

## EXPLORING THE IMPACT OF HORIZONTAL COLLECTIVISM ON CREATING SHARED VALUE ACTIONS: A STUDY ON BRAND ATTITUDE, PURCHASE INTENTION, AND SOCIAL CORPORATE ENGAGEMENT

Liwia JANKOWSKA<sup>1</sup>, Urszula GARCZAREK-BAK<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny w Poznaniu; liwajankowska@gmail.com,  
ORCID: 0009-0009-5829-5749

<sup>2</sup> Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny w Poznaniu; urszula.garczarek-bak@ue.poznan.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-3979-7964

\* Correspondence author

**Purpose:** This study aimed to investigate the impact of collectivism and individualism dimensions, both horizontal and vertical, on shared value actions, specifically within the realms of brand attitude, purchase intention, and social corporate engagement.

**Design/methodology/approach:** An online survey, distributed through an external portal, was employed for data collection with a sample size of 366 participants from the USA. Subsequently, structural equation modeling (SEM) was applied to analyze the gathered data.

**Findings:** It has been established that horizontal collectivism holds significant importance in the decision-making process regarding participation in Creating Shared Value (CSV) actions and can influence individual behaviors and additional purchase activities.

**Research limitations/implications:** Given the study's focus on a specific demographic, extending the research to diverse cultural contexts may offer valuable insights into the generalizability of the results.

**Practical implications:** The identified significance of horizontal collectivism in shaping decision-making processes and influencing behaviors presents practical implications for business experts seeking to enact changes in their enterprises. Recognizing the pivotal role of horizontal collectivism can guide strategic initiatives aimed at fostering shared value actions within organizations. Conversely, the insignificance of horizontal individualism highlights the need for businesses to focus on collective values and collaboration when implementing initiatives related to shared value.

**Originality/value:** The research problem addressed in this paper is an intriguing topic for discussion in a business context, given the increasing influence of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives and the growing number of companies engaging in environmental and social activities. Consumers are becoming increasingly conscious during the decision-making process, and their consumption choices are becoming more sustainable and environmentally friendly. This trend will inevitably necessitate business decision-makers and producers to conduct new market analyses and, at times, redefine the goals or entire strategies of their companies, both now and in the future.

**Keywords:** Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), Creating Shared Value (CSV), Collectivism, Individualism.

**Category of the paper:** Research paper.

## 1. Introduction

In the current era, where social and environmental issues are becoming increasingly prevalent and pressing, businesses face the challenge of aligning their business objectives with benefits for society and the natural environment (Camilleri, 2017). In the context of this challenge, there is a growing emphasis on the concept of Creating Shared Value (CSV). While academia, as noted by Ham et al. (2020), has started to closely scrutinize CSV, research in this area is still in its early stages (Yoo, Kim, 2019), therefore an investigation of the customers' perceptions about how well a firm integrates both social and economic dimensions, simultaneously makes meaningful contributions to the CSV literature.

CSV is focused on the identification and development of connections between social progress and economic advancement through the investment in solutions to social and environmental issues. Creating Shared Value has been proposed by Kramer and Porter (2011) as the next phase after Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). Simultaneously, it ensures the enduring competitiveness of the company while maintaining a balance between economic and social value (Crane et al., 2014).

Creating Shared Value, by design, concerns increasing economic and social value rather than redistributing pre-existing value by companies (Wójcik, 2016). An example illustrating this difference in perspectives is the Fair Trade movement mentioned by Kramer and Porter (2011), aiming to boost the income of impoverished farmers by paying them higher prices for the same crops. However, Fair Trade primarily relies on redistribution rather than enhancing the overall value created. In contrast, the shared value perspective focuses on improving farming techniques, empowering local supplier groups and other institutions, leading to increased farmer productivity, yields, product quality, and sustainable development. This, in turn, augments the revenue and profits, benefiting both the farmers and the companies that purchase from them. The social benefits of providing appropriate products to low-income and disadvantaged consumers can be substantial, while the profits for companies can be significant (Kramer, Porter, 2011). In Koo, Baek, and Kim's (2019) article, CSV consists of three components: economic, social, and personal (self-realization) value. Engaging in societal initiatives is a common goal across all elements, with common economic and personal value involving goal setting and pursuit, while personal and social values encompass solidarity, defending competition, and personalization.

