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Abstract
Millennials’ increasing interest in luxury goods is extensively changing the luxury landscape. This cross-cultural study obtains a deeper understanding of which value perceptions influence South Korean and Dutch millennial consumers’ purchase intentions for luxury goods. To reflect trends and the characteristics of millennials, this study analyzes four perceived values associated with luxury goods: investment, functional, individual, and social values. The findings reveal similarities and differences in the effect of the four perceived values on attitudes and purchase intention for luxury goods among Korean and Dutch millennials. Four dimensions of individualism versus collectivism (horizontal individualism, vertical individualism, horizontal collectivism, and vertical collectivism) are discussed by comparing cultural differences across the two countries. The results of this study contribute to the fields of luxury goods consumption, luxury consumer behavior, luxury goods marketing, and millennial consumer behavior.
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Introduction

Luxury brands are making their products trendier and more suited to their main target group, millennial consumers, those born between 1980 and 2000 (Lee & Kotler, 2015; The Straits Times, 2020). Millennials make up an important consumer group for marketers (Burnasheva et al., 2019). This is because, especially for luxury goods, millennials have more consumption power than previous consumer generations (Ordun, 2015). More importantly, they make up a large proportion of the population around the globe: around one fifth of the U.S. and South Korean populations (United States Census Bureau, 2019; Yonhap News, 2019) and around one fourth of the Dutch population (CBS, 2018).

Millennials grew up experiencing major technological innovations, such as the rise of ecommerce and social network sites (SNS), which enables them to engage with brands in a different way (Kotler & Armstrong, 2016, p. 101). As a result, many millennials are attached to portraying their ideal self-image and comparing themselves with others on SNS (Bergman et al., 2011). Their sense of community, through the use of SNS, influences consumers’ decision-making and their attitude toward luxury goods (Burnasheva et al., 2019; Ordun, 2015). Millennials express their style, personality, and identity through the consumption of goods (Geraci & Nagy, 2004). If a product or service matches their personal image, they do not mind paying a premium price (Geraci & Nagy, 2004).

Value perception is a critical factor that influences millennials’ purchase intention for luxury goods (Faschan et al., 2020). Investment, resale, hedonism, materialism, social status, and social comparison characterize this cohort (Burnasheva et al., 2019; Jun et al., 2021; Moreno et al., 2017) and are important antecedents for luxury goods consumption (Bian & Forsythe, 2012; Chattalas & Shukla, 2015; Lee et al., 2018). Even though many scholars have studied the perceived values of luxury goods (Salehzadeh & Pool, 2017; Vigneron & Johnson, 1999; Wiedmann et al., 2009), they have mainly focused on basic constructs such as price, quality, hedonism, and conspicuousness. Because millennials have become a very important consumer group for luxury goods, it is important to obtain a deeper understanding of their consumption behavior for luxury goods, one that reflects the value perceptions of millennials in a cross-cultural context. Therefore, this study explored the perceived investment, functional, individual, and social values of luxury goods among millennials.

Previous research has found that millennials share very similar values and perceptions because of globalization (Faschan et al., 2020). They are therefore often referred to as a global cohort (Moreno et al., 2017; Ordun, 2015). Despite the similarities, differences also exist (Faschan et al., 2020; Kapferer & Valette-Florence, 2022). Notably, cultural differences influence consumption behavior (Hennigs et al., 2012). As noted in previous literature, very little cross-cultural research has explored the similarities and differences between countries (Shukla, 2012). Although many studies have investigated millennials’ perceived values toward luxury goods in the U.S. (Chattalas & Shukla, 2015) and China (Bian & Forsythe, 2012), research comparing South Korea and the Netherlands is lacking.)
South Korean and Dutch millennials need to be researched for several reasons. South Korea is receiving increasing interest from marketers worldwide because both female and male Korean millennials show increasing interest and demand for luxury goods (Choi et al., 2010; Lee, 2019). Between 2021 and 2025, luxury goods sales in Korea are predicted to increase by 7.05% annually (Statista, 2020a), whereas the overall Asian luxury goods market is expected to have annual growth of 6.38% during the same period (Statista, 2020c). The Dutch luxury market is also predicted to grow by 6.54% annually between 2021 and 2025 (Statista, 2020b), whereas the overall European luxury market is expected to see annual growth of 5.62% during the same period (Statista, 2020d). The increasing interest and demand for luxury goods among Dutch millennials (Winkelstraat.nl, 2021) has resulted in stronger growth in the Dutch luxury goods market than in nearby Belgium (5.08%), Luxembourg (5.95%), and Germany (5.32%) (Statista, 2022a, b, c). Even though Dutch consumers have a high interest in fashion and luxury goods (Sobol et al., 2018), little is known about their luxury consumption behavior.

