the opinion leader.

According to Engel and Blackwell (1982) and Rogers (1983) opinion leaders are strong in influencing consumers’ views. Assael (1984, p.413) suggest that opinion leaders are very good in knowledge where as Hawkins, Best and Coney (1983) emphasize information transmission ability of opinion leaders. Jacoby and Hoyer (1981) stated that at least in some product categories, opinion leaders appear to be more knowledgeable and involved with the product class.
Bloch and Richins (1983) posited that opinion leadership was a manifestation of everlasting involvement in a product class. Midgley (1976), argued product involvement remains the predominant explanation for opinion leaders conversation about products.

Feick and Price (1987), suggested, that opinion leadership has been viewed as being product class specific. The studies by researchers (King and Summers, 1970; Langeard, et al., 1978; Myers and Robertson, 1972; Silk, 1966) indicated that there was no general opinion leader.

2.2.4 DIFFUSION AND EARLY PURCHASERS/ADOPTERS

Feick and Price (1987) reported that the second group of market place personal influencers who received substantial research attention was early purchasers. Feick and Price (1987) opined that early purchasers can exert either a passive or active influence on late purchasers. According to Midgley and Dowling (1978) the active diffusion of information by early adopters is generally thought of as occurring through product–related conversation. Empirical studies (Arndt, 1967; Baumgarden, 1975; Lambert, 1972) reported that early adopters talk about products. Talking about a product may serve to indicate the adopter’s assessment of the product (Engel, et al., 1969). Arndt (1967); Baumgarten (1975); Lambert (1972) empirical research has confirmed that early adopters talk about products. Early adopters talk about product for product related reasons (Feick and Price, 1987).

Researches (Robertson, 1971; Robertson and Myers, 1969) suggest that early adopters are product specific and there is no general early adopter. Based on their review of relevant literature on earlier research on opinion leaders and early adopters Feick and Price (1987) in their seminal research summarized that opinion leaders and early adopters influence other consumers owing to their product–specific knowledge or expertise. They have mentioned that opinion leaders’ knowledge or expertise arises from involvement with a specific product or product class and motivates them to indulge in information dissemination. In the case of early adopters this expertise arises from product usage or purchase experience of specific product and motivates them towards information provision.
2.2.5 DIFFUSION AND GENERAL MARKET INFLUENCERS

Studies by Thorelli, et al. (1975) and Thorelli and Thorelli (1977) indicate that some consumers are more careful and concerned in making purchase decisions. Research by Hirschman (1980) and Raju (1980) reports many people enjoy browsing and window shopping. Kassarjian (1981) suggested that marketplace involvement need not be restricted to a particular product class or purchase situation. He mentioned that some individuals may be consistently more involved in marketplace activities.

Slama and Tashchian (1985) reported a characteristic they call “purchasing involvement”. They suggest that individuals with greater purchasing involvement tend to know where to shop for certain items, where to get a good price on products and what outlets are having sale and special offers. Feick and Price (1987) viewed that the individuals characterised by Kassarjian (1981) and by Slama and Tashchian (1985) could also be marketplace influencers and indicated that they seek and provide general marketplace information to other consumers.

2.3 MARKET MAVEN

The word maven comes from Hebrew via Yiddish and means one who understands, based on an accumulation of knowledge. The term was originally used by some of pilot study respondents to describe individuals who have information about variety of products and like to share their information with others (Feick and Price, 1987, p. 85). Originally Feick and Price (1987) generated a set of 40 items based on the market maven concept definition. Feick and Price (1987) used factor analysis, item – to – total correlations and Cronbach’s alpha to select a set of six items for use in the telephone survey instrument. The selected six items were used for the final survey of sample with 7 point strongly disagree to strongly agree scale. The reliability measures reported were Cronbach’s alpha (.82) and the item to total correlations ranged from .48 to .65.

The definition of the market maven describes market maven as one who possesses marketplace knowledge and interest and willingness to share and provide marketplace information to other consumers. The definition is different from that of opinion leader in which the opinion leader derives ability to influence others, from his product specific knowledge and expertise. Feick and Price (1987) delineated market maven with their empirical research which reports that market mavens’ influence is
derived from general marketplace knowledge and expertise and does not require that these individuals be early purchasers of products or even users of products about which they have information.

Feick and Price (1987) have cited Baumgarten (1975); Feldman and Armstrong (1975); Summers (1970, 1971) and indicated possibility for overlap of early adoption and opinion leadership. Feick and Price (1987) posited that market mavens also can be opinion leaders or early purchasers of particular products. Market mavens’ general marketplace expertise should lead them to early awareness of new products hence, an increased likelihood of early adoption and may also lead them to acquire not only general market information but also in-depth information on selected products hence an higher likelihood of being opinion leader also. Feick and Price (1987) opined that the concept of the market maven, however, is distinct from the concepts of opinion leadership and early adoption, as it is predicted on a more general knowledge of markets. Feick and Price (1987) reported discriminant validity between opinion leadership measure and market maven measures to assert they are two distinct concepts.

Feick and Price (1987) in their research formed several propositions on market mavens’ characteristics. All the propositions compared the attitudes and behaviour of market mavens with those of individuals who are not market mavens. Goldsmith, et al. (2006) mentioned that managers would seek insight into persuading market maven for dissemination of marketplace information. Citing the studies done by Kotler and Zaltman (1976); Guiltinan and Monroe (1980); Kassarjian (1981); Slama and Tashchian’s (1985) on purchasing involvement, Feick and Price (1987) have opined that market mavens were to be generally more attentive to the marketplace, and expected them to find out about new products across product categories before individual who were not market mavens. Market mavens interact with sales people, gather information and provide the same to other consumers (Williams and Slama, 1995).

Market maven concept includes marketplace involvement, market mavens are expected to be more likely to attend to advertising and enjoy shopping (Feick and Price, 1987). Feick and Price (1987) tested the existence of market maven in U.S.A. with four propositions and reported the above stated views on market mavens. Feick and Price (1987) have cited Guiltinan and Monroe (1980); Kassarjian (1981); and
Slama and Tashchian’s (1985) to have opined that interest and enjoyment in shopping, keenness towards advertisements and use of coupons can be considered as indicators of market place involvement.