Kramer and Porter (2011) confirm that the most powerful players on the international stage are often able to achieve a competitive advantage by engaging with important communities. Companies that can embrace this new, local approach will be able to create value in partnership with these communities. Key factors that have an impact include: energy consumption and logistics, resource utilization, supply, distribution, employee productivity, as well as location (Li et al., 2022). Creating Shared Value opens up many new needs to address, products to

introduce, customers to serve, and ways to configure the value chain. It also focuses companies on achieving the right kind of profits - profits that bring social benefits, rather than diminishing them (Menghwar, Daood, 2021). This goal arises not out of charity but from a deeper understanding of competition and the creation of economic value. This further evolution of the capitalist model recognizes new and better ways to develop products, serve markets, and build productive businesses. To achieve the goals related to shared value, five elements are necessary:

- Common Agenda – the development of a shared vision for change and the approach to its implementation.
- Common Measurement System – establishing a concise list of indicators that will help determine how a company's performance will be measured and reported.
- Mutually Reinforcing Activities.
- Continuous Communication – All stakeholders must engage in frequent and organized communication to build trust and coordinate mutual goals.
- Dedicated Project Backbone Support from one or several independent organizations (Kramer and Pfitzer, 2016).

In this context, the Creating Shared Value approach can help companies change the way they conduct business by building long-term relationships based on trust (Park, 2020). Corporate trust is crucial for maintaining and improving a company's performance because it can motivate and drive the corporation to take actions that contribute to increasing value for all stakeholders (Pfajfar et al., 2022). The CSV approach allows a company to go beyond the traditional concept of Corporate Social Responsibility and focus on creating value for all stakeholders. In this way, the company can build trust by focusing on real social and economic needs while also achieving financial benefits (Lim, Lee, 2022).

People's perception of Creating Shared Value actions has a significant impact on their behaviors and purchasing decisions, simultaneously serving as a crucial aspect shaping contemporary society and business (Ham et al., 2020). Several factors play prominent roles in the perception and subsequent participation in shared value creation activities.

Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism are integral elements that distinguish dominant cultural orientations, highlighting the importance of individuality versus group harmony (Sivadas, Bruvold, Nelson, 2008). The most significant shift in thinking concerning individualism-collectivism that has occurred since Hofstede's (1984) popularization of the construct in the organizations literature. By viewing the construct as bi-dimensional (individualism and collectivism rather than individualism versus collectivism), the opportunity to explain anomalous behavior has been created. The Horizontal and Vertical Individualism-Collectivism (HVIC) scale was created to assess both horizontal and vertical subtypes of individualism and collectivism. Singelis et al. (1995) identify horizontal and vertical subtypes for both individualism and collectivism. In horizontal cultures, there is an emphasis on equality, where individuals perceive others as having a similar sense of self, often found in homogeneous cultures. Conversely, vertical cultures accept inequality (Triandis, 1995). Therefore, a culture's

characteristics can be defined by its endorsement of Horizontal Collectivism (HC), Vertical Collectivism (VC), Horizontal Individualism (HI), and Vertical Individualism (VI) (Chiu, Chia, 2015).

Individuals with individualistic values perceive themselves as independent entities, aligning their behaviors and preferences with personal attitudes, leading to a distinct self-perception and a tendency to follow one's own preferences. Whereas individuals with collectivistic values see themselves as interdependent with others and generally adhere to social norms (Bechtoldt, Choi, Nijstad, 2012). The horizontal and vertical dimensions relate to how these values are manifested in social relationships. Cultures with horizontal dimensions underscore equality and diminish power distance. Within horizontal relationships, structural egalitarianism prevails, with all members embracing interdependence and equal status. Conversely, vertical relationships are structured hierarchically, with members of a culture acknowledging and embracing inequality, assigning importance to social rank or status. In cultures with vertical dimensions, the emphasis lies on hierarchy and a reverence for authority (Boyle, Saklofske, Matthews, 2014). These dimensions differ from the traditional dimension of individualism/collectivism as they provide a more vivid understanding of how cultural values are expressed in different contexts. However, there are individual differences within cultures, and not all individuals within a given culture will share the same values or behaviors (Sivadas, Bruvold, Nelson, 2008).

