DOI 10.2478/sbe-2020-0028

SBE no. 15(2) 2020

DOES CONSUMER SPIRITUALITY BLOCK THE ROAD TOWARD INNOVATIVENESS? A MODERATED MEDIATION APPROACH

GARG AASHISH

University School of Applied Management, Punjabi University, Patiala

DHALIWAL RAN SINGH

Tourism, Hospitality and Hotel Management, Punjabi University, Patiala

Abstract:

Innovation is the only way to sustain in a highly competitive market, and the success of innovative products depends on the innovativeness level of the consumers. The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between consumer spirituality and consumer innovativeness through the mediating role of materialism. The study also attempts to determine the moderated mediation effect by taking gender as a moderator. In this study, the data were collected from 237 consumers through online surveys and from some target locations like malls, universities, public places in Punjab and Chandigarh by adopting judgemental sampling technique. Results indicated a significant negative relationship between consumer spirituality with materialism and consumer innovativeness while materialism and consumer innovativeness are significantly positively related. Furthermore, results showed that materialism mediates the relation between consumer spirituality and consumer innovativeness among both gender categories, but there is no moderated mediation effect of gender. The implications for marketing managers are discussed.

Key words: *Consumer spirituality, Materialism, Consumer innovativeness, SEM, Moderated mediation*

1. Introduction

In the present era of the highly competitive economy, the only way an organization can survive is, by providing new offerings to the market. Introduction of new products and services would not only expand the size of the business and revenues (Bartels & Reinders, 2011) but also helps in achieving sustainable competitive advantage and leads to the success of the organizations (Hauser, Tellis, & Griffin, 2006; Bartels & Reinders, 2011). Due to this, the issue of innovation had been given due attention by scholars in the field of management and business research (Hauser et al., 2006). Launching innovative products would help organizations in dominating the market. However, the success of any

newly launched product/service in the market depends on the acceptance level of the consumers. There are many products/services which failed at the introductory stage of their life cycle (Pauwels, Silva-Risso, Srinivasan, & Hanssens, 2004), despite successful technological, non-technological and process innovation. The acceptance level depends on whether the attributes of the newly launched product/service comply with the norms and values of the consumers (Noland, 2005). The success/failure of the new product or service depends on the innovativeness of consumers and it can be described as an intrinsic force which influences the acceptance level of new products/services (Mansori, 2012). Consumer innovativeness can be defined as a force which converts the fixed purchasing behavior of consumers to the dynamic response (Hirschman, 1980), and creates the propensity to frequently try novel products/services (Midgley & Dowling, 1978). Goldsmith and Foxall (2003) discussed three concepts of innovativeness which were innate innovativeness, consumer innovativeness, and domain-specific innovativeness. Innate innovativeness can be described as a personality trait regarding willingness to try new things, consumer innovativeness describes consumers who will try new things, and domain-specific innovativeness describes innovative consumers in the context of the specific product category. Few researchers in their study have highlighted the role of personal characteristics in new product adoption and have given stress to the individual attributes of the consumer by describing their role in new product adoption (Venkatraman & Price, 1990; Lassar, Manolis, & Lassar, 2005). This concept of innate innovativeness have been given due importance in psychology in highlighting the characteristics that innovator possesses (Midgley & Dowling, 1993; Hirschman, 1980) which further helps marketers in segmentation of the consumers on the basis of innovativeness traits they possess (Goldsmith, 2001).

Since Vedic times, India is delighted with a rich spiritual tradition. Consumers in India are understood as intensely spiritual consumers who respect spiritual values and neglect materialistic values. Numerous studies have been conducted on spirituality in the context of tourism, mobile ownership, family and marriage healing (Narang, 2013) but few studies have tried to explore its association with attitude and decision making of consumers. So this study would be the first attempt to examine the relation of consumer spirituality with the innate innovativeness of the consumer. There are also limited studies which observe the relationship between the materialism and innovativeness but both concepts are focused on success and recognition. Examination of the relationship between these variables would help in better understanding of economic psychology which is distinctive to the traditional problem-solving model of the consumer to maximize utility (Richins & Rudmin, 1994). The present study will also take into consideration the role of demographics in the relationship between variables. This article proposes that materialism may influence the innate innovativeness of consumer and further explores the relationship between consumer spirituality and consumers' innate innovativeness through materialism. As stated earlier, hardly few studies have investigated the influence of consumer spirituality on innate innovativeness through the mediating role of materialism. So this study attempts to fill up a significant research gap by developing a new framework in the area of consumer spirituality and consumers' innate innovativeness.