Feick and Price (1987) study undertook only exploratory investigation of the demographic profile of market mavens as they felt they were examining the existence of market maven for the first time and thought it was premature to anticipate the demographic profile of market maven group. Slama and Williams (1990) found mavens to possess large amount of information about new products. Slama and Williams (1990, p. 51) reported that “mavens provide more information than nonmavens about new products and food products”. Slama and Williams (1990, p. 52) suggested that, “because of this general knowledge, mavens would be more regularly sought out by information seekers than either early purchasers or opinion leaders”.

Feick and Price (1987), opined that the market maven would be more effective than the other two categories, opinion leaders and early adopters, for diffusing information, specifically on general changes in a product's marketing mix. Franco De Vita (1997) replicated Feick and Price (1987) research in United Kingdom and depicted the differences between market maven, opinion leaders and early adopters in diffusing marketplace information as shown in figure 2.1 and reported that as suggested by Feick and Price (1987) that market maven may be more effective in diffusing general changes in product’s market mix.
2.4 CONSUMER INNOVATIVENESS

Since Roger’s (1962) seminal work on diffusion, many consumer studies have measured innovativeness by time of adoption method. According to Kohn and Jacoby (1973), researchers attempting to study consumer innovativeness, use one of three methods: time of adoption, the cross sectional method or some form of self – report. Midgley and Dowling (1978, p. 235) have stated that "Innovativeness is the degree to which an individual makes innovation decisions independently of the communicated experience of others". According to Goldsmith and Hofacker (1991, p.91) “each has its theoretical and methodological strengths and weaknesses and none is universally accepted as the best way to operationalize consumer innovativeness construct”.

Midgley and Dowling (1978) described innovativeness as a personality trait that is central to the theory of innovation diffusion and present in all people to varying degrees. Steenkamp, Hofstede, and Wedel (1999) define innovativeness as a predisposition to deviate from previous choices and consumptive patterns by purchasing new and different products and brands. There is a considerable body of research that links innovativeness with personality traits and adoption behaviors (Boyd and Mason 1999; Steenkamp, Hofstede, and Wedel 1999).

Goldsmith and Hofacker (1991) suggest that innate innovativeness is a global personality trait that is not product category specific and predisposes one to be drawn to new innovations across diverse products and experiences. Venkatraman (1991) has opined that consumer innovativeness is linked to the desire for new and different experiences rather than new product adoption behavior. Thus argued higher degree of consumer innovativeness does not necessarily mean that consumers will always adopt new products or acquire them sooner than others.

Goldsmith and Hofacker (1991, p.209.) pointed out that researchers have been taking the time between introduction and adoption as an indicator to assign the category the adopter belong to innovativeness categorization scheme. Goldsmith (2001) study reported that consumer innovators are knowledgeable, somewhat price insensitive and likely to be heavy users. Consumer innovativeness refers to an interest in new products and a willingness to try them (Goldsmith and Foxall, 2003). Goldsmith, et al. (2003) found that consumer innovators have the ability to influence later buyers by serving as models to be initiated and as opinion leaders. Goldsmith, et
al. (2003) suggested that consumer innovators and market mavens are important to the retail success of new products.

Goldsmith, et al. (2003) used the domain specific innovativeness scale (DSI) developed by Goldsmith and Hofacker (1991) made up of six items to measure consumer innovativeness or a consumers’ tendency to shop for and to buy new products relatively earlier than other consumers do and it was adopted by Goldsmith, et al. (2003) to refer to the general market place instead of a specific product category to measure general consumer innovativeness.

Goldsmith, et al. (2003) study investigated the relationship between consumer innovativeness and market mavenism, among other constructs. Their results confirmed that “there is a positive correlation between scores of the consumer innovativeness scale and score of the market maven scale” and asserted that “consumer innovativeness and market mavenism are two separate constructs” (p.56,59) through correlation score and discriminant validity. Goldsmith, et al. (2003) recommended that there is abundant scope for future studies to explore the relationship market mavenism has with many more constructs and marketing stimuli relevant to consumer behaviour discipline, specifically in the areas of marketing communications.

Goldsmith, et al. (2006) opined that the relationship between consumer innovativeness and market mavenism established by their study through correlation analysis could be tested further with SEM analysis to establish causal relationship. San-Martin and Lopez-Catalan (2013) have opined that consumers’ innovativeness excite individuals to become more involved in products and services.

2.5 CONSUMER NEED FOR UNIQUENESS - (CREATIVE CHOICE COUNTERCONFORMITY - DIMENSION)

The self-concept of an individual seeking to be different from others will be "sustained and buoyed if he believes the good he has purchased is recognized publicly and classified in a manner that matches and supports his self-concept" (Grubb and Grathwohl, 1967, p. 25). Grubb and Grathwohl (1967) research explains how consumer goods serve individuals in forming and maintaining desired self – concepts, both self – image and social image enhancement.
The concept, consumers’ need for uniqueness originated from Snyder and Fromkin’s (1977) theory of uniqueness. According to this theory, individuals get driven by motives to distinguish themselves from others in social environment in a situation when they feel they are similar to others. Individuals attempt to gain self esteem and reduce negative effect of being similar to others. They try to achieve the expressions of uniqueness through various forms where the social penalties for being different are not severe. Snyder (1992) suggested that material expressions of one’s, differentiated from others, are particularly valued because they satisfy the need for uniqueness without risking severe social penalties. Snyder and Fromkin (1977) found that different individuals exhibit varying degrees of uniqueness motivation. Belk (1988) points out that individuals may fulfil their desire to be unique in different ways such as, through possession, displays, style of interpersonal interaction or domains of knowledge in which they exhibit expertise.

Consumers’ need for uniqueness – Creative choice counter conformity – Dimension: Kron (1983) posit that in western culture to distinguish one from others as unique and different, it requires material goods to create personal style that represent self. Kron (1983) suggest that creating one’s personal style in material displays is accomplished through the purchase of original, novel or unique consumer goods or through decorative collection, arrangement and display of goods (Belk et al., 1989; Kron, 1983). Tian, et al. (2001) state that this goal directed consumer behaviour reflects creative choice counter conformity. Tian, et al. (2001, p.52) felt that as follow up on uniqueness theory “Consumers’ need for uniqueness should reflect individual differences in consumer counter conformity motivation – a motivation for differentiating the self via consumer goods and the visual display of these goods that involves the volitional or wilful pursuit of differentness relative to others as an end goal”.