To uncover the similarities and differences in luxury goods consumption among Korean and Dutch millennials, this study conducted cross-cultural research that analyzed the influence of perceived values on their attitudes and purchase intention toward luxury goods. Moreover, to obtain a deeper understanding of the cultural differences across the two countries, this study employed a more sophisticated analysis using the four dimensions of cultural values (horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism). Because of the influence of globalization and Westernization on culture, individualistic values are increasing among millennials even in collectivistic cultures (Sobol et al., 2018). Although national cultures remain, the differences and similarities in Korean and Dutch millennials’ cultural values must be explored.

The findings of this study contribute to the fields of luxury goods consumption, luxury consumer behavior (especially among millennials), and luxury goods marketing. Additionally, scholars and practitioners can use the findings about the cultural differences between Korea and the Netherlands when they target advertising and communicate with millennial consumers in those countries.

Theoretical background and hypothesis development

Cross-cultural influence of perceived values on luxury goods attitudes and purchase intention among Korean and Dutch millennials

Perceived values of luxury goods

Perceived values refers to the benefits consumers see in a brand and how consumers define a brand from their viewpoint (Kotler & Armstrong, 2016, p. 37). Perceived values can be divided into various dimensions (Wiedmann et al., 2007) and are positively related to attitude toward luxury goods, which in turn increases consumers’ purchase intention (Salehzadeh & Pool, 2017). There is an ongoing debate about the dimensions of perceived values (Wiedmann et al., 2009).
Vigneron and Johnson (1999) developed a conceptual framework for the perceived values of luxury goods that influence consumer behavior: conspicuous, unique, social, hedonic, and quality values. Even though all individuals have these five value perceptions, the difference in defining what luxury goods mean could influence their degree of importance (Vigneron & Johnson, 1999). In line with Vigneron and Johnson (1999), Sweeney and Soutar (2001) argued that all perceived values are important in influencing consumers’ behavior, but their relative importance is different for every individual. Vigneron and Johnson (2004) suggested that the perceived values of luxury goods can also be divided into nonpersonal (interpersonal) perceptions, such as conspicuousness, uniqueness, and quality, and personal perceptions, like hedonism and extended self.

Inspired by previous literature, Wiedmann et al. (2007) developed a conceptual framework that measures the perceived financial, functional, individual, and social values of luxury goods. They argued that despite their high correlation, the four dimensions of perceived values are not interchangeable (Wiedmann et al., 2007). Based on this framework, Wiedmann et al. (2007) discovered that financial, functional, and individual perceived values are critical antecedents of luxury consumption.

Hennigs et al. (2012) applied the Wiedmann et al. (2007) framework to research in ten American, European, and Asian countries. They argued that consumers worldwide have similar perceived values, consisting of financial, functional, individual, and social values (Hennigs et al., 2012). However, the degree of importance of the four perceived values varies in different countries and cultures (Hennigs et al., 2012; Wiedmann et al., 2007). Thus, cross-cultural research is needed (Aliyev & Wagner, 2018) to understand the differences in perceived values between Korean and Dutch millennials. Previous researchers have also measured the following dimensions of value perceptions: self-directed symbolic/expressive, other-directed symbolic/expressive, experiential/hedonic, utilitarian/functional, and cost/financial values (Shukla & Purani, 2012); and self-symbolic, social-symbolic, hedonic, functional, and cost/sacrifice values (Faschan et al., 2020).

Instead of the perceived financial value emphasizing the high cost and financial sacrifice of luxury goods, previous literature show that the financial worth of luxury goods has been highly associated with investment (Chu & Liao, 2010; Turunen et al., 2020). Global trends show that millennials perceive the resale value of luxury goods as a financial investment (Jun et al., 2021, Thred UP, 2019). Thus, the perceived investment value of luxury goods is a crucial value perception that reflects the characteristics of millennials. Based on previous literature and recent trends, this study analyzes four dimensions (perceived investment, functional, individual, and social values) of perceived values of luxury goods.

**Investment value**

*Investment value* addresses what a consumer should sacrifice to acquire a luxury product (Hennigs et al., 2015; Wiedmann et al., 2009). The increasing premium price tags of luxury goods are perceived as the financial worth, which can be resold as secondhand at a significant return on investment (Turunen & Pöyry, 2020).
Korean, Chinese, and German consumers consider the premium price tag on luxury goods to be worth the money (Choo et al., 2012; Faschan et al., 2020). This financial worth has been associated with investment: purchasing luxury goods firsthand and selling them secondhand (Turunen et al., 2020). Thus, the expected resale value of luxury goods is reflected in the product’s perceived investment value (Turunen et al., 2020).

