Tanrikulu, Ceyda

Article

Consumer differences in motivated consumer innovativeness and global identity

Marketing i menedžment innovacij

Provided in Cooperation with:
ZBW OAS

Reference: Tanrikulu, Ceyda (2022). Consumer differences in motivated consumer innovativeness and global identity. In: Marketing i menedžment innovacij (1), S. 134 - 152. https://mmi.fem.sumdu.edu.ua/sites/default/files/576-2022_10_Tanrikulu_0.pdf. doi:10.21272/mmi.2022.1-10.

This Version is available at:
http://hdl.handle.net/11159/7253

Marketing and Management of Innovations
Issue 1, 2022

ISSN 2227-6718 (on-line)
ISSN 2218-4511 (print)

https://doi.org/10.21272/mmi.2022.1-10 **JEL Classification: M30, M31, M39**

Ceyda Tanrikulu,
Associate Professor, Adana Alparslan Turkes Science and Technology University, Turkey
ORCID ID, 0000-0001-9025-583X
email: ctanrikulu@atu.edu.tr

CONSUMER DIFFERENCES IN MOTIVATED CONSUMER INNOVATIVENESS AND GLOBAL IDENTITY

Abstract. *One of the main reasons for failure in sustainable marketing and innovative products is the lack of an adequate understanding of consumer wants and needs. Understanding the issues of motivations for innovativeness and identity in young consumers can provide important evidence for both theory and practice on achieving sustainability. Despite the importance of gender and generation cohort differences on motivated consumer innovativeness and global identity, similarities/differences and links between these variables for each group are not precise and waiting for research that provides clear evidence, especially in the pandemic period. Therefore, this paper aims 1) to determine the differences/similarities in gender and generational cohorts regarding the motivated consumer innovativeness and global identity and 2) to examine the relationship between motivating consumer innovativeness and global identity in given cohorts. Data were collected from consumers in Y and Z generations on an emerging market in Turkey through an online questionnaire. The main results indicated no gender differences for both motivated consumer innovativeness and global identity, whereas there were some differences between generational cohorts. Moreover, some significant relationships were found for each gender and generational cohort. In this study, significant differences were demonstrated about the motivations that drive consumers to be innovative in the Z generation, which has limited knowledge reserve and could be seen as a strong challenge. The findings were discussed, and suggestions were presented for both literature and managerial implications. Thus, this study could contribute to the current literature by confirming the significance of generation-specific differences in consumer behavior and stressing some similarities between Y and Z generations and differences, especially in pandemic conditions. It could be helpful as a roadmap for global marketers engaging in innovative marketing, consumer innovativeness, development of innovative products, and psychological consequences of globalization in young consumers, especially in emerging markets.*

Keywords: gender, generation cohort, global identity, global marketing, motivated consumer innovativeness, sustainability.

Introduction. One of the basic principles of sustainable marketing is innovative marketing which focuses on searching for new and better marketing offerings (Kotler and Armstrong, 2021). The failures of innovation result from insufficient knowledge regarding the consumers' wants and needs (Kaushik and Rahman, 2016), while understanding the motivation and identity of young consumers presents suitable insights into the development of innovative marketing offerings.

Consumer innovativeness is pivotal for both literature and business due to the following reasons: the need for broadening the knowledge about similarities and differences among consumers as markets expand globally, launching new products with increasing frequency around the world by companies, encouraging consumer welfare thanks to innovation (Tellis et al., 2009), relying on contribution of successful innovation in companies' growth and profit (Steenkamp et al., 1999), and also supporting sustainability by using resources effectively and efficiently through predicting successfully adopted innovations. Consumer innovativeness accelerates innovative behavior that drives adoption and diffusion of innovation (Thakur and Jasrai, 2018; Kaushik and Rahman, 2016; Kim et al., 2011). Additionally, based on the current approach in consumer behavior discipline, determining the motivations of consumers is the significant stage to be sure that a product meets the appropriate needs (Solomon, 2020). Besides that, human behavior is strongly based on motivations (Hwang et al., 2021). Motivational goals could present

Cite as: Tanrikulu, C. (2022). Consumer Differences in Motivated Consumer Innovativeness and Global Identity. *Marketing and Management of Innovations*, 1, 134-152. http://doi.org/10.21272/mmi.2022.1-10

Received: 13 March 2022 **Accepted:** 25 March 2022 **Published:** 30 March 2022

robust clarification for consumer behavior (Vandecasteele and Geuens, 2010). Motivation is a psychological state that could produce reliable insight into a tendency to pursue goals (Hwang et al., 2021), such as the intention to adopt new goods and services, which refers to consumer innovativeness (Tellis et al., 2009). The concept of motivated consumer innovativeness (MCI) in the consumer behavior literature provides a significant contribution to understanding the key triggers which lead to consumers buying innovations (Hawang et al., 2021; Caricati and Raimondi, 2015; Vandecasteele and Geuens, 2010) and is suggested to be useful for predicting consumers' innovative buying behavior (Caricati and Raimondi, 2015; Vandecasteele and Geuens, 2010). Moreover, consumers' identity is also one of the essential issues because it guides the choices of individuals (Oyserman, 2009), and consumption reflects the identity (Eryigit and Sunaoglu, 2017). Globalization, whose primary psychological influence is determined to be on the identity of individuals (Arnett, 2002), digitalization, and advanced technology in production and transportation encourage consumers to integrate with people on the other side of the world and become a part of the global culture, which means having a global identity (GI).

The gender differences are also suggested as crucial topics for researchers and implications, so it is required to advance the understanding due to limited research (Meyers-Levy and Loken, 2015). Limited and mixed previous findings in the literature, variation of gender differences based on culture and nationality (Ding et al., 2018; Gilal et al., 2018; Frank et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2011; Moss and Colman, 2001), change in roles and behaviors of female/male over time (Meyers-Levy and Loken, 2015), and usefulness of gender-based segmentation (Moss and Colman, 2001) for business implications stimulate the need of research on gender in consumer innovativeness and more specifically, in MCI. Moreover, the generation cohort of consumers is suggested as an important variable to understand consumers' attitudes, beliefs, values, and behavior since each cohort has distinctive characteristics (Soares et al., 2017). As global connections increase, generational shifts are predicted to become more important than differences in socio-economic features for determining behavior (Francis and Hoefel, 2018). In addition, generation cohort is useful for market strategies such as market segmentation (Thach et al., 2021; Soares et al., 2017) and adaptation-standardization strategy (Raskovic et al., 2016). But it should be noted that diversity among cultures, countries, and histories can form different generations. Some differences within the same cohort could also occur due to the country and cultural background differences (Thach et al., 2021). Furthermore, Sheth (2021) calls attention to emerging markets and addresses their growth as one of the main forces that lead to more convergence among marketing disciplines. Besides, these markets are demonstrated as the markets where many multinational companies face failure for a product that succeeds in developed countries (Sheth, 2021). Also, the young adult consumer cohort in emerging markets is indicated as heterogeneous, in contrast to multinational firms' mistaking of this cohort as homogeneous (Strizhakova et al., 2012). Age, which is used as one of the main tools to determine generations, is a key variable influencing consumer concern towards globalization in emerging markets (Strizhakova et al., 2012) and innovativeness (Raskovic et al., 2016). It implies the importance of the generation cohort in global marketing. While research on generation Z is defined as scarce (Thach et al., 2020), they are suggested as the biggest future challenge for marketers (Priporas et al., 2017). Thus, it is becoming crucial to understand what drives consumers to be more innovative, particularly in each gender and Y/Z generational cohorts.

In addition to all the above importance, the changes in consumer behavior in time of COVID-19 pandemic pressure reconfirm/replace previous findings or lead new investigations in many fields of consumer behavior literature such as MCI (Hwang et al., 2021) and GI. Time is suggested as a critical ingredient of motivated behavior (Steel and König, 2006); thus, the pandemic time can also have a significant role in MCI and GI, which means a special requirement for consumer research in this field.

Despite the importance of gender and generation cohort differences on MCI and GI, similarities/differences and links between MCI and GI for each group are not precise and waiting for research that provides clear evidence in the pandemic period.

Thus, this study aims 1) to determine the differences/similarities in gender and generational cohorts regarding the MCI and GI and 2) examine the relationship between MCI and GI in given cohorts. This study was conducted in Turkey as an emerging market. Therefore, it gave some significant evidence related to young Turkish consumers. The major results demonstrated gender invariance in MCI and GI. In turn, there were differences between generational cohorts. In this study, some significant relationships were addressed for each gender and generational cohort. Thus, it can contribute to providing fresh insight to expand the current knowledge about the gender and generation cohort, particularly in the pandemic. Furthermore, it could also be helpful for researchers and practitioners to deeper understand the comparison of each gender and Y/Z generation cohorts in terms of having GI and drivers of innovativeness, which provides additional evidence for innovative marketing.