According to Tian, et al. (2001, p.52) the conceptual definition of consumers’ need for uniqueness:

“Consumers’ need for uniqueness is defined as the trait of pursuing differentness relative to others through the acquisition, utilization and disposition of consumer goods for the purpose of developing and enhancing one’s self – image and social image. Consumer goods used for satisfying counter conformity motivations refer to product categories, brands and
versions or styles. Based on need for – uniqueness theory, nonconformity
theory, and the consumer behaviour literature consumers’ need for uniqueness
is conceptualized as subsuming three behavioral manifestation or dimensions.

1. Creative choice Counterconformity.
2. Unpopular choice counters conformity.
3. Avoidance of similarity”.

Tian, et al. (2001) view that creative choice counter conformity is a consumer
behavior that the consumer seeks social differentness from most others, but that this
consumer makes selections that are likely to be considered good choice by these
others. According to Mc Alister and Pessemier (1982) that a inclination for social
distinction through unusual products influences new product adoption and variety
seeking behaviour.

Tian, et al. (2001) carried out a detailed study towards scale development and
validation for consumers’ need for uniqueness construct measurement which had three
dimensions as mentioned earlier in this report. Originally a pool of 93 items was
generated to measure the three factors of consumers’ need for uniqueness (Tian, et al.,
2001).

Examining qualitative data gathered in an exploratory investigation, the
content validity of the items was assessed in two stages (Bearden et al. 1989). Tian, et
al. (2001) analyses resulted in a scale of 31, eleven items each for creative choice
counter conformity and unpopular choices counter conformity and nine items for
avoiding similarity. Tian, et al. (2001) study reported that the estimate of internal
consistency reliability, adjusted for dimensionality as suggested by Nunnally (1978),
were .94 in the student sample and .95 in the consumer mail survey sample.

Tian, et al. (2001) confirmed that CNFU is a measure of trait counter conformity
motivation in a consumer context, where as NFU was developed to capture the
general trait of need for social differentness. All individuals crave for uniqueness to
some extent (Ruvio, et al., 2008; Fromkin, 1972; Snyder, 1992).

Ruvio, et al. (2008) argued that CNFU operationalised with 31 items scale
(Tian, et al. 2001; Tian and Mckenzie, 2001) challenges scholars and respondents, by
its lengthy measurement scale and felt it might have hindered further research on it
and also expressed view that with such a long scale, there is always a concern about redundancy between closely related items.

Drolet and Morrison (2001, p.201) posited that shorter scales costs less, reduce monotony response bias and more specifically “an increase in the number of items encourage inappropriate response behaviour and gives rise to positively correlated error term across items within respondents”. Hence need for a short form and parsimonious CNFU scale to measure all three dimensions was recommended (Steenkamp and Baumgartner, 1995).

Ruvio, et al. (2008) conducted research with the objective to develop a short form CNFU scale to meet the challenge of item parsimony with original conceptualization of CNFU developed by Tian, et al. (2001) and to test the cross-cultural reliability and validity of the short form CNFU scale with data from Israel, the Palestinian authority and Slovenia.

Ruvio, et al. (2008) suggested that the short form CNFU scale with 12 items should enable researchers to use other constructs in the research without causing monotony and fatigue compared to lengthy original scale by Tian, et al. (2001). Ruvio, et al. (2008) mentioned that CNFU short – form scale “should encourage future research on the relationships between CNFU and new related constructs”, resulting in broader investigations. Ruvio, et al. (2008) recommended use of CNFU–S with confidence for future research. According to Kumar, et al. (2009) CNFU leads to positive attitudes toward foreign product resulting in high perceived quality and high emotional value. Ye, et al. (2012) study indicates that consumers’ need for uniqueness play a vital role in educating consumers about brand concepts and building favourable brand image.

2.6 STATUS CONSUMPTION

According to studies (Bierstedt, 1970; Dawson and Cavell, 1986) status is the position or rank in the society or group awarded to an individual by others. Donnenwerth and Foal (1974, p.786) have defined status as “an expression of evaluative judgement that conveys high or low prestige, regard, or esteem”. Barkow (1992) states that status is a form of power that consists of respect, consideration and envy from others and represent the goals of a culture and says that many people desire status and spend a lot of energy to acquire it. Mason (1992) points out that all
categories of people around the world evaluate the utility of the products they purchase on the basis of social advantage they derive from them. According to Belk (1988, p.104 – 105) that “even third world consumers are often attracted to and indulge in aspects of conspicuous consumption before they have secured adequate food, clothing and shelter”.

Hughes (1996) state that popularity of brands are partly proportionate to the status they confer on their owners. Eastman, et al. (1999. p.41) asserts the desire for status motivates much of consumer behaviour and cite that “popular opinion, journalistic accounts and academic theory all point to ‘Keeping up with Joneses’ as an activity for many people; and the purchase, use, display and consumption of goods and services are frequently described as a means of gaining social status (Veblen 1899, 1953; Packard, 1959; Mason, 1981; Scitovsky, 1992) ”. Freedman (1991) and Miller (1991) studies explain that a consumer may want to purchase or to consume goods and services for the status they present, irrespective of that consumer’s income or social class level. It is not correct to view the consumption of status products as only a habit of the very wealthy.

Eastman, et al. (1999 p.42) study reports that “scholars distinguish three different kinds of status: (1) status by definition or assignment (e.g., royalty), (2) status by achievement (an individual has higher status if he/she does a better job compared to others in his/her line of work), and (3) status by consumption (Hayakawa, 1963; Brown, 1991)”.

Eastman, et al. (1999. p.42) for their research defined status consumption as “the motivational process by which individuals strive to improve their social standing through the conspicuous consumption of consumer products that confer and symbolize status both for the individual and surrounding significant others”. Eastman, et al. (1999) conducted research which comprised six studies. The study developed valid, reliable self – report scales to measure status consumption. Six studies were conducted to purify the scale and to demonstrate its unidimensionality, internal consistency, validity and freedom from response bias. The authors recommended future research in building and testing theoretical models with status consumption and other consumer behaviour relevant constructs.
Eastman, et al. (1999) assert the status consumption construct was found to be related to, but distinct from similar constructs such as income, social class and materialism. According to Eastman, et al. (1999, p.42) “Consumers differ in how much they seek to gain prestige by consuming status goods. Thus, a measure of status consumption as a motivating force would be important to both researchers and managers”. Goldsmith, et al. (2006, p.412 – 413), asserted that “Mavenism may arise when the motives to seek uniqueness and status can be satisfied by paying attention to the new and different products in the market place and telling other consumers about them”.