Recently, the global luxury goods resale market has demonstrated stronger growth than the firsthand luxury market (Turunen & Pöyry, 2019), and millennials are leading the luxury resale market (Thred UP, 2019). For instance, Korean millennials put a premium on the resale value of luxury goods as a financial investment (Jun et al., 2021). This is reflected in the recent open-run phenomenon in Korea, where consumers wait in line for hours before opening and attempt to purchase luxury goods as soon as stores open (Jun et al., 2021).

Compared to Korean millennials, Dutch millennials are less likely to consider the perceived investment value before deciding on their luxury purchases. Even though Dutch millennials are big spenders on luxury goods (Winkelstraat.nl, 2021), resale value consciousness is less pronounced when purchasing luxuries. This is because the Dutch are more attached to possession of material goods (Dawson & Bamossy, 1990; Sobol et al., 2018); hence, they are less likely to resell luxury goods on the secondhand market (Dawson & Bamossy, 1990). More importantly, research has found that impulse buying strongly influences luxury consumption behavior among Dutch millennials (Winkelstraat.nl, 2021). In other words, Korean consumers emphasize the perceived investment value of luxury goods more than Dutch consumers do. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed (Fig. 1):

**H1** The perceived investment value of luxury goods positively influences attitudes toward luxury goods among Korean and Dutch millennials.

**H1a** The positive effect of perceived investment value on attitudes toward luxury goods is more pronounced among Korean millennials than among Dutch millennials.

**Functional value**

The functional value of luxury goods consists of the main benefits of the product (e.g., quality, usability, durability, and uniqueness) (Hennigs et al., 2015; Wiedmann et al., 2009). Studies have shown that the functional value of luxury goods, which consists of usability, high performance, quality, and uniqueness, are important antecedents of luxury consumption (Hennigs et al., 2015; Vigneron & Johnson, 1999; Wiedmann et al., 2009). Thus, the functional values of luxury goods are those that make them look exclusive, scarce, and well-crafted (Vigneron & Johnson, 1999).

Compared to Asian consumers, Western consumers generally place more emphasis on functional value, such as the quality and usability of luxury goods (Shukla & Purani, 2012). However, when it comes to the generational cohort, millennials put less emphasis on the quality of luxury goods (Faschan et al., 2020). Recent research has argued that functional value perception, such as high quality, is much
less important among Chinese than American millennials (Mundel et al., 2021). Faschan et al. (2020) also found that German and Chinese millennials do not associate superior quality and durability with perceived functional values of luxury goods. In light of previous literature, this study expects that the perceived functional value of luxury goods has a stronger effect on attitudes toward luxury goods among Dutch millennials than among Korean millennials. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed (Fig. 1):

H2 The perceived functional value of luxury goods positively influences attitudes toward luxury goods among Korean and Dutch millennials.

H2a The positive effect of perceived functional value on attitudes toward luxury goods is more pronounced among Dutch millennials than among Korean millennials.

Individual value

Perceived individual value addresses the individual’s self-directed personal attributes (Chattalas & Shukla, 2015; Wiedmann et al., 2009). Previous studies define individual value as materialism, hedonism, self-identity, and a customer’s personal orientation toward the consumption of luxury goods (Chattalas & Shukla, 2015; Hennigs et al., 2012, 2015). More importantly, the individual’s personality, beliefs, and attitudes are related to self-identity (Wiedmann et al., 2007).

Compared to previous consumer generations, millennials place greater importance on individual value perceptions such as materialism, hedonism, and self-identity values when they consume luxury goods (Burnasheva et al., 2019; Faschan et al., 2020). This is because millennials emphasize expressing their self-image and personality (Moreno et al., 2017; Ordun, 2015). More precisely, they express their self-identity and self-image through the consumption of luxury goods (Faschan et al., 2020).

Individual values are becoming an important value perception for Asian consumers (Bian & Forsythe, 2012). In particular, these values are becoming very important indicators for Chinese consumers (Zhang & Zhao, 2019). Burnasheva et al. (2019) argued that Korean and Russian millennials are strongly focused on materialism, resulting in positive attitudes toward luxury goods. Also, Korean and Russian millennials have a strong desire to express their unique self-image and personality through the consumption and possession of luxury goods (Burnasheva et al., 2019).

Nonetheless, previous studies revealed that Western consumers place more emphasis on hedonism than Asian consumers do (Aliyev & Wagner, 2018). European consumers in general, like the Dutch and British, place a stronger meaning on individual value perceptions and materialistic goods than Americans and Asians do (Chattalas & Shukla, 2015; Dawson & Bamossy, 1990; Shukla & Purani, 2012). In other words, Western consumers, like the Dutch, emphasize individual value perceptions more than Asian consumers, like Koreans (Aliyev & Wagner, 2018; Dawson & Bamossy, 1990; Shukla & Purani, 2012). Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed (Fig. 1):
**H3** The perceived individual value of luxury goods positively influences attitudes toward luxury goods among Korean and Dutch millennials.