Literature Review. In consumer behavior literature, identity is defined by Reed II et al. (2012) as «any category label with which a consumer self-associates that is amenable to a clear picture of what a person in that category looks like, thinks, feels and does». Individuals tend to have beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors which encourage self-identity (Westjohn et al., 2012). Identity becomes more dependent on individuals' preferences and the decisions each individual makes about which values to embrace, rather than social roles. Moreover, the identity of individuals is addressed as the primary effect of globalization on human psychology. Globalization can lead to identity-based transformation, namely, besides local identity, individuals form GI (Arnett, 2002). Tu et al. (2012) defined the concept of GI as «consumers feel they belong to the global community and identify with a global lifestyle». Individual with this identity believes that they have a shared sense of destiny and belonging with the individuals in the world. (Der-Karabetain and Ruiz, 1997). In other words, this identity expresses an interest in the similarities of individuals with other individuals, engagement in what is going on in the world, and being a member of world culture (Gao et al., 2020). Moreover, young individuals are influenced by globalization across the globe. They are able to constitute GI, which provides senses about belonging to global culture and comprehension related to events, practices, and knowledge about this culture (Arnett, 2002).

MCI combines motivation and innovativeness, two major concepts of consumer behavior literature. Briefly, it can provide motivational frameworks to consumer innovativeness. Motivation is related to factors that lead and promote goal-oriented buying, and individuals' goals activate them. Consumer innovativeness refers to an intention to buy a new product in a specific product category and being earlier than other consumers in the given segment (Vandecasteele and Geuens, 2010). Therefore, the definition of MCI is «internal and external factors that lead to consumers' innovative buying behavior» (Hwang et al., 2019). MCI has four sub-dimensions of motivation: functional (FUNCIn), hedonic, social, and cognitive. These dimensions are defined by Vandecasteele and Geuens (2010) as follows:

«Functionally motivated consumer innovativeness: Self-reported consumer innovativeness motivated by the functional performance of innovations and focuses on task management and accomplishment improvement. For instance: usefulness, quality, comfort. Hedonically motivated consumer innovativeness: Self-reported consumer innovativeness motivated by affective or sensory stimulation and gratification. For instance: pleasure, fun, sensation. Socially motivated consumer innovativeness: Self-reported consumer innovativeness motivated by the self-assertive social need for differentiation. For instance: being different and unique, status, standing. Cognitively motivated consumer innovativeness: Self-reported consumer innovativeness motivated by the need for mental stimulation. For instance: knowledge, information, intelligence».

This multidimensional approach is suggested to be more efficient for understanding the underlying causes of individuals' tendencies towards innovative products because innovations relate to their needs of achieving goals (Caricati and Raimondi, 2015; Vandecasteele and Geuens, 2010).

Gender refers to whether an individual is female or male based on genetic and biological features (Shaouf et al., 2016). Generally, based on the socio-cultural, evolutionary, hormone-brain, and selectivity hypothesis, which are the major theories explaining the gender differences and common findings, some core differences are noted in consumer behavior literature. In this manner, males are characterized as more self-oriented and have selective data processing. In contrast, females are determined to have comprehensive data processing and be more other-oriented, cautious responders, sensitive to negative data and differentiating conditions/factors (Meyers-Levy and Loken, 2015). Gender is determined as one of the most distinctive differences in consumer innovativeness because males and females may have divergent roles in society (Kim et al., 2011). Although consumers' gender is found to be a significant variable in innovativeness (Sohaib et al., 2019; Thakur and Jasrai, 2018; Lee et al., 2010; Tellis et al., 2009), others have indicated that gender-specific differences do not have an important role in consumer innovativeness (Wu et al., 2016; Caricati and Raimondi, 2015; Frank et al., 2015; Clark and Goldsmith, 2006) and especially in young adults (Ding et al., 2018). Therefore, no consensus is observed on gender-based consumer innovativeness. Previous studies revealed females have the intention to be guided by others' opinions and are more cost-conscious (Venkatesh et al., 2012), more engaged in new device adaptation (Hwang et al., 2019), and ease of use is important for them in adaptation (Ameen et al., 2018). In turn, males were more technologically innovative (Thakur and Jasrai, 2018; Lee et al., 2010). They were considered to be global innovators (Tellis et al., 2009). In Turkey, females were found to be more innovative (Akdogan et al., 2018), and innovator consumers were mostly highly-educated females (Karaarslan and Akdogan, 2015).

Previous findings indicate that males have instrumental motivations and are motivated by goal achievement and the utility of innovation. Thus, they tend to be instrumental and achievement-oriented. Males give more value to relative advantage, while females value compatibility more (Slyke et al., 2010). Also, females have communal proclivity. They focus on inclusiveness and interdependence while tending to be more other-oriented. Females are guided by social interaction and uniqueness (Meyers-Levy and Loken, 2015). Gender variances in the shopping perspective, which give some clue about the motivational difference among female and male, is explained by instrumental versus expressive dichotomy. Female is suggested to focus more on pleasure-seeking, while the male is argued to have the purchase-driven view that is motivated based on satisfying instrumental needs (Campbell, 1997). On the other hand, the research examining the gender in self-determined needs satisfaction showed no gender-specific differences in functionality and self-determined needs satisfaction. Moreover, the findings showed males are more aesthetic and hedonic than females in Pakistan, whereas the opposite results were for Chinese consumers (Gilal et al., 2018). However, according to Schwartz and Rubel-Lifschitz (2009), females and males may find pleasure in different activities or the same activities (for instance: socializing, sports, etc.). It could not be assumed that the significance of hedonism value is naturally higher for females or males. In contrast, another study has indicated that younger males in the early stages of experience have more hedonic motivation (Venkatesh et a.l, 2012). Furthermore, a current study examining gender-based differences in the decision-making of Indian consumers has indicated that females have a higher score for hedonism, novelty orientation, and price value consciousness (Mehta, 2020). In research performed in the COVID-19 outbreak, some gender differences in acceptance of innovative delivery systems are observed. Females are found to be influenced by peers and have more hedonic motivation, while no differences are found among gender groups for performance expectancy and innovativeness (Kapser et al., 2021). Therefore, mixed results have been reached in the literature regarding gender-based differences in motivation while several differences across gender groups are suggested, which could not be ignored.

As to the MCI perspective, a limited number of studies have been conducted for gender-based comparison, and they have reached mixed results. Vandecasteele and Geuens (2010) suggested that being female and male give rise to significant gender differences. Males were more innovative due to social, cognitive, and hedonic motivations, whereas functional motive was equal for both females and males. However, Caricati and Raimondi (2015) found no gender gap for all dimensions of MCI in Italy. Gender doesn't significantly differ in MCI (general) and functional, social, and cognitive dimensions. In turn, the significant gender difference was addressed in the hedonic dimension, and females were more hedonically innovative in research performed in Turkey (Ozden, 2019). Based on the previous common findings indicating differences, gender-specific differences were addressed in innovativeness, motivation, and underlying motives to be innovative. It would be expected that females and males differ in MCI and its dimensions. Therefore, this study presents the hypotheses as follows:

H1: There is a difference in gender groups regarding the MCI.

H2: There is a difference in gender groups regarding the dimensions of each MCI.

Drawing on evolutionary and role theories, Schwartz and Rubel-Lifschitz (2009) have claimed that females congenitally value universalism more when compared to males. The sociability of females is based on close dyadic relationships, while the sociability of males depends on being directed towards a larger group (Baumeister and Sommer, 1997). Females tend to be relational interdependence (close relation with the given individuals/small group). IN turn, males have intention regarding collective interdependence (relationship between larger groups) (Melnyk et al., 2009). Also, females are characterized by prosocial behaviors that are more social and relational, while males are featured to be more active and collectively oriented (Eagly, 2009). Furthermore, identity is tied to the social and cultural context. These contexts are often highly gendered (Gyberg and Frisén, 2017). Besides, GI refers to the propensity to identify with the wider world, symbolizing a much larger group of strangers and less personal connection. As mentioned above, these symbols are attributed to males in the given study. The recent study stated that males and GI have some social norms linked with large groups and broad relationships. Thus, identity congruence is obtained when males and GI are evident simultaneously (Gao et al., 2020). However, previous research conducted in high school students showed boys and girls were equal in the score of global-human identity (Der-Karabetian and Ruiz, 1997). Although previous findings made it difficult to deduce certain claims about which gender group is higher in GI level, they yield strong evidence for differences in this regard between females and males. Thus, the next hypothesis is as follows:

H3: There is a difference in gender groups regarding the GI.