2. Theoretical framework and hypothesis development

Consumer Innovativeness

Researchers in the area of consumer behavior have taken innovativeness as a psychographic variable, the study of which helps in forecasting of the innovative behavior (Midgley & Dowling, 1978; Rogers, 2010; Goldsmith & Hofacker, 1991; Le Louarn, 1997). Innovativeness can be defined as the propensity of attraction towards new products (Tellis, Yin & Bell, 2009; Steenkamp, Hofstede & Wedel, 1999), buying new products earlier than others in the society (Midgley & Dowling, 1978; Rogers, 2010; Cestre, 1996). Three concepts of consumer innovativeness were classified by Bartels and Reinder (2011) in their study which was innate innovativeness, domain-specific innovativeness, and innovative behavior. The concept of innate innovativeness which is a universal personality trait was first discovered by Midgley and Dowling (1978), and they described it as a global individual attribute which is not restricted toward the particular domain of consumer interests. Innate innovativeness is defined as an inclination toward new products across different product categories (Hirschman, 1980). Steenkamp et al., (1999) described innate innovativeness as a shift in consumer behavior from the static brand and product choices toward dynamic and innovative decisions. So from all above definitions, innate innovativeness can be labeled as a personality trait which includes propensity toward trying and adopting new things. Midgley and Dowling (1978) termed domain specific innovativeness as “product-specific innovativeness,” i.e., inclination toward new products across a single product category, and this innovativeness is restricted toward the specific domain of consumer interests. Few past studies (e.g. Roerich, Valette-Florence & Ferrandi, 2002) have found a positive association between innate innovativeness and domain-specific innovativeness and innate innovativeness along with “Interest in product category” was found to be an antecedent of domain-specific innovativeness (Goldsmith, Freiden, & Eastman, 1995; Hirunyawipada & Paswan, 2006). Using consumer innovativeness as a personality trait would help organizations in segregating innovators from the others which would further help firms in introduction of new products (Goldsmith et al., 1995; Hirunyawipada & Paswan, 2006) as these innovators would play an essential role in the diffusion of innovations in the society (Cowart, Fox & Wilson, 2008)

Consumer spirituality and Consumer innovativeness

Whenever a novel product is introduced in the market, its success depends on the acceptance level of the consumers (Noland, 2005). The acceptance of the product depends on how strictly the new product adapts to the customs, values of the consumer (Kardes, Posavac, & Cronley, 2004). Spirituality is all about morally right, i.e., people with high spirituality have their values, morals, and laws (Petchsawang & Duchon, 2009). Consumer spirituality can be defined as “the intrinsic motivation to seek and express autonomy, inner satisfaction, and self-actualization, maintain the harmonious and sacred relationship with others, and desire sacredness in products, services, and experiences.” Narang (2013) Pg. 8. Kotler, Kartajaya, and Setiawan (2010) in “Marketing 3.0” stated that consumers pick those products/ services which complete not only their emotional and functional needs but also human spirit. Therefore, a poor interpretation of cultural

perspective or the insensitivity of consumers' values can be offensive and create a negative impression in the mind of the consumer for the company and its product and thus render marketing efforts ineffective or even damage the image of the companies in a particular market (Kardes et al., 2008). Roccas (2005) reported that people with high spirituality would place more emphasis on avoiding uncertainty and variation and would give less stress to sensual desires. These types of people will avoid independent decision making and actions and will depend on peers for their efforts. Even Mansori, Sambasivan and Md-Sidin (2015) in their study reported that consumers with high ethnic and religiosity values are less prone to innovative products thus would have a lower level of innovativeness. So based on the above review, the following hypothesis has been formulated

Hypothesis 1: *Consumer spirituality negatively affects consumer innovativeness.*

Materialism and Consumer Innovativeness

Few studies in India disprove the opinion that people in India are more spiritual and found Indians to be purely materialistic and this may be due to the shift of Indian culture towards the western culture (Bhawuk, 2003). Belk (1984) defined materialism as a personality trait which differentiates individuals based on the importance given to worldly possessions and termed materialistic as individuals who are more inclined toward acquiring more possessions. Lee, Khan, and Mirchandani (2013) stated that consumers with high innovativeness are more inclined toward purchasing modern products because of the belief that, acquiring these would create more sense of happiness and success. More materialistic consumers would buy the latest and updated products with the impression that this purchasing act as a symbol of social standing (Muzinich, Pecotich & Putrevu, 2003). Goldsmith, Flynn, Goldsmith, and Kim (2013) investigated the relationship between materialism and fashion innovativeness and found a significant relationship between both of them. Materialist people compare the possessions they hold with the possessions owned by others and wants to be in the leading position in displaying the fashion. So it can be said that materialism may be an essential antecedent of innovativeness so based on the above review the following hypothesis is formulated

Hypothesis 2: *Materialism positively affects consumer innovativeness.*

Consumer spirituality and Materialism

Materialists consider possession as an essential part of their lives and believe that the more possession they acquire, the more happy and prosperous they will be. Religion is considered as controlling social force which is against the acquisition and display of more possessions. Materialism is usually contradictory to religious and family values which can create psychological pressure on the consumers, resulting in decreased wellbeing (Burroughs & Rindfleisch, 2002). Sorokin (1992) stated that spiritual or religious commitment diminishes the never-ending number of desires of the individual which he/she want to accomplish, specifically the material needs (Watson, Jones, & Morris, 2004). As mentioned earlier that there are some values which drive the behavior of the consumer but

there are some values which are contradictory with each other like self-enhancement and self-transcendent values (Christopher, Marek & Carroll, 2004) and few studies have empirically proved this in countries like Germany, Malaysia, USA (Kilbourne, Grünhagen, & Foley, 2005). Self-enhancement values are related to conspicuous consumption, materialism while self-transcendent values are related to spirituality, religiosity. Belk (1984) stated that the more focused consumer is toward worldly pursuits, the less focused he/she will be toward spiritual duties moreover materialism is like avaricious desires which may lead to immoral behaviors like theft which is in contradiction of the spiritual values. So from the above review, it can be hypothesized that a strong sense of spirituality would decline the aspiration for worldly pursuits.

Hypothesis 3: Consumer spirituality negatively affects Materialism.

