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Abstract

This dissertation improves our understanding of Asian consumers by providing a new perspective on the role of face in consumer decision-making. This dissertation develops a theory of face pressure which argues that consumers consider the effects of their decisions on their face (e.g. saving face) during the decision-making process and this exerts a pressure on conspicuous consumption intentions. This research contributes to the literature by fundamentally re-conceptualizing the role of face in the decision-making process to be a direct motivator of specific behavior. This conceptualization also incorporates important aspects of face that are critical to understanding its role in decision-making. The theory of face pressure considers face a direct motivator of behavior and, due to this novel perspective, identifies a pair of face pressure motivations - a motivation to gain face and a motivation to avoid the loss of face. It also captures the interdependence of face which theorizes that an individual’s behavior impacts the face of others. Finally, the theory of face pressure hypothesizes that face is context specific and the influence of face pressure will depend on the consumption context. A scale to measure face pressure is developed and, over four studies, evidence is provided to support the theory of face pressure and the validity of this face pressure scale. Then,
through multiple experiments, it is demonstrated that face pressure is moderated by the expectation of social evaluation of the consumption or purchase behavior. When there is an expectation of social evaluation, the motivations to gain face and avoid the loss of face exert a pressure on the decision is such a way that the most face-beneficial outcome is more likely to be chosen. However, this pressure significantly reduces when consumption occurs in a setting where there is no expectation of social evaluation. The results of these studies also have a managerial relevance. These experiments demonstrate that advertising the face-related value of a product can be an effective form of product marketing when social evaluation is likely. These studies also demonstrate that it is possible to create sensitivity to social evaluation in consumers within an advertisement itself, which in turn makes face-related messaging effective. In sum, this dissertation creates a new theoretical framework upon which further study of face and its role in Chinese (and other cultures) consumer behavior can be built, develops a scale with which to engage in such research, and provides managers with potential new forms of persuasive messaging when expanding or building their brand in Asia.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

In 2012, according to China’s national bureau of statistics, China’s retail sales were over $3.3 trillion and its middle class is over 150 million people and estimated to more than double by 2016 (Cavender and Rein 2009; Cui and Song 2009; Gerth 2010), highlighting the need to understand the Chinese consumer. Perhaps in response to the economic strength and potential of the Chinese economy, research has started to focus on understanding the cultural differences between western and eastern consumers. A common focus of academic research is on individualism vs. collectivism, examining how individuals vary in their focus on the self vs. the group (Hofstede, 2010; Shavitt et al. 2006). This research generally finds that western consumers are more individualistic, while eastern consumers are more collectivistic. However, this is not the only significant difference between American and Chinese consumers and some have called for a more in-depth understanding of the Chinese consumer, their unique cultural mindset and the role this mindset plays in their consumption behavior (Oyserman 2006).

Some recent research has examined how well current decision-making models explain Chinese consumer behavior (Bagozzi et al. 2000; Lee and Green 1991). These studies have found that current models and constructs do not do as good a job predicting
behavior in Asia as they do in western cultures, indicating that there are critical aspects of the Asian consumer, beyond their collectivistic nature, that are being ignored.

This research, as called for by Oyserman (2006), goes beyond the traditional focus on collectivism to demonstrate that face (e.g. saving face or losing face) is one of these critical constructs. Face, a concept that is woven into the fabric of Chinese society, is the confidence that society has in a person’s moral character and how society perceives a person’s prestige gained through success and ostentation (Chen 1990). It has been described as “abstract and intangible…yet the most delicate standard by which Chinese social intercourse is regulated” (Lin 1935, p. 201 as quoted in Chen 1990, p.131), “the respectability and/or deference which a person can claim for himself from others” (Ho 1976, p. 883) and as a self-image that is maintained, enhanced, or lost as a result of interpersonal interactions or actions (Brown and Levinson 1987; Goffman 1967). It is inherent in the daily lives of Chinese, influencing the way they interact with each other (Chang and Holt 1994; White et al. 2004).

A review of the literature finds that there is a need for a theoretical framework that helps guide future research on the topic of face. Perhaps because no framework exists, the constructs created to measure the role of face in decision-making do not sufficiently reflect the nuances of face that have been discussed in the literature to date. Furthermore, the scales developed to measure these constructs are all trait-based measures that do not capture the situational variability of face; therefore, while they can be used to predict chronic tendencies, they cannot effectively predict specific behavior intentions.
In an attempt to provide the theoretical framework that is missing, this dissertation conceptualizes face in a new way – as a direct motivator of specific behaviors. Using this new conceptualization, a theory of face pressure is developed that identifies a new construct, face pressure, and captures four key aspects of the influence of face on decision-making. First, this construct, unlike previous measures which focus on individual differences in face awareness or sensitivity, is conceptualized as a motivator of behavior. Therefore, face pressure can be used to predict specific behavior intentions in specific contexts and is capable of varying across situations for any given individual. Second, re-conceptualizing face as a motivation allows for the examination of the motivation to gain face and the motivation to avoid the loss of face and their distinct influence on a behavioral decision. Third, face pressure also incorporates the interdependent nature of face – the notion that one’s actions not only affect one’s own face but also the face of others. Finally, the theory of face pressure hypothesizes that, unlike many other social variables, the context of consumption is a critical moderator of the influence of face pressure. It is expected that face pressure will only be influential when there is an expectation of social evaluation.

In summary, the literature to date has studied the influence of face on decision-making from a trait-based perspective. In the process, the constructs and measures developed are capable of predicting general behavioral tendencies, but cannot account for intra-individual or situational variance in the role of face. Theoretically, this dissertation contributes to the literature by developing a framework that treats face as a context and behavior specific motivation in the decision-making process. In doing so, this dissertation
also addresses aspects of face that were previously overlooked, such as its dual motivations and interdependence. Moreover, the theory on face is advanced by identifying a key moderator, the expectation of social evaluation, which can aid in identifying the situations in which face will be influential.

Empirically, this dissertation also develops and validates a measure of face pressure based on the conceptualization of face as a motivator of specific behavior. This measure is then used to study the context specific aspect of face. In the process, it is discovered that advertising messages that leverage the inherent face-value of a product can be extremely effective when there is an expectation of social evaluation and that this expectation of social evaluation can be made salient through the advertisement itself, providing two managerial takeaways from this research as well.

Chapter 2 reviews the literature on face and lays out, in detail, the theory of face pressure, explaining its key tenets and creating the foundation for the further empirical analyses. Chapter 3 focuses on the development of the face pressure measure and reports the results from four studies that validate this scale and demonstrate its superior predictive value relative to previous face-related measures. Chapter 4 details a set of experiments intended to examine the context specific nature of face pressure. These studies demonstrate the importance of face pressure in contexts when social evaluation is expected and provide a few simple managerial takeaways. Finally, Chapter 5 summarizes the results of this dissertation, discusses their implications and examines the contribution of this work to the literature.
Chapter 2: The Theory of Face Pressure

Face

Face is present in the daily lives of Chinese individuals (Chang and Holt 1994) and its importance to Asian culture is undeniable. The concept of “face” is frequently discussed in the literature as an important and critical variable affecting Chinese behavior. It has been described as “abstract and intangible…yet the most delicate standard by which Chinese social intercourse is regulated (Chen 1990, p.131). A Chinese proverb states “a man needs face like a tree needs bark,” and Gao (1998, p.48) suggests that losing face is “like a tree being stripped of its bark—a life and death situation.” It is pointed out further that “not to give a person face is the utmost height of rudeness and is like throwing down a gauntlet to him" (Chen 1990, p. 131).

The origin of the word face comes from a literal translation of the words lien and mien-tze; however, like many words, face has a much deeper idiomatic meaning than simply the front part of the head (Ho 1976). Lien refers to the confidence that society has in a person’s moral character. Everyone is granted an amount at birth and cannot gain lien, but only lose it. Mien-tze is how society perceives a person’s prestige gained through success and ostentation. Mien-tze is not a birth right and can fluctuate up or
down throughout one’s lifetime depending on how one conducts oneself during complex social interactions within certain social groups. It can only be given and taken away by others (Chan et al. 1987; Ho 1976). For example, being caught stealing would result in a loss of lien, while a failure to make the Dean’s List would result in a loss of mien-tze.

Though important, because of its nuance, face has been difficult to formally conceptualize (one researcher felt face was “impossible to define” [Lin, 1935, p.202]) and researchers have put forth a variety of different definitions. Face has been defined as the self image that is maintained, enhanced, or lost as a result of interpersonal interactions or actions (Brown and Levinson 1987; Goffman 1967). Similarly, Ho (1976, p.883) defines face as “the respectability and/or deference which a person can claim for himself from others.” However, Chan et al. (2003) define face as prestige that one holds or that is recognized by others through one’s success or social position (Chan et al. 2003).

Goffman’s definition focuses on the self-image a person has based on how he is treated. In other words, an individual’s face is a personal characteristic that is evidenced through the way others treat that individual. Ho’s definition considers face a characteristic that is not contained within the individual, but rather is granted by others, while Chan et al.’s focus is on the social standing that one has in a society. While these definitions all differ in their exact interpretation of face, the role of society and others in the formation or granting of face is evident in all three. They all agree that face is a social phenomenon; without other’s to grant or recognize it, face has no true value or importance.

While defining face has been a challenge, many researchers have spent time explaining what it is not. Other constructs such as status, honor, dignity, and prestige
have been proposed as equivalent to face, but each falls short of capturing the complexity and various facets of the Chinese concept of face. As defined by Ho (1976), status defines a place within a social system, regardless of the person who may occupy that role. This status can affect one’s face but face is influenced by more than just a societal standing. Face is also not the same as honor or dignity. Face can drive a person to engage in illicit behavior, though this behavior would neither be considered honorable nor dignified. For example, while there is an inherent risk of face loss if caught cheating, failing an exam and being expelled may be a great enough potential loss of face to warrant this illicit behavior. While this act can protect a person’s face, it is not an honorable act.

While the term prestige has been used on occasion as a definition of face, numerous scholars have argued against this equivalency (Ho 1976; Li and Su 2007). Prestige, unlike status, is not about a role, but about an individual’s competence, ability, expertise, or skill (Bierstedt 1950; Simmel 1950). This concept cannot capture the interdependent aspect of face; namely, that one’s behavior can affect the face of important others. Prestige is also not something to which one is entitled; however, one owns a certain amount of face from birth. While status, honor, dignity and prestige can all be considered sources of face, no one construct captures its entire essence.

Face is also fundamentally different from other social constructs like Attention to Social Comparison Information (ATSCI; Bearden and Rose 1990) or the subjective norm. The ATSCI measures a person’s chronic tendency to pay attention to social comparisons. Unlike ATSCI, face itself is not an individual difference variable. Though, to date, it has
primarily been treated as a trait (as will be discussed in detail in the section on previous face-related measurement that follows), face is not invariant to context. For example, a CEO may be shown a large amount of face in a business setting, but among the elders of his family the CEO might be granted less face. However, it is not just an issue of chronic vs. situational face. Face is not a characteristic that a person has, like a chronic prevention tendency, but rather a summary of numerous judgments that others make of a person. Ho (1976, p.876) makes a critical point in this regard; “a person’s face is assessed in terms of what others think of him; the assessment does not include what the person thinks of himself, but may include what he thinks others think of him.”

Subjective norm measures what others think one should do and proposes that this influences decisions. Subjective norm and its antecedents, normative beliefs and motivation to comply, do not involve self-perceptions, but rather are focused on conforming to expectations to attain socially mediated rewards as the term motivation to comply implies. Compliance is the type of influence that is driven largely by reward power and if a person complies with what most people expect that person to do in a particular situation it is not likely to reflect on his personal view of himself. On the other hand, face, being a uniquely eastern concept, has a significant influence on self-perception. This influence stems from the highly group-oriented nature of eastern society as a whole. People’s identities are defined by societal roles, relations and interactions (Ho 1976; Hu 1944; Ting-Toomey 1994); therefore, the face that a person is granted by society is going to influence self-perception. This implies that face is influential because of the external pressure provided by society, but also because of the internal desire to
perceive oneself as high in face. Moreover, a lack of deference to a person can be taken as a deprivation of not just that person’s face, but also the face of his relatives or superiors (Ho 1976). Face influences behavior, not just because of compliance, but also because of a person’s own perceptions, making this a more personally relevant concept than subjective norm in Chinese society.

Face has been discussed by international academics and its influence on negotiation, organizational behavior, conflict, and family life researched (Chen 1990; Gao 1998; Leung and Chan 2003; Redding and Ng 1983). Among others, Leung and Chan (2003) studied the role that face played in negotiation, finding that those more sensitive to face were more likely to engage in behaviors that both enhanced their own face and granted the other negotiator face. Redding and Ng (1983) find that face plays an important role in the relationship between managers and workers in an organization. They find that gains in face lead to strong feelings of pride, satisfaction and confidence, while losses of face regularly lead to shame and frustration. They conclude that the best way to protect face in an organization is to grant face to those of both higher and lower standing, and most importantly to return it when it is given.

Chen (1990) engaged in detailed ethnographic research to examine how face affects behavior at the dinner table. The author’s findings indicate that, as a host, having an abundance of food and, as a guest, demonstrating proper enjoyment are crucial components to providing the other parties involved the appropriate amount of face. To study interpersonal communication, Gao (1998) studied conversations between characters on a TV show. Pertinent to this research, this study found that people in this TV show
discussed both gaining and losing face; specifically, claiming someone has lost face or integrity was found to be extremely damaging to the relationship between the two characters.

While much research on face has focused on these interpersonal interactions, face also exerts a significant influence on consumption behavior, product attitudes and purchase decisions. To this end, recent research examining the influence of face in business and on consumer decisions has shown that face influences a consumer’s brand sensitivity, gift-giving and luxury purchase (Bao et al. 2003; Chan et al. 2003; Fan and Xiao 1998; Wong and Ahuvia 1998). Wong and Ahuvia (1998) highlight the role that face plays in the growing materialism and conspicuous consumption evident in Chinese society. Chan et al. (2003) discuss the art of gift giving in China and highlight the importance of face in this tradition. Specifically, a gift must be respectful and dignified in order to maintain both the giver and the receiver’s face. Moreover, gifts must be even more carefully chosen when given to those with more face than the giver (i.e. parents, managers, mentors). Bao et al. (2003) study the role of face consciousness on various consumer tendencies such as brand consciousness and novelty seeking. The authors find that face consciousness increases a consumer’s brand consciousness and their tendency to consider the high price, high quality heuristic. They conclude that this is one potential reason why consumers pay higher prices for name brand products.