According to Hader (2008) the level of consumption of luxury and status goods have gone up as the consumer affluence has grown. Goldsmith, et al. (2012a) have reported that status consumption is an individual difference variable and also report that status consumption, as motivating construct, has important influences on specific consumer behavioural outcomes. Patsiaouras and Fitchett (2012) state that status consumption extend a leading role in social relationships via individual actions and behavior.

2.7 MARKET HELPING BEHAVIOUR (INFORMATION PROVIDED – DIMENSION)

Arndt (1967); King and Summers (1967) studies indicate that informal market assistance, in the form of information and recommendations has a strong influence on consumer preferences and choices. Samli (1970) reported that 40% of a retailers’ customers were attracted by the recommendations of friends. Price and Feick (1984) reported that 91% of respondents would like to use an interpersonal source for the purchase of major durables. Amato (1985, 1990) posit market helping behaviours fall within the theoretical domain of everyday helping behaviour.

Price, et al. (1995, p.255), cite Dichter (1966) for having identified ‘people of goodwill’ consumers, who helped each other in marketplace activities, and indicated that “to more recent research on information sharing there is an accumulation of evidence that consumers help each other in marketplace activities”. Murray (1991) cited by Price, et al. (1995) had opined that across wide range of products and services categories it has been found consumers rely on other consumers for help especially in the provision of market information.
Price, et al. (1995) cited studies (Kiel and Layton, 1981; Newman, 1977; Thorelli, 1971; Udell, 1966) to have reported “buyers name interpersonal sources more frequently than any other source when explain their external search efforts”. Consumers planning purchase of services or decisions involving social and financial risks show greater preference for interpersonal sources of information (Beaty, et al. 1987; Murray, 1991; Formisano, et al. 1982).

Studies explain (Hartman and Kiecker, 1991; Price and Feick, 1984) that market helpers provide a variety of different kinds of assistance in product decision problems, evaluating alternatives and making the final product choice. Researches (Bell, 1967; Furse, et al., 1984; Hartman and Kiecker, 1991, Midgley, 1983; Westbrook and Fornell, 1979) indicate that purchase help can be of different kind from casual short conversations to accompanying to a store with someone or visiting a store for someone. Ditcher (1966) indicated that empathic, altruistic motives as reasons for market helping behaviour specific to market information provision.

Price, et al. (1995) investigated the relationships between market helping behaviour and two hypothesized predictors, general altruism and market place involvement and the role of market maven construct. Price, et al. (1995) examined altruistic disposition and marketplace involvement as two potential predictors of market helping behaviour with market maven construct as mediating variable that mediates between the predictors altruistic disposition and market place involvement and market helping behaviour.

Price, et al. (1995) hypothesized a model for examining and understanding the frequency of everyday market helping activities. The model did not attempt to predict a specific market helping situation, but focussed on factors that help to explain why some people help in the market place more than other people. The model hypothesized by Price, et al. (1995) had marketplace involvement, altruism, as predictors to market helping behaviour construct and market maven construct as mediating variable. The market helping behaviour construct was measured with items that focussed on task performed for others and information provided to others.

For the market helping behaviour construct, Price, et al. (1995) used two dimensional indicators: one for task performed: and the other was for information provided. The results indicated that marketplace involvement and altruism as
predictors of market helping behaviours had positive, significant correlation. Price, et al. (1995) study reported that market maven construct had mediating effect between antecedents’ altruism and marketplace involvement constructs and the consequence market helping behaviour construct.

2.8 REVIEW OF THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.8.1 SUMMARY OF FEICK AND PRICE (1987) SEMINAL RESEARCH

Feick and Price (1987) demonstrated empirically the market mavens were distinct from opinion leaders and early purchasers. Feick and Price (1987) research proved that all four of the propositions formed by them were supported by their study, which were:

1. That “market mavens “ were aware of new products earlier than those of individuals who were not market mavens”
2. That “market mavens will demonstrate higher levels of general market information seeking than those of individuals who were not market mavens”.
3. That “market mavens will exhibit higher levels of information provision to other consumers across product categories than those of individuals who were not market mavens.
4. That “market mavens will demonstrate higher levels of general market interest through enjoyment of shopping, attention to advertising and use of coupons than those of individuals who were not market mavens.

Feick and Price (1987) while testing the existence of market maven construct, shown interest in eliciting information on two main product categories, 1) Food and common house hold products and 2) Non – prescription drugs and health and beauty products.

Feick and Price (1987, p.94) indicated that “market mavens as individuals can recognise the market maven quality in themselves and can identify the characteristic in others”. Feick and Price (1987) strongly recommended to marketing managers that market mavens were good channel for diffusing general messages about marketing mix changes, across multiple product categories.

Feick and Price (1987) indicated that no clear demographic profile of the maven was evident from their results and insisted future study should focus on
identifying other means of profiling the maven that did not rely on demographic data. They also emphasized the need to identify the motivating factors which would enhance mavens’ interest to seek and provide marketplace information.

2.8.2 STUDYING MARKET MAVEN BEYOND DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS

Bettman, (1979) mentioned that an important function of marketing and consumer research was to identify and comprehend individual difference characteristics of consumer.

Clark and Goldsmith (2005, p.290) stated that “little is known about the motivations and psychological attributes of the market maven”. Clark and Goldsmith (2005) mentioned that the objective of their study was to investigate the psychological profile of market maven so as to add value to scientific body of knowledge about this influential category of consumers and to provide marketing managers better clarity and understanding towards evolving promotion strategies to appeal to market mavens.

Clark and Goldsmith (2005) hypothesized and tested model for relationships between market maven and select individual differences that are nomologically related to mavenism. Clark and Goldsmith (2005) research results indicate “market mavens do have a need for uniqueness expressed through their product and brand choices”. Geissler and Edison (2005) have reported that market mavens have positive association with ‘affinity for technology’ and personality traits ‘need for cognition’ and ‘dispositional optimism’. According to Chelminski and Coulter (2007) research findings, personality trait ‘consumer self-confidence’ was positively related to market mavenism.