The generation cohort theory was developed by Mannheim (1952) and represented as «a particular kind of identity of location, embracing related «age groups» embedded in a historical-social process» (Mannheim, 1952). The concept of generation cohort refers to «a particular population who experience the same significant event within a certain time period or as a set of individuals entering a system at the same time, who are presumed to have similarities due to shared experiences that differentiate them» (Latkovikj and Popovska, 2020). Based on the theory, individuals in the same generation cohort generally share a similar set of beliefs, attitudes, values, and behaviors because of having the same political, social, and economic experiences (Thach et al., 2021; Lissitsa and Kol, 2021) and technological environment (Noble et al., 2004). The value systems, wishes, and needs specific to their cohort are also carried within the given cohort as they get older and reach their new life stages (Schewe and Meredith, 2004). Moreover, these similar experiences lead to a generational identification of distinctive values, beliefs, expectations, and behaviors (Egri and Raltson, 2004; Noble et al., 2004). Many previous studies have clarified the difference among consumers due to generational differences. However, there are also recent studies that find similarities between Y and Z generations and differences (Hysa et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2021; Szromek et al., 2019; Bulut et al., 2017; Saritas and Barutcu, 2016). Birthdate is used to define the cohorts, while there is no consensus for the beginning and end dates to classify them. However, Generation Y is

defined as those born in 1980-1994 and generation Z as 1995-2010 in previous research (Zhang et al., 2021; Dabija et al., 2018:148) and the business (Francis and Hoefel (McKinsey & Company), 2018).

Generation Y (also known as Millennials) is the «first global consumer segment» (Kim et al., 2009) and the children of the world that have begun to globalize (Ayhun, 2013). Francis and Hoefel (2018) explained their behavior. Multiculturalism, being conscious of social problems, and using advanced technology are valuable issues for this generation group. Millennials are highly mobile and visit many locations, curious to gain experience and knowledge. They are achievement-oriented and have friends from different parts of the world. Also, they highly value freedom, creativity, and innovation (Hysa et al., 2021; Szromek et al., 2019). Soares et al. (2017) determined their common characteristics as tech-savviness and influence by their peers, low trust in the brand, using social media effectively, being open-mindedness, motivation. Ordun (2015) highlighted their intelligence, and Barber et al. (2010) remarked on their high buying power.

Generation Z is «the first generation born into the digital world» (Priporas et al., 2017). Besides, they are called true digital natives (Francis and Hoefel, 2018). Thanks to digitalization, the children in Generation Z have a qualitatively different growth experience than previous generations. These experiences provide early access to the adult world in many ways (Bassiouni and Hackley, 2014). The main characteristics are as follows: be realistic and open-minded, have responsibility (Thach et al., 2021), be communaholic and dialoguer, live life pragmatically (Francis and Hoefel, 2018), financially dependent on their parents (Hysa et al., 2021), and focus more on innovation (Priporas et al., 2017). Moreover, smart technologies could influence their experiences significantly (Priporas et al., 2017). Generation Z consumers in Turkey have different attitudes and behavior when compared with other generations. Social media usage covers a significant part of their time, while the purposes of their usage are establishing relationships and communication. Besides, social media allows them to converge with global friends. Generation Z consumers are determined to be open to new consumption, adapt to new conditions, and value innovations (Tari-Kasnakoglu et al., 2020). Compared to individuals in previous generations, individuals in Generation Z are more pragmatic and analytical in decision-making (Francis and Hoefel, 2018). The study conducted in Turkey showed that Generation Y and Generation Z have different decision-making styles. Generation Z is more hedonic-entertainment oriented (Kavalcı and Unal, 2016). Generation Z consumers have always had more options than previous generations in the market. Therefore, design-based or aesthetic differentiation is crucial in their choice. Technological and design-based innovations are also important for the motivation of this generation (Wood, 2013).

Furthermore, they are more concerned with cool product properties than experiences when compared to Generation Y (Thach et al., 2021). Besides differences among these generations, some common features are also suggested. For instance, both generations are determined to be digital natives (Lissitsa and Kol, 2021) and share lifestyle characteristics (Zhang et al., 2021). However, a common approach for generations could be stated that each generation cohort has distinctive features reflected in their consumption behaviors. Globalization impacts young consumers' identity in emerging markets (Strizhakova et al., 2008), like young people in another part of the world. It leads young generations to become more convergent (Lazarevic, 2012), just like advanced information, transportation, and communication technologies. Global similarities in youth culture cover identity, consumption, and cultural innovations among young generations. Thus, Generation Y suggests universal ideas and similarities considering local differences (Lazarevic, 2012), while social media allows Generation Z to converge with global friends (Tari-Kasnakoglu et al., 2020). Under the generation cohort theory and previous research emphasizing differences, it would be expected that there are generational differences in GI and the motivational construct of being innovative. Therefore, the next hypotheses are as follows:

H4: There is a difference in generation cohort (Y and Z) regarding the GI.

H5: There is a difference in generation cohort (Y and Z) regarding the MCI.

H6: There is a difference in generation cohort (Y and Z) regarding each dimension of MCI.

Global culture could shape both consumer identities that can signify via consumption and motivation of consumers (Torelli and Stoner, 2019). Moreover, global technology in communication has made it possible for individuals with GI to enlarge their living spaces and meet cultural practices worldwide. Westjohn et al. (2009) determined that consumers having global identification are more likely to use technology. Thus, there is a significant positive association between global identification and technology usage. Previous social identity research demonstrated that individuals have the intention to respond positively to identity-consistent stimuli in the presence of accessible identity (Zhang and Khare, 2009). Furthermore, Oyserman (2009) offers an identity-based motivation perspective focusing on «attention on the motivational pull toward identity-congruent action and identity-congruent cognitive procedures». Based on this perspective, consumers search for identity-congruent choices for consumption, and this motivation affects various consumption preferences expressing identity (Oyserman, 2009). In addition, the evaluation of the object depends on the fit between the individual identity and object, while thinking, acting, feeling are in line with the identity of the individuals. Individuals are also motivated to perform under their identity, which turns into an issue of goal-seeking (Reed II et al., 2012). Strizhakova et al. (2012) suggested young adult consumers are innovative and identity-conscious. Raskovic et al. (2016) found ethnocentrism (opposite of GI) has a weak relationship with innovativeness, and innovativeness seems to be directed via social identity in consumers. Interpreting GI could also be significantly related to innovativeness among these consumers. Thus, it would be expected that the Z versus Y generation cohort differently motivates innovativeness and global identification. Hence, if the innovation is compatible with the consumer's identity, motivation to buy innovation could reflect the individual's identity, demonstrating the relationship between GI and MCI. Based on the previous findings indicating differentiation mentioned above, some variance in search of the choice related to the innovativeness that is congruent with the GI would be expected in gender and generation cohort. Thus, the association of GI with MCI (and its dimensions) would differ in these cohorts. Therefore, examining this association in each gender and generation cohort can provide more specific knowledge. Based on the above grounds, the following hypotheses are presented:

H7: GI relates to MCI and its dimensions in females.

H8: GI relates to MCI and its dimensions in males.

H9: GI relates to MCI and its dimensions in Y generation.

H10: GI relates to MCI and its dimensions in Z generation.

Methodology and research methods. This study aimed to determine whether there are any significant gender and generational cohort differences in MCI (and its dimensions) and GI. It also attempted to identify the relationship between MCI, MCI dimensions, and GI for each gender and generational cohort. The hypotheses are given in the previous section were developed based on the previous findings and the study purpose. Because of time limitations and pandemic conditions, the data were gathered from Turkish consumers in the Y and Z generation through an online questionnaire. Turkey is one of the Euro-Asian countries located in Western Asia (the Anatolian peninsula) and Southeastern Europe. Turkish Statistical Institute (TUIK) has reported that, as of the end of 2020, the total population of Turkey was 83,614,362, while the young population constituted 15.4% of the total population.

Furthermore, 51.3% of the young population were males, and 48.7% were female (TUIK, 2021). Based on Hofstede's national cultural model with six cultural dimensions (Hofstede Insight, av date: 2021), Turkey is described as high in both power distance (score of 66) and uncertainty avoidance (score of 85). Moreover, it is collectivist (with 37 scores individualism) and feminine (masculinity score is 45). Additionally, Turkey has intermediate scores for both long-term orientation (with a score of 46) and indulgence (with a score of 49).

The questionnaires were conducted using convenience and snowball sampling techniques in March-June 2021. Respondents were asked to send the questionnaire to their friends born between 1980 and

2013 if possible. These efforts made it possible to collect data from various provinces of Turkey in a relatively short time. 391 questionnaires were collected with no missing value. The questionnaire form consisted of 24 items to measure MCI (20 items) and GI (4 items) and demographical questions such as age, gender, etc. The scales were taken from previous research that has proven validity and reliability to facilitate appraisement of the research variables. MCI was measured using the multidimensional scale, which includes functionally, hedonically, socially, and cognitively motivated consumer innovativeness, from Ozoglu and Bulbul (2013), while the GI scale was taken from Tu et al. (2012). The variables were measured using a 7-point Likert scale, with 1 – certainly disagree, 4 – neither agree nor disagree and 7 – certainly agree. The questionnaire form was designed so that the respondents had to fill in all statements and questions to avoid any missing value. A pretest was performed with 20 consumers to ensure the clarity of the statements in questionnaire form and eliminate any possible misunderstanding before application. After necessary revisions, respondents were requested to fill out the form independently to ensure getting freely and accurately opinions.