There are three important takeaways from the literature reviewed. First, face has a consistent presence in the mind of the Chinese consumer, and, therefore is likely to be considered directly in relation to specific behaviors. People will make judgments of the
effect of their behavior on their face and these judgments will motivate them to act in a manner consistent with their motivation to protect or increase their face. Second, face is a context-specific construct. The pressure that face will exert on purchasing a gift is not the same in all situations; it will be higher when giving a gift to someone with more face or at important events. Third, society and other individuals are critical components to understanding face because, not only do they grant an individual face, their face can also be affected by the actions of that individual. In the next section, the research measuring face is reviewed, and its limitations with regard to these three takeaways are discussed. After this review, the theory of face pressure is introduced, which uses these takeaways as key tent poles in its framework and, in the process, provides a new theory with which to study the role of face in consumer behavior.

Prior Face-related Measurement

There have been a few attempts to measure the impact of face in the consumer research literature and, to date, each empirical work has operationalized its face-related construct as an individual difference or trait variable.

Leung and Chan (2003) define “face-work” as the social skills people use to protect their face and the face of the others with whom they are interacting in a negotiation setting and identify four dimensions of “face work:” reciprocity, response, respect and reputation. A portion of their work focuses on people’s perceptions of how behavior and face interact in a negotiation setting (e.g. “The practice of respect and
consideration can greatly enhance our own face;” “Donation can enhance your mien-tze;”
“The more face you have, the greater the favour you can obtain from others;” “Rejecting
other without consideration will cause them losing face;” “To comment directly on
other’s opinion will cause them to lose face.”). These measures provide an initial
indication that people do consider the face-related implications of their actions, but the
focus of this research is limited to interpersonal behaviors in a negotiation setting.

While Leung and Chan (2003) find that the Chinese negotiators scoring most
highly on the Leung and Chan face-work scale were also most likely to employ face
enhancement activities when they engaged in negotiations with high status others, these
results do not allow for examination of varied contexts. For example, what would happen
if negotiation occurred with a lower status other? Would rejecting another person without
consideration be acceptable if that other was clearly in the wrong or dishonorable? In
addition, one item in their measure specifically asks about the effect of donation on mien-
tze. When a specific behavior is included in the measure itself, it can appropriately be
used as a general tendency measure, but cannot be considered to study the role of face in
specific behavioral contexts. For example, if one wanted to measure the importance of
face in buying a pair of jeans, this measurement would be diluted by an item focused on a
completely different behavior.

White et al. (2003) examine the effect of what they call “face threat sensitivity”
on negotiators’ likelihood of reaching satisfactory agreements and find that those with
high threat sensitivity are less likely to reach satisfactory agreements in negotiation than
those that are low in this trait. Like Leung and Chan, this measure is developed within the
context of social interaction and negotiation. However, the measure itself does not involve negotiation, but rather measures a general tendency for an individual to be sensitive to instances when their face is being threatened. While clearly relevant in negotiation, this construct could also be used to study other, more general consumption tendencies. However, because this measure is conceptualized as a trait measure, it does not allow for intra-individual variations that depend on the context of consumption. It simply can identify individuals who have a higher sensitivity to face threats and determine how this might influence their behavior, in general.

Bao et al. (2003) define “face-consciousness” as a desire to enhance or maintain face and measured subjects’ standing on this scale by asking them to rate their agreement with four statements (e.g., “It is important that others like the products and brands I buy.” “Sometimes I buy a product because my friends do so.” “Name-brand purchase is a good way to distinguish people from others.” “Name products and brands purchase can bring me a sense of prestige.”). They find that face-consciousness is higher in China than in the US and that face-consciousness is positively related to brand and fashion-consciousness. One contribution of this measure is that it moves away from social interaction (like the White et al. and Leung and Chan research) to examine the role of face in consumption. However, like “face threat sensitivity,” this measure is focused on the general tendency that an individual has to be conscious of face in their consumption decisions and how this consciousness varies across individuals and cultures.

Li and Su (2007) address three different aspects of what they call face consumption – conformity face consumption (e.g., “it is important that others like the
products and brands I buy”), distinctive face consumption (e.g., “name brand purchase is a good way to distinguish people from others”) and other-oriented face consumption (e.g., “when buying a gift for others I always consider the prestige of the gift”)– and found that Chinese consumers score more highly on each of these types of face-related consumption than American consumers. Like the “face consciousness” measure, this research focuses on studying individual differences that can be used to identify variation across cultures, but not contexts. In one dimension of their face measure, Li and Su (2007) use a specific context (“it is important to have a dinner party in a good restaurant even though I will pay a lot of money”). Again, similar to the measure in Leung and Chan (2003), including a specific behavior in the scale itself makes this measure only applicable for studying chronic tendencies and not other specific behaviors.

More recently, Chan et al. (2009) measured “concern for face” using six agree-disagree statements (e.g., “I care about others’ attitudes toward me”) and also found that Chinese consumers were higher in concern for face than western consumers. Those scoring highly on concern for face were also more dissatisfied with a social failure than subjects reporting lower levels of concern for face. This scale, while useful in studying cultural differences, also suffers from the same limitations as the previously discussed measures. It focuses purely on individual differences and chronic tendencies limiting its ability to predict specific behaviors in specific contexts.

While these chronic measures are extremely valuable to understanding face sensitivity or concern across cultures or individuals, they are all limited in their application to specific behaviors in specific contexts. However, Ho (1976, p. 875) points
out that “face is not invariant with respect to all situations” but is something bestowed by the group in those situations in which there are clear expectations for behavior. Rather than being relatively constant one should expect face-related sensitivity or concern to vary across situations; for example, face may be quite important in public situations relative to private or unimportant situations. Though these context effects exist, they cannot be captured by the current constructs in the literature. These individual difference variables can only be used to study general awareness, concern and consciousness of face (Bao et al. 2003; Chan et al. 2009; Leung and Chan 2003; Li and Su 2007).

The situational variability of face highlights the need for a face-related construct that can capture these context effects. To address this gap in the literature, the theory of face pressure focuses on developing a face-related construct that captures various aspects of face and is not limited to being a trait variable. Therefore, one contribution of this dissertation is to provide a theory that goes beyond trait-based variation to study intra-individual variations in the role that face plays in behavior.

Furthermore, none of the measures reviewed above capture the interdependence of face. A person’s actions not only affect his own face, but also that of important others. For example, an immoral act will also hurt the face of the parents and family of an individual. However, all the measures described above focus on the individual, with no incorporation of the role others play in face-related behavior. The inability to capture this influence is a significant limitation to understanding how face influences behavior. The inclusion of this interdependence in the theory of face pressure is another theoretical contribution of this research.
The Theory of Face Pressure

Motivator of Specific Behavior

Face pressure is defined as the behavior-specific influence of the repercussions of our actions on our face and the face of others important to us. As noted previously, even though face itself is granted by society, people have perceptions about their own face. It follows that people have beliefs about the impact of various actions on their face, and these beliefs apply a pressure on the decision-making process. This concept is similar to Johnson and Eagly’s (1989) idea of impression relevant involvement in which one becomes involved in a task because he is sensitive to social scrutiny. Similarly, the expectation of the positive or negative face-related evaluation that comes from engaging in a specific behavior exerts a pressure to act in a manner that will increase face or avoid losing it. Therefore, face pressure is based on a forecast of the face-related consequences of an action.

Until now, face has been treated as a chronic, trait-based construct. For example, an individual could fall anywhere from extremely to not very concerned for face in Chan’s CFF scale, but this level of concern would, in theory, hold across all situations. While there may be a chronic tendency for some people to be more concerned for or sensitive to face, this research has proposed that the influence of face on decision-making can vary, not just from person to person within a specific context, but also from context
to context for a specific individual. This first key aspect of the theory of face pressure differs from previous face-related conceptualizations because it is not attempting to study face sensitivity or concerns in general but rather fundamentally re-conceptualize it as a motivator of specific behavior. This conceptualization allows this construct to vary for an individual across various consumption contexts.

Since face is highly dependent on context, a new measure is needed that can examine the role of face in decision-making while maintaining the flexibility to do so in various contexts. The situational variability of face and face-related concerns as well as consumer researchers’ interests in understanding the determinants of specific consumer behaviors highlight the need for measures of face sensitivity that are situation specific. It follows that, if the interest is in predicting specific behaviors in particular situations, the face-related measure should also be specific to the behavior and situation of interest. Therefore, another contribution of this dissertation is to introduce a more specific measure of the face-related pressure on an individual in a specific consumer decision situation.

It has been argued (Ajzen and Fishbein 1977; Fishbein and Ajzen 1975) that if the objective is to predict behavior with psychological variables there is a need for high correspondence between the specificity of predictor and criterion variables. The behavioral prediction literature in psychology makes it clear that prediction of specific behaviors or intentions, as opposed to broad sets of behavioral tendencies, calls for predictor variables that are equally specific.
It has been shown, for example, that predictions of behavioral criteria are stronger when predictor and criterion variables are correspondent in terms of their specificity than when one variable (e.g., the predictor) is general and the criterion (e.g., behavioral intention) is specific (Ajzen and Fishbein 1977; Epstein 1979; Fishbein and Ajzen 1975). The research indicates that when one’s objective is to predict specific behaviors, specific predictors account for a higher percent of variance in the behavioral criterion when they are correspondent with the behavioral criterion than when they are not. General measures of predictor variables should predict general behavioral tendencies, but to predict a specific behavioral criterion a context specific measure of the predictor variable should be used. In other words, if the goal is to understand specific behaviors a specific measure is needed and that specific measure should be a more powerful predictor of behavior that a trait measure. Therefore, because face pressure is conceptualized as a motivator of specific behavior, it is hypothesized that

H1a: Face pressure will significantly predict specific behavior intentions in a specific consumer behavior or purchase context.

H1b: Face pressure will be a superior predictor of specific behavior intentions in a specific consumer behavior or purchase context when compared to trait-based face-related constructs.
In chapter 3, evidence is provided supporting both these hypotheses. Chapter 4 also provides experimental evidence that face pressure does predict behavioral intention more effectively than other trait-based measures. The method for the development of the face pressure scale is discussed in detail in chapter 3.

**Dual Motivations**

This new conceptualization of face suggests that there are two face-related motivational forces: the desire to gain more face and the desire to avoid the loss of face. Ho notes that “the opposite of gaining face…is distinguishable from what is called a ‘loss’ of face” (Ho 1976, p.871). Park and Guan (2009) also differentiate between positive and negative face threats and find that these threats lead to different behaviors. In other words, the Chinese differentiate between gaining and avoiding the loss of face and can behave differently depending on which dimension of face is currently salient or relevant. As Ho eloquently states, “Thus, face is not lost merely on account of a failure to gain it, but face must be protected from being lost precisely because of the demoralizing repercussions which otherwise follow” (p. 871).

This multi-dimensionality is not without precedent. Li and Su’s (2007) measure of face consumption, discussed in the section of previous face-related measurement had a multi-dimensional structure that distinguished between different facets of the role of face in consumption. Similarly, as reviewed earlier, Leung and Chan (2003) found four dimensions in their measure of face. There is also precedent for a multi-dimensional
structure that distinguishes between gains and losses. For example, prospect theory (Kahneman and Tversky 1979) argues that gains and losses have very different psychological effects. Moreover, there is considerable support in the attitude and cognitive psychology literature for models that separate positive and negative pressures to act. For example, Bagozzi (1996) and Burnkrant and Page (1988) showed that the cognitive dimensions underlying attitude to donate blood are represented as two separate dimensions – one comprised of positive beliefs and the other negative beliefs. The bivariate model of evaluative space (Cacioppo and Berntson 1994; Cacioppo et al. 1999) is based on a review of evidence of the separation of positive and negative dimensions on a variety of issues as well as physiological evidence that supports the separability and uniqueness of positive and negative reactions to stimuli.

Face pressure allows for differential behavioral effects of gaining and avoiding the loss of face, a distinction that is crucial to understanding face. This enables research to more accurately capture the manner in which face exerts a pressure on behavior and examine the conditions under which face pressure influences with behavior intention. Therefore, it is hypothesized that

H2: The face pressure construct will have a two-dimensional structure with one dimension measuring the motivation to gain face and the second dimension measuring the motivation to avoid the loss of face.
The studies in chapter 3 test this hypothesis, demonstrating that the measure developed does, in fact, have a two-dimensional structure hypothesized by the dual motivation aspect of the theory of face pressure.

*Interdependence*

Previous conceptualizations of face only focus on one’s personal face. However, one important aspect of face pressure can be traced to the interdependent nature of Chinese society. In Confucian cultures, an individual is not a solitary entity, but is rather defined by his relations: son, brother, father and coworker (Gao 1998; Ting-Toomey 1988; Ting-Toomey and Kurogi 1998). Because of the interdependent nature of Asian culture, perceptions of individuals are more influenced by others and society as a whole (Bao et al. 2003; Hwang 2006; Li and Su 2007).

This extends to the concept of face pressure. Not only do one’s actions and accomplishments affect one’s own face, they also reflect on closely related others, such as parents, family or friends. Granting an individual face also grants face to their relatives or superiors (Ho 1976). Most significantly, our actions can affect our parent’s face, but also our close family, ancestors, peer groups and other reference groups. For example, a student caught cheating would not just lose his or her own face but also the face of that student’s parents. The student’s behavior may even affect the face of the student body of the university he or she attends.
Therefore, when deciding how to act, one must not only consider the repercussions of these actions on their own face but also on the face of others in their social circles (Gao 1998; Joy 2001). Face pressure accounts for the personal effect while also capturing the interdependent nature of face discussed above.

Context Specificity

In important social situations, face may be lost by behavioral performance that does not meet expectations of acceptability and may be gained through accomplishments or superior performance. However, judgments can only be made about behaviors when there are expectations for behavior and when that behavior is or will become public knowledge. In order to compare actions to expectations, it is crucial that the behaviors being evaluated are of a social nature (Gao 1998; Ting-Toomey 1988). When purchasing a pillow for a private bedroom or an undershirt, the face-related implications of this decision are low and, therefore, not as likely to be considered as when purchasing a throw pillow for the living room or a dress shirt. Asians are also highly attuned to social appraisal making it easier for them to make predictions of the appraisals they will experience after engaging in any behavior (Chang and Holt 1994). Since Chinese consumers are attuned to when their actions will be evaluated, face exerts an influence on conspicuous consumption by creating a face-driven expectation of what one should consume based on the social situation, the social standing of the individual and the face-related implications of the consumption decision.
A major failing of previous conceptualizations of face is that they do not enable a researcher to study these context effects inherent in the role of face in decision-making. Therefore, another contribution of the theory of face pressure’s conceptualization is that, because it is context specific, context effects can be studied. It is possible to examine whether the same person will feel a greater pressure from face when giving a gift versus just purchasing a product for the self. This can be expanded to any other set of potential purchase / consumption contexts.