Puspa and Tjandra-Rahardja (2009) indicate that a good understanding about the role of market maven in personal communications will help organizations to evolve strategic WOM marketing communications to disseminate positive information about their brands. Stokburger-Sauer and Hoyer (2009) reported that mavenism is a consequence of need for variety, resulting in keenness to acquire marketplace knowledge. Goldsmith, et al. (2012b) suggested that marketing managers can benefit through WOM by targeting consumers with high market mavenism tendency.
These research findings have encouraged the author to study market maven and other consumer behaviour relevant concepts which are expected to affect and affected by market maven.

2.8.3 MARKET MAVEN AND CONSUMER INNOVATIVENESS

Studies by Engel, et al. (1995) and Rogers (1995) vindicate that consumer innovativeness is hypothesized to be associated with several types of consumer characteristics and behaviours including socioeconomic, personality and communication variables. Goldsmith, et al. (2003) also felt that measure of consumer innovativeness is to be positively associated with measures of these variables forming a nomological network.

Goldsmith, et al. (2003) opined that retailers seek to maximize sales and profit by appealing to their best customers. Study of relationship between consumer innovativeness and market maven, two concepts derived from consumer behaviour theory, can help retail managers understand what some of their best customers are like (Goldsmith, et al., 2003). Consumer innovativeness describes buyers who wish to learn about and own the newest products. They are knowledgeable, somewhat price insensitive and likely to be heavy users (Goldsmith, 2001). Feick and Price (1987) have stated that market maven is an important construct specifically describing shopping behaviour as he possesses marketplace information on products and provide them to other consumers to facilitate their buying process.

Consumer researchers have studied both consumer innovativeness and market mavens separately, but few studies have examined the relationship or compared their effects on shopping. Goldsmith, et al. (2003) have reported that the measure of consumer innovativeness and market maven scale score (maveness) were positively correlated and also there was ample evidence for discriminant validity, suggesting that they were two related but distinct construct.

Goldsmith, et al. (2006) research on psychology of market mavenism studied empirically the relationship between market mavenism and consumer behaviourally relevant constructs global innovativeness, CNFU (Creative Choice Counterconformity-Dimension)) and status consumption and reported that these constructs explained more variance in market mavenism than did demographics. Goldsmith, et al. (2006) have cited Sproles and Sproles (1990, p.137) having stated
that novelty and fashion conscious tendency explains consumers who “appear to like new and innovative products and gain excitement from seeking out new things” and the recreational and shopping conscious tendency leads some consumers to view shopping as a pleasant activity that can be fun.

Goldsmith, et al. (2006) suggested that mavenism may ensue when the motives to seek uniqueness can be fulfilled by paying attention to the new and different products in the market place and by providing information about them to other consumers.

According to Goldsmith, et al. (2006, p.413) study “market mavenism is positively related to global innovativeness” and reported that market maven scale scores were correlated positively to global innovativeness.

2.8.4 MARKET MAVEN AND CONSUMERS’ NEED FOR UNIQUENESS (CCC)

Clark and Goldsmith (2005) have reported that market mavens do have a need for uniqueness, a psychological attribute, through their product and brand choices. Market mavens are looking for products and brands that will distinguish themselves from the crowd. Advertisements to mavens should highlight product attributes that will make the consumer of the product dissimilar from other consumers (Clark and Goldsmith, 2005).

Consumer need for uniqueness is a multidimensional construct consisting of three dimensions: (1) creative choice counterconformity, (2) unpopular choice counterconformity, and (3) avoidance of similarity. According to Tian, et al. (2001) creative choice counter conformity dimension of CNFU is the tendency to select products and brands that are different from the established norms but are still viewed as acceptable.

Goldsmith, et al. (2006) opined that individuals with predisposition of mavenism are approached for their views by other consumers. Hence, it is likely that their market place choices are considered as acceptable, though they appear to be counter to market place norms and Goldsmith, et al. (2006, p.414) hypothesized “market mavenism is positively related to creative choice counter conformity”. Goldsmith, et al. (2006) reported that market maven scale scores were correlated positively with creative choice counter conformity dimension of CNFU.
2.8.5 MARKET MAVEN AND STATUS CONSUMPTION

Goldsmith, et al. (2006) ascertained the psychological profile of market mavenism considering various psychological variables that are relevant to consumer behaviour and which could be related to the psychological profile of market maven. Goldsmith, et al. (2006) have reported that their research was intended to identify the motives, personality traits, stimuli of maven which would enhance mavenism and kindle interactions with other consumers. Goldsmith, et al. (2006) have opined that the products market maven consume convey a certain level of status within the consumer group.

Eastman, et al. (1999, p.42) defines status consumption as “the motivational process by which individuals strive to improve their social standing through the conspicuous consumption of consumer products that confer and symbolize status both for the individual and surrounding significant others”. Loulakis and Hill (2010) asserted that status consumption is an individual difference variable.

Goldsmith, et al. (2006, p. 413) posited that market mavens enhanced their status through conspicuous purchases and reported that “market mavenism is positively related to status consumption”.

2.8.6 MARKET MAVEN AND MARKET HELPING BEHAVIOR (IP)

According to Price, et al. (1995) consumers extensively rely on other consumers for assistance (especially in the provision of market information) on wide range of product purchases. To support this statement they have cited, consumers seek assistance from other customers for services (Murray, 1991), for non-durables (Feick and Price, 1987) and for durables (Furse, Punj and Stewart, 1984; Midgley, 1983; Punj and Staelin, 1983).

Price, et al. (1995) reported significant relationships between market helping behaviour and antecedants general altruism and market place involvement. Price, et al. (1995) study results confirmed that market maven construct mediate completely the relationship between the predictor constructs general altruism and market place involvement and criterion construct market helping behaviour.
2.9 MOBILE PHONES

“Mobile Phones become status symbol” was an article in ‘The New York Times’ by Richardson (1994). According to the article “in a country where living standards and disposable income have been rising each year for most of the past decade and where materialism is rampant, a mobile phone is a relatively affordable status symbol”. The popularity of mobile phones is not unique to India, it is a worldwide phenomenon, but the rate of market penetration and growth mobile phones have created in India both in urban and rural market have been an interesting consumer behaviour relevant phenomenon.