The mediating role of Materialism

As earlier conceptualized, consumer spirituality affects materialism and materialism effects the consumer innovativeness. So the question of the matter is: Does materialism plays a mediating role in the relationship between consumer spirituality and consumer innovativeness? According to Belk (1984), materialism is a desire for acquiring material possessions and spirituality may reduce the urge to purchase new products which further can restrict consumer to go for innovative products. Spiritual values oppose desire for acquisition of material goods (Burroughs & Rindfleisch, 2002) and placing a low emphasis on material possessions would decline the intensity to go for innovative products more conspicuously (Christopher et al., 2004). So based on the above discussion it is anticipated that materialism mediates the relation between consumer spirituality and consumers' innate innovativeness. Hence the following hypothesis has been formulated:

Hypothesis 4: Materialism mediates the relation between consumer spirituality and consumer innovativeness.

The moderating role of Gender

Few past studies have found that gender is a significant driver of consumer innovativeness (e.g., Steenkamp & Burgess, 2002; Tellis et al., 2009) and materialism. Women are considered to be more innovative than the men in terms of fashion (Wharton, 2007), and innovators are observed as females as compared to males (e.g., Fischer & Arnold, 1994; Goldsmith & Newell, 1997). Few studies also stated that men's are more innovative as compared to female (Tellis et al., 2009). According to studies conducted by researchers (e.g., Lewallen, Miller, & Behm-Morawitz, 2016; Grotts & Johnson, 2013 and Liao, Shen, & Chu, 2009), gender is a significant driver of materialism also, and females are more materialistic as compared to the males. Lerman & Maxwell (2006) identified gender not to be significantly correlated with consumer innovativeness. So based on review available the following hypothesis has been formulated.

Hypothesis 5: *Gender moderates the mediation effect of materialism on the relation between consumer spirituality and consumer innovativeness.*

So based on all the hypothesis the proposed conceptual framework is represented in Figure: 1

Figure 1: Proposed Conceptual Framework

3.Research methodology

Sample and procedure

Judgemental sampling was employed to collect data from consumers of different age groups. Data was collected through a questionnaire survey which was spread through the social networking sites and also personally from some target locations like malls, universities, public places in Punjab and Chandigarh. A total of 296 responses received, 237 questionnaires were found suitable for further analysis and rest were discarded thus the effective response rate was more than 80%.

Instruments

In the current study, the questionnaire has been used to collect data in respect of three variables: consumer spirituality, materialism, and consumer innovativeness and the survey also contained the demographics which were relevant to the study. In order to measure consumer spirituality, 11 item scale also named as CONSPIRIT scale was adopted from Narang (2013). In order to assess materialism among consumer, items from the modified scale of materialism given by Richins (2004) was adopted. Consumer innovativeness was measured using items from the scale developed by Le Louarn (1997).

All the items in the scale were measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

A principal component analysis employing varimax rotation was carried out to differentiate dimensions amongst variables. As the scale of spirituality was new and not adequately validated in past studies, the validity and reliability of the scales were inspected through pre-analysis of exploratory factor analysis as suggested by Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black (1995). While conducting factor analysis, the factor loading of three materialism statements two statements of consumer innovativeness were below the minimum prescribed limit, i.e., below 0.50 so they were also removed for further analysis. All the variables under the study were found to be strongly reliable with the Cronbach's alpha value greater than 0.60 (Bernstein & Nunnally, 1994) thus showing good internal consistency. *Table 1* shows the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity while *Table 2* depicts Cronbach's alpha and factor loading of all the statements.

Table 1: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.963
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	4427.955
	Df	210
	Sig.	.000

Table 2: Rotated Component Matrix^a with Cronbach's alpha

Variables	Statements of Variables	Component (Factor Loadings)		
		1	2	3
CONSUMER SPIRITUALITY (Cronbach's alpha = 0.965)	Being true in relationships is important to me.	.827		
	I buy products to fulfil my personal needs and not to impress others or to meet the expectations of others.	.823		
	I think the current problems in society are due to the conflict between the individual's and the society's goals.	.812		
	I make my purchases to please myself and not under any pressure from society.	.808		
	I prefer to buy from those retail outlets that are reliable and trustworthy.	.806		
	I connect to the universe on a daily basis.	.802		
	I consider ethical issues in making purchase decisions.	.798		
	I prefer to use products that are efficient and less energy consuming for both my personal and	.794		

	society's benefits.			
	My purchases are aligned with my philosophy of life.	.790		
	My efforts are directed towards understanding the purpose and meaning of life.	.790		
	I respect everyone.	.777		
MATERIALISM (Cronbach's alpha = 0.923)	Buying things gives me a lot of pleasure.		.781	
	I like to own things that impress people.		.778	
	I like a lot of luxury in my life.		.776	
	Some of the most important achievements in life include acquiring material possessions.		.757	
	I enjoy spending money on things that aren't practical.		.688	
	My life would be better if I owned certain things I don't have.		.682	
CONSUMER INNOVATIVENESS (Cronbach's alpha = 0.918)	Before trying a new product, I try to learn what friends who possess this product think about it.			.844
	I never buy something I don't know anything about with the risk of making a mistake.			.829
	I'd rather choose a brand that I usually buy rather than try something I am not confident in.			.821
	I am the kind of person who tries every new product at least once.			.806

Control Variables

In order to avoid the confounding relationships, the study included demographic variables which should be controlled as per literature available. The variables that should be statistically controlled were age (Midgley & Dowling, 1993; Rogers, 1995; Im, Bayus, & Mason, 2003; Ponchio & Aranha, 2008; Flynn, Goldsmith, & Korzenny, 2011), qualification (Rogers, 1995; Martinez et al., 1998; Midgely & Dowling, 1993; Robertson, 1971), income (Tellis et al., 2009; Im et al., 2003 ; Venkatraman, 1991), marital status (Tellis et al., 2009; Midgely & Dowling, 1993).