The demographic characteristics of the respondents were as follows: two hundred forty-five of them were female (62.7%), two hundred five of them were Z generation (52.4%). 36.3% of the respondents had a high school diploma, 68% of respondents were single, and 43 % of the respondents had an income over 2000 TL. As to research variables-based characteristics, they were motivated to be innovative (mean is 4.719), had high-level GI (mean is 5.481), were hedonically (mean is 5.374), cognitively (mean is 4.990), and functionally innovative (mean is 4.712), and the level of their social motivations for being innovative was close to the medium level (mean is 3.800).

The data were analyzed by using SPSS 20 software. Age was taken into account when assigning participants to generation groups. Generation Z has been identified as those born in 1995 and after (until 2003, for participants to be over the age of 18) and Generation Y as those born between years of 1980-1994, taking into account the recent common approach (Hysa et al., 2021; Lissitsa and Kol, 2021; Zhang et al., 2021) and the studies conducted for Turkish consumers (Tari-Kasnakoglu et al., 2020). Independent sample t-test and correlation analyses were conducted to test the hypotheses. It was assumed that the normality assumption is fulfilled based on the central limit theorem (Central limit theorem (CLT): When the sample size increases, the samples' means demonstrate normal distribution (Nakip, 2003). One of the common approaches indicates that the sample size should be greater than 30 or 50 for CLT to be used (Kurtulus, 2004). Outliers were eliminated for each analysis. Grouping variables were gender (female/male) and generation (Y generation/Z generation), while testing variables were MCI and its dimensions (FUNCIn, HEDOIn, SOCIn, and COGIn). Hedges's g values, suitable for comparing two groups with unequal sample sizes, were calculated to determine the effect size after each t-test analysis. The interpretation of the Pearson correlation coefficient was based on the criteria as follows (Buyukozturk et al., 2019):

1) if the coefficient is less than 0.30, the relationship is weak;
2) if it is between 0.30 and 0.70, there is moderate relation;
3) if it is greater than 0.70, the relationship is strong.

Also, R^2 coefficient was used to determine explained variance ratio (Sipahi et al., 2010:144). As the explained variance value increases, it could be possible to determine the value of one variable by using the other variable (Buyukozturk et al., 2019).

Results. Table 1 presents the result of analyses for the validity and reliability of the scales used in this research. Based on the factor analysis performed to examine the validity, the KMO-Barlett test demonstrated that each KMO value exceeded 0.7, and the Barlett test values were significant. No items were excluded because each factor loading value exceeded 0.5 (Hair et al., 2019). The results also revealed that MCI had four sub-dimensions (FUNCIn, SOCIn, HEDOIn, and COGIn) congruent with the original scale study (Ozoglu and Bulbul, 2013). The scores of all calculated Cronbach α coefficients to

determine the reliability exceeded the criterion of 0.70, showing that the requirements for a reliable scale (Hair et al., 2011) were fulfilled. Thus, by considering all, the validity and reliability of the scales were acceptable.

Table 1. Validity and reliability test results

Variable	Factor Analysis	Cronbach α
M	KMO:0.916, Chi-square: 5161.975, df:190, p<0.01; % Variance: 69.776	0.929
	Factor Loading	
FUNCIn		FUNCIn's α:0.844
FUNCIn1	0.579	
FUNCIn2	0.788	
FUNCIn3	0.803	
FUNCIn4	0.718	
FUNCIn5	0.571	HEDOIn's
HEDOIn		α: 0.908
HEDOIn1	0.637	
HEDOIn2	0.807	
HEDOIn3	0.861	
HEDOIn4	0.873	
HEDOIn5	0.787	
SOCOM		SOCIn's
SOCIn1	0.714	α: 0.857
SOCIn2	0.759	
SOCIn3	0.835	
SOCIn4	0.772	
SOCIn5	0.756	COGIn's α:0.906
login		
COGIn1	0.508	
COGIn2	0.709	
COGIn3	0.795	
COGIn4	0.834	
COGIn5	0.873	
GI	KMO:0.728,Chi-square: 387.818, df:6, p<0.01; % Variance: 58.344	GI's
	Factor Loading	α:0.748
GI1	0.704	
GI2	0.778	
GI3	0.815	
GI4	0.754	

Notes: GI: global identity, MCI: motivated consumer innovativeness, FUNCIn: functionally motivated consumer innovativeness, HEDOIn: hedonically motivated consumer innovativeness, SOCIn: socially motivated consumer innovativeness, COGIn: cognitively motivated consumer innovativeness, y gen: Y generation and z gen: Z generation.

Sources: developed by the authors.

Table 2 illustrates the result of the independent sample t-test performed to test hypotheses about the group differences. The difference between Cohen's d and Hedges's g is very small when the sample size is above 20 (Lakens, 2013). Therefore the results were interpreted using Cohen's d criteria. This criterion suggests that values of 0.2, 0.5, and 0.8 indicate small, medium, and large effects, respectively (Cohen, 1992). The results indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between gender groups in not only GI [t=(386)1.375; p>0.05)] but also in MCI [t(386)=0.268; p>0.05)] and FUNCIn [t(389)=-0.501; p>0.05)], HEDONIn [t(384)=0.458; p>0.05)], SOCIn [t(389)=1.396; p>0.05)], and COGIn [t(389)=-0.782; p>0.05)]. Moreover, the calculated Hedges's g value in 95% interval revealed very small effect for GI

(0.152), MCI (0.027), FUNCIn (-0.052), HEDONIn (0.045), SOCIn (0.149), and COGIn (-0.081). That encourged the fact that the GI and MCI (with dimensions) means of the groups did not differ significantly. Therefore, H1, H2, H3 were not supported. The results indicated that both female and men had equal means regarding GI, MCI, and MCI's dimensions.

Table 2. The result of t-test for gender and generation groups

Variables	N	Mean	Std. dev.	Levene sig.	t	Sig.	Result
GI				0.000	1.375	0.170	no difference
female	242	5.584	1.133				
male	146	5.392	1.445				
M				0.348	0.268	0.789	no difference
female	244	4.758	1.211				
male	144	4.725	1.142				
FUNCIn				0.305	-0.501	0.617	no difference
female	245	4.682	1.547				
male	146	4.761	1.451				
HEDOIn				0.015	0.458	0.647	no difference
female	245	5.450	1.611				
male	141	5.381	1.307				
SOCOM				0.037	1.396	0.164	no difference
female	245	3.898	1.677				
male	146	3.635	1.873				
login				0.508	-0.782	0.435	no difference
female	245	4.944	1.493				
male	146	5.068	1.554				
GI				0.029	-1.149	0.251	no difference
y gen	185	5.491	1.284				
z gen	197	5.633	1.107				
M				0.156	-2.520	0.012	difference
y gen	185	4.568	1.260				
z gen	205	4.874	1.139				
FUNCIn				0.455	-0.364	0.716	no difference
y gen	186	4.682	1.554				
z gen	205	4.738	1.474				
HEDOIn				0.000	-4.291	0.000	difference
y gen	186	5.022	1.731				
z gen	205	5.694	1.312				
SOCOM				0.004	-3.158	0.002	difference
y gen	186	3.507	1.554				
z gen	205	4.066	1.474				
login				0.007	-0.098	0.922	no difference
y gen	186	4.982	1.664				
z gen	205	4.998	1.370				

Notes: GI: global identity, MCI: motivated consumer innovativeness, FUNCIn: functionally motivated consumer innovativeness, HEDOIn: hedonically motivated consumer innovativeness, SOCIn: socially motivated consumer innovativeness, COGIn: cognitively motivated consumer innovativeness, y gen: Y generation and z gen: Z generation.

Sources: developed v by the authors.