**H3a** The positive effect of perceived individual value on attitudes toward luxury goods is more pronounced among Dutch millennials than among Korean millennials.

**Social value**

Perceived social value addresses the other-directed symbolic value that luxury goods hold (Choo et al., 2012; Shukla & Purani, 2012). Previous literature has defined *social value* as the need for status and prestige (Hennigs et al., 2015). Through the consumption of luxury goods, consumers hope to receive social approval in upper-middle-class communities and make a good impression on others (Wiedmann et al., 2007, 2009).

Furthermore, consumers experience different treatment in social situations where they publicly display luxury goods (Nelissen & Meijers, 2011). As a result, consumers have great concern about how their network perceives them when they are wearing luxury goods (Lee et al., 2018). This means that people judge others by what they are wearing, and some experience different treatment based on their outfits (Nelissen & Meijers, 2011). Thus, the perception of social treatment through luxury consumption is associated with social value perceptions (Nelissen & Meijers, 2011).

Millennials tend to compare themselves with others on SNS through the consumption of luxury goods (Ordun, 2015). They tend to seek higher social status and compare themselves with others through the use and consumption of luxury goods (Burnasheva et al., 2019). Thus, a stronger need for social status and social comparison leads to more positive attitudes toward luxury goods (Zhang & Kim, 2013).

In addition, previous literature has found differences across countries in the degree of influence of perceived social value (Shukla & Purani, 2012). For instance, Indian consumers display higher levels of perceived social value than British consumers (Shukla & Purani, 2012). Among Dutch consumers, the perception of gaining social status through luxury goods enhances consumers’ attitudes toward luxury goods (Dawson & Bamossy, 1990). Dawson and Bamossy (1990) suggested that the Dutch emphasize status symbols more strongly than Americans do.

Korean millennials are also more sensitive than American millennials to the perceived social value of luxury goods (Lee et al., 2018). Korean millennials are more susceptible to conspicuousness and social status, which positively influences their attitudes and purchase intention toward luxury goods (Lee et al., 2018). Faschan et al. (2020) argued that social value and status consumption are crucial antecedents to millennials’ value perception, which they reveal to be more important among Chinese than German millennials. Therefore, it is reasonable to infer that Asian consumers, like Koreans, emphasize social value perceptions more than Western consumers, like the Dutch (Faschan et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2018; Shukla & Purani, 2012). Thus, this study proposes the following hypothesis (Fig. 1):
H4 The perceived social value of luxury goods positively influences attitudes toward luxury goods among Korean and Dutch millennials.

H4a The positive effect of perceived social value on attitudes toward luxury goods is more pronounced among Korean millennials than among Dutch millennials.

**Attitudes and purchase intention for luxury goods**

*Brand attitude* is defined as an individual’s overall feeling toward a brand (Mitchell & Olson, 1981). Brand attitude largely depends on what consumers think, see, and feel about a brand or product (Mitchell & Olson, 1981). A positive influence on attitudes toward luxury goods leads to higher purchase intention (Zhang & Kim, 2013).

Meanwhile, *purchase intention* indicates how much a consumer wants to consume luxury goods. Previous literature has argued that consumer purchase intention is influenced by various factors, such as consumers’ attitudes and value perceptions toward luxury goods (Kotler & Armstrong, 2016, p. 185; Salehzadeh & Pool, 2017). Among the factors that influence purchase intention, attitude toward luxury goods is the strongest determinant. Therefore, this study expects that attitudes toward luxury goods will positively influence the purchase intention toward luxury goods. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed (Fig. 1):

H5 Attitudes toward luxury goods positively influence purchase intention toward luxury goods among Korean and Dutch millennials.

**Comparison of Korean and Dutch millennials’ cultural values**

**Individualism and collectivism among millennials in two cultures**

Previous studies have argued that Asian countries are collectivistic and that Western (American and European) countries are individualistic (Aliyev & Wagner, 2018; Bian & Forsythe, 2012; Shukla & Purani, 2012). Thus, Korean national culture is
perceived as collectivistic, whereas Dutch national culture is perceived as individualistic (Hofstede Insights, 2022).

In general, cultures with strong individualism use “I” a lot, whereas cultures with strong collectivism put a higher emphasis on “we” (Hofstede Insights, 2022). Dutch culture is highly individualistic (Hofstede Insights, 2022). They highly value the individual self and their close network (Hofstede Insights, 2022). Unlike Koreans, the Dutch use words such as “the Netherlands, the Dutch, and my family” that strongly emphasize the “I” and the individual self. In Korean collectivistic society, interpersonal relationships are perceived as highly valuable (Hofstede Insights, 2022). For instance, Koreans often think in the “we” form using “our country, our language, our family” (Babe, 2017).