4. Data analysis

The data gathered was coded and saved in SPSS version 23 and SEM was used to analyze the proposed structural model using AMOS version 24. Past researches recommended a minimum sample size of 200 (Hoogland & Boomsma, 1998; Kline, 2004; Weston & Gore, 2006; Kline, 2015). Thus the basic necessity to apply SEM analysis have

been met. Firstly the reliability and validity of the instrument were determined. The reliability was determined using Cronbach's alpha, and validity (discriminant and convergent) were examined using Principal Component Analysis (PCA) & Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). Moreover, to analyze the mediation effect data were analyzed using the mediation model as proposed by (Hayes, 2017) using the bootstrapping technique at 95% confidence level. Finally moderated mediation was analyzed to determine if there is a significant difference in mediation results among gender categories, i.e., males and females.

5. Results

Demographic characteristics of the respondents

Table 3: Demographic profile of Respondents

Demographic Variables	Categories	Frequency	Valid Percentage
Gender	Male	133	56.1
	Female	104	43.9
Marital Status	Married	51	21.5
	Single	186	78.5
Age	18-30	66	27.8
	31-45	96	40.5
	46-60	70	29.5
	61 and above	5	2.2
Qualification	Undergraduate	39	16.5
	Graduate	63	26.6
	Post Graduate	80	33.8
	professional/diploma	55	23.2
Income	< 2 lakhs	83	35
	2 lakhs - 4 lakhs	90	38
	> 4 lakhs	64	27

(Source: Primary data)

Table 3 represents the results of demographic statistics showing the frequency and percentage of all the variables as per the categories.

Correlation Analysis

Mean, standard deviation and correlation among all the variables of the study, i.e., consumer spirituality, materialism, and consumer innovativeness were calculated. Table 4 represents the mean and standard deviation while Table 5 describes the correlation among variables.

Table 4: Mean and standard deviation of Variables

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Materialism	2.1438	1.02189	237
Consumer Spirituality	2.7989	1.16383	237
Consumer Innovativeness	2.2713	0.98775	237

(Source: Primary data)

Table 5: Correlation Statistics of variables

	Materialism	Consumer spirituality	Consumer Innovativeness
Materialism	1	-.734	.755
Consumer spirituality	-.734	1	-.562
Consumer Innovativeness	.755	-.562	1

(Source: Primary data)

Results of the correlational analysis reveals that spirituality is significantly negatively correlated with materialism ($r = -.734$, $\text{sig} = .000$) and consumer innovativeness ($r = -.562$, $\text{sig} = .000$) while materialism and consumer innovativeness were significantly positively correlated ($r = .755$, $\text{sig} = .000$). All the three variables were found to be significantly correlated with each other thus providing fundamental support to the hypothesis.

Measurement Model

The fit of the three-factor model was analyzed using CFA. The validity of the model was examined using convergent and discriminant validity. To achieve convergent validity the factor loadings should be greater than .50 (Kline, 2015), $\text{AVE} > .5$ (Fornell & Larcker, 1981), composite reliability should be greater than 0.7 (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010) and to achieve discriminant validity average variance explained (AVE) should be greater than maximum shared variance (MSV) and average share variance (ASV) (Hair et al., 2010). Table 6 represents the validity statistics

Table 6: Validity Statistics of variables

	CR	AVE	MSV	Max	INV	CS	MAT
Consumer Innovativeness	0.914	0.728	0.506	0.931	0.853		
Consumer spirituality	0.965	0.714	0.491	0.965	-0.534	0.845	
Materialism	0.924	0.670	0.506	0.925	0.711	-0.701	0.819

Note: Validity master was used to analyzing the validity which was fully established

Invariance test was also tested on the measurement model to analyze metric and configural invariance for our multigroup (Gender) confirmatory factor analysis. After conducting the configural invariance test the results showed chi-square = 456.6 and $\text{df} = 366$ and all values were above the minimum prescribed limits i.e. $\text{CMIN/DF} = 1.248 \leq 3$ (Hair et al., 2010), $\text{GFI} = 0.851 > 0.8$ (Homburg & Baumgartner, 1995), $\text{PGFI} = 0.674 \geq 0.5$ (Wu, 2009), $\text{CFI} = 0.980 \geq 0.9$ (Hair et al., 2010) and $\text{RMSEA} = 0.032 \leq 0.08$ (Steiger, 1990). Metric variance test examines whether specific scale items under their specific construct are the same across different groups or not. It is required to have at least a partial metric invariance before proceeding to further tests (Vandenberg & Lance, 2000). To test this variance chi-square value and degree of freedom of two models are compared with constrained factor loading in one group and unconstrained factor loading in another group.

After running the model fit results showed chi-square = 474.9 and df = 387. To examine the existence of a significant difference the test was applied, and *table 7* represents the results that the proposed model is robust as the model is invariant with p-value = 0.630.

Table 7: Chi-square difference test

	<u>Chi-square</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>p-value</u>	<u>Invariant?</u>
Overall Model				
Unconstrained	456.6	366		
Fully constrained	474.9	387		
Number of groups		2		
Difference	18.3	21	0.630	YES

Structural Model

After confirming the validity and reliability, the proposed model was further put for SEM analysis. The direct effects of using standardized path coefficients are portrayed in *Table 8*.