As to generation cohorts, some significant differences were found. The t-test results exhibited a significant difference for MCI [(t(388)=-2.520; p<0.05)], HEDOIn [(t(389)=-4.291; p<0.05)], and SOCIn [(t(389)=-3.158; p<0.05)]. In addition, the calculated Hedges's g values in 95% interval were as follows:

MCI (-0.254), HEDOIn (-0.439), and SOCIn (-0.321), which reported a small effect size. The calculated effect size values indicated that the differences between the groups were small, whereas these differences were still statistically significant. The means of each group were considered to determine which group had a higher level in these variables. Compared to means of Y generation, the means of Z generation respondents were higher for all these variables (MCI: 4.874, HEDOIn: 5.694, and SOCIn: 4.066). Therefore, H5 was supported. On the other hand, no statistical difference between generation groups was observed for GI [t(380)=-1.149; p>0.05)], FUNCIn [(t(389)=-0.364; p>0.05)], and COGIn [(t(389)=-0.098; p>0.05)]. Hedges's g values in 95% interval were calculated for these variables. The results indicated a very small effect size (GI: -0.118, FUNCIn: -0.036, and COGIn: -0.010). The results showed that each of the GI, FUNCIn, and COGIn mean scores of the generation groups did not differ significantly, and the effect size values did not strongly support each other. Therefore, H4 and H6 were not supported.

Table 3 illustrates the correlation analysis results for each group. The Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated to determine the correlation among pairs of research variables, namely between GI and MCI and its dimensions. Table 3 shows that GI had statistically significant positive correlations with some of the research variables. The results for the female group showed significant positive correlations between GI and MCI (r=0.249; p<0.05), FUNCIn (r=0.178; p<0.05), and HEDOIn (r=0.168; p<0.05) but in weak level; whereas moderate level correlations between GI and COGIn (r=0.390; p<0.05) was determined. GI variable explained 6.20%, 3.16%, 2.82%, and 15.21% of the total variances in the MCI, FUNCIn, HEDOIn, and COGIn variables, respectively. In turn, in male group, there was a significant positive moderate correlation between GI and MCI (r=0.308; p<0.05), FUNCIn(r=0.310; p<0.05), and COGIn(r=0.431; p<0.05), while a significant positive weak correlation existed between GI and SOCIn (r=0.170; p<0.05). The GI variables explain 9.49%, 9.61%, 18.58%, and 2.89% of the total variances in the MCI, FUNCIn, COGIn, and SOCIn variables, respectively.

Table 3. The correlation analysis results

Groups	GI-MCI	GI-function	GI-HEDOIn	GI-SOCIn	GI-COGIn
Female					
r	0.249**	0.178**	0.168**	0.062	0.390**
Sig.	0.000	0.006	0.009	0.340	0.000
n	241	239	240	242	241
Male					
r	0.308**	0.310**	0.160	0.170*	0.431**
Sig.	0.000	0.000	0.058	0.043	0.000
n	142	142	141	142	142
Y generation					
r	0.150*	0.179*	0.168*	0.041	0.391**
Sig.	0.044	0.015	0.022	0.579	0.000
n	181	183	184	183	183
Z generation					
r	0.375**	0.235**	0.225**	0.143*	0.508**
Sig.	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.044	0.000
n	198	197	199	198	199

*Notes: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Sources: developed v by the authors.

In Y generation group, GI demonstrated significant positive moderate correlation with COGIn (r=0.391; p<0.05) and positive weak correlation with MCI (r=0.150; p<0.05), FUNCIn (r=0.179; p<0.05), and HEDOIN (r=0.168; p<0.05). Results demonstrated that the GI variable could explain 15.29%, 2.25%,

3.20%, and 2.82% of the total variances in the COGIn, MCI, FUNCIn, and HEDOIn variables, respectively. Moreover, GI and MCI (r=0.375; p<0.05) and also it all dimensions FUNCIn (r=0.235; p<0.05), HEDOIn (r=0.225; p<0.05), SOCIn (r=0.143; p<0.05), and COGIn (r=0.508; p<0.05) were positively correlated in Z generation cohort. The results revealed that GI correlates moderately with COGIn and weakly with others. GI variable was found to explain 14.06%, 5.52%, 5.06%, 2.04%, and 25.80% of the total variances in the MCI, FUNCIn, HEDOIn, SOCIn, and COGIn variables, respectively.

Conclusions. This study checked the existence of any significant gender and generational cohort differences in MCI (and also its dimensions) and GI. Also, it examined the relationship between MCI (and MCI dimensions) and GI for given groups. Gender-specific differences in MCI and GI were not found. These findings support the previous research indicating insignificant gender variances (Ozden, 2019; Caricati and Raimondi, 2015). The findings showed both male and female respondents have GI and be equal for this identity. This result could mean similarity in the issue of identity, the main effect of globalization on human psychology. Also, the innovativeness of respondents in both genders was driven by hedonic, functional, and cognitive-based factors. These motives could be congruent with the need to be innovative in females and male consumers. Participants had more hedonic motives than other motives, followed by functional and cognitive motives. The obtained results plainly indicated that both females and males could find pleasure in innovation, and sensory gratification, fun, enjoyment, and emotional value lead to more innovative products. In other words, it is possible for both genders to find pleasure in innovations such as sports, eating, listening, etc. It could motivate them to be innovative. Hence, this finding supported the argument that there is no inherent gender difference in hedonic values, so females and males engage in activities pleasurable in life (Schwartz and Rubel-Lifschitz, 2009). Although a previous study conducted with consumers in a similar age group in Turkey found that females had the higher hedonic motivation (Ozden, 2019), both gender groups were equal in terms of hedonic motivation. Remarkably, the previous study was conducted before the pandemic. It can be argued that pandemic conditions' effect on consumer behavior could explain the basis of the difference between the two studies. During the pandemic period, the challenging conditions experienced by individuals stimulated their hedonic needs such as pleasure, entertainment, and enjoyment and increased hedonic motivation. Thus, this may have led to hedonic innovativeness in both females and males. Besides hedonic motivation, both genders were also functionally motivated, and invariance was observed. They were equally motivated to be innovative by getting superior performance and quality, usefulness, and value for money, which confirmed the previous results (Ozden, 2019; Caricati and Raimondi, 2015; Vandecasteele and Geuens, 2010). Consumers become more conscious, rising consumer expectations, the decrease in the difference between competing products, and superior technical features of products may encourage notion in both genders that an innovative product must already be functionally superior and useful.

Furthermore, mental stimulation, novelty, and intelligence as cognitive motives drive both genders to buy innovative products concerned with innovations that stimulate cognitive impulses. However, Sohaib et al. (2019) confirmed cognitive innovativeness influences females more to online purchasing. Therefore, socio-cultural differences and pandemic conditions may produce different results. Considering the findings of the previous gender research in innovativeness, the major findings in this study indicate innovativeness's motivations were the same for females and males. They show gender invariance in GI strongly supports the judgment that gender roles and behaviors change over time (Wood, 2013). Although communal-agentic roles continue, the stereotypes for females and males have changed, such as females becoming assertive and males focusing more on social influence than before (Meyers-Levy and Loken, 2015), which has also affected both males and female consumers to meet their needs and achieve their goals. Globalization, advanced technologies, and increased education and welfare level could form genders' life expectations, attitudes, values, identities, and behavior. Socialization, pleasure in life, knowledge/experience, and utility/ease of use are important for both gender groups as consumers to fulfill

needs and meet expectations. Thus, both gender groups seem to have GI and hedonically, functionally, socially, and cognitively motivated to innovations to fulfill their innate and constant roles and new roles.

Based on the basic findings of the study, Y and Z generation respondents had GI, and this identity is at an equal level. This result is suitable with the notion that Gen Y is the first global segment (Kim et al., 2009). It can be deduced that Gen Z and the following generations are favorable for having GI. Furthermore, these findings also support the claims related to the effect of globalization on identity in young consumers (Arnett, 2002), more specifically young consumers in emerging markets (Strizhakova et al., 2008). The major results indicating that GI is invariant across gender and generation cohorts could also be explained by the COVID-19 pandemic as a global crisis. This pandemic has encouraged consumers worldwide (both female/male and Generation Y/Z) to share similar concerns, sensations, values, ideas, and motivations in many fields like human health and welfare. It has led to more interest and knowledge about the whole world and sharing common pains and feelings. Therefore, like technology and globalization, it could drive consumers to become more convergent, resulting in a revival in global identities. Moreover, the major findings reconfirmed the importance of the generation cohort in innovativeness, especially in MCI. The findings stated that respondents from generation Z versus Y had different motives for innovativeness. There were significant differences between generation Y and Z regarding the MCI, HEDOIn, and SOCIn. Generation Z respondents have higher among them. This finding claimed that participants generally have motivation for being innovative. However, the generation Z cohort was more motivated for innovativeness had higher levels of HEDOIn and SOCIn when compared to Generation Y respondents. This result confirmed the previous findings, which indicated their hedonic-entertainment orientation (Kavalcı and Unal, 2016). Their higher social media usage rate for communication (Tari-Kasnakoglu et al., 2020) may also explain their social motive. As their level of MCI was higher, it is claimed that generation Z is a more appropriate cohort for launching an innovation that provides hedonic and social utilities. While generation was found to lead to significant differences in given, generation Y and Z had an equal and high-level FUNCIn and COGIn, meaning they engage in functional and cognitive innovations. These findings supported the research, which found generational similarities and differences (Hysa et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2021). Therefore, besides differences, generational similarities should also be considered to understand young consumers' motivation.