The division of cultures into individualism and collectivism highlights differences in the approach to respect for individual rights. In individualistic cultures, expressing distinctiveness is crucial, where the primary value is the individual and their immediate family. There is greater freedom in setting goals, and the bonds between group members are looser. These cultures typically show a greater tendency toward nonconformity, focus on oneself, and may exhibit less concern for the well-being of others. In contrast, in collectivistic cultures, the priority is group membership, and decisions are made with the well-being of the entire group in mind rather than the individual (Kim, 1995).

Collectivists, both horizontal and vertical, share a similar approach to values associated with the conservative pole. They emphasize values such as "security" (stability and protection of society, relationships with others, and one's own identity), "adaptation" (restraining socially unacceptable impulses and actions), and "tradition" (respect for cultural, religious customs, and ideas). Horizontal collectivists place greater emphasis on the value of "benevolence" (caring for the well-being of close individuals), while vertical collectivists focus on the value of "power" (control over people and resources) (Czerniawska, 2020).

Individualists, both horizontal and vertical, show similar attachment to values associated with the openness to change pole. They appreciate values such as "self-determination" (independence in thinking and action), "stimulation" (novelty, excitement, challenges), and "hedonism" (pleasure, sensuality). However, they differ in the context of the power dimension. Horizontal individualists assign greater value to "universalism" (tolerance and

protection of all people and the environment), while vertical individualists focus on the value of "achievement" (skills consistent with social standards) (Czerniawska, 2020).

Based on aforementioned literature review, it is predicted that horizontal dimensions, as opposed to vertical ones, will have a positive impact on consumer attitudes towards the brand. Therefore, we hypothesized:

H1: Horizontal collectivism positively influences consumer perception of the brand and will be the most significant dimension among all.

H2: Horizontal individualism negatively influences consumer perception of the brand and will be the least significant dimension among all.

H3: Vertical collectivism positively influences consumer perception of the brand, but to a lesser extent than horizontal collectivism.

H4: Vertical individualism negatively influences consumer perception of the brand, but to a lesser extent than horizontal individualism.

These hypotheses suggest that the horizontal dimensions of collectivism and individualism are expected to play a more substantial role in shaping consumer attitudes toward the brand compared to the vertical dimensions. The hypotheses also indicate the expected direction of the influence of each dimension on brand perception.

Hypotheses (H5 to H8) regarding the impact of different dimensions on purchase intentions:

H5: Horizontal collectivism positively influences purchase intentions and will be the most significant dimension among all.

H6: Horizontal individualism negatively influences purchase intentions and will be the least significant dimension among all.

H7: Vertical collectivism positively influences purchase intentions, but to a lesser extent than horizontal collectivism.

H8: Vertical individualism negatively influences purchase intentions, but to a lesser extent than horizontal individualism.

These hypotheses extend the analysis to the impact of the various dimensions on purchase intentions. Similar to the previous set of hypotheses, these hypotheses suggest the expected direction and significance of the influence of each dimension on consumer purchase intentions.

The set of hypotheses (H9 to H12) focuses on how different dimensions of collectivism and individualism influence the perception of a brand's social engagement:

H9: Horizontal collectivism positively influences the perception of a company's social engagement and will be the most significant dimension among all.

H10: Horizontal individualism negatively influences the perception of a company's social engagement and will be the least significant dimension among all.

H11: Vertical collectivism positively influences the perception of a company's social engagement, but to a lesser extent than horizontal collectivism.

H12: Vertical individualism negatively influences the perception of a company's social engagement, but to a lesser extent than horizontal individualism.