India with population at 1.21 billion has 929.37 million wireless subscribers, of which 596.98 million are urban subscribers and 332.38 are rural subscribers with monthly growth of 0.43% and 1.78% respectively according to Telecom Regulatory Authority of India Press Release No: 143/2012 dated 4th July 2012. These figures indicate the tremendous growth of wireless telecommunication in India which in turn has created phenomenal market growth for mobile phones, Mobile phones are used for variety of purposes such as communication, news, entertainment, social networking, marketing communications and information sharing. Possession of mobile phones offers different values to the possessor like utility value, life style and status values.

The perception, attitude and behavioural aspects of a consumer towards purchase and possession of mobile phones are perceived to have symbolic social, cultural life style and self -dimensions. Hence, the author considered and applied the hypothesized model of this study specific to mobile phones in Indian context as it would reflect various facets of psychological factors of consumers’ behaviour in the applied form of an emerging product in Indian market.

2.10 FASHION CLOTHINGS

Vieira (2009) has cited Sproles (1974) to have posited three points that describe a contemporary theory of fashion i) The generalised concept of fashion – “Fashion may be defined as a broadly based behavioural phenomenon evidenced in a variety of material and non – material contexts. ii) Fashion : an object and a process – “ Fashion may be conceptualised both as an object and as a conceptual process. iii)
The mechanisms of the fashion process – The fashion process may mechanistically characterised as a process of social influence and diffusion”.


Author of this report, conducted detailed literature review, identified ample scope for performing further extension research toward psychologically profiling, consumer behaviourally very useful market maven and felt the need for hypothesizing an extended research model and to test the proposed model with hypothesised relationship of consumer behaviour relevant constructs namely : consumer innovativeness (CIN), consumer need for uniqueness - creative choice counter conformity (CNFU-CCC) and status consumption (SC) as predictor exogenous antecedent constructs, the market maven (MM) construct as an endogenous construct and market helping behaviour - information provided dimension (MHB) as a criterion ultimate endogenous consequence construct. Conceptual model was hypothesized and tested for generic product categories, and was applied specific to mobile phones and fashion clothings as these products cut across consumer segments of wide range of demographics.
2.11 NATURE OF RESEARCH

Madden, et al (1995) emphasized the importance of replication research and he indicated that few replication studies are being reported in advertising and marketing communication literature and insisted that journal publisher should encourage researchers in this field to conduct replicative research. “Replications are an important component of research in that they convert tentative belief into more reliable knowledge” (Berthon, et al., 2003, p.511).

According to Kane (1984) replicability is the cornerstone of scientific research. Rosenthal and Rosnow (1984) argue that replicability is the most genuine way of developing body of scientific knowledge. This view is supported both in general by Collins (1985) and in advertising particularly (Reid, et al., 1981; Ehrenberg (1990); Madden, et al., 1995). The marketing communication field lacks replication research (Arndt, 1976; Reid, et al., 1981; Madden, et al., 1995; Easley, et al., 2000).

Later Berthon, et al. (2002) Hubbard and Armstrong (1994) state that replication as a duplication of earlier published empirical study to assess whether similar finding can be obtained to investigate the generalisability of earlier research findings. They also mention that extension does not alter the conceptual relationships of the earlier study but would include the modification of either exogenous or endogenous constructs; the inclusion of new constructs or drawing a new sample from a different population.

Brown and Gaulden (1984) argued that it is not absolutely must that replication of research be clones. Berthon, et al. (2002, p. 516) summarize that “any one research study can be thought of as occupying conceptual space bounded by generation and replication”. Thus, these two elements define the region of potential research space.

As per them, in pure replicative research all possible parameters remain the same between studies and in pure generative research all parameters are newly created. Pure replication is an ideal, not possible, because one parameter must change between studies namely time (Berthon, et al., 2002).

Berthon, et al. (2002, p. 517) posited that “given a specific research problem or phenomenon, it is feasible, although unlikely, to change all major research
parameters (relative to previous research) in the process of exploring the problem. The middle ground between the extremes of pure replication and pure generation is that of extension. Any one piece of research in this region is, therefore, a combination of replication and generation. Thus, an index of extension \( \varepsilon \) (epsilon) may be defined as:

\[
\varepsilon = \frac{\gamma}{(\gamma + \rho)} \quad \text{where}
\]

\[\gamma \text{ (gamma) = the novel parameters of a project.}\]

\[\rho \text{ (rho) = the replicative parameter}\]

This index would range from 1 – pure generative project, to 0 a pure replicative project. The relationship between replication and extension is illustrated in figure 2.2.

---

**Fig. 2.2 Nature of Research**

Considering above literature, this research lies in the replication and extension region, as this study has replicated Feick and Price (1987) research to test the existence of market maven construct, conceptualised by Feick and Price (1987) seminal research, in Indian context and studied the new associations and relationships of consumer behaviour relevant important constructs which were not studied in earlier research as proposed in this research.

**2.12 GENERAL RESEARCH APPROACH**

Feick and Price (1987) posited in their seminal research that the market maven is different from early purchasers and opinion leaders and more effective than early purchasers and opinion leaders in diffusing marketplace general information.

The researcher felt the need for conducting replication and extension study of Feick and Price (1987) research to assess its validity in Indian context in order to
ascertain the generalisability of Feick and Price (1987) seminal research’s inferences in Indian culture and economical conditions.

Considering the important role market maven has in diffusion of marketplace general information and marketing communication process, the researcher also felt the need for research in identifying the motives of market maven. Towards this need, for identifying the motives of market maven, researcher conducted an extension research of study conducted by Goldsmith, et al. (2006). The purpose was to examine empirically the associations between the important consumer individual attributes: consumer innovativeness, status consumption, consumer need for uniqueness (creative choice counterconformity – dimension) as antecedent constructs to market maven and market helping behaviour (information provided dimension) as consequence construct to market maven construct.

Author included the construct market helping behaviour and conducted SEM analysis which was not performed by Goldsmith, et al. (2006). Mediation effect of market maven between the independent variables consumer innovativeness, status consumption and the consumers’ need for uniqueness (creative choice counterconformity – dimension) and the dependent variable market helping behaviour were researched for the first time in this study.