Interestingly, while all respondents were relatively young, they had less social motivation for innovativeness in gender and generation cohorts. The pandemic conditions could explain these findings. Restrictions during the pandemic period such as closure of schools, flexible working, remote working, and curfews (which are also constraints that applied in the data collection process of this study) prevented the respondents from socializing in physical environments. For this reason, the inability to adequately share innovations with peers or social circles may have negatively affected the motivation for innovations that others can see and affect others, which could be used to increase the prestige of individuals in their social environment. Although socialization continues in the online setting, the online communication environment does not provide the opportunity to pass on innovative product-related experiences to the social environment as clearly and in detail as the physical environment. The pandemic conditions have negatively affected the social sharing of innovations, meeting the need for uniqueness, and creating/sharing social meaning, namely, the motivational power of social factors for innovation decreases in the said period. Therefore, SOCIn should be reconsidered when pandemic restrictions are reduced and lifted.

Although each group's calculated significant correlation coefficients could not be used to make cause-effect relationships claims, they present knowledge about the level and direction in which the variables change together. The results for gender groups demonstrated a significant positive correlation that GI and MCI change together and in the same direction. GI correlated moderately with MCI in the male group while weakly in the female group. Therefore, when GI increases, MCI also increases. In other words, a change in GI means a change in MCI in males and females. As to dimensions of MCI, GI has a positive association

with FUNCIn, HEDOIn, and COGIn in the female group, whereas its positive associations with FUNCIn, SOCIn, and COGIn were detected in the male group. The moderate level relationship between GI and COGIn was the most significant for males. The relationship between these variables in females was the strongest relationship among the other relationships calculated for females. Hence, GI and COGIn move in the same direction; these variables tend to increase together (i.e., greater GI is associated with greater COGIn) for both genders. Also, compared to MCI and its other dimensions, the value of COGIn could be determined more with the GI variable for both gender groups. The generation Y cohort found a significant positive correlation between GI and MCI, FUNCIn, HEDOIn, and COGIn. Even though weak level correlations were observed in relation between GI and MCI, FUNCIn, and HEDOIn, these associations were found to be significant. Thus, as the GI level increases, motivation for innovativeness hedonic and functional-based motives also increase in this cohort. More specially, a moderate positive correlation between GI and COGIn pointed out that they tend to increase together. Moreover, the results for the generation Z cohort presented evidence of a significant positive association between GI and MCI and its all dimensions, meaning that GI tends to increase with MCI and all dimensions of MCI. The ratio at which the GI and COGIn variables explained each other indicated that the value of COGIn could be determined more by using the GI variable compared to other variables for the Generation Z cohort. Although the explanatory level between GI and other variables was low, there were positive and significant relationships between them. Hence, it is useful to consider GI when understanding MCI patterns of the generation Z cohort, especially cognitive-based motivations. It should be noted that this relationship is more important than others in understanding the change in GI and COGIn due to the higher rate of explaining each other in this cohort. The findings indicated that the value of COGIn could be determined more with GI variable for generation cohorts, likes in gender groups. Moreover, moderate and especially weak correlation coefficients determined in this study demonstrated the existence of other significant variables that can explain the variation of GI and MCI (also its dimensions) in gender and generational cohorts. Each cohort could interpret these findings that as consumers' GI levels get stronger, their motives for innovativeness will also increase.

This study could be useful as a roadmap for global marketers engaging in innovative marketing, consumer innovativeness, development of innovative products, and globalization. Understanding young consumers' innovativeness and the psychological consequences of globalization are crucial for successful sustainable company performance. The findings demonstrated that both gender and generation cohorts seem to be motivated for innovativeness and have GI. This study identified the motives for innovativeness in gender and generation Y/Z cohorts, which can be useful in understanding how new products satisfy consumers' appropriate needs. Innovativeness in gender groups was driven especially by functional, hedonic, and cognitive-based factors. Hedonic motivators are more likely to encourage the innovativeness of both females and males. Thus, being superior in presenting entertainment, enjoyment, fun, and self-gratification are indispensable for the value proposition of the innovative product.

The evidence of study suggested that generation may be more useful criteria rather than gender for the strategic development of value propositions and in the field of strategic marketing. Although respondents from generations Y and Z were similar in terms of having functional and cognitive motivations. Generation Z has more hedonic and social motivation than generation Y. Besides, all MCI dimensions drove generation Z. Hedonic and social motivator could be more helpful to attract generation Z cohort, compared to generation Y. Thus, it is recommended that, unlike Y, generation Z should be the major target consumers for the innovative products offering more hedonic and social values, or if Z generation is selected for target consumers, all of the motivators is indispensable but hedonic should be emphasized much more than others. Because identity is related to positioning strategies (Westjohn et al.,2012), this study suggested that these motives should be considered when determining how the innovative product is defined on important attributes by generation Y/Z cohort consumers. Moreover, considering the basic

competitive strategy, for example, differentiation as winning strategy suggested by Porter (1996) and product leadership value disciples proposed by Treacy and Wiersema (1993), this study offers some strategic insights. One of the business implications of the findings is that the innovative product is recommended to provide functional, hedonic, and cognitive values to target customers in generation Y/Z cohorts. In contrast, the social and hedonic value of the innovative product should be emphasized much more for generation Z for differentiation. These values are also crucial when developing superior, innovative products and promoting them because this generation cohort can be triggered for innovativeness thanks to functional, hedonic, and cognitive motives. Besides these motives, social innovativeness was low due to the pandemic restrictions. Social motivation should also be reconsidered because these cohorts are very active in social life. Based on innovative marketing principles, it is also suggested that the motives and identity of young consumers are indispensable for any marketing improvements. For example, social media applications with global values and hedonic innovations could be preferred for promotion-based improvements such as selecting new and appropriate promotional tools. Moreover, the GI findings and the positive relationship between GI and COGIn in each gender and generation cohort demonstrate a potentially attractive market in Turkey for innovative global products that can respond to cognitive motivations.

Theoretically, this study could contribute to the current literature by confirming the significance of generation-specific differences in consumer behavior and stressing some similarities between generations Y and Z and differences, like much recent research mentioned above. It clearly demonstrated the motivational differences among generation Y and Z cohorts for being innovative. This study claimed that generation Z cohort consumers were more motivated to be innovative and cognitively and socially innovative than generation Y. Thus, generation was an important variable in determining which drivers would trigger consumers to be innovative and which would not. The findings revealed that GI was equal in both generation Y and Z cohorts, which can mean that both of two young generations are being a member of global culture with their local identification. This study also enhances the existing consumer behavior literature on gender similarities in GI and motivations that drive consumers to be innovative. More specifically, it also attached knowledge to the importance of the positive association between GI and COGIn in generation Z, which encourages strategic understanding related to them. In addition, in consumers' self-positioning strategy context, it can be expected that consumers (in both genders and generation cohorts) can develop positive attitudes and behavior related to an innovative product that satisfies cognitive motives to reinforce their GI. This study has some limitations. First, this study was conducted in Turkey as an emerging country in Eurasia so that the findings may be more suitable for countries with similar cultural backgrounds. The differences/similarities between gender and generation cohorts can vary from culture to culture. Therefore, it could be useful to test hypotheses in consumers with different cultural backgrounds and developed countries to obtain generalized and validate findings. Second, the sampling methods and the size have prevented us from generalizing the findings. The expanded sample size and random sampling methods are suggested to generalize the results. Third, this study examined gender and generation cohort as a grouping variable. Thus, it would be valuable to explore whether these variables are a moderator variable in the relationship between the GI and MCI and its dimensions to gain deeper insight. Four, a potential research field could be exploring the generation Z cohort's innovativeness patterns by considering product involvement, financial power, and focused regulatory orientation. Five, pandemic conditions lead the consumers to many behavioral alterations; thus, future research can investigate the other generational cohort's innovativeness and GI based on the cultural and conditional background. Last, this study is a cross-sectional study carried out in COVID-19. Under changes in consumer patterns over time and the dynamic nature of globalization's effect on people, longitudinal research is recommended to obtain more profound knowledge about changes and

advancements in each gender and generational cohort and consumer behaviors under the effect of globalization.