These hypotheses explore how different dimensions of individualism and collectivism may impact the way consumers perceive a company's social engagement. The hypotheses indicate the expected direction and significance of the influence of each dimension on the perception of corporate social engagement. A structural model will be used to test the relationships between these factors, and data on the levels of collectivism and individualism among respondents will be collected to assess the significance and direction of the impact of these variables on the perception of CSV actions.

## 2. Method

In the context mentioned above, the present investigation utilized an online survey, employing a questionnaire distributed through an external portal for participant recruitment. A total of 366 residents from the United States were chosen to take part, and each participant received a modest compensation as acknowledgment for their time and engagement. The empirical material allowed for the analysis of results using the structural equation modeling method. To ensure the reliability of the data, several strategic measures were implemented. Participants were selected based on their positive history of task completions. Strict measures were in place, allowing each participant only one survey submission, enforced by restricting it to one survey per IP address. Moreover, attention-checking questions were incorporated into the survey to assess the level of attention and identify respondents who answered reflexively or in a haphazard manner, allowing for their exclusion from the analysis.

The majority of the study participants were male, making up 207 individuals, accounting for 56.56% of the total respondents. Meanwhile, 43.4% of the respondents were female. The average age of the participants was 36.82 years, with the youngest respondent being 20 years old and the oldest, 76 years old. The standard deviation was 10.92. In terms of income, most respondents fell within the income bracket of \$50,000 to \$75,999 annually and held a Bachelor's Degree. The last question related to the paper's content was about the average annual income donated to charitable causes. The most frequent response was \$500 to \$799, followed by less than \$500, while the least common responses were \$1300 and above (the highest value among the responses).

The first part of the study involves describing a situation, followed by questions presented to the study participants: *Imagine that brand X, which you were not familiar with before, exists in the private sector and conducts a series of activities related to environmental and social responsibility. The company offers a wide range of environmentally friendly products due to their fair production. What's more, a percentage of their sales goes towards various charitable causes, such as supporting children from impoverished households or raising funds for rainforest conservation. Additionally, customers can participate in campaigns organized by*

brand X that go beyond product purchases. These campaigns include self-development workshops, such as webinars on stress management, and environmentally oriented activities, like beach cleanups.

The first section involved the analysis of general factors influencing brand perception, the creation of shared value, and purchase intention, as presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.**

*Analysis of factors influencing brand perception, social engagement, and purchase intentions.*

Item	Statement
Purchase Intention	PI1 - I would like to buy any product sold by this company PI2 - I am willing to purchase product off their website or stationary store PI3 - I will make an effort to search and then buy any product which contributes to values held by this company
Brand Attitude	BA1 - My attitude toward this brand is unappealing/appealing BA2 - My attitude toward this brand is bad/good BA3 - My attitude toward this brand is unpleasant/pleasant BA4 - My attitude toward this brand is unfavorable/favorable
Social Contribution of the Company	SCC1 - The company improves the economic welfare of the community SCC2 - The company fosters local residents' training and development (education) SCC3 - The company helps create a better society SCC4 - The company strives to enhance stable relationship through collaboration with its suppliers

Source: own elaboration based on Youn et al., (2020) and Ham, et al., (2020).

The second section comprised questions based on the content of the article and concurrently on Sivadas' study (2008), focusing on the horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism. This was done to later assess their relationship with Section 1. The content of these questions is presented in Table 2.

**Table 2.**

*Variables related to dimensions of individualism and collectivism.*

Item	Statement
Horizontal Individualism	HI1 - I enjoy being unique and different from others in many ways HI2 - I often "do my own thing" HI3 - I am unique individual
Horizontal Collectivism	HC1 - My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me HC2 - The well-being of my co-workers is important to me HC3 - If a co-worker gets a prize, I would feel proud HC4 - I feel good when I cooperate with others
Vertical Collectivism	VC1 - I would do what would please my family, even if I detested that activity VC2 - I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group VC3 - Children should feel honored if their parents receive a distinguished award VC4 - I would sacrifice an activity that I enjoy very much if my family did not approve of it
Vertical Individualism	VI1 - I enjoy working in situations involving competition with others VI2 - Competition is the law of nature VI3 - Without competition it is not possible to have a good society

Source: own elaboration based on Sivadas, Bruvold, Nelson, 2008.