In this study the proposed conceptual model was applied and tested for mobile phones and fashion clothings to ascertain the conceptual model’s validity across product categories. Mobile phones and fashion clothings were chosen, as these two categories of products touches the lives of people of almost all demographic categories and have phenomenal market penetration and growth in India.

2.13 RESEARCH HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Motivated by the scope and currency of the problem statement, research questions were raised and the objectives were formulated, detailed literature review was undertaken. To answer the research questions and to accomplish the objectives of the study research hypotheses were proposed and tested.

Goldsmith, et al. (2012a) suggest that market mavens are attentive to their social surroundings to acquire knowledge of the market as a sort of updates for social exchanges where they want to fit in and gain the special attention of their social groups. Market mavens are driven by certain motives which draw their attention.
Information sought is disseminated by mavens to other consumers to stand out from their peers to enhance their credibility and social influence. In an effort to gain insight on market mavens’ individual difference motives that will amplify market maveness tendency the following hypotheses were proposed and tested.

Research hypotheses for this study were developed on the platform of detailed literature review and evolved by synthesising established theory. Hypotheses of this study are listed in the following section of the thesis:

2.13.1 HYPOTHESES - EXISTENCE OF MARKET MAVEN, CONCEPTUALISED BY FEICK AND PRICE (1987), IN INDIAN CONTEXT

H$_1$: There is a positive relationship between market maveness and specific information provision on following household food products:

- H$_{1a}$: Hot beverages
- H$_{1b}$: Frozen Foods
- H$_{1c}$: Packaged fruit juices
- H$_{1d}$: Breakfast cereals

H$_2$: There is significant difference in the specific information provision on following household food products of different levels of mavenism:

- H$_{2a}$: Hot beverages
- H$_{2b}$: Frozen Foods
- H$_{2c}$: Packaged fruit juices
- H$_{2d}$: Breakfast cereals

H$_3$: There is a positive relationship between market maveness and specific information provision on following skin and hair care products:

- H$_{3a}$: Deodorants
- H$_{3b}$: Skin care products
- H$_{3c}$: Hair care Product

H$_4$: There is a significant difference in the specific information provision on the following skin and hair care product of different levels of mavenism:

- H$_{4a}$: Deodorant
- H$_{4b}$: Skin care Product
- H$_{4c}$: Hair care Products
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H5: There is a positive relationship between market maveness and specific information provision on following consumer electronics goods and home appliances:

H5a: Laptops
H5b: MP 3 players
H5c: Audio equipment
H5d: Televisions
H5e: Digital Camera
H5f: Home appliances

H6: There is a significant difference in the specific information provision on the following consumer electronic goods and home appliances of different levels of mavenism:

H6a: Laptops
H6b: MP 3 players
H6c: Audio equipment
H6d: Television
H6e: Digital Camera
H6f: Home appliances

H7: There is a positive relationship between market maveness and enjoyment for shopping following categories:

H7a: General shopping
H7b: Shopping for food and common household product.
H7c: Shopping for beauty care products.
H7d: Shopping for consumer electronics goods / Home appliances

H8: There is a significant difference in the enjoyment of shopping for following categories of goods of different levels of mavenism:

H8a: General shopping
H8b: Shopping for food and common household products
H8c: Shopping for beauty care products.
H8d: Shopping for Consumer electronics goods/ Home appliances

H9: There is a positive relationship between market maveness and information seeking about new products through advertisement:
H\textsubscript{10}: There is a significant difference in the information seeking about new products through advertisement of different levels of mavenism

2.13.2 HYPOTHESES - EFFECT OF DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS ON MARKET MAVEN

H\textsubscript{11a}: There is a significant difference in the market maveness of different gender.

H\textsubscript{11b}: There is a significant difference in the market maveness of different category of age.

H\textsubscript{11c}: There is a significant difference in the market maveness of different category of marital status.

H\textsubscript{11d}: There is a significant difference in the market maveness of different category of education qualification.

H\textsubscript{11e}: There is a significant difference in the market maveness of different category of occupation.

H\textsubscript{11f}: There is a significant difference in the market maveness of different category of individual monthly income.

H\textsubscript{11g}: There is a significant difference in the market maveness of different category of family monthly income.

H\textsubscript{11h}: There is a significant difference in the market maveness of different types of family.

H\textsubscript{11i}: There is a significant difference in the market maveness of different category of environment in which grew up.

2.13.3 HYPOTHESES –RELATIONSHIPS - CONCEPTUAL MODEL

2.13.3.1 CONSUMER INNOVATIVENESS AND MARKET MAVEN

Consumer researchers have studied both consumer innovativeness and market mavens separately, but few studies have examined the relationship or compared their effects in consumer behavior context. Goldsmith, et al. (2003) have reported that the measure of consumer innovativeness and market maven scale score (maveness/mavenism/market maven tendency) were positively correlated and also
there was ample evidence for discriminant validity, suggesting that they were two related but distinct construct.

Goldsmith, et al. (2006) suggested that maveness may ensue when the motives to seek uniqueness can be fulfilled by paying attention to the new and different products in the market place and by providing information about them to other consumers.

Goldsmith, et al. (2006, p.413) study hypothesized “market mavenism is positively related to global innovativeness”. To be consistent with their trait as the most sought after credible source of information about market place, market mavens are expected to be aware of innovations and about innovative products across various categories, confirmation of this fact in Indian context will provide insight to profile market maven. Hence hypothesis was proposed to test whether relationship exists between Consumer Innovativeness (CIN) and Market Maveness (MM) in Indian context (figure 2.3).

\[H_{12a}: \text{There is a positive relationship between consumer innovativeness and market maveness.}\]

2.13.3.2 CONSUMERS’ NEED FOR UNIQUENESS (CCC) AND MARKET MAVEN

Clark and Goldsmith (2005) have reported that market mavens do have a need for uniqueness, a psychological attribute, through their product and brand choices. Market mavens are looking for products and brands that will distinguish themselves from the crowd. Advertisements to market mavens should highlight product attributes that will make the consumer of the product dissimilar from other consumers (Clark and Goldsmith, 2005). Goldsmith, et al. (2006) reported positive association between market maven and CNFU-CCC. According to Ye, et al. (2012) the importance of CNFU lies in its close association with consumers’ self concept. The intention of market maven to stand out from other consumers as market place information provider would be motivate him to seek and provide information about unique products and services. This study wanted to evaluate the relation between consumers’ need for uniqueness – creative choice counterconformity (CNFU-CCC) and market maveness (MM) in India, an emerging market, so as to create cues to maven to assimilate brand information and to promulgate. Hence, the hypothesis was proposed (figure 2.3).
H₁₂b: There is a positive relationship between consumers’ need for uniqueness (creative choice counterconformity) and market maveness.