In conclusion, the gender of consumers does not seem to produce significant differences for having GI and motivations to be innovative. There are significant differences and similarities in motivated innovativeness between consumers in generation Y and Z cohorts, while both generations have GI. Thus, GI seems to be invariant across gender and generation cohorts (Y and Z). Moreover, generation Z cohort consumers are more motivated to be innovative. Specifically, they have more cognitive and social motives for innovativeness than generation Y. GI could also be helpful to explain an observed change in COGIn or vice versa for both genders and generation Y and Z cohorts. The association between GI and COGIn in generation Z demonstrates that GI can be more skillful for interpreting the change in generation Z's cognitive motives for innovativeness.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

References

Akdogan, S., Uyar, K. & Gullu, K. (2018). Profiles of consumer innovativeness in Turkey. *Journal of Management Marketing and Logistics*, *5*(3), 236-245. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Ameen, N., Willis, R., & Shah, M. H. (2018). An examination of the gender gap in smartphone adoption and use in Arab countries: A cross-national study. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *89*, 148-162. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Arnett, J. J. (2002). The psychology of globalization. *American psychologist*, *57*(10), 774-783. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Ayhun, S. E. (2013). Differences between generatıons and organizational effects. J*ournal of Economics and Management Research*, *2*(1), 93-112. Retrieved from [Link]

Barber, N., Taylor, D. C., & Strick, S. (2010). Selective marketing to environmentally concerned wine consumers: a case for location, gender and age. *Journal of consumer marketing*. 27(1), 64–75. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Bassiouni, D. H., & Hackley, C. (2014). 'Generation Z'children's adaptation to digital consumer culture: A critical literature review. *Journal of Customer Behaviour*, *13*(2), 113-133. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Baumeister, R. F., & Sommer, K. L. (1997). What do men want? Gender differences and two spheres of belongingness: Comment on Cross and Madson (1997). *Psychological Bulletin, 122*(1), 38–44. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Bulut, Z. A., Kökalan Çımrin, F., & Doğan, O. (2017). Gender, generation and sustainable consumption: Exploring the behaviour of consumers from Izmir, Turkey. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *41*(6), 597-604. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Buyukozturk, S., Cakmak, E. K., Akgün, O. E., Karadeniz, S., & Demirel, F. (2019). Scientific Research Methods in Education. Pegem Akademi, 26.th Edition. Retrieved from [Link]

Campbell, C. (1997). Shopping, pleasure and the sex war. In: Falk P, Campbell C, editors. *The Shopping Experience*. London: Sage; 166–176. Retrieved from [Link]

Caricati, L., & Raimondi, M. (2015). The motivated consumer innovativeness scale: initial Italian validation. *TPM: Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, *22*(3), 363-383. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Clark, R. A., & Goldsmith, R. E. (2006). Interpersonal influence and consumer innovativeness. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *30*(1), 34-43. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*(1), 155-159. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Dabija, D. C., Postelnicu, C., & Dinu, V. (2018). Cross-generational investigation of ethics and sustainability. Insights from Romanian retailing. In *Current Issues in Corporate Social Responsibility* (pp. 141-163). Springer, Cham. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Der-Karabetian, A., & Ruiz, Y. (1997). Affective bicultural and global-human identity scales for Mexican-American adolescents. *Psychological Reports*, *80*(3), 1027-1039. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Ding, Z., Vuchkovski, D., Zabkar, V., Hirose, M., & Rašković, M. (2018). Ljubljana to Tokyo: Understanding drivers of young-adult consumer innovativeness and the role of regionalism in Eastern Europe and East Asia. *JEEMS Journal of East European Management Studies*, *23*(3), 502-522. Retrieved from [Link]

Eagly, A. H. (2009). The his and hers of prosocial behavior: An examination of the social psychology of gender. *American Psychologist, 64*(8), 644–658. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Egri, C. P., & Ralston, D. A. (2004). Generation cohorts and personal values: A comparison of China and the United States. *Organization Science*, *15*(2), 210-220. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Eryigit, C., & Sunaoglu, S. K. (2017). The effects of perceived brand globalness and local iconness on brand prestige and perceived quality: The role of consumers' cultural identity. *Management and Marketing Journal*, *15*(2), 7-21. [Google Scholar]

Francis, T., & Hoefel, F. (2018). True Gen': Generation Z and its implications for companies. *McKinsey & Company*, *12*. [Google Scholar]

Frank, B., Enkawa, T., Schvaneveldt, S. J., & Torrico, B. H. (2015). Antecedents and consequences of innate willingness to pay for innovations: Understanding motivations and consumer preferences of prospective early adopters. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *99*, 252-266. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Gao, H., Mittal, V., & Zhang, Y. (2020). The Differential Effect of Local-Global Identity Among Males and Females: The Case of Price Sensitivity. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *57*(1), 173-191. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Gilal, F. G., Zhang, J., Gilal, N. G., & Gilal, R. G. (2018). Integrating self-determined needs into the relationship among product design, willingness-to-pay a premium, and word-of-mouth: a cross-cultural gender-specific study. *Psychology research and behavior management*, *11*, 227–241. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Gyberg, F., & Frisén, A. (2017). Identity status, gender, and social comparison among young adults. *Identity*, *17*(4), 239-252. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Hair, J. F., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Black, W. C. (2019). Multivariate Data Analysis (8th Ed.) Cengage Learning, EMEA. ISBN: 978-4737-5654-0. Retrieved from [Link]

Hair, J. F., Celsi, M. W., Money, A. H., Samouel, P., & Page, M. J. (2011). Essentials of business research methods (2nd ed.). New York: M. E.Sharpe Inc. Retrieved from [Link]

Hofstede Insight. (2021). Compare Countries, Retrieved from [Link]

Hwang, J., Choe, J. Y., Choi, Y. G., & Kim, J. J. (2021). A comparative study on the MCI of drone food delivery services before and after the outbreak of COVID-19. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *38*(4), 368-382. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Hwang, J., Lee, J. S., & Kim, H. (2019). Perceived innovativeness of drone food delivery services and its impacts on attitude and behavioral intentions: The moderating role of gender and age. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *81*, 94-103. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Hysa, B., Karasek, A., & Zdonek, I. (2021). Social media usage by different generations as a tool for sustainable tourism marketing in society 5.0 idea. *Sustainability*, *13*, 1018. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Kapser, S., Abdelrahman, M., & Bernecker, T. (2021). Autonomous delivery vehicles to fight the spread of Covid-19 – How do men and women differ in their acceptance? *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, *148*, 183-198. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Karaarslan, M. H., & Akdoğan, M. (2015). Consumer innovativeness: A market segmentation. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *6*(8), 227237. [Google Scholar]

Kaushik, A. K., & Rahman, Z. (2016). Self-service innovativeness scale: introduction, development, and validation of scale. *Service Business*, *10*(4), 799-822. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Kavalcı, K. & Unal, S. (2016). A Research on Comparing Consumer Decision-Making Styles and Learning Styles in Terms of the Generatıon Y and Z. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *20*(3), 1033-1050. Retrieved from [Link]

Kim, W., Di Benedetto, C. A., & Lancioni, R. A. (2011). The effects of country and gender differences on consumer innovativeness and decision processes in a highly globalized high-tech product market. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*.23(5), 714-744. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Kotler, P. & Armstrong, G. (2021), Principles of Marketing,Global Edition, Pearson Education Limited. Retrieved from [Link]

Kurtulus, K. (2004). Marketing Research (7th ed.). Literatur Publishing, Istanbul. [Google Scholar]

Lakens, D. (2013). Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: a practical primer for t-tests and ANOVAs. *Frontiers in psychology*, *4*, 863-875. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Latkovikj, T., & Popovska, M. B. (2020). How millennials, gen Z, and technology are changing the workplace design?. Proceedings of the 6th International Workshop on Socio-Technical Perspective in IS Development. [Google Scholar]

Lazarevic, V. (2012). Encouraging brand loyalty in fickle generation Y consumers. *Young consumers*. 13(1), 45-61. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Lee, H. J., Cho, H. J., Xu, W., & Fairhurst, A. (2010). The influence of consumer traits and demographics on intention to use retail self-service checkouts. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*.28(1), 46-58. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Lissitsa, S., & Kol, O. (2021). Four generational cohorts and hedonic m-shopping: association between personality traits and purchase intention. *Electronic Commerce Research*, *21*(2), 545-570. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Mannheim, K. (1952). "The problem of generations", in Kecskemeti, P. (Ed.), Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge: Collected Works, Routledge, New York, NY, pp. 276-322. Retrieved from [Link]

Mehta, R. (2020). Gender-based differences in consumer decision-making styles: implications for marketers. *Decision*, *47*(3), 319-329. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Melnyk, V., Van Osselaer, S. M., & Bijmolt, T. H. (2009). Are women more loyal customers than men? Gender differences in loyalty to firms and individual service providers. *Journal of Marketing*, *73*(4), 82-96. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Meyers-Levy, J., & Loken, B. (2015). Revisiting gender differences: What we know and what lies ahead. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *25*(1), 129-149. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Moss, G., & Colman, A. M. (2001). Choices and preferences: Experiments on gender differences. *Journal of Brand Management*, *9*(2), 89-98. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Nakip, M. (2003).Marketing Research, Techniques and Applications. Seckin Publishing, Ankara. [Google Scholar]