Table 8: Results of Structural Model

Hypothesis	Relationships			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Hypothesis accepted
H- 1	INV	<---	CS	-0.505	0.082	-6.158	***	YES
H- 2	INV	<---	MAT	0.667	0.072	9.3	***	YES
H- 3	MAT	<---	CS	-0.745	0.083	-8.962	***	YES

Notes: 1. *** p -value < 0.01; ** p -value < 0.05 and * p -value < 0.10.

2. INV- Consumer Innovativeness, MAT- Materialism, CS- Consumer Spirituality

Results from the tables display that there is a significant negative relationship between consumer spirituality and consumer innovativeness (CR= -6.518, p -value < .01) thus supporting Hypothesis-1. Results also supported hypothesis-2 as results by depicting that there is a significant positive relationship between materialism and innovativeness (CR= 9.3, p -value > .01). Moreover, materialism and consumer spirituality were also found to be significantly negatively related to each other (CR= -8.962, p -value> .01) thus supporting hypothesis-3.

To determine the indirect effect of consumer spirituality on consumer innovativeness, bootstrapping technique with 2000 bootstrap samples at a 95% confidence interval was employed. Results of mediation analysis are displayed in *Table 9*.

Table 9: Mediation Results

Type of effects	Before Mediation test	After Mediation test	Hypothesis
Direct effect of consumer spirituality on Consumer Innovativeness	Estimate= -.505 (p -value<.01)***	Estimate= .036 (p -value= 0.699)	Hypothesis 4 accepted
Indirect effect of consumer spirituality on consumer innovativeness	-----	Estimate= -.623 (p -value= 0.003)***	

Notes: *** p -value < 0.01; ** p -value < 0.05 and * p -value < 0.10

The above results supported hypothesis 4 by depicting that there exists full mediation in the relation between consumer spirituality and consumer innovativeness through materialism. As Indirect effect is significant (Estimate= -.623, p -value= 0.003) so there exists a mediation and to check whether it is partial or full the direct effect is examined and as per result direct effect of consumer spirituality on consumer innovativeness (Estimate= .036, p -value= 0.699) have become insignificant so there exists full mediation (Hair et al., 1995; Hayes, 2017) in this case.

Moderated mediation analysis

In this, it is analyzed whether the results of the indirect effect is conditional on the moderating variable or not. In this study moderation effect of gender was analyzed on mediation analysis. To examine the moderated mediation, firstly the mediation effect among both gender categories was analyzed, and then the significant difference among the mediation effect was examined. The indirect effect in case of males and females are depicted in *Table 10* and to determine the moderating mediation effect significance value of the difference in both indirect effects was determined using estimands (Hayes, 2017) was determined in *Table 11*

Table 10: Standardised indirect effect among Gender categories

Type of effect	Males	Females
Indirect effect of consumer spirituality on consumer innovativeness	Estimate = -.550 p -value = .001***	Estimate = -.549 p -value = .001***

Notes: *** p -value < 0.01; ** p -value < 0.05 and * p -value < 0.10

Table 11: User-defined estimands: MyModMed estimands

Parameter	Estimate	Lower	Upper	P	Hypothesis
(A x B)-(C x D)	.053	-.307	.511	.740	Hypothesis 5 rejected

Notes: Indirect effect for males= (A x B), Indirect effect for females=(C x D)

So from the above results, it is summarised that there is significant mediation effect of materialism on the relation between consumer spirituality and consumer innovativeness among both gender categories while there is no moderated mediation in the proposed model (p -value = .740 > .05), so hypothesis 5 have been rejected.

6. Discussion

The present research was an attempt to explore if, materialism mediates the relation between consumer spirituality and consumer innovativeness. The results of the study depicted a significant negative relation between consumer spirituality and consumer innovativeness thus supports the implications of a few previous studies (Mansori, Sambasivan, & Md-Sidin, 2015; Roccas, 2005). There are very few studies which examined the impact of Religion (Hirschman, 1980) and religiosity (Mansori, 2012) on the

consumer innovativeness but none of the studies had examined the role of consumer spirituality in diminishing consumer innovativeness, and this present study fills the research gap. The present study found the significant linkage between materialism and consumer innovativeness also thus supporting few previous studies (Lee et al., 2013; Goldsmith et al., 2013; Muzinich et al., 2003). The indirect effect of consumer spirituality on innovativeness through materialism is significant among both males and females. Thus hypotheses 1,2,3,4 have been accepted. The moderated mediation effect of gender on mediation results have also been analyzed, and it has been seen that mediation exists both in case of males and females, but there is no moderated mediation present in the sample of the study, i.e., there is no significant difference between mediation effect among both gender categories. Thus hypotheses five have not been accepted. Bartels and Reinders (2010) came up with three concepts of innovativeness: Innate innovativeness, domain-specific innovativeness, and innovative behavior. Few researchers have pointed out the low predictive validity of innate innovativeness (eg. Hurt, Joseph, & Cook, 1977) and high validity of domain-specific innovativeness (Goldsmith & Hofacker, 1991). However, the present study is a first attempt to link consumer spirituality with the consumer innovativeness, and moreover, innate innovativeness is also a significant driver of domain-specific innovativeness (Roerich et al., 2002). So this constraint is acceptable due to the exploratory nature of the study and adaption of innate innovativeness scale would help in the segmentation of consumers between innovation seekers and non-innovation seekers.