The theory of face pressure also enables study of what context effects moderate the influence of face pressure on behavior intention. For example, it is possible that face exerts little to no pressure in a private consumption context, while it exerts much more pressure when consumption is public. In fact, the theory of face pressure hypothesizes that this is exactly the case; however, it is not because consumption is either public or private but because these settings either create an expectation of social evaluation or do not. Put simply, if a person believes a certain purchase or consumption experience will be judged by another, then face pressure will be relevant; however, if there is no expectation of social judgment, face pressure will not influence behavior or purchase intention. Importantly, there is a subtle but important distinction between public / private and expectation of social evaluation. While these seem to go hand in hand, it is possible to create an expectation of social evaluation without specifying that the consumption will be public. For example, while two individuals are both making a public purchase, one may be more sensitive to social judgment. This person would have a higher expectation of social evaluation and, therefore, would likely be more influenced by face pressure than
the person less sensitive to social judgment. This distinction is critical and the theory of face pressure hypothesizes that it’s the expectation of social evaluation, and not privacy, which is the vital moderator of face pressure. Based on this, the theory of face pressure predicts that face pressure should only be a significant driver of behavior when there is an expectation of social evaluation of the purchase or consumption behavior. Therefore, it is hypothesized that

H3: Purchase intentions for prestige products will be greater in contexts with an expectation of social evaluation than in contexts with no expectation of social evaluation.

This hypothesis, in isolation, is not extremely novel; however, it is a necessary precursor to studying the role of face pressure plays in affecting purchase intention. The real contribution of this research comes from identifying the role that face pressure plays in this relationship between the context of consumption and purchase behavior. Therefore, it is hypothesized that

H4: Face pressure will be greater in contexts with an expectation of social evaluation than in contexts with no expectation of social evaluation.

H5: Face pressure will mediate the effect of the expectation of social evaluation on purchase intention.
Validating these context specific hypotheses that follow from theory of face pressure is the primary focus of chapter 4 and, in that chapter, study 7 examines the issue discussed above regarding the difference between an expectation of social evaluation and privacy.
Chapter 3: Scale Development and Validation

Introduction

The focus of chapter 3 is on developing and validating a scale that can be used to measure an individual’s face-related motivation in a consumption scenario. Because this measure is not an individual difference variable, but more like an expectancy value measure, the scale development was done using procedures developed in the attitude domain. Using in-depth interviews and exploratory surveys, a six-item measure of face pressure is developed (see Appendix A) that is consistent with the theory of face pressure. Then, over four studies, this measure is validated, and, in the process, evidence is provided to support the theory of face pressure.

Exploratory Research and Measure Development

To qualitatively validate the theory of face pressure and to develop a face pressure scale, in-depth interviews were conducted with a small number of native Asians (two males, three females) well versed in the concept of face. The sample ranged in age from
25-31 years and consisted of subjects that had spent the majority of their lives in Asia but had been in the US from one to five years.

Over a period of 60 – 90 minutes subjects had an in-depth discussion of face and face-related concerns. The interviewees showed consistency in their definition and descriptions of the role of face in consumption. The interviewees indicated that face is not important in all consumer decisions but primarily those that are public and involving. When asked to provide examples of such scenarios, interviewees listed events such as a weddings, work events or shopping trips. This discussion provided the basis for the consumption scenarios developed in studies 1 – 4. They also addressed differences between gaining and avoiding the loss of face and the fact that either one or both of these potential motivations may be salient, consistent with the dual motivation aspect of the theory of face pressure described in chapter 2. Finally, they stressed the importance of considering the effect that consumer decisions have, not just on their own face but also on the face of their parents and important others in their lives. The results of the interviews were consistent with the theoretical framework developed in the theory of face pressure and presented in chapter 2. Subjects’ responses also provided the basis for the development of a face pressure scale to measure the pressure exerted by face when considering a specific consumer decision.

Since the measure employed in this research is different from the general measures that have been previously studied, development of this construct was conducted in a manner more akin to an expectancy-value attitude rather than an individual difference variable, and the scale development procedure that was employed was also
consistent with the elicitation of modal beliefs procedure used in the attitude domain (e.g., Ajzen and Fishbein 1977; Sutton et al. 2003). Following the in-depth interviews, two exploratory studies were used to identify the salient face pressure referents (i.e. others whose face would be affected by an individual’s actions). The first exploratory survey was administered to a panel of Chinese students who spoke English as a second language (n = 80). In this survey, participants were asked to list all the potential individuals or groups whose face would be influenced by their actions. In the second exploratory survey, also administered to a panel of Chinese students with English as a second language, people were asked to evaluate the potential impact of their actions on a long list of potential referents that was derived from an analysis of the previous exploratory survey’s results. The data from this second survey revealed that a parent’s face was the most likely to be impacted by an individual’s actions. There were no other potential referents that were consistently believed to be impacted by an individual’s face. Some participants listed a spouse or co-workers, while others focused on extended family or peer groups. The results indicate that, while others may also be affected, the three people whose face is most likely to be affected by an individual’s actions are the individual themselves and the individual’s parents. To address this, the face pressure measure specifically measures the effect of an individual’s actions on his own face, his parent’s face, and then an unidentified group called “important others” which is included to capture other potentially relevant referents (spouses, peers, co-workers, extended family).
The in-depth interviews and exploratory studies supported three predictions developed in the theory of face pressure: first, the results from the in-depth interviews indicated that the prospect of both gaining and losing face would be salient supporting the dual motivation aspect of the theory of face pressure; second, the two exploratory surveys confirmed the interdependence of face and identified which individuals or referent groups (e.g., friends, parents, etc.) would be salient; third, from the in-depth interviews, it was evident that face was situationally relevant. Responses by the interviewees identified various public and important consumption contexts in which decisions would likely be influenced by face pressure. These critical aspects of face pressure were incorporated in the development of the face pressure scale (see Appendix A for the specific items) and consumption contexts used in studies 1 - 4.

The nature of the measure provides the flexibility to study various behaviors in various contexts, therefore enabling study of the context specificity of face pressure. In sum, results from in-depth interviews and exploratory surveys supported the theory of face pressure developed in chapter 2; specifically its role as a motivator of behavior, its multi-dimensionality, and its interdependence. This exploratory work also provided the basis for the face pressure scale that can be used to explore the role of face in decision-making.
Overview of Studies

The next four studies empirically verify the theoretical framework developed in theory of face pressure above and validate the face pressure scale. In study 1, the two-dimensional structure of the face pressure scale is validated and results support the hypothesis, H1a, that face pressure does predict consumption decisions. In studies 2 and 3, these initial results are replicated using different consumption contexts. Studies 2 and 3 also demonstrate the convergent, discriminant. Finally, these two studies also demonstrate face pressure’s ability to predict specific behavior better than other trait-based constructs. Study 4 examines the role of face pressure in the Theory of Reasoned Action decision-model, finding it to be an omitted variable, distinct from both attitude and subjective norm.

Study 1

The purpose of the study 1 was to test hypotheses H1a and H2. H1a states that face pressure will predict behavior intention and H2 states that face pressure will have a two-dimensional structure that separates the motivation to gain face from the motivation to avoid the loss of face. Results from this study indicate that all six items developed in the exploratory research are relevant and form a two-dimensional construct as theorized. They also reveal that these dimensions are significant predictors of behavior intention.
Method

A survey, in English, was distributed to a sample of English speaking undergraduate Chinese students from a Chinese university (n = 289). In this survey, the two key items being measured were behavior intention and the face pressure construct. Subjects were given a questionnaire in a classroom setting in which they were exposed to the wedding scenario (Appendix B, wedding scenario). In this scenario, inspired by the in-depth interviews, participants were asked to imagine they were going to a family wedding party and needed to wear a suit / dress to this event. They were then asked to respond to three behavioral intention questions regarding subjects’ intention to buy a new suit / dress for the occasion (“How likely are you to buy a new suit / dress?” Likely / Unlikely. “How probable is it that you will buy a new suit / dress?” Probable / Improbable. “I will buy a new suit / dress.” Agree / Disagree). These were followed by the six-item face pressure measure (see table 1). The face pressure items were adapted to match the context (e.g. “My buying a new suit / dress to the party will cause me to gain face.” “My wearing a new suit / dress to the party will cause my parents to gain face.” “My wearing a new suit / dress to the party will keep those who are important to me from losing face”). Participants first saw the intention questions in a random order. After completing the intention questions, all other questions were presented in a randomized order. All questions, unless noted in table 1, were measured using seven-point agree-disagree scales where 1 was “strongly disagree” and 7 was “strongly agree.”
Results and Discussion

Multi-dimensional Structure. One objective of study 1 was to demonstrate the two-dimensional structure of face pressure construct. To accomplish this a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted on a baseline, one-dimensional, model in which all six items in the face pressure scale load on a single face pressure dimension (figure 1, Panel A; Chi Sq=92.53, df=9, RMSEA=.180, NFI=.84, NNFI=.76, CFI=.85, GFI=.90). The fit of this one-dimensional model is then compared with the proposed two-dimensional model that distinguishes between gaining and avoiding the loss of face. Specifically, the first three items in the face pressure scale were modeled to load onto the “Face Pressure – Gain” dimension while the last three items loaded onto the “Face Pressure – Avoid Loss” dimension. The results of a CFA found that the two-dimensional model that separates gaining face from avoiding loss of face (figure 1, Panel B; Chi Sq=41.39, df=8, RMSEA=.120, NFI=.93, NNFI=.90, CFI=.94, GFI=.95) provides a better fit to the data than the one factor model. A Chi squared goodness-of-fit test reveals that the difference in fit between the two dimensional model and the one dimensional model is significant (Chi sq = 51.14, df=1, p<.001) providing evidence that face pressure conforms to a two-dimensional structure in which gaining face and avoid loss of face are distinct but correlated constructs (r=.57), supporting hypothesis H2.

Though the RMSEA value of this model is greater than the rule-of-thumb cutoff of .1, this is to be expected in small models with so few degrees of freedom and large sample size (Little 2013). In structural equation modeling, the degrees of freedom are...
driven by the number of elements in the variance-covariance matrix and the number of parameters estimated, not the number of participants (see Rigdon 1994 for exact calculations and examples). One method to provide a better test of the model fit is to expand the model to include other constructs, thereby providing more degrees of freedom. This has been done in the behavior intentions analysis that follows, demonstrating that these models, do, in fact, provide satisfactory levels of fit.

Behavior Intentions. To test hypothesis H1a, whether face pressure exerts a pressure on behavior, a model was fit (see figure 2) using the two dimensions of face pressure as predictors of behavioral intention (Chi Sq = 70.78, df = 24, RMSEA = .082, NFI = .94, NNFI = .93, CFI = .96, GFI = .95). This model found both dimensions of face pressure to have significant causal paths to behavior intention, supporting hypothesis H1a. This model also provides evidence supporting the hypothesis H2 which states that gaining and avoiding the loss of face are separable motivations. Specifically, it is seen that, for this scenario, gaining face exerts more pressure on behavior intentions than avoiding the loss of face (gaining face = .31, avoiding loss = .16) and, based on parameter estimate confidence intervals, this difference is significant, p< .05.

Study 1 provides initial evidence that face pressure is two-dimensional and predictive of intention. H1a states that face pressure will predict behavior intentions. Support for this hypothesis is seen in the significant causal path coefficients from both dimensions of face pressure to intention. H2 hypothesizes that the structure of face pressure, based on the dual motivation aspects of the theory of face pressure, will be two-dimensional. A CFA confirmed that a two-dimensional structure provides the best fit,
supporting H2. In the following 2 studies, these results will be replicated, while also providing evidence of the convergent, discriminant and predictive validity of the face pressure scale as well as its generalizability across consumption contexts.

Study 2

Studies 2 and 3 have many goals. The first goal is to replicate the two key results from study 1: the dimensionality of the face pressure measure and its predictive capability. Second, these studies aim to expand on previous results by also examining the convergent and discriminant validity of the face pressure measure. By including previously used measures, it is possible to test hypothesis H1b that face pressure will be a superior predictor of behavior intentions than trait-based constructs. Finally, study 3 uses a different consumption context to ensure the generalizability of the results across contexts.

In study 2, to examine the convergent and discriminant validity of the face pressure construct a previously described face measure (i.e., Li and Su’s face consumption scale, 2007) and a measure of a different but related construct, status (i.e., Eastman et al.’s status scale 1997) were included. The face consumption scale was used because of its focus on face and consumption behavior and because it was based on previous face-related constructs (Bao et al. 2003). The status scale enabled comparison to a construct that has frequently been confounded in the literature with face (Ho 1976).
Status less explicitly measures social influence, allowing us to compare face pressure to a measure that is socially relevant but not a direct measure of face.

Method

A survey, in English, was distributed to a sample of English speaking undergraduate Chinese students from a Chinese university (n = 362). In this survey, the key items being measured were face pressure and behavior intention. Participants were also asked to complete the Li and Su (2007) face consumption scale which consisted of nine statements and Eastman et al.’s (1997) status scale that consisted of five statements (see table 2). Subjects were given a questionnaire in a classroom setting in which they were exposed to the wedding scenario (see Appendix B, wedding scenario) and then asked to respond to behavioral intention questions regarding subjects’ intention to buy a new suit / dress for the occasion (e.g. “How likely are you to buy a new suit / dress?” Extremely Likely / Extremely Unlikely. “How probable is it that you will buy a new suit / dress?” Extremely Probable / Extremely Improbable. “I will buy a new suit / dress” Strongly Agree / Strongly Disagree). These items were followed by items measuring face pressure that adapted the scale in appendix A to specifically match the consumption context (e.g., “My buying a new suit / dress to the party will cause me to gain face.” “My wearing a new suit / dress to the party will cause my parents to gain face.” “My wearing a new suit / dress to the party will keep those who are important to me from losing face”). In other words, the phrase “behavior X” was replaced with the focal consumption
behavior. As noted above, status (e.g., “I am interested in new products with status.” “I would buy a product just because it has status.” “I would pay more for a product if it had status.”) and face consumption (e.g., “It is important that others like the products and brands I buy.” “It does not matter what friends think of different brands or products before I purchase a product.” “Sometimes I buy a product because my friends do so.”) were also measured. The presentation order of these constructs was randomized and all items measuring each construct were randomized as well. All questions, unless noted in table 2, were measured using seven-point agree-disagree scales where 1 was “strongly disagree” and 7 was “strongly agree.”