Noble, S. M., Schewe, C. D., & Kuhr, M. (2004). Preferences in health care service and treatment: a generational perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, *57*(9), 1033-1041. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Ordun, G. (2015). Millennial (Gen Y) consumer behavior their shopping preferences and perceptual maps associated with brand loyalty. *Canadian Social Science*, *11*(4), 40-55. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Oyserman, D. (2009). Identity-based motivation: Implications for action-readiness, procedural-readiness, and consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *19*(3), 250-260. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Ozden, A. T. (2019). A Research on The Examining of The Relationship Between Consumer Innovation and The Need for Social Approval. *Journal of Business Research-TURK*, *11*(3), 1537-1558. [Google Scholar]

Ozoglu, B., & Bulbul, H. (2013). The Reliability and Validity Study of the Motivated Consumer Innovativeness (MCI) and Perceived Risk Scales. *Journal of Alanya Faculty of Business/Alanya Isletme Fakültesi Dergisi, 5(3)*.129-139. [Google Scholar] [Link]

Porter, M. (1996). "What is strategy?". *Harvard Business Review*, *74*(6), 61-78. Retrieved from [Link]

Priporas, C. V., Stylos, N., & Fotiadis, A. K. (2017). Generation Z consumers' expectations of interactions in smart retailing: A future agenda. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *77*, 374-381. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Rašković, M., Ding, Z., Škare, V., Došen, Đ. O., & Žabkar, V. (2016). Comparing consumer innovativeness and ethnocentrism of young-adult consumers. *Journal of Business Research*, *69*(9), 3682-3686. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Reed II, A., Forehand, M. R., Puntoni, S., & Warlop, L. (2012). Identity-based consumer behavior. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *29*(4), 310-321. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Saritas, E., & Barutcu, S. (2016). Generations in analysis of consumer behaviors: a study on social media using. *Pamukkale Journal of Eurasian Socioeconomic Studies*, *3*(2), 1-15. Retrieved from [Link]

Schewe, C. D., & Meredith, G. (2004). Segmenting global markets by generational cohorts: determining motivations by age. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour: An International Research Review*, *4*(1), 51-63. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Schwartz, S. H., & Rubel-Lifschitz, T. (2009). Cross-national variation in the size of sex differences in values: effects of gender equality. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *97*(1), 171-185. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Shaouf, A., Lu, K., & Li, X. (2016). The effect of web advertising visual design on online purchase intention: An examination across gender. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *60*, 622–634. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Sheth, J. (2021). New areas of research in marketing strategy, consumer behavior, and marketing analytics: the future is bright. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, *29*(1), 3-12. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Slyke, C. V., Bélanger, F., Johnson, R. D., & Hightower, R. (2010). Gender-based differences in consumer e-commerce adoption. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, *26*(1), 17-34. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Soares, R. R., Zhang, T. T. C., Proença, J. F., & Kandampully, J. (2017). Why are Generation Y consumers the most likely to complain and repurchase?. *Journal of Service Management*, 28(3), 520-540. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Sohaib, O., Kang, K., & Nurunnabi, M. (2019). Gender-based iTrust in e-commerce: The moderating role of *cognitive* innovativeness. *Sustainability*, *11*(1), 175-191. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Solomon, M (2020). Consumer Behavior: Buying, Having, and Being, Global Edition, 13th Ed. Pearson. Retrieved from [Link]

Steel, P., & König, C. J. (2006). Integrating theories of motivation. *Academy of management review*, *31*(4), 889-913.

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. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Strizhakova, Y., Coulter, R. A., & Price, L. L. (2008). Branded products as a passport to global citizenship: Perspectives from developed and developing countries. *Journal of International Marketing*, *16*(4), 57-85. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Strizhakova, Y., Coulter, R. A., & Price, L. L. (2012). The young adult cohort in emerging markets: Assessing their glocal cultural identity in a global marketplace. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *29*(1), 43-54. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Szromek, A. R., Hysa, B., & Karasek, A. (2019). The perception of overtourism from the perspective of different generations. *Sustainability*, *11*(24), 7151. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Tari-Kasnakoglu, B., Ture, M., & Kalender, Y. (2020). Generation Z in Turkey: A Generation with High Hopes and Big Fears. In *The New Generation Z in Asia: Dynamics, Differences, Digitalisation*. Emerald Publishing Limited.pp:167-179. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

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. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Thach, L., Riewe, S., & Camillo, A. (2020). Generational cohort theory and wine: analyzing how gen Z differs from other American wine consuming generations. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*.33(1), 1-27. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Thakur, A., & Jasrai, L. (2018). A Logit Model to Predict Innovativeness among Mobile Telecom Service Users. *Global Business Review*, *19*(3), 54-71. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Torelli, C. J., & Stoner, J. L. (2019). Global consumer culture: consequences for consumer research. *International Marketing Review*.36(4), 587-592. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Treacy, M., & Wiersema, F. (1993). Customer intimacy and other value disciplines. *Harvard business review*, *71*(1), 84-93. Retrieved from [Link]

Tu, L., Khare, A., & Zhang, Y. (2012). A short 8-item scale for measuring consumers' local-global identity. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *29*(1), 35-42. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

TUIK. (2021). İstatistiklerle Gençlik, 2020. Retrieved from [Link]

Vandecasteele, B., & Geuens, M. (2010). Motivated consumer innovativeness: Concept, measurement, and validation. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *27*(4), 308-318. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Venkatesh, V., Thong, J. Y., & Xu, X. (2012). Consumer acceptance and use of information technology: extending the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 157-178. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Westjohn, S. A., Arnold, M. J., Magnusson, P., Zdravkovic, S., & Zhou, J. X. (2009). Technology readiness and usage: a global-identity perspective. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *37*(3), 250-265. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Westjohn, S. A., Singh, N., & Magnusson, P. (2012). Responsiveness to global and local consumer culture positioning: A personality and collective identity perspective. *Journal of International Marketing*, *20*(1), 58-73. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Wood, S. (2013). Generation Z as consumers: trends and innovation. *Institute for Emerging Issues: NC State University*, *119*(9), 1-3. [Google Scholar]

Wu, L. H., Wu, L. C., & Chang, S. C. (2016). Exploring consumers' intention to accept smartwatch. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *64*, 383-392. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Zhang, J., Ye, H., Bhatt, S., Jeong, H., Deutsch, J., Ayaz, H., & Suri, R. (2021). Addressing food waste: How to position upcycled foods to different generations. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, *20*(2), 242-250. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Zhang, Y., & Khare, A. (2009). The impact of accessible identities on the evaluation of global versus local products. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *36*(3), 524-537. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Джейда Танрикулу, доцент, Університет науки і технологій Адана Алпарслана, Туреччина

Вмотивоване споживання інноваційних товарів та визнання приналежності до «світової спільноти»: відмінності між споживачами

Однією із головних причин низького рівня ефективності впровадження заходів щодо популяризації інноваційних продуктів є нерозуміння наявних запитів та потреб споживачів. При цьому на теоретичному та практичному рівнях необхідною умовою є розуміння мотивів, які спонукають молодь до інноваційної поведінки. Автором зазначено, що мотиви, якими керуються споживачі при купівлі інноваційних продуктів та визнанні приналежності до «світової спільноти», залежать від гендерного та вікового факторів. Однак, виявлені збіги/відмінності та зв'язки можуть відрізнятись між соціально-демографічними групами, що вказує на необхідність проведення більш детальних досліджень, особливо під час пандемії. Метою статті є: 1) визначення мотивів, які спонукають споживачів до придбання інноваційної продукції та визнання приналежності до «світової спільноти» залежно від соціально-демографічних факторів (гендер, вік тощо); 2) дослідження взаємозв'язку між зазначеними вище мотивами. Вихідні дані для дослідження сформовано за результатами онлайн-опитування споживачів поколінь Y та Z на ринку, що розвивається в Туреччині. За результатами дослідження встановлено відсутність гендерних відмінностей у мотивах до споживання інноваційної продукції та визнання приналежності до «світової спільноти». При цьому спостерігається низка відмінностей між поколіннями Y та Z. У ході дослідження виявлено суттєві взаємозв'язки між гендером та поколінням. Отримані результати засвідчили низку суттєвих відмінностей у мотивах, які стимулюють до споживання інноваційної продукції серед покоління Z. Автором виявлено низку збігів та відмінностей у споживчій поведінці між поколіннями Y та Z, особливо під час пандемії. Отримані результати можуть бути дорожньою картою для учасників глобального ринку, які займаються питаннями інноваційного маркетингу, споживчої інноваційності, розробленням інноваційних продуктів особливо для ринків країн, що розвиваються.

Ключові слова: гендер, когорта поколінь, світове громадянство, глобальний маркетинг, мотиви споживчої інноваційності, сталість.