To assess the impact of the horizontal and vertical dimensions of collectivism and individualism on the perception of CSV actions, a structural equation modeling (SEM) analysis was conducted. During the study, it was examined whether the application of theoretical constructs was reflected in the research results. It's worth noting that the scenario pertained to questions from section 1, while the remaining two sections and demographic questions related to the consumer's approach rather than a specific situation or company.

### 3. Results

The constructs detailed in the analysis include PI (Purchase Intention), SCC (Corporate Social Commitment), and BA (Brand Behavior) at the first level of analysis. The correlation between this group of factors and the dimension of collectivism and individualism, namely HC (Horizontal Collectivism), HI (Horizontal Individualism), VC (Vertical Collectivism), and VI (Vertical Individualism), was analyzed. It can be observed that each of these factors has its unique and individual connections between the first and second levels of the model. Factors related to collectivism and individualism are associated with brand behavior. To evaluate which of them are relevant to the research area, a detailed analysis of the data for each factor was conducted.

The Factor Loading coefficient serves to assess how well a given item represents the underlying construct. The P-value indicates the statistical significance of the result, i.e., the likelihood of the test. Cronbach's Alpha regulates the test's reliability and measures the degree of interrelatedness between individual items in a set of questions and how consistently they measure the same construct. Composite Reliability (CR) is a measure used in SEM to assess the internal consistency or reliability of a latent variable with multiple indicators. CR is similar to Cronbach's Alpha but is considered a more appropriate measure of reliability for latent variables with multiple indicators. It evaluates the extent to which the indicators of a latent variable consistently measure the same underlying construct. Higher CR values indicate greater reliability or internal consistency of the composite variable. Average Variance Extracted (AVE) is a measure used in SEM to assess the convergent validity of a latent variable. It quantitatively measures the proportion of variance in the indicators of a latent variable that is captured by the underlying construct. Below is Table 3 presenting the results of the factor analysis, including factor loadings, Cronbach's alpha coefficients, and t-statistic values for each factor.



**Table 3.***The results of the factor analysis*

Construct	Item	Loading	P-value	Cronbach's $\alpha$	CR	AVE
PI	PI1	0.768	***	0.815	0.816	0.597
	PI2	0.807	***			
	PI3	0.742	***			
SCC	SCC1	0.781	***	0.835	0.835	0.559
	SCC2	0.73	***			
	SCC3	0.76	***			
	SCC4	0.718	***			
BA	BA1	0.799	***	0.865	0.868	0.623
	BA2	0.827	***			
	BA3	0.739	***			
	BA4	0.786	***			
HI	HI1	0.732	***	0.772	0.772	0.53
	HI2	0.699	***			
	HI3	0.756	***			
HC	HC1	0.69	***	0.809	0.81	0.516
	HC2	0.691	***			
	HC3	0.753	***			
	HC4	0.737	***			
VC	VC1	0.759	***	0.806	0.815	0.528
	VC2	0.775	***			
	VC3	0.611	***			
	VC4	0.733	***			
VI	VI1	0.825	***	0.839	0.839	0.635
	VI2	0.799	***			
	VI3	0.768	***			

Source: own elaboration.

The data in Table 4 allows for an assessment of the strength of the relationship between variables and factors, internal scale consistency, and the statistical significance of the factor analysis results.

**Table 4.***Analysis of Covariance*

chisq	df	SRMR	RMSEA	AGFI	NFI	CFI	GFI	RFI	IFI	TLI
636.859	254	0.05	0.064	0.959	0.89	0.93	0.97	0.87	0.931	0.917

Source: own elaboration.