However, millennials in collectivistic cultures are exhibiting strong individualistic values because of the influence of globalization and Westernization on culture (Cho et al., 2013; Sobol et al., 2018). Therefore, deeper insights into millennials’ cultural values must be obtained. For instance, Korean millennials show stronger individualistic characteristics than previous generations (Choi et al., 2010), and their emphasis on elevating their quality of life through personal development, exploring self-identity, and spending more “me” time is growing (Choi, 2016; Johnson, 2020). Such changes are observed in Korean society through the increasing trends of honbap (eating alone) and honsul (drinking alcohol alone) (Choi, 2016; Johnson, 2020). Furthermore, with more than 33% of people living alone in Seoul, Korea, one-person households are rapidly increasing (The Korea Times, 2021), leading to the honjok (alone tribe) phenomenon (Johnson, 2020). Thus, Korean millennials possess strong individualistic cultural values.

Sivadas et al. (2008) argued that there is a difference in culture on the personal and national levels. To measure cultural differences at the individual level, Triandis and Gelfand (1998) introduced four dimensions of individualism and collectivism: horizontal and vertical individualism, and horizontal and vertical collectivism.

*Horizontal individualism* (HI; e.g., Sweden, Denmark, Australia, the Netherlands) values everyone as equal and individuals as independent from others (Shavitt et al., 2011; Singelis et al., 1995). In line with the characteristics of horizontal individualists, Dutch and Korean millennials highly value income, workplace equality, the need for uniqueness, and self-expression (Jung, 2021; Sivadas et al., 2008). The Dutch strongly emphasize work–life balance (Hofstede Insights, 2022); similarly, Korean millennials perceive this as the most crucial aspect of the work environment (Bahk, 2020). Thus, this study expects horizontal individualistic cultural values to be the strongest among Korean and Dutch millennials.

By contrast, *vertical individualism* (VI; e.g., the U.S., the U.K., France, Canada, and Germany) acknowledges inequality between individuals; thus, hierarchy is present in society (Shavitt et al., 2011; Singelis et al., 1995). Individuals strive to be better than others, and the self is seen as very important (Singelis et al., 1995). Vertical individualists put more emphasis on prestige, recognition, and promotion (Triandis, 1994). However, a study by Job Korea has found that Korean millennials put less emphasis on promotion (Bahk, 2020). Korean millennials also have a lower preference for a hierarchical working environment (Bahk, 2020). Among the Dutch, VI is weaker than the
horizontal dimensions (Oppenheimer, 2004). Thus, this research expects vertical individualistic values to be weaker than HI among Korean and Dutch millennials.

Meanwhile, being part of a group or community and caring for others is seen in a horizontally collectivistic (HC; e.g., Israeli kibbutz) culture, where equality is seen as important (Singelis et al., 1995). Cho et al. (2013) suggested that Korean millennials still have collectivistic values, but they strongly focus on the horizontal self. This implies that Korean millennials have horizontal collectivistic cultural values. Among the Dutch, collectivistic values are also identified by the many team projects and collaborations (Hofstede Insights, 2022). This is further reflected in the feminine cultural values of the Dutch, as expressed in how people care for each other (Hofstede Insights, 2022). The Dutch are highly horizontal, with both individualistic and collectivistic cultural values (Oppenheimer, 2004). However, millennials place more focus on the horizontal self (e.g., Burnasheva et al., 2019), meaning that HC is expected to be weaker than HI.

Similar to VI, vertical collectivism (VC; e.g., Eastern Europe, Korea, and East Asia) acknowledges inequality between individuals; thus, hierarchy is present in society (Shavitt et al., 2011; Singelis et al., 1995). It also suggests that respecting decisions made by others is valued, and the individual must take full responsibility for the entire group because the individual is part of a group or community (Singelis et al., 1995). In Korean national culture, inequality between individuals is accepted, and conformity is seen as important (Hofstede Insights, 2022). However, inequality and conformity are much less important among Korean millennials (Bahk, 2020). This research expects that vertical collectivistic values (vs. horizontal dimensions) are weaker than VI among Korean and Dutch millennials (Oppenheimer, 2004).

Overall, cultures have all four dimensions of individualism and collectivism (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998), but place distinct emphasis on a specific cultural dimension. In general, verticality represents Korean society (Shavitt et al., 2011), meaning that hierarchy and competition between individuals are emphasized (Shavitt et al., 2011; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). In contrast, horizontality represents Dutch society (Oppenheimer, 2004), which means that equality between individuals is highly prioritized (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Thus, this research proposes the following hypotheses:

**H6** Korean and Dutch millennials are significantly different on the four dimensions of cultural values (HI, VI, HC, and VC).