Practical implications

The present study came up with the significant implications for the marketing managers responsible for bringing new product offerings, identifying the early adopters and framing strategies for those early adopters. To gain a proper understanding of innovative consumer behavior, this area of research is very vital for marketing managers. The results of the study pinpoint that spiritual values restrict consumers to adopt new products and services by dwindling materialistic motivation. So to make new products and offering successful in the Indian market, it is important to tailor their products according to the values that drive the innovative behaviors (Piderit, 2000; Reynolds, Gengler & Howard, 1995) so that effective positioning strategy can be formulated and implemented. Managers must be able to understand the facets of spirituality which can affect the level of openness of the consumers so that they can come up with effective strategies to reduce the resistance level of spiritual consumers for new products. Spiritually oriented consumers are mindful regarding their purchases and its further consequent effect on society, ecology and their own lives (Sheth, Sethia, & Srinivas, 2011). So business firms should deem the element of spirituality during the development of new product and planning of marketing mix strategy. Few consumers develop negative perceptions towards advertisements of new products as they think that these new products are against their spiritual pursuits (Shyan Fam, Waller, & Zafer Erdogan, 2004). Managers may promote their products through the backing of various spiritual organizations and by creating awareness regarding the benefits of the products for society and their own lives. Thus the attributes of innovative products and benefits that can be derived should be linked with the spiritual

values of the consumers to diminish the resistance to change among these innovative consumers.

Limitations and directions for future research

As with any study, some limitations exist; this opens the opportunities for future research. First, in the present study sample was taken from Punjab and Chandigarh only future research should also include some samples from different states in India to improve the validation of results. Second, a self-reported questionnaire was used which may bring the effect of common method bias. However, this limitation is not of much concern if a questionnaire is multi-statement and properly validated (Spector, 1987). Third, judgemental sampling was used to collect data from multiple age categories to cover respondents with different spirituality levels (Wink & Dhillon, 2002), so future studies may use random sampling of consumers to increase the generalization of results. Fourth, though various demographic variables except gender were controlled to diminish the confounding effect, they may affect modeled relationships so future studies may take the significant demographical variables as moderators to gain more profound insights into relationships. Finally, future studies can use a domain-specific scale of innovativeness to validate the results for the specific domain of the products. Other essential variables which were not in the scope of the study can be taken into consideration for future researches.

7. References:

- Bartels, J., & Reinders, M. J. (2011). Consumer innovativeness and its correlates: A propositional inventory for future research. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(6), 601-609. doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2010.05.002
- Belk, R. W. (1984). Three scales to measure constructs related to materialism: Reliability, validity, and relationships to measures of happiness. *ACR North American Advances*. Retrived from <http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/6260/volumes/v11/NA-11>
- Bernstein, I. H., & Nunnally, J. C. (1994). Psychometric theory. *New York: McGraw-Hill*. Oliva, TA, Oliver, RL, & MacMillan, IC (1992). A catastrophe model for developing service satisfaction strategies. *Journal of Marketing*, 56, 83-95. doi.org/10.1177/002224299205600306
- Bhawuk, D. P. (2003). Culture's influence on creativity: the case of Indian spirituality. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(1), 1-22. [doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767\(02\)00059-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(02)00059-7)
- Burroughs, J. E., & Rindfleisch, A. (2002). Materialism and well-being: A conflicting values perspective. *Journal of Consumer research*, 29(3), 348-370. doi.org/10.1086/344429
- Cestre, G. (1996). Diffusion and innovativity: definition, modeling and measurement. *Research and Applications in Marketing (French Edition)*, 11 (1), 69-88. doi.org/10.1177/076737019601100105
- Christopher, A. N., Marek, P., & Carroll, S. M. (2004). Materialism and Attitudes Toward Money: An Exploratory Investigation. *Individual Differences Research*, 2(2). Retrived from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2004-19396-003>
- Cowart, K. O., Fox, G. L., & Wilson, A. E. (2008). A structural look at consumer innovativeness and self-congruence in new product purchases. *Psychology & Marketing*, 25(12), 1111-1130. doi.org/10.1002/mar.20256
- Fischer, E., & Arnold, S. J. (1994). Sex, gender identity, gender role attitudes, and consumer behavior. *Psychology & Marketing*, 11(2), 163-182. doi.org/10.1002/mar.4220110206