Results and Discussion

Multi-dimensional Structure. One objective of this study was to replicate the results from study 1. Therefore, a baseline, one-dimensional model, where all six face pressure items loaded onto one construct, was tested and found to provide a relatively weak fit (Chi Sq = 340.88, df = 9, RMSEA = .32, NFI = .76, NNFI = .60, CFI = .76, GFI = .76). The results of a CFA found that a two-dimensional model that separates gaining face from avoiding loss of face improves fit (Chi Sq = 144.60, df = 8, RMSEA = .217, NFI = .90, NNFI = .82, CFI = .90, GFI = .88; see fig 3). A Chi square goodness-of-fit test was used to determine whether the improvement in fit provided by the two-dimensional model is significant, and, as expected, the two dimensional model is found to provide a better fit (Chi sq = 196.28, df = 1, p < .001) to the data than the baseline model,
supporting H2. These results show that, for Chinese consumers, face pressure has a two-dimensional structure in which gaining face and avoid loss of face are distinct but correlated constructs (r = .65).

Though the RMSEA value of even this improved model is not below the .1 rule-of-thumb, as noted in study 1, this is to be expected in models which so few degrees of freedom (Little 2013). This concern is allayed in the following models which add the status and face consumption constructs to the model, thereby, providing more degrees of freedom.

Convergent and Discriminant Validity. To provide evidence of convergent and discriminant validity, consistent with Anderson and Gerbing (1988), a structural model (see figure 4) that included the two-dimensional face pressure construct, Li and Su’s (2007) face consumption scale and Eastman et al.’s (1997) status scale in addition to behavior intention was examined (Chi Sq=713.66, df=220, RMSEA=.079, NFI=.88, NNFI=.90, CFI=.92, GFI=.85). Overall, this model, as expected with its increased degrees of freedom, demonstrates improved model fit. Both dimensions of face pressure correlate significantly with Li and Su’s measure of face consumption (r_FPGain = .32, t(360) = 6.41, p < .001; r_FPAccess = .19, t(360) = 3.67, p < .001). This, in conjunction with the previously noted stronger correlation between face pressure’s dimensions (r = .65), provides support for convergent validity (r_FP_gain,FP_avoid vs. r_FP_gain, face consumption, Steiger’s Z = 8.77, p < .001; r_FP_gain,FP_avoid vs. r_FP_avoid, face consumption, Steiger’s Z = 6.13, p < .001). Furthermore, the correlations between face pressure and face consumption are higher than correlations with a related but different measure (i.e.,
Eastman et al.’s status scale, $r_{FPGain} = .19$, $r_{FPAvoidLoss} = .01$; see figure 4) and this provides support for the scale’s discriminant validity ($r_{fp_gain, status} vs. r_{fp_gain, face consumption}$, Steiger’s $Z = 3.36, p < .001$; $r_{status, fp_avoid} vs. r_{fp_avoid, face consumption}$, Steiger’s $Z = 4.50, p < .001$).

**Behavior Intention.** The final goal of study 2 was to provide empirical support for hypothesis H1b that face pressure will exhibit higher correlation with behavioral intentions than previous face-related measures. As expected, both gaining face and avoiding loss of face are significant predictors of behavioral intention (gaining face = .48, avoiding loss = .23; see figure 4). In the case of this behavior, the prospect of gaining face is a stronger predictor than losing face and the fact that the correlations differ in magnitude provides further support for the difference between the two dimensions ($r_{fp_gain, bi} vs. r_{fp_avoid, bi}$, Steiger’s $Z = 6.15, p < .001$). The model also shows that both face pressure dimensions are stronger predictors of intention than either face consumption or status ($r_{face consumption, bi} = .13$, $r_{status, bi} = .07$; $r_{fp_gain, bi} vs. r_{face consumption, bi}$, Steiger’s $Z = 6.11, p < .001$; $r_{fp_gain, bi} vs. r_{status, bi}$, Steiger’s $Z = 6.51, p < .001$; $r_{fp_avoid, bi} vs. r_{face consumption, bi}$, Steiger’s $Z = 1.52, p < .07$; $r_{fp_avoid, bi} vs. r_{status, bi}$, Steiger’s $Z = 2.19, p < .05$). The fact that the face pressure dimensions are stronger predictors of intention than face consumption provides support for H1b and suggests that a specific motivation-based measure of face pressure that captures the interdependent and multi-dimensional nature of face is a stronger predictor of behavioral intentions than the more traditional trait based measures of face.
In study 2, a CFA confirmed the two-dimensional structure of face pressure, supporting H2. Including two other measures, face consumption and status, allowed a model to be developed that tested H1b, the superior predictive power of face pressure. Results from this model found that both the pressure to gain face and to avoid its loss had significantly higher causal path coefficients to behavior intention than all other measures, providing strong support for H1b, the value of the face pressure scale and the conceptualization of face as a motivator of specific behavior.

Study 3

The goal of study 3 is to provide supporting evidence for the results obtained from study 2; but, by using a new consumption context and different comparison variables, study 3 also demonstrates the generalizability of the face pressure measure. Study 3 follows the same procedure used in study 2 but uses a different consumption behavior scenario. The new scenario describes a much less formal situation than the wedding scenario – a shopping trip with a group of close friends in which the friends buy a new pair of jeans (see Appendix B, shopping scenario). According to the in-depth interviews, the social nature of the situation and the friends’ behavior will make face pressure relevant. Again, two face sensitivity constructs (Li and Su’s face consumption (2007) and Chan et al.’s (2009) concern for face, CFF) were measured in addition to face pressure. This time, CFF (e.g., “I care about praise and criticism from others.” “I care about others’ attitudes toward me.” “I hate being taken lightly.”) was used because it was a very recent
face-related measure that has shown consistent effects across cultures and individuals. Susceptibility to interpersonal influence (SUCSEP; Bearden et al. 1989) was also included as a measure of social influence that was not a measure of face but still differed from subjective norm (e.g., “I often consult other people to help choose the best alternative available from a product class.” “If I want to be like someone, I often try to buy the same brands that they buy.” “It is important that others like the products and brands I buy.”). It is expected that previous results on predictive validity, namely, that the two factor face pressure scale is a stronger predictor of behavior intention than the other measures of face sensitivity will be replicated.

Method

A survey was distributed to a sample of Chinese students (n = 277) that spoke English as a second language. The questionnaire began with the scenario similar to earlier studies (see Appendix B, shopping scenario). Following exposure to the scenario, participants were asked for their intention to buy the jeans. Face pressure, face consumption, concern for face, and SUCSEP were then measured (see table 3). The face pressure measure was altered to match the context (e.g. “My buying the new, trendy jeans will cause me to gain face.” “My buying a pair of the new, trendy jeans will cause my parents to gain face.” “My buying a pair of the new, trendy jeans will cause those who are important to me to gain face.”). The order of all constructs and all items within a construct were randomized, similar to earlier studies. All questions, unless noted in table
3, were measured using seven-point agree-disagree scales where 1 was “strongly disagree” and 7 was “strongly agree.”

Results and Discussion

Multi-dimensional Structure. The results of a CFA found that a two-dimensional model that separates gaining face from avoiding loss of face fits better than a one-dimensional model (Two-Dimensions: Chi Sq = 87.84, df = 8, RMSEA = .190, NFI = .92, NNFI = .86, CFI = .92, GFI = .90 vs. One Dimension: Chi Sq = 120.01, df = 9, RMSEA = .21, NFI = .88, NNFI = .82, CFI = .89, GFI = .87; see fig 3). A Chi square goodness-of-fit test shows that the two-dimensional model provides a better fit (Chi sq=32.17, df=1, p< .001) than the single factor baseline model, replicating the results of previous studies and providing more support for H2. Again, concern for the high RMSEA values in these models is allayed by the larger models used to test validity.

Convergent and Discriminant Validity. To examine convergent and discriminant validity, consistent with Anderson and Gerbing (1988), a structural model (see figure 5) was examined that included face pressure, face consumption, CFF and SUSCEP as predictors of behavioral intention (Chi Sq = 1337.50, df = 579, RMSEA = .069, NFI = .86, NNFI = .91, CFI = .92, GFI = .86). Both dimensions of the face pressure construct correlate significantly with face consumption ($r_{fp\_Gain, face\_consumption} = .54$, $t(275) = 10.64$, p < .001; $r_{fp\_avoid, face\_consumption} = .45$, $t(275) = 8.36$, p < .001). These levels of correlation between face consumption and each of the face pressure dimensions are significantly
lower than the correlation between the two dimensions of face pressure ($r_{fp\_gain,fp\_avoid}$ vs. $r_{fp\_gain, face\ consumption}$, Steiger’s Z = 6.54, $p < .001$; $r_{fp\_gain,fp\_avoid}$ vs. $r_{fp\_avoid, face\ consumption}$, Steiger’s Z = 8.83, $p < .001$), providing support for the discriminant validity of the face pressure scale. With CFF, lower levels of correlation ($r_{fp\_Gain, CFF} = .20$, $r_{fp\_avoid, CFF} = .12$) than even the correlation between the dimensions of face pressure and face consumption ($r_{fp\_gain, face\ consumption}$ vs. $r_{fp\_gain, CFF}$, Steiger’s Z = 6.84, $p < .001$; $r_{fp\_avoid, face\ consumption}$ vs. $r_{fp\_avoid, CFF}$, Steiger’s Z = 6.33, $p < .001$) are found. Given that CFF assesses individual differences in concern for face rather than the face-related pressure facing the consumer in a specific consumption situation, it is not surprising to see these lower correlations. A CFA of the SUCSEP measure found the expected two factor solution. However, to make the interpretation and understanding of the construct relationships simpler, it was used as a one dimensional construct, where all the items were summed to create one SUCSEP score. Analysis using both dimensions separately provided no greater insight and yield similar conclusions as to the validity of face pressure. There is only moderate correlation with SUSCEP ($r_{fp\_gain, SUCSEP} = .42$, $r_{fp\_avoid, SUCSEP} = .35$), which lends more support to the belief that face pressure is different from interpersonal influence but still a social phenomenon. In all, the face pressure dimensions correlated more highly with each other ($r_{fp\_gain,fp\_avoid} = .80$) than any other constructs, but still demonstrated enough of a correlation with these other constructs to support its relevance as a social construct. These relationships, therefore, indicate that face pressure again demonstrates convergent and discriminant validity.
**Behavior Intention.** Again, as in previous studies, face pressure predicts behavioral intention, \((r_{fp\_gain, bi} = .52, r_{fp\_avoid, bi} = .33)\), supporting H1a, and gaining face exerts more pressure on behavior intentions than avoiding the loss of face \((r_{fp\_gain, bi} vs. r_{fp\_avoid, bi}, \text{ Steiger's Z} = 5.57, p < .001; \text{ see figure 5})\). The results also show, as in the prior studies, that the gain dimension of the face pressure construct is a stronger predictor of behavioral intention than any of the previously published face-related scales employed in this research \((r_{face\_consumption, bi} = .37, r_{fp\_gain, bi} vs. r_{face\_consumption, bi}: \text{ Steiger's Z} = 2.98, p < .001; r_{CFF, bi} = .20, r_{fp\_gain, bi} vs. r_{CFF, bi}: \text{ Steiger's Z} = 4.67, p < .001; r_{SUCSEP, bi} = .25, r_{fp\_gain, bi} vs. r_{SUCSEP, bi}: \text{ Steiger's Z} = 4.64, p < .001)\). In this study, the loss avoidance dimension of face pressure did not correlate significantly more than the face consumption measure, only marginally more than SUCSEP \((r_{fp\_avoid, bi} vs. r_{SUCSEP, bi}: \text{ Steiger's Z} = 1.23, p < .11)\) and significantly higher than CFF \((r_{fp\_avoid, bi} vs. r_{CFF, bi}: \text{ Steiger's Z} = 1.71, p < .05)\). Therefore, in study 3, hypothesis H1b only received partial support.

In general, the results from study 3 support the theory of face pressure and replicate the results from the previous two studies. More support for H2 is seen through the CFA models. Again, face pressure is found to be a significant predictor of behavior intention; however the motivation to avoid face loss did not have a significantly larger causal path coefficient than face consumption. Though, in isolation, this result is not supportive of H1b, if both dimensions of face pressure are considered, there is overall support for H1b. Moreover, because there are two face-related motivations, it is possible that in different contexts one of these motivations is stronger. In the first three studies the
motivation to gain face was greater; however, the opposite may be possible. This possibility is discussed in the general discussion of chapter 3 and explored in study 8.

Study 4

Having already established the validity of the face pressure construct, study 4 expands the scope of the problem to examine the role of face pressure in the Theory of Reasoned Action model for Chinese consumers. Below is a brief review this model, but for a detailed explanation see Ajzen and Fishbein (1980).

The Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) is one of the more comprehensive and thoroughly researched models employed to explain consumers’ decisions (e.g. condom use [Albarracin et al. 2001, blood donation [Burnkrant and Page 1988], hearing aid use [Burnkrant et al. 1991]). Over the years, it has also been used to examine consumer behaviors related to automobiles, banking, coupons, and soft drinks (Lutz 1977; Ryan and Bonfield 1980; Sheppard et al. 1988; Shimp and Kavas 1984).

This model holds that behavior intention is a function of two, and only two, variables – an attitude toward the behavior and subjective norm (Ajzen and Fishbein 1980). Attitude toward the behavior (Att_b) is defined as the general feeling of favorableness toward performing the considered behavior and is determined by the salient beliefs about the consequences (b_i) of the behavior and the relative evaluation of these consequences (e_i). Subjective norm (SN) is a person’s belief about whether most people important to the individual think he should or should not perform the considered
behavior. It is defined by what specific referents think about his performing this behavior (NB) and his motivation to comply to their wants (MC). In other words, when considering a behavior, people consider whether important others think they should engage in the behavior, and use this information in their decision-making model. The algebraic model of the TRA is $B \sim BI = w1 (Att_b) + w2 (SN)$, where $B =$ actual behavior, $BI =$ behavior intention, $Att_b =$ the attitude to the behavior and $SN =$ the subjective norm. The weights, $w1$ and $w2$ are regression coefficients which determine the influence of each component of this model on behavior intention (see figure 6).