**H7** Korean and Dutch millennials have the strongest horizontal individualism (HI) among the four dimensions of cultural values (HI, VI, HC, and VC).

**H8** Korean and Dutch millennials have stronger horizontal cultural values (HI and HC) than vertical cultural values (VI and VC).
Methodology

Participants and procedures

Millennials in this study are defined as those born between 1980 and 2000. The data were collected through two web-based online questionnaires distributed via recognized consumer research panel services in Korea and the Netherlands. The questionnaires were administered in two languages: Korean for the Korean survey and English for the Dutch survey. Most Dutch people are bilingual (Sobol et al., 2018), with more than 70% of them fluent in English (Sobol et al., 2018); hence, this study conducted the survey in English, instead of Dutch, to minimize possible cross-translation errors. Both surveys were cross-translated to minimize and prevent any differences and errors in translation. After the data were cleaned, 440 responses from Korea and 423 from the Netherlands were used as the final sample for the analysis.

The Korean sample consists of female respondents in their 20s (28%) and 30s (24.5%) and male respondents in their 20s (24.1%) and 30s (23.4%). Most respondents were attending university or had graduated from a university (71.6%). Additionally, 44.5% of the respondents were office workers, followed by students (18%). Most respondents were unmarried (70.9%).

The Dutch sample consists of female respondents in their 20s (30.5%) and 30s (27%) and male respondents in their 20s (15.6%) and 30s (27%). Most respondents were attending university or had graduated from a university (55.1%), followed by those who were attending or had graduated from vocational college (27.2%). Additionally, 25.8% of the total respondents were office workers, followed by specialists/practitioners (21.3%) and students (15.4%). Most respondents were unmarried (70.2%). Table 1 presents the respondents’ profile.

Measures and data analysis

In this study, luxury goods is defined as luxury fashion brands sold in department stores and duty-free shops that have a deep history and craftsmanship and are sold at a premium price. These brands are, for example, Gucci, Dior, Louis Vuitton, Chanel, Hermès, Vacheron Constantin, Rolex, and Cartier. The questionnaire consisted of a definition of luxury goods; questions related to luxury consumption; and items measuring perceived values, attitudes, purchase intention, individualism, and collectivism. The questionnaire also included demographics: gender, year of birth, education level, occupation, and marital status. To ensure adequate motivation by respondents (Herzog & Bachman, 1981), this study used a maximum of five items per construct. All items were measured on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = “strongly disagree” to 7 = “strongly agree.”

To analyze the perceived values that reflect the characteristics and behavior of millennials, this study determined that applying items from a single previous study was insufficient. Therefore, for this study, 18 items of perceived values were adopted and modified from previous literature (Bian & Forsythe, 2012; Nelissen & Meijers, 2011;
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To fit the context of millennial consumers, this study measured attitudes toward luxury goods using five modified items from the affect-related themes in Dubois et al. (2005) Attitudinal Items Toward Luxury Scale. Three modified items from Bian and Forsythe (2012) were used to measure the purchase intention for luxury goods. To measure the individualism and collectivism of both countries, this study used 12 modified items from Singelis et al. (1995) and Triandis and Gelfand (1998). The Korean and Dutch data were analyzed through exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses, a measurement invariance test, and structural equation modeling analysis. Additionally, a t-test was used to compare the cultural dimensions across the two groups.

| Table 1  | Respondents’ profile                                      | Korea (%) | The Netherlands (%) |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------|
| Gender   |                                                           |           |                     |
| Male     |                                                           | 47.5      | 42.6                |
| Female   |                                                           | 52.5      | 57.4                |
| Age (year of birth) |                                                   |           |                     |
| 1980–1990 |                                                           | 48.0      | 53.9                |
| 1991–2000 |                                                           | 52.0      | 46.1                |
| Education level |                                                 |           |                     |
| High school (and lower) |                                                | 7.5       | 6.6                 |
| Vocational college |                                                | 9.5       | 27.2                |
| University |                                                           | 71.6      | 55.1                |
| Graduate school |                                                | 11.4      | 11.1                |
| Occupation |                                                      |           |                     |
| Office worker |                                               | 44.5      | 25.8                |
| Government official |                                            | 4.5       | 8.0                 |
| Self-employed |                                             | 4.1       | 6.9                 |
| Production |                                           | 3.9       | 6.6                 |
| Sales/service |                                         | 5.9       | 11.8                |
| Specialist/practitioner |                                | 12.3      | 21.3                |
| Student   |                                           | 18.0      | 15.4                |
| Homemaker |                                          | 2.5       | 1.4                 |
| Unemployed |                                         | 4.3       | 2.8                 |
| Marital status |                                         |           |                     |
| Married   |                                           | 29.1      | 29.8                |
| Unmarried |                                         | 70.9      | 70.2                |
Results

Luxury consumption among Korean and Dutch millennials

The Korean sample has three types of respondents: those who were interested in luxury goods and purchased luxury goods (71.6%), those who were interested in luxury goods but did not have any purchasing experience (10.2%), and those who were not interested in luxury goods but purchased them (18.2%).