2.13.3.3 STATUS CONSUMPTION AND MARKET MAVEN

Goldsmith, et al. (2006, p.413) posited that market mavens enhanced their status through conspicuous purchases and hypothesized that “market mavenism is positively related to status consumption” and reported that market maveness was positively associated with status consumption. Loulakis and Hill (2010) assert that status consumption is an individual difference variable. Goldsmith, et al. (2012) state that status consumption relates to accumulation to express position. As market mavens are expected to be well informed on market place information, it should include information on status of the products and services. To strengthen the theory, hypothesis was proposed and tested in fast developing nation India, country with huge market potential (figure 2.3).

H₁₂c: There is a positive relationship between status consumption and market maveness.

2.13.3.4 MARKET MAVEN AND MARKET HELPING BEHAVIOR–INFORMATION PROVIDED

Price, et al. (1995) conducted research and reported significant relationships between market helping behaviour and antecedents’ general altruism and market place involvement. Price, et al. (1995) confirmed that market maven construct mediate completely the relationship between the antecedents constructs general altruism and market place involvement and consequence construct market helping behaviour. This finding has motivated the authors to test the association between market maven and market helping behavior- information provided, in Indian context, to contribute to the marketing field with tested and proven relationship so that managers can leverage on the positive relationship to enhance business revenue. Hence the hypothesis was proposed (figure 2.3).

H₁₂d: There is a positive relationship between market maveness and market helping behaviour.
2.13.4 HYPOTHESES –RELATIONSHIPS - SPECIFIC TO MOBILE PHONES MODEL

To validate the hypothesized conceptual model, the proposed model was adapted specific to product ‘mobile phones’ as it was considered to be a product which is of interest to consumers of different demographics, social statuses and life styles (figure 2.4).

H13a: There is a positive relationship between consumer innovativeness and market maveness – specific to mobile phones.

H13b: There is a positive relationship between consumers’ need for uniqueness (creative choice counterconformity) and market maveness – specific to mobile phones.

H13c: There is a positive relationship between status consumption and market maveness – specific to mobile phones.

H13d: There is a positive relationship between market maveness and market helping behaviour - specific to mobile phones

2.13.5 HYPOTHESES –RELATIONSHIPS - SPECIFIC TO FASHION CLOTHING MODEL

To validate the hypothesized conceptual model, the proposed model was adapted specific to product ‘fashion clothings’ as it was considered to be a product which is of interest to consumers of different demographics, social statuses and life styles (figure 2.5).

H14a: There is a positive relationship between consumer innovativeness and market maveness – specific to fashion clothings.

H14b: There is a positive relationship between consumers’ need for uniqueness (creative choice counterconformity) and market maveness – specific to fashion clothings.

H14c: There is a positive relationship between status consumption and market maveness – specific to fashion clothing.

H14d: There is a positive relationship between market maveness and market helping behaviour – specific to fashion clothing.
CIN = Consumer Innovativeness; CNFU = Consumers’ Need For Uniqueness-creative choice counterconformity-dimension; SC = Status Consumption; MM = Market Maven (Maveness); MHB = Market Helping Behaviour – Information Provided-dimension.

**Fig. 2.3 Proposed Structural Model – Conceptual**

MCIN = Consumer Innovativeness (Mobile Phones); MCNFU = Consumer Need For Uniqueness-creative choice counterconformity-dimension (Mobile Phones); MSC = Status Consumption (Mobile Phones); MM = Market Maven (Maveness); MMHB = Market Helping Behaviour – Information Provided-dimension (Mobile Phones).

**Fig. 2.4 Proposed Structural Model – Mobile Phones**
To ascertain and acquire insight on the mediating role of market maven (maveness), hypotheses were proposed with hypothesized motives as independent variables, market maven as intervening ‘mediating’ variable and market helping behavior as dependent variable.

H_{15a}: Market maveness mediates the effect between consumer innovativeness and market helping behavior (figure 2.6).

H_{15b}: Market maveness mediates the effect between consumers’ need for uniqueness (creative choice counterconformity) and market helping behavior (figure 2.7).

H_{15c}: Market maveness mediates the effect between status consumption and market helping behavior (figure 2.8).

Fig. 2.6 Hypothesized Mediating Role of Market Maven CIN – MM – MHB
2.13.7 HYPOTHESES - MEDIATING ROLE –SPECIFIC TO MOBILE PHONES MODELS

To ascertain and acquire insight on the mediating role of market maven (maveness), hypotheses were proposed for models adapted specific to ‘mobile phones’ with hypothesized motives as independent variables, market maven as intervening ‘mediating’ variable and market helping behavior as dependent variable. This would validate the proposed conceptual (mediation) models.

H_{16a}: Market maveness mediates the effect between consumer innovativeness and market helping behaviour – specific to mobile phones (figure 2.9).

H_{16b}: Market maveness mediates the effect between consumers’ need for uniqueness (creative choice counterconformity) and market helping behaviour – specific to mobile phones (figure 2.10).

H_{16c}: Market maveness mediates the effect between status consumption and market helping behaviour - specific to fashion clothings (figure 2.11).
2.13.8 HYPOTHESES - MEDIATING ROLE –SPECIFIC TO FASHION CLOTHINGS MODELS

To ascertain and acquire insight on the mediating role of market maven (maveness), hypotheses were proposed for models adapted specific to ‘fashion clothings’ with hypothesized motives as independent variables, market maven as intervening ‘mediating’ variable and market helping behavior as dependent variable. This would validate the proposed conceptual (mediation) models.
H$_{17a}$: Market maveness mediates the effect between consumer innovativeness and market helping behaviour – specific to fashion clothings (figure 2.12).

H$_{17b}$: Market maveness mediates the effect between consumers’ need for uniqueness (creative choice counterconformity) and market helping behaviour – specific to mobile phones (figure 2.13).

H$_{17c}$: Market maveness mediates the effect between status consumption and market helping behaviour – specific to fashion clothings (figure 2.14).