Ajzen and Fishbein argue that any variable external to their model only influences intention and behavior through its effect on either attitudes or subjective norm (Ajzen and Fishbein 1980). According to Azjen and Fishbein, many variables may influence behavior intentions; however, none of these variables have a direct impact on intention. Rather, they contend that the influence of these variables is indirect and mediated by either attitudes, subjective norm, or both. Research examining the validity of this claim has been mixed; some research has found possible missing components, while others have supported the TRA model (Bagozzi et al. 1992; Fitzmaurice 2005). On the whole, however, the TRA has proven to be reliable; in fact, a meta-analysis of the research using the TRA model found that, while there were varied and sometimes inappropriate uses of the model, it remained extremely robust in predicting behavior intentions (Sheppard et al. 1988).

Even with the multitude of TRA related papers, an issue that has received minimal attention is the validity of the TRA model in other cultures. As noted by Bagozzi
et al. (2000), there is a “conspicuous lack of discussion on cross-cultural applications in basic attitude texts and in cross-cultural psychology books.” Only a few studies have attempted to examine the TRA model across culture (e.g., Bagozzi et al. 2000; Cheng and Ng 2006; Lee and Green 1991). Findings from these studies indicate that, in Chinese culture, subjective norm was more influential than in American culture, which the authors hypothesize is due to the collectivistic nature of Chinese culture (Bagozzi et al. 2000). Furthermore, the TRA model did not do as good a job explaining variance for Chinese consumers as it did for western consumers (Bagozzi et al. 2000; Lee and Green 1991). Taken together, these results imply that the TRA model is missing something critical to understanding Chinese decision-making and that social influence is very important in this process. The theory of face pressure suggests that part of this additional social influence is driven by face pressure and that face pressure will prove to be an omitted variable in the TRA model of Chinese behavior intention.

As discussed earlier, face pressure is a different social phenomenon than SN. SN is focused on what others want an individual to do while face pressure focuses on how an individual’s actions affect themselves and others. Because of the role of face in the fabric of society, Chinese will also be extremely familiar with and sensitive of face and face-related appraisals and rely on these appraisals for their own view of themselves and beliefs. Given face pressure’s unique position as a forecast of a social phenomenon, it is expected that Chinese consumers’ decision-making models will differentiate between subjective norm and face pressure. It is also expected that face pressure will be more highly correlated with attitude than SN because of this internalization.
Method

For this study, a third consumption scenario was developed, while still ensuring that it would allow for face-related concerns to exert a pressure on decision-making (see Appendix B, holiday party). In this scenario, participants were told they were in charge of organizing a work holiday party. They were told they needed to pick a restaurant for the events and had to decide between a family friendly and an upscale and elegant restaurant. The survey was distributed to a sample of Chinese students (n = 245) that spoke English as a second language. The questionnaire began with the scenario as in the earlier studies. Following exposure to the scenario, participants were asked for their intention to plan the party at the elegant restaurant. After this, face pressure, SN, and Att_b were all measured (see table 4). The face pressure measure was altered to match the context (e.g. “My making the reservation at the upscale and elegant restaurant will cause me to gain face”). Exploratory surveys were used to ascertain the relevant referents for the SN items. The presentation of each construct was randomized and the items comprising each construct were also randomized. All questions, unless noted in table 4, were measured using seven-point agree / disagree items, where 1 was “strongly disagree” and 7 was “strongly agree.”
Results and Discussion

Behavior Intention. As a number of previous studies have focused on the face pressure measure itself, the results reported below focus primarily on the role of face pressure in the TRA model. The standard TRA model results in a worse fit (Chi Sq = 399.68, df = 131, RMSEA = .092, NFI = .74, NNFI = .74, CFI = .77, GFI = .85) when compared to a model that includes face pressure as a third component (Chi Sq = 354.25, df = 129, RMSEA = .058, NFI = .91, NNFI = .92, CFI = .95, GFI = .86; see figure 7), providing strong evidence that face pressure is an omitted variable in the TRA model, supporting the argument that face is important in Chinese consumer behavior and provides one potential explanation for the poor fit of behavioral decision-making models to eastern consumers. It also provides more evidence supporting H1a, finding that face pressure even predicts behavior intention when controlling for other well-established drivers of behavior.

One other result from this model deserves attention. The main reason people select the elegant restaurant is not because of their personal attitude toward the restaurant but because of the social pressure (r_attitude = -.67). This negative correlation indicates that those who were more likely to pick the upscale restaurant had less strongly positive attitudes towards the upscale restaurant as well. In fact, those who liked it the least felt the most pressure to pick the upscale restaurant. Therefore, the key drivers of their decisions were of a social nature. This coincides with the results from Bagozzi et al.
(2000) and Lee and Green (1991), who found that social influences were significantly more influential in Chinese TRA models than in western TRA models.

General Discussion

Across four studies, chapter 3 identifies the role of face pressure in Chinese consumer decision-making and provides empirical insight into the importance of face. It validates the theory of face pressure which conceptualizes face as a motivator of specific behavior. Chapter 3 develops a context specific construct, face pressure, which can be used to explain behavioral intentions while accounting for context effects, a critical aspect of face that has been ignored by previous face-related measures. It captures the interdependent nature of face, demonstrating that consumers consider how their actions will affect, not just their own face, but the face of others as well. It also supports the notion that face pressure is multi-dimensional by finding that gaining and avoiding the loss of face can both exert pressure on behavior intentions, but that both are needed to fully understand the role of face pressure. In the process, it is discovered that, for Chinese consumers, face pressure is an omitted variable in the TRA model, and one that needs to be included to fully understand how these consumers make consumption decisions.

Over the four studies, a differential influence of the two dimensions of face pressure was found. Specifically, gaining face was more highly correlated with behavior intention than avoiding the loss of face. This is interesting, and somewhat surprising, because, generally, Asian consumers have been shown to be more prevention oriented
than promotion oriented (Lee, Aaker and Gardener 2000; Lee, Keller and Sternthal 2010). However, these results are likely due to the difference in the cost of “doing the wrong thing” in each situation. Presumably, people have socially acceptable suits and jeans, so, while buying a new suit or a trendy pair of jeans is desirable and can improve one’s face, there was no risk of being socially unacceptable and losing face. Similarly, when picking a restaurant, while the family style restaurant might not be classy enough, there was no indication that it was subpar and, thereby, a reason to lose face. However, if the other behavioral options were unsatisfactory, it is expected that the pressure to avoid the loss of face would be more influential. This is explicitly examined in study 8 of chapter 4. In study 8, participants were told that their old suit was ill-fitting, damaged and horribly out of style and this caused the motivation to avoid face loss to be more influential in the decision-making process than motivation to gain face.

The studies in this chapter are limited by their cross-sectional nature. Causality cannot be confidently proclaimed without some form of temporal separation or experimental manipulation. While temporal separation of the individual difference variables from the consumption scenario is difficult, the lack of this separation should not be a significant concern. If the consumption scenarios are influencing all the measured constructs, it should do so in a way that would work against these results. A “halo effect” of behavior intention should influence all variables, not just the face pressure items. Yet, even without this separation, it was found that face pressure is a better predictor of behavior intention than any other measure. However, causality can be more confidently proclaimed with some form of experimental manipulation. In chapter 4, to address this
issue, the focal product is manipulated, making causal statements between the manipulation and preferences possible. Results from chapter 4 will show that only face pressure and product preference were affected by the expectation of social evaluation and allow for stronger claims about the value of face pressure over other measures to be made.

The scenarios that were selected for examination in chapter 3 were also primarily public and involving. These attributes of the scenarios were intentionally selected to ensure that face would play a crucial role in the decision-making process allowing or the examination of the face pressure scale and testing of the theory of face pressure. However, in chapter 4, it is demonstrated that face is indeed context specific and that face pressure, unlike previous general measures, captures this specificity. The ability of the new face pressure construct to both understand behavior and account for context is critical to understanding face, Chinese consumers and global marketing strategy.
Chapter 4: Examining Context Specificity

Introduction

Chapter 3 and its studies focused on understanding the structure of the face pressure construct, verifying the multi-dimensional and interdependent nature of face pressure and validating the 6-item measure of face pressure. Yet, the theory of face pressure also discusses the importance of context to face pressure; namely, face should only exert an influence on intentions in situations where the decision or behavior comes with an expectation of social evaluation. For example, one will be very careful to buy name brands when giving a gift, in part due to the face pressure of the situation (Chan et al. 2003). To this point, all the studies have used consumption contexts where this is an expectation of social evaluation, enabling an examination the face pressure construct itself. However, in chapter 4, the consumption experience is explicitly manipulated to study the role that context plays on the face pressure-purchase intention relationship. Doing this empirically supports the context specificity aspect of the theory of face pressure and will provide evidence to support hypotheses H3, H4 and H5, which all address the importance of the expectation of social evaluation.
Studies 5 and 6 demonstrate that face pressure has a significantly stronger influence on purchase intention and preference when there is public consumption context and, therefore, an expectation of social evaluation. Specifically, study 5 finds that the relative preference for a prestige product increases when the expectation of social evaluation exists, providing support for H3. Study 5 also includes two trait-based measures enabling a comparison of the relative ability to predict behavior intention across contexts of face pressure and these trait measures. A mediation analysis demonstrates that this context effect cannot be captured by previous general measures of face providing more evidence supporting H1b, which states that face pressure will be a superior predictor of a specific behavior in a specific context than a trait-based measure.

Study 6 looks at situations of high or low expectation of social evaluation, but studies absolute purchase intentions (not relative) for a product which is advertised as either high or low in prestige. This study builds the previous research by identifying the influence that advertising messages can have on face pressure. Results from study 6 indicate that advertising the social value of a product can be effective in increasing the face pressure to buy this product and, thereby, driving purchase intention.

Study 7 further examines the influence that advertising messages can have on face pressure. In study 7, rather than manipulating the context of consumption, the advertisement itself is manipulated to subtly make social evaluation salient. This operationalization is important because it teases apart the expectation of social evaluation from the visibility of the product, an issue discussed in chapter 2. Study 7 discovers that it is possible for an advertisement itself to create a high expectation of social evaluation.
This result suggests that face-related advertising does not need an external source to increase face pressure, but can do so itself, and, in doing so, can make its messaging more effective at driving purchase intention.

Study 5

The goal of study 5 is to experimentally demonstrate the importance of context in the role of face and the ability of face pressure to capture this context effect. As discussed in chapter 2, it is hypothesized that the main reason public contexts are rife with face pressure is because of the expectation of social judgment. In this study, this expectation of social judgment is manipulated by the visibility of the consumption experience.

To study the context specific nature of face pressure, we draw on literature addressing the role of social influence on product purchase. Generally, social influences affect necessity and luxury purchases in different ways (Smith and Mackie 2007). If a product is a luxury, public consumption can influence both the likelihood of purchase and the brand purchased (Bearden and Etzel 1982). A luxury purchase is more likely when there is public consumption because this purchase suggests affluence or prestige. More importantly, if a luxury product is purchased, it is likely that the brand purchased will be a well-known, high-end brand. This is because one purpose of luxury products is to demonstrate a level of sophistication and this is, generally, only achieved by purchasing the best possible brand in the product category (Smith and Mackie 2007). This suggests that, for luxury products, there are two aspects of the decision process that can be
influenced by face. On the other hand, a necessity, by definition, is a product that one needs, eliminating the decision of whether to buy. However, it is still possible to demonstrate social status or prestige through the brand purchased. This allows the focus to be solely on the brand decision and make is possible to isolate the role of public consumption on face pressure. If a product is a necessity and consumed in private, face pressure, should play a minimal role. However, if this product is consumed in public, then face pressure should influence the brand purchased. A study by Childers and Rao (1992) discovered that this framework applied to social influence in Thailand, giving us confidence that it is applicable to the Chinese consumer as well.

Method

A survey was distributed to a sample of first year undergraduate students in the US who were of Chinese citizenship (n = 79). Consistent with the studies in chapter 3, relative behavior intention, face pressure, face consumption, CFF and SN were all measured. The behavior intention items were operationalized as relative product preference between a more expensive and less expensive product (e.g. “How likely are you to buy the more expensive product?” Likely / Unlikely. “What are the chances you will buy the less expensive product?” Likely / Unlikely). These items intentionally did not indicate which would be of higher face value, but the general inference that consumers will make is that the more expensive brand will result in a more positive face outcome. The face pressure items were also adapted to match the context (e.g.
“My buying the more expensive product will cause me to gain face”). The other constructs were all measured in the same way as previous studies. Again, the presentation order of all constructs was randomized and all items measuring each construct were randomized as well. All questions were measured using seven-point agree-disagree or likely-unlikely scales where 1 was “strongly disagree” and 7 was “strongly agree.”

The key difference in this study from those in chapter 3 was that the consumption context was manipulated to be either more or less public (see Appendix B, public vs. private). In the private condition, participants were told that they were buying socks to wear inside ski boots, while in the public condition they were told they were buying these socks for use at the gym. Wearing socks inside ski boots should be private consumption because these socks will not be seen while skiing; however, wearing socks at the gym, with shorts, makes it very likely they will be seen by those on the treadmill next to you. Therefore, study 3 is a 2-cell experiment where product privacy is manipulated to be either public or private. To verify that the gym context was considered more public than the skiing context, participants were asked to evaluate the consumption context on a 7-point semantic differential scale with endpoints ‘extremely public’ and ‘extremely private.’
Results and Discussion

Manipulation Check. An ANOVA on the perceived privacy of the consumption context found a significant main effect of privacy (F(1,77) = 14.75, p < .001), where the gym context was considered more public than the skiing context (M_gym = 4.6, M_ski = 3.2).

Relative Purchase Preference. A main effect of privacy on relative purchase preference indicates that participants’ relative preference for the more expensive brand was greater when the consumption context was more public (F(1,77) = 7.44, p < .01, M_private = 3.6, M_public = 4.4), supporting H3 and indicating that the nature of consumption affects product preference. As discussed in chapter 2, this result by itself is expected; however, demonstrating this effect is important because it makes it possible to test the importance of face pressure in mediating the effect of context on purchase intention.

Face Pressure. Matching the relative purchase preference results, an ANOVA revealed that there was a main effect of product privacy on face pressure gain (F(1,77) = 5.28, p < .05, M_private = 3.2, M_public = 4.0). However, a separate ANOVA revealed that the manipulation had no effect on face pressure_avoid loss (F(1,77) = 1.06, p > .30, M_private = 3.1, M_public = 3.4). This lack of an effect is consistent with the expectation, discussed at the end of chapter 3, that the two dimensions of face pressure will vary in their importance as predictors, depending on the behavior examined. In sum, these results are supportive of H4 which states that face pressure will be greater in
contexts with an expectation of social evaluation than in contexts with no expectation of social evaluation.