The Dutch sample has two types of respondents: those who were interested in luxury goods and purchased luxury goods (89.6%) and those who were interested in luxury goods but did not have any purchasing experience (10.4%). Unlike Korean millennials, Dutch millennials do not purchase luxury goods when they are not interested. Explanations for this could be that Koreans purchase luxury goods as a gift to others or that they purchase luxury goods for reasons other than interest.

Most Korean (64.1%) and Dutch (53.4%) respondents purchased one to three items within the past year. Among luxury fashion goods (e.g., bags, shoes, small leather goods, accessories, watches, and ready-to-wear clothing), bags were purchased the most. Generally, Korean respondents spent more money than Dutch respondents on luxury goods consumption. Most Korean millennials purchased luxury goods at department stores (28.6%), duty-free shops (26.3%), international retailers (12.5%), and outlets (11.6%). Most Dutch respondents purchased luxury goods at department stores (23.8%), online (21.7%), outlets (20.7%), offline (10.6%), and while traveling overseas (8.6%). Dutch millennials had a relatively higher preference for purchasing luxury goods online.

Among Korean millennials, the most liked luxury brands (ranked from first to fifth) were Gucci, Hermès, Christian Dior, Cartier, and Rolex. A difference is noted in the top five most purchased luxury brands: Gucci, Louis Vuitton, Burberry, Prada, and Saint Laurent. Among Dutch millennials, the top five most liked luxuries were Gucci, Chanel, Louis Vuitton, Balenciaga, and Givenchy. However, the most purchased luxury brands were different from their favorites: Michael Kors, Valentino, Scotch & Soda, Louis Vuitton, and Armani. The results reveal that Dutch millennials purchased more affordable luxury brands than Korean millennials. This may be explained by the burden of living expenses on Dutch millennials, who become independent at a much younger age than Korean millennials. Because many Korean millennials live with their parents until they get married, the proportion of spending that goes to luxury consumption may differ between the two groups.

Korean respondents mainly received the latest updates on luxury brands online (30.9%) through mobile applications, the brand’s homepage, newsletters, and online forums. They also used SNS to receive the latest updates on luxury goods (24.9%), followed by looking around in a luxury boutique (16.5%) and from friends, family, and acquaintances (11.8%). Respondents who used SNS to receive the latest news about luxury goods mainly used Instagram (58.1%), followed by Facebook (23.2%), YouTube (14.4%), and Twitter (4%).

To obtain the latest updates on luxury brands, Dutch respondents mainly used SNS (30.3%), followed by looking around in a luxury boutique (21%) and online
(19.7%) through mobile applications, the brand’s homepage, newsletters, and online forums. Also, 11.3% received the latest updates from magazines and 10.5% received them from friends, family, and acquaintances. Respondents who used SNS to receive the latest news about luxury goods mainly used Twitter (36.3%), followed by YouTube (29.4%), Facebook (18.2%), and Instagram (16.1%).

Measure assessment and equivalence

This study conducted a principal component analysis (PCA) and varimax rotation for the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to confirm that the items were correctly linked to the respective variables (Table 2). For the main constructs, the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) values are greater than 0.8 for both samples.

According to the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) results for Korea and the Netherlands, as shown in Table 3, all estimates of the indicators are statistically significant and all the factor loadings are > 0.7. Cronbach’s alpha values are above 0.7 (Table 3). For both samples, the CFA results indicate satisfactory model fit indices, and CR and AVE estimates exceed the applicable level (CR > 0.7, AVE > 0.5), giving further evidence of convergent validity. Although some model fit indices do not exceed 0.9 (the threshold value suggested by Forza & Filippini, 1998; Hair et al., 2006) for the Korean sample, they still meet the requirement (acceptable if above 0.8) suggested by other researchers (Baumgartner & Homburg, 1996; Doll et al., 1994).

The results of the correlation analysis are shown in Table 4, which includes the bivariate correlations between the variables. The results reveal that some correlations are greater than 0.4, on average, which is considered a normal correlation between variables. In particular, the correlations between perceived investment, functional, individual, and social values and attitudes and purchase intention are between 0.138 and 0.696. Also, the AVE values are greater than the main constructs’ squared correlations. Thus, discriminant validity has been achieved (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Based on the CFA results for the Korean and Dutch sample, measurement invariance was tested. Previous literature suggests that cross-cultural research must test for measurement invariance (Mullen, 1995; Steenkamp & Baumgartner, 1998). This process is needed to identify whether the same measurement constructs hold across the two samples (Shukla & Purani, 2012). This study used the procedures outlined by Byrne (2004) to assess cross-national invariance of the scales (e.g., configural, metric, and scalar invariance). Moreover, this study used the multigroup CFA in AMOS 24.0 (Byrne, 2004; Comşa, 2010).