The conclusions drawn from the presented factor analysis table indicate several significant observations. The first important conclusion is the high internal consistency of the PI scale (Purchase Intent), confirmed by a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.815. All three items in the PI scale have significant and strong loading factors, confirming their significant contribution to the construction of PI. Overall, the PI scale exhibits a high level of internal consistency (CR = 0.816 > 0.7) and is well internalized (AVE = 0.597 > 0.5).

Similarly, the SCC scale (Corporate Social Commitment) demonstrates high internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.835 (>0.7). All four items in the SCC scale have significant and strong loading factors. The SCC scale also features a high level of internal consistency (CR = 0.835) and adequate internalization (AVE = 0.559). The remaining

scales (BA, HI, HC, VC, VI) also exhibit high internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.865, 0.772, 0.809, 0.806, and 0.839, respectively. All items in these scales have significant and strong loading factors, confirming their significant contributions to the respective constructs. The CR and AVE values for these scales also indicate high internal consistency and adequate internalization.

In summary, the results of the factor analysis confirm that all the tested scales are internally consistent, and the individual items within the scales significantly contribute to their assigned constructs. The results of the analysis indicate a generally good fit of the model to the data, as evidenced by the high values of the AGFI (Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit Index), CFI (Comparative Fit Index), GFI (Goodness-of-Fit Index), and IFI (Incremental Fit Index). Additionally, the low values of the SRMR (Square Root Mean Residual) and RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation) emphasize the robustness of the analysis. The ratio of chi-squared to degrees of freedom (df) is also less than 3, meeting the statistical test condition. Therefore, it can be concluded that the model fits the data satisfactorily. As part of the analysis, an assessment was also conducted to evaluate the degree of correlation between observable variables and the significance of the relationships between them. All loadings presented in Table 5 show values exceeding 0.5. Based on this, it can be inferred that there is a high level of mutual correlation between the factors. Furthermore, it can be observed that the HC factor (Horizontal Collectivism) exerts the greatest influence on first-level factors such as purchase intention, social engagement, and brand behaviors.

**Table 5.**

*Degree of Correlation and Significance of Relationships Between Observable Variables*

	PI	SCC	BA	HI	HC	VC	VI
PI	1.000						
SCC	0.919	1.000					
BA	0.906	0.956	1.000				
HI	0.767	0.702	0.777	1.000			
HC	0.862	0.821	0.874	0.891	1.000		
VC	0.778	0.778	0.766	0.694	0.832	1.000	
VI	0.604	0.605	0.557	0.597	0.623	0.826	1.000

Source: own elaboration.

Table 6 presents the SEM analysis, encompassing results and conclusions regarding the study, its assumptions, and the verification of structural assumptions.

**Table 6.**

*SEM Analysis*

Dependent variable	Independent variable	Beta	SE	p-value
BA	HC	0.796	0.5801	**
BA	HI	0.0004	0.3871	NS
BA	VC	0.142	0.3577	NS
BA	VI	-0.065	0.2347	NS
PI	HC	0.788	0.6218	**
PI	HI	-0.036	0.4137	NS

Cont. table 6.

PI	VC	0.102	0.3815	NS
PI	VI	0.046	0.2525	NS
SCC	HC	0.842	0.6081	**
SCC	HI	-0.176	0.4173	NS
SCC	VC	0.125	0.3673	NS
SCC	VI	0.08	0.2447	NS

Source: own elaboration.

## 4. Discussion

The obtained data confirm the first three hypotheses, revealing a positive relationship, as demonstrated earlier. Specifically, concerning the variable BA (Brand Attitude), a notable positive relationship exists with both HC (Horizontal Collectivism) and VC (Vertical Collectivism). An increase in the values of HC and VC correlates with an escalation in the variable BA. However, the variable VI (Vertical Individualism) does not show a significant impact on the variable BA. For the variable PI (Purchase Intention), both the HC and VC variables have a significant influence on it. An increase in the values of HC and VC is associated with an increase in the variable PI. However, the variable HI does not demonstrate a significant impact on the variable PI. Concerning the variable SCC (Social Corporate Citizenship), the HC variable has a significant positive influence on it. An increase in the values of HC leads to an increase in the variable SCC. The variable HI (Horizontal Individualism) does not show a significant impact on the variable SCC. It is worth noting that the p-values for many variables are significant, indicating the statistical significance of relationships between variables. The beta level is also significantly higher for the HC variable, indicating a strong influence of this factor on the other constructs. Significance at  $p < 0.01$  is denoted in the table by the symbol \*\* and occurs only for the HC variable, indicating a good fit of this factor to the other variables.