Other Measures. The privacy manipulation did not significantly impact face consumption, concern for face or subjective norm (all F’s < 1). These results reveal a significant failure of previous face-related measures to capture the context of consumption and provide compelling, experimental evidence to support H1b that face pressure is a superior predictor of specific behaviors in specific contexts than trait-based measures. While context had no effect on these trait-based measures, it did significantly influence face pressure, providing clear evidence supporting the context specific aspect of the theory of face pressure and demonstrating that traditional, trait-based face measures cannot capture this effect.

Mediation. The results above indicate that face pressure is capturing the context specific nature of face while other more general face-related measures do not. To provide further evidence in support of this result, a mediation analysis was also conducted which demonstrates that only face pressure mediates the relationship between the consumption context and the relative purchase preference. Preacher and Hayes’ (2008) bootstrapping method for multiple mediators was conducted using privacy of the consumption context as the independent variable, relative product preference as the dependent variable and concern for face, face consumption, SN and the two face pressure dimensions as possible mediators. The results from this analysis indicate that consumption context only had a significant effect on the gain dimension of face pressure, consistent with the results reported above (see figure 8). The effect of face pressure has a confidence interval that
does not include 0 ([-1.64, -.01]), the direct effect of product privacy on face pressure is significant (a_fpgain = -2.07, p < .05), the direct effect of face pressure on relative purchase preference is significant (b_fpgain = .27, p < .05) and this relationship mediates the total effect of product privacy on relative purchase preference (c=-1.60, p < .01 vs. c’= -.53, p > .05), supporting H5. There are no significant effects of CFF, face consumption, or SN (all a and b paths have p values that are NS).

Study 5 provides the first experimental evidence demonstrating the importance of face pressure and the value of re-conceptualizing face as a motivator of specific behaviors. First, the results reveal that the motivation to gain face was significantly higher in a public consumption context, thereby verifying the situational variability of face. Second, by including two trait-based measures of face, this analysis also confirms the hypothesized failure of individual difference variables in capturing this context effect. This is an important result for two reasons. First, it demonstrates face pressure’s unique ability to capture the contextual effects of face on product decisions. Second, these results also make it even more evident that the pressures to gain and avoid the loss of face are distinct in Chinese consumer decisions.

The results of this study also have managerial relevance. Understanding the role of face in China has the potential to impact marketing strategy for companies that are expanding into Asia. First, product managers must be aware of how face pressure influences decisions in their product category. General measures can only tell marketers a consumer base’s propensity to be concerned with or sensitive to face. Face pressure allows them to study whether, and for which products and situations, these concerns are
exerting a pressure on the decision-making process. Once these products and situations have been identified, as done with collectivism and race (Lau-Gesk 2003; Whittler and Spira 2002), promotional strategies and persuasive messaging can be devised to address face and ads can highlight the face-related value of a product. In studies 6 and 7, the focus shifts to the role that context and expected social evaluation play in the efficacy of such persuasive messaging.

Study 6

Study 6 continues to examine the role of context on face pressure with a focus on testing hypotheses H3, H4 and H5 but also explores the influence that persuasive advertisement messaging can have on face pressure. Study 5 demonstrated the importance of context effects and also discussed the managerial value of understanding these effects. To further this, in study 6, advertisements were developed that had persuasive messaging focused on the functional value of a product or the face-related value of a product. This study explicitly tests the efficacy of face-related advertising, finding that it can be extremely effective in contexts where there is an expectation of social evaluation.
Method

Study 6 was conducted on a sample of first year undergraduate students in the US who were Chinese citizens (n = 107). This study had a 2 [Expectation of Social Evaluation: Private vs. Public Consumption] x 2 [Ad Focus: Face-related appeal vs. Functional value appeal] between-subjects design. The manipulation of expectation of social evaluation was operationalized by describing the consumption scenario as follows: “Imagine you are browsing your local weekly newspaper. You have been wanting to buy yourself a new pair of long athletic socks to wear inside your ski boots [with your gym sneakers]. Please evaluate the product in the following advertisement.” As before, wearing socks inside ski boots should be private consumption because these socks will not be seen while skiing; however, wearing socks at the gym, with shorts, makes it very likely they will be seen by those on the treadmill next to you. The ad focus was manipulated such that one advertisement focused on the functional attributes of the product (comfort, performance) while the other focused on its face-related value (prestige, status; see Appendix C).

The two primary dependent variables measured were purchase intention and face pressure. Participants were asked to evaluate the product and provide their purchase intentions. These intentions differed from those in study 5 because it was not a relative preference for a “higher-end” product, but rather a non-comparative evaluation of the product. All questions were measured using seven-point agree-disagree or likely-unlikely scales where 1 was “strongly disagree” and 7 was “strongly agree.” A manipulation
check question was also included to identify whether the public consumption scenario was, in fact, more public and led to a higher expectation of social evaluation. To verify that the gym context was considered more public than the skiing context, participants were asked to evaluate the consumption context on a 7-point semantic differential scale with endpoints ‘extremely public’ and ‘extremely private.’ To verify that the gym context had a higher expectation of social evaluation than the skiing context, participants were asked to evaluate the consumption context on a 7-point semantic differential scale with endpoints ‘extremely likely to be socially evaluated’ and ‘extremely unlikely to be socially evaluated.’

Results and Discussion

Manipulation Check. An ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of the consumption context on the perceived visibility of the product ($F(1,103) = 6.02$, $p < .05$, $M_{private} = 3.2$, $M_{public} = 4.1$). There was also a main effect of the consumption context on the likelihood of social evaluation ($F(1,103) = 6.78$, $p < .05$, $M_{private} = 2.8$, $M_{public} = 3.7$).

Purchase Intention. An ANOVA was run that demonstrated a significant interaction between the ad appeal and the context of consumption ($F(1,103) = 9.61$, $p < .01$; see figure 9). A planned contrast was conducted which revealed that the face-related ad focus was only effective at increasing purchase intention when consumption was
public and there was an expectation of social evaluation (M_face-related ad, public consumption = 4.3, all other M = 2.5, p < .01), supporting H3.

**Face Pressure.** Two ANOVAs were also run to examine the effect of the independent variables on face pressure (see fig 10). Similar to the results from study 5, an ANOVA using the pressure to gain face resulted in a significant interaction of consumption context and ad focus (F(1,103) = 4.26, p < .05), matching the pattern of the purchase intention results. A planned contrast was conducted which revealed that the face-related ad focus was only effective at increasing the pressure to gain face when consumption was public and there was an expectation of social evaluation (M_face-related ad, public consumption = 5.4, all other M = 4.2 – 4.2, p < .05), supporting H4. Again, also consistent with study 5, there were no significant effects of the independent variables on the pressure to avoid face loss. As noted above this lack of an effect is expected because of the nature of the behavior under examination and will be explored more thoroughly in study 8.

**Mediation.** A mediation analysis using Preacher and Hayes’ (2008) bootstrapping method for multiple mediators was conducted to demonstrate that face pressure mediated the effect of the independent variables on purchase intention. This procedure was conducted using the expectation of social evaluation and ad focus as the independent variables, purchase intention as the dependent variable and with gaining face pressure and avoid the loss of face pressure as possible mediators. The results from this analysis indicate that the independent variables had an effect on the gain dimension of face pressure, consistent with the results reported above (see figure 11). The direct effect of
the independent variables on gaining face pressure is significant (a_gain = .94, p < .01) while the direct effect of the independent variables on avoiding the loss of face is not significant (a_avoid = -.05, p > .90), consistent with the results from the previously reported ANOVA. The direct effect of gaining face pressure on purchase intention is significant (b_gain = .20, p < .05) while the direct effect of the avoiding the loss of face on purchase intention is not significant (b_avoid = -.06, p > .40). From these results it is evident that only the pressure to gain face is a possible mediator and does, in fact, mediate the total effect of the independent variables on purchase intention (c = .97, p < .001 vs. c’ = .22, p > .50), supporting hypothesis H5.

Study 6 is valuable from both a theoretical and a practical standpoint. Theoretically, the results of this study support hypotheses H3, H4 and H5 and validate the context specific aspect of the theory of face pressure. Moreover, they also validate the conceptualization of face pressure as a motivational driver of purchase intentions. Managerially, these results indicate that, in situations where there is an expectation of social evaluation, advertising a product’s face value can be an effective strategy to drive intention.

Study 7

Study 7 expands on the results from study 6 on both the theoretical and practical fronts. Theoretically, study 7 addresses the difference between public consumption and the expectation of social evaluation. As explained in chapter 2, face pressure is context...
specific. In particular, face pressure should only be influential when there is an expectation of social evaluation. Studies 5 and 6 operationalize this expectation through manipulating the privacy of the product. This means it is possible that it is not social evaluation that is critical but just privacy. Of course, these two concepts are very closely tied together. If consumption will be public it is almost certain that there will be social judgment. However, study 7 teases these two slightly different concepts apart and isolates the expectation of social evaluation. In the process, study 7 also finds that it is possible for an advertiser to manipulate the expectation of social evaluation using subtle social cues in the advertisement itself.

**Method**

Study 7 was conducted on a sample of first year undergraduate students in the US who were Chinese citizens (n = 135). Study 7 had a 2 [Social Cue: Absent vs. Present] x 2 [Ad Focus: Face-related appeal vs. Functional value appeal] between-subjects design. The social cue was operationalized by either placing the product being advertised in a ring of people or not (see Appendix D). The ad focus was manipulated such that one advertisement focused on the functional attributes of the product (comfort, performance) while the other focused on its face-related value (prestige, status; see Appendix D).

The two primary dependent variables measured were purchase intention and face pressure. All questions were measured using seven-point agree-disagree or likely-unlikely scales where 1 was “strongly disagree” and 7 was “strongly agree.”
Two manipulation check questions were also included to test which conditions led to a higher expectation of social evaluation or made the product seem more public. Participants were asked to evaluate the focal product on a 7-point semantic differential scale with endpoints ‘extremely public’ and ‘extremely private.’ They were then asked to evaluate the focal product on a 7-point semantic differential scale with endpoints ‘extremely likely to be socially evaluated’ and ‘extremely unlikely to be socially evaluated.’

Results and Discussion

Manipulation Check. An ANOVA revealed no effect of the social cue on the perceived visibility of the product (F(1,131) = 6.02, p > .15, M_present = 4.6, M_absent = 4.1). There was, however, a main effect of the social cue on the likelihood of social evaluation (F(1,131) = 22.90, p < .01, M_present = 5.2, M_absent = 3.9).

Purchase Intention. An ANOVA was run that demonstrated a significant interaction between the ad appeal and the social cue (F(1,131) = 4.40, p < .05; see figure 12). A planned contrast was conducted which revealed that the face-related ad focus was only effective at increasing purchase intention when the social cue was present (M_face-related ad, social cue present = 3.8, all other M = 2.4 – 2.6, p < .05), supporting H3.

Face Pressure. Two ANOVAs were also run to examine the effect of the independent variables on face pressure (see fig 13). An ANOVA using the pressure to gain face resulted in a marginally significant interaction of social cue and ad focus
F(1,131) = 3.73, p < .06, matching the pattern of the purchase intention results. Again, a planned contrast was conducted which revealed that the face-related ad focus was only effective at increasing the motivation to gain face when the social cue was present (M_face-related ad, social cue present = 5.2, all other M = 3.7 – 3.9, p < .05), supporting H4. As expected, given the context of the behavior in question, there were no significant effects of the independent variables on the pressure to avoid loss. However, study 8 will alter the consumption context demonstrating that the pressure to avoid loss can also be a driver of purchase intention.

Mediation. A mediation analysis using Preacher and Hayes’ (2008) bootstrapping method for multiple mediators was conducted to examine whether either dimension of face pressure mediated the effect of the independent variables on purchase intention. This procedure was conducted using social cue and ad focus as the independent variables, purchase intention as the dependent variable and with gaining face pressure and avoid the loss of face pressure as possible mediators. The results from this analysis indicate that the independent variables had an effect on the gain dimension of face pressure, consistent with the results reported above (see figure 14). The direct effect of the independent variables on gaining face pressure is significant (a_gain = .83, p < .05) while the direct effect of the independent variables on avoiding the loss of face is not significant (a_avoid = .35, p > .20), consistent with the results from the previously reported ANOVAs. The direct effect of gaining face pressure on purchase intention is significant (b_gain = .51, p < .01) and the direct effect of the avoiding the loss of face on purchase intention is also significant (b_avoid = -.17, p < .05). Finally, the pressure to gain face mediates the total
effect of the independent variables on purchase intention ($c = .87, p < .001$ vs. $c' = .50, p > .15$), supporting H5.

Study 7 builds on the results from the previous studies. Hypotheses H3, H4 and H5 were almost completely supported by the analysis of study 7. However, the real contribution of study 7 was to tease apart context privacy from the expectation of social evaluation. In this study, the context of the consumption was held constant and the focal product was considered equally public to all participants, regardless of experimental condition. However, participants presented with the ad containing the social cue did have a higher expectation of social evaluation. This higher expectation was the cause for an increased sense of face pressure, and this increased pressure mediated the effect of the social cue on purchase intentions.

Study 8

The purpose of study 8 is to demonstrate the importance of the dual motivation conceptualization developed in the theory of face pressure. To this point, the experiments in this chapter have all found that the motivation to gain face mediated the effect of context on purchase intention, but that there was no significant effect of the context on the motivation to avoid the loss of face. At first blush, this result is unexpected, because, as previously noted, Asian consumers have been shown to have a stronger prevention orientation as compared to a promotion orientation (Lee, Aaker and Gardener 2000; Lee, Keller and Sternthal 2010). Moreover, these results question the importance of the dual
motivation aspect of the theory of face pressure. Examining only these three experiments, it could be argued that the motivation to avoid the loss of face is superfluous. However, the studies reported in chapter 3 would dispute this argument. Every study in chapter 3 found a significant causal path was between the motivation to avoid face loss and behavior intention was found. Therefore, though this effect was not seen in studies 5, 6, or 7, chapter 3 provided evidence demonstrating the importance of the dual motivation conceptualization. However, even in chapter 3, the motivation to gain face was more influential than the motivation to avoid the loss of face. This leads to two questions: why is the motivation to gain face stronger and when will the motivation to avoid the loss of face be stronger? Study 8 identifies one consumption context attribute that answers these questions.