- Flynn, L. R., Goldsmith, R. E., & Korzenny, F. (2011). Brand engagement in self-concept: A psychometric and demographic analysis. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(2), 5. Retrived from <http://www.jmrpublication.org/Default.aspx>
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of marketing research*, 18(1), 39-50. doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104
- Goldsmith, R. E. (2001). Using the domain specific innovativeness scale to identify innovative internet consumers. *Internet Research*, 11(2), 149-158. doi.org/10.1108/10662240110695098
- Goldsmith, R. E., & Foxall, G. R. (2003). The measurement of innovativeness. *The international handbook on innovation*, 321-330. doi.org/10.1016/B978-008044198-6/50022-X
- Goldsmith, R. E., & Hofacker, C. F. (1991). Measuring consumer innovativeness. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 19(3), 209-221. doi.org/10.1007/BF02726497
- Goldsmith, R. E., & Newell, S. J. (1997). Innovativeness and price sensitivity: managerial, theoretical and methodological issues. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 6(3), 163-174. doi.org/10.1108/10610429710175682
- Goldsmith, R. E., Flynn, L. R., Goldsmith, E. B., & Kim, W. M. (2013). Fashion innovativeness and materialism. *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*, 4(4), 266-283. doi.org/10.1080/20932685.2013.817142
- Goldsmith, R. E., Freiden, J. B., & Eastman, J. K. (1995). The generality/specificity issue in consumer innovativeness research. *Technovation*, 15(10), 601-612. [doi.org/10.1016/0166-4972\(95\)99328-D](https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-4972(95)99328-D)
- Grotts, A. S., & Widner Johnson, T. (2013). Millennial consumers' status consumption of handbags. *Journal of fashion marketing and management: an international journal*, 17(3), 280-293. doi.org/10.1108/JFMM-10-2011-0067
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (7). & Black, WC, 1995, Multivariate Data Analysis. *Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall International*.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). Multivariate data analysis: International version. *New Jersey, Pearson*.
- Hauser, J., Tellis, G. J., & Griffin, A. (2006). Research on innovation: A review and agenda for marketing science. *Marketing science*, 25(6), 687-717. doi.org/10.1287/mksc.1050.0144
- Hayes, A. F. (2017). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford Publications.
- Hirschman, E. C. (1980). Innovativeness, novelty seeking, and consumer creativity. *Journal of consumer research*, 7(3), 283-295. doi.org/10.1086/208816
- Hirunyawipada, T., & Paswan, A. K. (2006). Consumer innovativeness and perceived risk: implications for high technology product adoption. *Journal of consumer marketing*, 23(4), 182-198. doi.org/10.1108/07363760610674310
- Homburg, C., & Baumgartner, H. (1995). Assessment of causal models. Inventory and application recommendations. *Marketing NDT*, 17 (3), 162-176. doi.org/10.15358/0344-1369-1995-3-162
- Hoogland, J. J., & Boomsma, A. (1998). Robustness studies in covariance structure modeling: An overview and a meta-analysis. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 26(3), 329-367. doi.org/10.1177/0049124198026003003
- Hurt, H. T., Joseph, K., & Cook, C. D. (1977). Scales for the measurement of innovativeness. *Human Communication Research*, 4(1), 58-65. doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1977.tb00597.x

- Im, S., Bayus, B. L., & Mason, C. H. (2003). An empirical study of innate consumer innovativeness, personal characteristics, and new-product adoption behavior. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 31(1), 61-73. doi.org/10.1177/0092070302238602
- Kardes, F. R., Posavac, S. S., & Cronley, M. L. (2004). Consumer inference: A review of processes, bases, and judgment contexts. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 14(3), 230-256. doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp1403_6
- Kilbourne, W., Grünhagen, M., & Foley, J. (2005). A cross-cultural examination of the relationship between materialism and individual values. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 26(5), 624-641. doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2004.12.009
- Kline, R. B. (2004). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling (methodology in the social sciences).
- Kline, R. B. (2015). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. Guilford publications.
- Kotler, P., Kartajaya, H., & Setiawan, I. (2010). *Marketing 3.0: From products to customers to the human spirit*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Lassar, W. M., Manolis, C., & Lassar, S. S. (2005). The relationship between consumer innovativeness, personal characteristics, and online banking adoption. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 23(2), 176-199. doi.org/10.1108/02652320510584403
- Lee, K., Khan, S., & Mirchandani, D. (2013). Hierarchical effects of product attributes on actualized innovativeness in the context of high-tech products. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(12), 2634-2641. doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.05.024
- Lerman, D., & Maxwell, S. (2006). Joining a consumer society: Russian immigrant versus American materialism. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour: An International Research Review*, 5(6), 479-490. doi.org/10.1002/cb.197
- Lewallen, J., Miller, B., & Behm-Morawitz, E. (2016). Lifestyles of the rich and famous: Celebrity media diet and the cultivation of emerging adults' materialism. *Mass Communication and Society*, 19(3), 253-274. doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2015.1096945
- Liao, S. L., Shen, Y. C., & Chu, C. H. (2009). The effects of sales promotion strategy, product appeal and consumer traits on reminder impulse buying behaviour. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 33(3), 274-284. doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-6431.2009.00770.x
- Louarn, PL (1997). The trend to innovate consumers: conceptual analysis and proposal of a scale of measurement. *Research and Applications in Marketing (French Edition)*, 12(1), 3-19. doi.org/10.1177/076737019701200101
- Mansori, S. (2012). Impact of religion affiliation and religiosity on consumer innovativeness; the evidence of Malaysia. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 7(3), 301-307. Retrived from <http://eprints.intimal.edu.my/id/eprint/131>
- Mansori, S., Sambasivan, M., & Md-Sidin, S. (2015). Acceptance of novel products: the role of religiosity, ethnicity and values. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 33(1), 39-66. doi.org/10.1108/MIP-03-2013-0050
- Martinez, E., Polo, Y., & Flavian, C. (1998). The acceptance and diffusion of new consumer durables: differences between first and last adopters. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 15(4), 323-342. doi.org/10.1108/07363769810225975
- Midgley, D. F., & Dowling, G. R. (1978). Innovativeness: The concept and its measurement. *Journal of consumer research*, 4(4), 229-242. doi.org/10.1086/208701
- Midgley, D. F., & Dowling, G. R. (1993). A longitudinal study of product form innovation: the interaction between predispositions and social messages. *Journal of consumer research*, 19(4), 611-625. doi.org/10.1086/209326
- Muzinich, N., Pecotich, A., & Putrevu, S. (2003). A model of the antecedents and consequents of female fashion innovativeness. *Journal of retailing and consumer services*, 10(5), 297-310. [doi.org/10.1016/S0969-6989\(02\)00060-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0969-6989(02)00060-7)