Unfortunately, the empirical data obtained do not allow for a clear determination of the influence of the remaining dimensions on the perception of CSV actions. In contrast, Cui, Zeng, and Jin (2022) found that vertical individualism had no significant impact on socioeconomic-oriented consumption. Furthermore, their research revealed that horizontal individualism, horizontal collectivism, and vertical collectivism positively influenced both eco-friendly and socioeconomic-oriented consumption. Similarly, the results from Moon, Travaglino, and Uskul's (2018) study also indicated no difference across two cultural settings in the association between Social Value Orientation and the vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism.

Based on Ur Rahman et al.'s (2023) study, it contributes by providing new theoretical and managerial insights into understanding culturally relevant sustainable consumption motives. It aims to establish appropriate strategies for promoting sustainable consumption in cross-cultural contexts by highlighting the significance of incorporating the vertical-horizontal dimension into cross-cultural analyses based on individualism-collectivism. Our discovery that Horizontal Collectivism emerges as the most influential factor on first-level constructs like purchase intention, social engagement, and brand behaviors is in alignment with Booyesen, Guvuriro, and Campher (2021), where their study finds only horizontal collectivism to be associated with greater preferences for altruism through the social discounting task. Further research is required to elucidate the causal mechanisms through CSV decisions.

Acknowledging the study's limitations, it is crucial to highlight that it was conducted exclusively on a subset of the population — residents of the United States. Different nationalities, national cultures, or differently formulated assessment statements would inevitably influence responses, potentially altering the analysis. The conclusions drawn from this study can offer valuable insights for decision-makers across businesses of any size and within various industries looking to implement the concept of creating shared value. These insights are particularly relevant when formulating short- and long-term goals and making strategic decisions related to product sales in both physical stores and e-commerce. Managers should recognize the potential necessity of educating customers about their company's CSV strategy. This is because unintended adverse consequences may arise regarding the impact of their company's economic performance on customers' perception of their brand. Hence, the significance lies not only in implementing a CSV strategy but also in effectively communicating and educating the public about it.

## 5. Conclusion

Collectivism, particularly its vertical dimension involving the acceptance of hierarchy while maintaining a sense of group belonging, significantly influences engagement in broadly defined social activities. It can be inferred that individuals actively participate in shared value creation to enhance their social status and ascend within the hierarchy. Simultaneously, there is a desire to attain intangible benefits and recognition from leaders, including opinions and groups. With the continuous evolution of the CSV concept, shifting consumption trends, and the growing interest of businesses in sustainable practices, alongside dynamic environmental and societal trends, ongoing research becomes imperative. In future research, exploring the evolving dynamics of collectivism and individualism, while also considering other psychological factors such as altruism or egoism, should be a priority. Examining different scenarios, including alterations to the company description, reducing the number of questions

for increased participant engagement, and enhancing precision in their formulation, should be considered. The significance of diversifying respondents from multiple countries cannot be overstated, given the varied cultural approaches to this topic.