The previous results are due to the low risk of face loss in all the scenarios examined so far. There is low risk of face loss in these contexts because it is likely people have socially acceptable suits, jeans and socks. Therefore, people were likely to have been primarily motivated by the opportunity to gain face. However, if the context creates a high risk of face loss (e.g. the clothes already owned are not socially acceptable), it is expected that the pressure to avoid the loss of face will be more influential in driving behavior. In study 8, the context is explicitly manipulated to create one setting where there is a low risk of face loss and a second context in which this risk is higher.
Method

Study 8 was distributed in China to a sample (n = 276) of Chinese students who spoke English as a second language. Study 8 had a 2-cell design that manipulated the risk of face loss [Low Risk vs. High Risk]. To operationalize the risk manipulation, the wedding scenario used in previous studies was employed. However, for the high risk condition, at the end of the wedding scenario the following was added: “You try on the suit / dress you usually wear to these occasions and find that it fits well. However, you are concerned that your suit / dress is slightly worn and out of fashion.” The addition of this statement made it clear to participants that their current formal wear was not socially acceptable and suggested a risk of face loss if this suit / dress was worn to the party (see Appendix B: wedding scenario – study 8).

The two primary dependent variables measured were purchase intention and face pressure. All questions were measured using seven-point agree-disagree or likely-unlikely scales where 1 was “strongly disagree” and 7 was “strongly agree.”

A manipulation check question was also included to test whether the high risk condition did in fact present the participants with a greater risk of face loss. Participants were asked to evaluate how likely they would be to lose face if they did not buy a suit on a 7-point semantic differential scale with endpoints ‘extremely unlikely and ‘extremely likely.’
Results and Discussion

Manipulation Check. An ANOVA revealed a significant effect of the manipulation on the perceived likelihood of losing face ($F(1,274) = 43.66, p < .001$, $M_{\text{no risk}} = 3.4, M_{\text{risk}} = 4.8$). This ensures that the difference in the consumption scenarios altered the risk of face loss.

Purchase Intention. An ANOVA revealed a significant effect of condition on purchase intention ($F(1,274) = 9.01, p < .001$, $M_{\text{low risk}} = 4.7, M_{\text{high risk}} = 5.2$; see table 5). This result is encouraging because it indicates that, when there is a high likelihood that face will be lost, people are more likely to make a purchase to avoid this than they are when there is an opportunity to gain face. This result is consistent with the previous literature discussed that found Asian consumers to be strongly prevention oriented (Lee, Aaker and Gardener 2000; Lee, Keller and Sternthal 2010).

Face Pressure. Two ANOVAs were also conducted to examine the effect of the manipulation on each dimension of face pressure. An ANOVA on the motivation to avoid the loss of face revealed a significant effect of the manipulation ($F(1,274) = 21.87, p < .001$, $M_{\text{low risk}} = 3.7, M_{\text{high risk}} = 4.6$; see table 5). This result provides extremely strong evidence that the risk of face loss activated the motivation to avoid the loss of face. This also supports the argument made that previous results did not show evidence of a strong avoidance motivation because there was not a strong risk of face loss. An ANOVA on the motivation to gain face revealed no significant effect of the manipulation ($F(1,274) = 2.25, p > .10$, $M_{\text{no risk}} = 4.4, M_{\text{risk}} = 4.1$; see table 5). This lack of an
effect is not surprising because, though an individual in the high risk condition may principally be driven by the motivation to avoid face loss, the purchase of a new suit still provides an opportunity to gain more face. The primary goal of the purchase may be to stave off the loss of face, but it can still serve as a way to enhance face.

To completely examine the impact of an enhanced risk of face loss, it is also necessary to compare the difference in motivation levels within each condition. Doing so reveals that, in the low risk condition there was a significantly higher motivation to gain face than to avoid the loss of face (M_difference = .42, t(141) = 2.95, p < .01). However, when there was a high risk of losing face, the motivation to avoid the loss of face was stronger than the motivation to gain face (M_difference = -.71, t(133) = -6.06, p < .001).

Taken together, the results from this study demonstrate the importance of both the dual motivation and context specific aspects of the theory of face pressure. In any given context, it is possible for there to be a higher or lower risk of face loss. The amount of risk sense by the consumer will determine which face-related motivation will be stronger. In a context where there is high risk, the motivation to avoid the loss of face will be the stronger driver of behavior. This context specific effect demonstrates the importance of the dual motivation aspect of the theory of face pressure. Moreover, these results edify the importance of the motivational re-conceptualization of the role of face. No trait measure could capture the difference in contexts that was identified in study 8.
General Discussion

Theoretically, the studies in chapter 4 demonstrate that, when studying face, it is crucial to understand context, supporting the theory of face pressure. The theory of face pressure hypothesizes that the expectation of social judgment is a moderator of the amount of pressure face will exert on a purchase intention. Studies 5 and 6 examine the role of social judgment on face pressure by operationalizing social judgment using the visibility of the consumption experience. This poses a potential confound. Is it truly the expectation of social judgment that is moderating face pressure? Or, rather, is it the case that face pressure will be influential anytime a public product is being purchased? Study 7 is able to tease these two effects apart by studying the same product, without changing the context of consumption but simply making the likelihood of social evaluation salient. The results from this study provide strong evidence that it is, in fact, social judgment that creates face pressure. Of course, social judgment goes almost hand in hand with public consumption; therefore, it is likely that the intention to purchase a product that will be purchased or consumed in public will be influenced by face pressure.

Often, when deciding to make a purchase we are comparing products and judging their relative merits. For this reason, study 5 looked at the relative preference for a product that was high in face value compared to one that was lower in face value. However, it is possible that, when purchasing products, a consumer may not compare products. Therefore, it is also important to examine whether face pressure influences purchase intentions for products when they are viewed on their own and not in
comparison to a higher or lower status brand. Studies 6 and 7 provide this evidence. In these two studies, it is found that the expectation of social judgment led to an increased face pressure and, thereby, an increased purchase intention for a high face-related value product, even when it was not being compared to a lower face-related value product.

Study 8 demonstrated the importance of both dimensions of face pressure. The prior experiments all found that the pressure to gain face was influenced by the context of consumption and this effect mediated the effect of context on purchase intention. However, these studies found no effect of context on the pressure to avoid the loss of face. Given the nature of the products and contexts examined, this was not unexpected. While people saw the advertised products as a way to increase their face, it is likely they had socially acceptable clothing at home already, thereby, making the consumption context one with little threat of face loss. However, in study 8, the context was manipulated to explicitly state that already owned clothing was socially unacceptable, creating a purchase context with a significant risk of face loss. In this context, the pressure to avoid the loss of face became the driver of purchase intention. This result is extremely important because it demonstrates that both the motivation to gain face and the motivation to avoid the loss of face can influence behavior and that the context of consumption can dictate which motivation is dominant.

Chapter 4 also provides practical value for marketers and brand managers. By developing and validating a measure of face pressure, this dissertation has enabled managers to measure how important face pressure is to their own products and test this importance across various potential consumption contexts. Studies 6 and 7 also provide
two insights that are valuable to a product or brand in China. First, study 6 demonstrates that advertising the face-related value of a product can be effective. Second, study 7 demonstrates that, if a product has a high face-related value, that an advertisement can create its own expectation of social evaluation that will then make that face-related value of the product seem more valuable.
Chapter 5: Conclusion

Summary

The focus of this dissertation was on the influence that face can have on a consumption or purchase decision. While there has been considerable discussion of this topic in other disciplines, it has only recently begun receiving attention in the consumer behavior literature. This early research has focused primarily on identifying general tendencies of individuals and focused on examining cross-cultural differences in these general tendencies. Moreover, a large part of this initial research has been done without the aid of a theoretical framework to guide the research on face. Therefore, a primary goal, and contribution, of this dissertation is to develop such a framework. Based on literature in sociology, organizational behavior, and marketing, this dissertation developed a theory of face pressure, with the intention that this theory would provide a framework for the role of face in consumer behavior that can be built upon by future research.

One major contribution of this dissertation was to advance the literature on face by re-conceptualizing its role in consumer behavior as a motivation. Prior consumer research had conceptualized face as an individual difference variable. Various studies
examined how different individuals or cultures varied in their sensitivity of or concern for face. General measures of face make a contribution by permitting researchers to separate those for whom face concerns are most important from others who are less concerned about this variable. However, this conceptualization, while useful to identify traits of individuals suffers from various limitations. Most importantly, conceptualizing face as an individual difference variable does not allow for the context of the consumption behavior to play a role in the decision-making process. This dissertation argues that contexts differ in terms of their face-related implications and therefore a framework and a measure is needed that permits researchers to examine the impact of face-related pressures on specific behaviors in specific contexts.

In chapter 2, based on previous literature, the theory of face pressure is developed, providing this framework. It creates a new construct, face pressure, which acts as a motivation in the decision process, rather than an individual trait. Chapter 2 develops a new theoretical framework that is capable of addressing the situational variance of face, an aspect of face trait-based measures cannot address.

This re-conceptualization allowed for the development of the dual motivation component of the theory of face pressure, which hypothesized that there are two distinct, but correlated, face-based motivations: the motivation to gain face and the motivation to avoid the loss of face. The theory of face pressure also formally included the interdependence of face, the idea that the impact of one’s actions affects the face of important others as well as one’s own face.
In chapter 3, a measure, face pressure, is created based on the theoretical foundation built in chapter 2. A contribution of this scale development chapter was the creation of a measure that could address the context specificity of the influence of face on consumption and purchase behavior. By using scale development procedures consistent with expectancy-value measures, the face pressure scale was developed in such a manner that it can be easily molded to study almost any behavior in almost any context. This new construct can be used as a basis for further research on the role of face in decision-making.

Exploratory work in this chapter also uncovered the important others that will be affected by the interdependent nature of face. Almost universally, in contexts with face-related implications, an individual’s actions will affect the face of the individual and of his parents. It was also found that, depending on the context, the face of other “important others” (i.e. friends, cousins, managers) could be altered by an individual’s behavior. This measure supports the hypothesized interdependence, an aspect of face previous empirical research had generally not measured, providing another novel contribution to the empirical literature on face. Over the studies in chapter 3, due to this re-conceptualization and the incorporation of these critical aspects of face, the face pressure measure consistently demonstrates superior predictive capability relative to trait-based face measures and other social constructs, supporting hypotheses H1a and H1b. In this chapter, in all four studies, confirmatory factor analysis also found the hypothesized two dimensions of face pressure, supporting H2.
The focus of chapter 4 is on the context specificity of face. A trait-based approach to face does not allow for the study of its situational variance; however, treating face as a motivation makes it possible to study differences in the role of face across various consumption contexts. By using the face pressure scale developed in chapter 3, the studies in chapter 4 demonstrate that face exerts a stronger pressure on consumption behavior when social evaluation of the focal decision is expected, supporting H3 and H4. For example, when deciding whether to wear an old, torn shirt, face pressure will be more important if this shirt is likely to be socially evaluated. If a person is only going to be at home, alone, watching a movie, face will exert minimal pressure on the decision to wear this shirt. However, if a friend is coming over to watch that same movie, a person will consider the potential face-related consequences of wearing the old shirt and this will exert a pressure on the decision, making it less likely they will wear the old shirt. Even more interestingly, in study 7, just the implication that a product might be socially evaluated is enough to create face pressure and, through this added pressure, influence purchase intention. These two results demonstrate the potential value to the marketer of creating face pressure in a decision context and highlighting the face-related value of the focal product.

Finally, study 8 demonstrates the effect that context can have in determining the relative influence of the two face pressure motivations. When there is low risk of face loss, people’s purchase decisions are driven more strongly by the motivation to gain face; however, when the context suggests a high risk of face loss, the motivation to avoid the loss of face drives purchase intentions.
The results from chapter 4 also provide value to companies, brands and marketers who either already have an Asian presence or are hoping to expand their business into this economically powerful culture. Managerially, this dissertation provides a way to test for the importance of face in any given consumption scenario. While managers may have previously known that Chinese consumers were more sensitive to face than western consumers, with the face pressure measure, they can identify how much influence face pressure has on the consumption decision and how the context of consumption might change this relationship.

The results from chapter 4 suggest that some forms of face-related advertising could be useful in contexts where face is proven to be influential. In fact, advertising that appealed to consumers by focusing on the products face value was preferred to ads focused on the functional value when consumption was public. Therefore, for public products (i.e. clothing, jewelry, automobiles) advertisements in China may be more successful if they focus on the face-related value of the product.

From this practical perspective, face pressure may partially explain the extreme success of luxury products in Asia (KPMG 2007). The growing middle class in China has more dispensable income and has been faced with a flood of luxury products in their marketplace. Stories abound of taxi drivers who buy expensive watches but struggle to buy groceries and parents who spend lavishly on weddings and, in the process, sacrifice their financial security. In these cases, it is likely that the motivation to gain or avoid face loss is exerting a pressure on the consumer to buy a new Louis Vuitton hand bag or host an extravagant wedding party.
Future Research

There are a number of important directions in which the research on face and face pressure can be taken. The focus of this entire dissertation was on the Chinese consumer. As previously discussed, it is well-known that face is a critical part of Chinese society and daily life; however, the concept of face exists in many other cultures, both eastern and western. It is important to expand the scope of this research and understand how face pressure influences consumer behavior in other cultures. It is very possible that face will influence behavior in similar ways in other eastern cultures (Japanese, Indian, etc.). To extend the theory of face pressure to these cultures would simply require conducting similar experiments to those in this dissertation to explore any possible differences in the role that face pressure plays in these different eastern cultures. A more interesting avenue of research might be to study the role of face in a western culture like America. Perhaps, because face is less salient in western culture, it has a much smaller influence on behavior intentions than it does in an eastern culture. It has also been well established that western cultures are less collectivistic than eastern cultures (Ting-Toomey 1988; Ting-Toomey and Kurogi 1998) leading to an interesting theoretical question about the role of the collectivistic aspect of face pressure in a western society. It is very possible that western consumers worry much less about others and, therefore, the two face pressure items focused on the self might be the most important items to measure. When testing this scale in a western setting, it would be beneficial to conduct exploratory work to verify the
important referents. Furthermore, tests to verify the structure of the face pressure construct are critical. Because of their individualism, the theory of face pressure for western consumers may not need interdependence. The face pressure construct may be most effective by measuring the two motivations to avoid and gain face for the self.

It is also of value to explore the interaction of face pressure with other face-related concepts in the literature. One obvious place to start is to examine how face pressure interacts with the different trait-based measures of face described in this research. White et al.’s concept of face threat sensitivity suggests that those who are higher in threat sensitivity might be more motivated by the motivation to avoid the loss of face than the motivation to gain face. In essence, these individuals might be more prone to seeing any given context with a higher risk of face loss and therefore act like the individuals face with the explicit threat of face loss in study 8.