- Narang, R. (2013). Measuring Consumer spirituality through a valid scale. Retrived from <http://hdl.handle.net/11718/11492>
- Noland, M. (2005). Religion and economic performance. *World development*, 33(8), 1215-1232. doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2005.03.006
- Pauwels, K., Silva-Risso, J., Srinivasan, S., & Hanssens, D. M. (2004). New products, sales promotions, and firm value: The case of the automobile industry. *Journal of marketing*, 68(4), 142-156. doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.68.4.142.42724
- Petchsawang, P., & Duchon, D. (2009). Measuring workplace spirituality in an Asian context. *Human resource development international*, 12(4), 459-468. doi.org/10.1080/13678860903135912
- Piderit, S. K. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional view of attitudes toward an organizational change. *Academy of management review*, 25(4), 783-794. doi.org/10.2307/259206
- Ponchio, M. C., & Aranha, F. (2008). Materialism as a predictor variable of low income consumer behavior when entering into installment plan agreements. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour: An International Research Review*, 7(1), 21-34. doi.org/10.1002/cb.234
- Reynolds, T. J., Gengler, C. E., & Howard, D. J. (1995). A means-end analysis of brand persuasion through advertising. *International Journal of research in marketing*, 12(3), 257-266. [doi.org/10.1016/0167-8116\(95\)00025-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-8116(95)00025-W)
- Richins, M. L. (2004). The material values scale: Measurement properties and development of a short form. *Journal of consumer Research*, 31(1), 209-219. doi.org/10.1086/383436
- Richins, M. L., & Rudmin, F. W. (1994). Materialism and economic psychology. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 15(2), 217-231. [doi.org/10.1016/0167-4870\(94\)90001-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-4870(94)90001-9)
- Robertson, T. S. (1971). *Innovative behavior and communication*. Holt McDougal.
- Robertson, T. S., & Kassarian, H. H. (1991). *Handbook of consumer behavior*. Prentice Hall.
- Roccas, S. (2005). Religion and value systems. *Journal of Social Issues*, 61(4), 747-759. doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2005.00430.x
- Roerich, G., Valette-Florence, P., & Ferrandi, J. M. (2002). An exploration of the relationships between innate innovativeness and domain specific innovativeness. *ACR Asia-Pacific Advances*. Retrived from <http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/11841/volumes/ap05/AP-05>
- Rogers Everett, M. (1995). Diffusion of innovations. New York, 12.
- Rogers, E. M. (2010). *Diffusion of innovations*. Simon and Schuster.
- Sheth, J. N., Sethia, N. K., & Srinivas, S. (2011). Mindful consumption: a customer-centric approach to sustainability. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 39(1), 21-39. doi.org/10.1007/s11747-010-0216-3
- Shyan Fam, K., Waller, D. S., & Zafer Erdogan, B. (2004). The influence of religion on attitudes towards the advertising of controversial products. *European Journal of marketing*, 38(5/6), 537-555. doi.org/10.1108/03090560410529204
- Sorokin, P. A. (1992). The crisis of our age. Oxford: One world Publications.
- Spector, P. E. (1987). Method variance as an artifact in self-reported affect and perceptions at work: myth or significant problem?. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72(3), 438. doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.72.3.438
- Steenkamp, J. B. E., & Burgess, S. M. (2002). Optimum stimulation level and exploratory consumer behavior in an emerging consumer market. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 19(2), 131-150. [doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8116\(02\)00063-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8116(02)00063-0)
- Steenkamp, J. B. E., Ter Hofstede, F., & Wedel, M. (1999). A cross-national investigation into the individual and national cultural antecedents of consumer innovativeness. *Journal of marketing*, 63(2), 55-69. doi.org/10.2307/1251945

- Steiger, J. H. (1990). Structural model evaluation and modification: An interval estimation approach. *Multivariate behavioral research*, 25(2), 173-180. doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr2502_4
- Summers, J. O. (1971). Generalized change agents and innovativeness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 8(3), 313-316. doi.org/10.2307/3149568
- Tellis, G. J., Yin, E., & Bell, S. (2009). Global consumer innovativeness: Cross-country differences and demographic commonalities. *Journal of International Marketing*, 17(2), 1-22. doi.org/10.1509/jimk.17.2.1
- Vandenberg, R. J., & Lance, C. E. (2000). A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance literature: Suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organizational research. *Organizational research methods*, 3(1), 4-70. doi.org/10.1177/109442810031002
- Venkatraman, M. P. (1991). The impact of innovativeness and innovation type on adoption. *Journal of Retailing*, 67(1), 51. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/openview/d216a5b1eb19fab1d75cbe5070a7f28f/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=41988>
- Venkatraman, M. P., & Price, L. L. (1990). Differentiating between cognitive and sensory innovativeness: Concepts, measurement, and implications. *Journal of Business research*, 20(4), 293-315. [doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(90\)90008-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(90)90008-2)
- Watson, P. J., Jones, N. D., & Morris, R. J. (2004). Religious orientation and attitudes toward money: Relationships with narcissism and the influence of gender. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 7(4), 277-288. doi.org/10.1080/13674670310001606478
- Weston, R., & Gore Jr, P. A. (2006). A brief guide to structural equation modeling. *The counseling psychologist*, 34(5), 719-751. doi.org/10.1177/0011000006286345
- Wharton, K. (2007). Men Buy, Women Shop": The Sexes Have Different Priorities When Walking Down the Aisles. Retrieved from <https://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article/men-buy-women-shop-the-sexes-have-different-priorities-when-walking-down-the-aisles/>
- Wink, P., & Dillon, M. (2002). Spiritual development across the adult life course: Findings from a longitudinal study. *Journal of Adult Development*, 9(1), 79-94. doi.org/10.1023/A:1013833419122
- Wu, M. L. (2009). Structural equation modeling: Operation and application of AMOS. *Chongqing Univ.*