## References

1. Bechtoldt, M.N., Choi, H.S., Nijstad, B.A. (2012). Individuals in mind, mates by heart: Individualistic self-construal and collective value orientation as predictors of group creativity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(4), 838-844.
2. Booyesen, F., Guvururo, S., Campher, C. (2021). Horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism and preferences for altruism: A social discounting study. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 178, 110856.
3. Boyle, G.J., Saklofske, D.H., Matthews, G. (Eds.) (2014). *Measures of personality and social psychological constructs*. Academic Press.
4. Camilleri, M.A. (2017). Corporate sustainability and responsibility: creating value for business, society and the environment. *Asian Journal of Sustainability and Social Responsibility*, 2(1), 59-74.
5. Chiu, C.Y., Chia, S.I., Wan, W.W. (2015). Measures of cross-cultural values, personality and beliefs. *Measures of personality and social psychological constructs*, 621-651.
6. Crane, A., Palazzo, G., Spence, L.J., Matten, D. (2014). Contesting the value of “creating shared value”. *California management review*, 56(2), 130-153.
7. Cui, G.-Q., Zeng, J.-Y., Jin, C.-H. (2022). The Impact of Vertical/Horizontal Individualism and Collectivism on Ethical Consumption. *Sustainability*, 14(21), 14254. MDPI AG. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su142114254>
8. Czerniawska, M. (2020). Horizontal and vertical “individualism–collectivism” and values. *Kultura-Społeczeństwo-Edukacja*, 2, 293-309.
9. Ham, S., Lee, S., Yoon, H., Kim, C. (2020). Linking creating shared value to customer behaviors in the food service context. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 43, 199-208.
10. Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*, Vol. 5. Sage.
11. Jin, C.H. (2018). The effects of creating shared value (CSV) on the consumer self–brand connection: Perspective of sustainable development. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 25(6), 1246-1257.
12. Kim, U. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism: A psychological, cultural and ecological analysis*, No. 21. NIAS Press.
13. Koo, J., Baek, S., Kim, S. (2019). The effect of personal value on CSV (creating shared value). *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 5(2), 34.

14. Kramer, M.R., Pfitzer, M.W. (2016). The ecosystem of shared value. *Harvard business review*, 94(10), 80-89.
15. Kramer, M.R., Porter, M. (2011). *Creating shared value, Vol. 17*. Boston, MA, USA: FSG.
16. Li, X., Liu, D., Zhang, Z., Cheng, T., Liu, L., Yuan, J. (2022). The impact of internal and external green supply chain management activities on performance improvement: evidence from the automobile industry. *Heliyon*, 8(11).
17. Lim, J.R., Lee, S.Y. (2022). Creating shared value (CSV) and mutually beneficial relationships to address societal issues and develop corporate competitive advantage: A case study of Yuhan-Kimberly and an aging population. *Public Relations Review*, 48(4), 102225.
18. Menghwar, P.S., Daood, A. (2021). Creating shared value: A systematic review, synthesis and integrative perspective. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 23(4), 466-485.
19. Moon, C., Travaglino, G.A., Uskul, A.K. (2018). Social value orientation and endorsement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism: An exploratory study comparing individuals from North America and South Korea. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 2262.
20. Park, K.O. (2020). How CSV and CSR affect organizational performance: A productive behavior perspective. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(7), 2556.
21. Pfajfar, G., Shoham, A., Małecka, A., Zalaznik, M. (2022). Value of corporate social responsibility for multiple stakeholders and social impact—Relationship marketing perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 143, 46-61.
22. Singelis, T.M., Triandis, H.C., Bhawuk, D.P., Gelfand, M.J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-cultural research*, 29(3), 240-275.
23. Sivadas, E., Bruvold, N., Nelson, M. (2008). A reduced version of the horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism scale: a four-country assessment. *Journal of Business Research*, pp. 201-210.
24. Triandis, H.C. (1995). *Individualism & collectivism*. Westview Press.
25. Ur Rahman, S., Chwialkowska, A., Hussain, N., Bhatti, W.A., Luomala, H. (2023). Cross-cultural perspective on sustainable consumption: Implications for consumer motivations and promotion. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 25(2), 997-1016.
26. Wójcik, P. (2016). How creating shared value differs from corporate social responsibility. *Central European Management Journal*, 24(2), 32-55.
27. Yoo, H., Kim, J. (2019). Creating and sharing a bigger value: A dual process model of inter-firm CSV relative to firm performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 99, 542-550.
28. Youn, H., Yin, R., Kim, J.H., Li, J.J. (2020). Examining traditional restaurant diners' intention: An application of the VBN theory. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 85, 102360.