Moreover, the results from study 8 also demonstrate that, in some consumption contexts, the motivation to avoid face loss can be much stronger than the motivation to gain face. As Ho (1976, p.871) points out “Face is not lost merely on account of a failure to gain it, but face must be protected from being lost precisely because of the demoralizing repercussions which otherwise follow.” This quote highlights the importance of avoiding the loss of face and how this differs from gaining face. Ho’s statement also suggests that people concerned with their face are extremely prevention focused, a mindset that emphasizes safety, responsibility, and security needs and is concerned with losses and is especially sensitive to failure (Crowe and Higgins 1997). One can also imagine examples of risky behaviors that could prove to have a high payoff.
in face if they go well, but can be quite damaging if they go poorly. For example, a student who cheats on a test and receives an A, stands to gain face for their performance, but must weigh the potential cost of being caught and losing face. Similarly, the first person to usher in the skinny jeans style popular today took a big risk in straying from the previous standard of baggy jeans. If the style caught on, they would be seen as trend-setting and fashionable; if it did not, social evaluation would not be so kind. Research understanding the relationship between the regulatory focus and face pressure could shed more light on how consumer decisions are made, especially in risky consumption contexts.

Finally, it would be beneficial to extend this research to focus on potential social implications of face. A recent campaign called the Banyan Tree Project is working hard to remove the shame surrounding HIV and AIDS in Asian and Pacific Island communities. “Saving face is a common cultural concept in A&PI communities, where individuals seek to protect the family from perceived public shame or disgrace. Saving face contributes to silence about sex, HIV, and safe sex practices and lead to higher rates of HIV infection and a lack of knowledge about one's HIV status. For example, 1 in 3 Asians and Pacific Islanders is living with HIV does not know it and over half of Pacific Islanders have never been tested for HIV(www.BanyanTreeProject.org).” While this campaign is working hard to improve this situation, there is still much that can be done. Consumer psychologists and public policy researchers can help by understanding the root of this shame and finding potential ways in which to alleviate the pressure to save face.
Contributions

Theoretically, this dissertation contributes to the literature in numerous ways. The re-conceptualization of face as a context specific motivator of specific behaviors rather than a trait is completely new. Previous research focused on an individual’s general tendency to be concerned for or sensitive to face; this re-conceptualization argues that one’s behavior is not just influenced by general traits, but specifically motivated by one’s face-related motivation. As part of this re-conceptualization, the theory of face pressure was developed which incorporated the dual motivation and interdependent aspects of face. These two aspects of face have generally been ignored by previous empirical work. However, this dissertation demonstrates their importance in understanding the role of face pressure in decision-making.

The theory of face pressure also argues that the context is critical to understanding the role of face in the decision process. A serious limitation of all previous measures is that they are incapable of capturing these context effects. A person high in concern for face is assumed to be high in concern for face no matter the context. Yet, the studies in chapter 4 clearly demonstrate the importance of context specificity and the value of the theory of face pressure. Furthermore, chapter 4 identified two attributes of a context that can are important: the likelihood of social evaluation and the risk of face loss. Understanding the effect that these have on the role of face pressure in the decision process provides initial insight into how face pressure may influence behavior in various other contexts.
Empirically, this dissertation developed and validated a new measure of face pressure. It also demonstrated the superior predictive ability of the face pressure measure to predict specific consumption and purchase intentions. This research also demonstrated how the face pressure measure can be expanded to study various contexts of consumption and, by doing so, provided evidence for the generalizability of the face pressure measure.

Managerially, this dissertation provided three main takeaways. First, managers can quickly and easily ascertain the importance of face pressure in the decision-making process regarding their product by creating their own consumption context and measuring face pressure. Second, if face pressure is found to be high in a given context, the results from this dissertation suggest that managers should focus on highlighting the face-related value of their product, as this can be an effective way to increase purchase intention. Third, if face pressure is not found to be high in a given context, it is possible for advertising itself to create a perception of social evaluation and trigger face pressure motivation. This would increase the efficacy of any marketing communication regarding the face-related value of a product.

By creating a theoretical framework, this dissertation has provided structure to an area of research that was lacking in formality. There is still much that can be learned and studied about the role of face in consumption, behavior and society. The hope is that the work done in this dissertation and the framework developed in the theory of face pressure will provide a basis and springboard for further research on this psychological concept.
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Appendix A: Face Pressure Scale

1. My engaging in behavior X will cause me to gain face
2. My engaging in behavior X will cause my parents to gain face
3. My engaging in behavior X will cause those who are important to me to gain face
4. My engaging in behavior X will keep me from losing face
5. My engaging in behavior X will keep my parents from losing face
6. My engaging in behavior X will keep those who are important to me from losing face
Appendix B: Consumption Scenarios

*Wedding Scenario*

Imagine the following situation: Your cousin’s wedding is coming up very soon. To celebrate, it was decided that there would be a large wedding party to which your parents would be invited, as well as yourself and other close family members and friends. This party is fast approaching and you are considering what you will wear to this occasion. It is a formal affair and therefore, you decide on a suit / dress.

*Wedding Scenario - Study 8*

Imagine the following situation: Your cousin’s wedding is coming up very soon. To celebrate, it was decided that there would be a large wedding party to which your parents would be invited, as well as yourself and other close family members and friends. This party is fast approaching and you are considering what you will wear to this occasion. It is a formal affair and therefore, you decide on a suit / dress. **You try on the suit / dress you usually wear to these occasions and find that it fits well. However, you are concerned that your suit / dress is slightly worn and out of fashion.**
Shopping Scenario

Imagine the following situation: You are going shopping with your friends at the mall. All of you are a close group of friends and enjoy spending time together. As you are shopping, everyone notices that there is a new trend in jeans that seems to be this year’s fashion. All your friends decide to get a pair of these new, trendy jeans.

Holiday Party Scenario

The holiday season, including Christmas and Chinese New Year, is rapidly approaching. You have decided to host a party for your manager and a few co-workers to celebrate the holidays. You value and enjoy your job, and enjoy the people with whom you work, especially your manager. With the dinner fast approaching, you must decide at which restaurant to make the reservation. You are considering a normal family friendly restaurant or a more upscale and elegant restaurant.

Public vs. Private Scenario

Imagine you are in the clothing section of your local department store because you want to buy yourself a new pair of long athletic socks to wear [with your sneakers at the gym / inside your ski boots on a ski trip]. There are many different brands of similar quality, some of which are relatively more expensive and some of which are relatively less expensive. Please think about what factors would influence your decision to pick a certain brand, specifically a more expensive brand over a less expensive brand.
Appendix C: Study 6 Stimuli

**Popular**

Everyone wants with it, you will be considered prestigious and signal to others your social status and reflect well on you and those related to you.

**Get the Most Effective Sock on the Market**

This is the new sock that beats the rest. Its stylish look and quality craftsmanship make it comfortable while still enabling you to perform at the highest levels. Get them today!
Appendix D: Study 7 Stimuli

**GET THE MOST EFFECTIVE SOCK ON THE MARKET**

This is the new sock that everyone wants. With it, you will be considered prestigious. Its stylish look and quality craftsmanship make it comfortable while still enabling you to perform at the highest levels. Get them today!

**GET THE MOST POPULAR SOCK ON THE MARKET**

This is the new sock that everyone wants. With it, you will be considered prestigious. Its stylish look and quality craftsmanship will signal to others your social status and reflect well on you and those related to you. Get them today!
Table 1: Study 1 Descriptive Statistics

*p < .05, **p < .01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Intention</td>
<td>How likely are you to buy a new suit / dress? (Likely / Unlikely)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How probable is it that you will buy a new suit / dress? (Probable / Improbable)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will buy a new suit / dress</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face Pressure (Gain)</td>
<td>My wearing a new suit / dress to the party will cause me to gain face</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face Pressure (Avoid)</td>
<td>My wearing a new suit / dress to the party will cause my parents to gain face</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My wearing a new suit / dress to the party will cause those who are important to me to gain face</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face Pressure (Avoid)</td>
<td>My wearing a new suit / dress to the party will keep me from losing face</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My wearing a new suit / dress to the party will keep my parents from losing face</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My wearing a new suit / dress to the party will keep those who are important to me from losing face</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Intention</td>
<td>How likely are you to buy a new suit/dress? (Likely / Unlikely)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How likely are you to buy a new suit/dress? (Probable / Improbable)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will buy a new suit/dress</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face Pressure (Gain)</td>
<td>My wearing a new suit/dress to the party will cause me to gain face</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My wearing a new suit/dress to the party will cause my parents to gain face</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My wearing a new suit/dress to the party will cause those who are important to me to gain face</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face Pressure (Avoid)</td>
<td>My wearing a new suit/dress to the party will keep me from losing face</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My wearing a new suit/dress to the party will keep my parents from losing face</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My wearing a new suit/dress to the party will keep those who are important to me from losing face</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face Consumption</td>
<td>It is important that others like the products and brands I buy</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It does not matter what friends think of different brands or products before I purchase a product</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes I buy a product because my friends do so</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name brand purchase is a good way to distinguish people from others</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What I consume should be consistent with my social status</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name brand product purchases can bring me a sense of prestige</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is important to have a dinner party in a good restaurant even though I will pay a lot of money</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When buying gifts for others, I always consider the prestige of the gift</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I buy a cheap gift for my friend, both my friend and I will feel that we have lost face</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>I am interested in new products with status</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would buy a product just because it has status</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would pay more for a product if it had status</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The status of a product is irrelevant to me</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A product is more valuable to me if it has some snob appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>How likely are you to buy a pair of the new, trendy jeans? (Likely /Unlikely)</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How probable is it that you will buy a pair of the new, trendy jeans? (Probable / Improbable)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will buy a pair of the new, trendy jeans?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face Pressure</td>
<td>My buying a pair of the new, trendy jeans will cause me to gain face</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My buying a pair of the new, trendy jeans will cause my parents to gain face</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My buying a pair of the new, trendy jeans will cause those who are important to me to gain face</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face Pressure</td>
<td>My buying a pair of the new, trendy jeans will keep me from losing face</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My buying a pair of the new, trendy jeans will keep my parents from losing face</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My buying a pair of the new, trendy jeans will keep those who are important to me from losing face</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face Consumption</td>
<td>It’s important that others like the products and brands I buy</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t want my friends to think of different brands or products before I purchase a product</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes I buy a product because my friends do so</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name brand purchases is a good way to distinguish people from others</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What I consume should be consistent with my social status</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name brand purchase can bring me sense of prestige</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It’s important to have a dinner party in a good restaurant even though I will pay a lot of money</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When buying gifts for others, I always consider that prestige of the gift</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I buy a cheap gift for my friend, both my friend and I will feel that we have lost face</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern For Face</td>
<td>I care about praise and criticism from others</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I care about others’ attitudes toward me</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am being taken lightly</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will be very angry if others are impolite to me</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would be very happy if I am treated with respect</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will be very upset if I am criticized in public</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSCEP</td>
<td>I often consult other people to help choose the best alternative available from a product class</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I want to be like someone, I often try to buy the same brands that they buy</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It’s important that others like the products and brands I buy</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To make sure I buy the right product or brand, I often observe what others are buying and doing</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I try to purchase the latest fashion styles until I am sure my friends approve of them</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I often identify with other people by purchasing the same products and brands they purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I have little experience with a product, I often ask my friends about the product</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When buying products, I generally purchase those brands I think others will approve of</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like to know what brands and products make good impressions on others</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I frequently gather information from friends or family about products before I buy</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If other people can see me using a product, I often purchase the brand they expect me to buy</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I achieve a sense of belonging by purchasing the same products and brands that others purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Study 3 Descriptive Statistics

* p < .05, ** p < .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Intention</td>
<td>I will hold the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How likely are you to hold the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant? (Likely / Unlikely)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How probable is it that you will hold the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant? (Probable / Improbable)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the chances you will hold the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant? (Likely / Unlikely)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face Pressure (Gain)</td>
<td>My holding the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant will cause me to gain face</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My holding the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant will cause my parents to gain face</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My holding the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant will cause those who are important to me to gain face</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face Pressure (Avoid)</td>
<td>My holding the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant will keep me from losing face</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My holding the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant will keep my parents from losing face</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My holding the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant will keep those who are important to me from losing face</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>Most people important to me think I should hold the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My parents think I should hold the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My spouse or significant think I should hold the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My friends would expect me to hold the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My coworkers think I should hold the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My manager thinks I should hold the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att_b</td>
<td>I think that holding the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant will be good</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think that holding the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant will be beneficial</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think that holding the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant will be unpleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think that holding the dinner party at an elegant and upscale restaurant will be satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Study 4 Descriptive Statistics
Table 5: Study 8 Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Behavior Intention</th>
<th>Motivation to Gain Face</th>
<th>Motivation to Avoid Face Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Study 1 CFA
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Model Fit: Chi Sq=92.53, df=9, RMSEA=.180, NFI=.84, NNFI=.76, CFI=.85, GFI=.90

Model Fit: Chi Sq=41.39, df=8, RMSEA=.120, NFI=.93, NNFI=.90, CFI=.94, GFI=.95
Figure 2: Face Pressure Predictive Validity

![Diagram of model fit with arrows and coefficients]

Model Fit: Chi Sq=70.78, df=24, RMSEA=.082, NFI=.94, NNFI=.93, CFI=.96, GFI=.95
Figure 3: Study 2 and 3 CFA
Figure 4: Study 2 Validity Model

Model Fit: Chi Sq=713.66, df=220, RMSEA=.079, NFI=.88, NNFI=.90, CFI=.92, GFI=.85
Figure 5: Study 3 Validity Model

Model Fit: Chi Sq = 1337.50, df = 579, RMSEA = .069, NFI = .86, NNFI = .91, CFI = .92, GFI = .86
Figure 6: The Theory of Reasoned Action
Figure 7: Study 4 TRA Model

Model Fit: Chi Sq = 354.25, df = 129, RMSEA = .058, NFI = .91, NNFI = .92, CFI = .95, GFI = .86
Figure 8: Study 5 Mediation Analysis
Figure 9: Study 6 Purchase Intentions
Figure 10: Study 6 Face Pressure
Figure 11: Study 6 Mediation Analysis
Figure 12: Study 7 Purchase Intentions
Figure 13: Study 7 Face Pressure
Figure 14: Study 7 Mediation Analysis