Table 5 shows that the RMSEA value for M1 is 0.059, indicating its goodness of fit. The other model fit measure, CFI (0.916), is above the recommended threshold value of 0.9. Thus, the measures indicate that configural invariance is achieved across the Korean and Dutch samples.

The other model measures the full metric invariance (M2). Comparing the difference between the two models, this study’s results suggest that the metric invariance
Table 2  List of measurement items

| Perception                      | Korea Factor loading | The Netherlands Factor loading |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| **Perceived investment value**  |                      |                               |
| Luxury goods can be resold on second-hand markets, which helps my personal finances | 0.864                  | 0.850                        |
| Reselling luxury goods on the second-hand market makes up for new luxury purchases | 0.835                  | 0.838                        |
| **Perceived functional value**  |                      |                               |
| Luxury goods are of superior quality | 0.833                  | 0.852                        |
| Luxury goods can be used for a long time | 0.814                  | 0.833                        |
| In my opinion, luxury goods are special | 0.516                  | 0.586                        |
| **Perceived individual value**  |                      |                               |
| Luxury goods are a reward for my hard work | 0.649                  | 0.684                        |
| Luxury goods give me happiness  | 0.637                  | 0.798                        |
| Luxury stimulates my desire for possession | 0.634                  | 0.682                        |
| I would be happier if I could afford to buy more luxury goods | 0.747                  | 0.585                        |
| **Perceived social value**      |                      |                               |
| Luxury goods make me feel superior | 0.726                  | 0.701                        |
| Luxury goods have the effect of raising my social status and identity | 0.823                  | 0.849                        |
| Luxury goods enhance my reputation | 0.869                  | 0.872                        |
| Others respect me more when I wear or carry luxury goods | 0.782                  | 0.855                        |
| Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO)        | 0.892                  | 0.839                        |
Table 3  Results of reliability test and confirmatory factor analysis

|                      | Perceived investment value | Perceived functional value | Perceived individual value | Perceived social value | Attitudes | Purchase intention |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| **Korea**            |                             |                             |                           |                        |           |                   |
| CR                   | 0.823                       | 0.816                       | 0.822                     | 0.890                  | 0.792     | 0.737             |
| AVE                  | 0.736                       | 0.658                       | 0.614                     | 0.712                  | 0.630     | 0.647             |
| Cronbach’s alpha     | 0.823                       | 0.795                       | 0.818                     | 0.887                  | 0.794     | 0.733             |
| **The Netherlands**  |                             |                             |                           |                        |           |                   |
| CR                   | 0.722                       | 0.758                       | 0.800                     | 0.894                  | 0.791     | 0.787             |
| AVE                  | 0.634                       | 0.596                       | 0.586                     | 0.719                  | 0.628     | 0.697             |
| Cronbach’s alpha     | 0.712                       | 0.733                       | 0.786                     | 0.889                  | 0.793     | 0.787             |
| **Model fit statistics** |                 |                             |                           |                        |           |                   |
| CMIN/DF              | 4.080                       | 0.889                       | 0.841                     | 0.921                  | 0.920     | 0.084             |
| GFI                  | 3.825                       | 0.890                       | 0.844                     | 0.911                  | 0.910     | 0.082             |
| AGFI                 |                             |                             |                           |                        |           |                   |
| IFI                  |                             |                             |                           |                        |           |                   |
| CFI                  |                             |                             |                           |                        |           |                   |
| RMSEA                |                             |                             |                           |                        |           |                   |

Table 4  Correlation matrix

|                      | Investment | Functional | Individual | Social | Attitudes | Purchase intention |
|----------------------|------------|------------|------------|--------|-----------|--------------------|
| **Korea**            |            |            |            |        |           |                    |
| Investment           |            |            |            |        |           |                    |
| Functional           | 0.444      |            |            |        |           |                    |
| Individual           | 0.390      | 0.604      |            |        |           |                    |
| Social               | 0.378      | 0.492      | 0.633      |        |           |                    |
| Attitude             | 0.494      | 0.571      | 0.696      | 0.689  |           |                    |
| Purchase intention   | 0.340      | 0.543      | 0.680      | 0.501  | 0.644     |                    |
| **The Netherlands**  |            |            |            |        |           |                    |
| Investment           |            |            |            |        |           |                    |
| Functional           | 0.286      |            |            |        |           |                    |
| Individual           | 0.259      | 0.428      |            |        |           |                    |
| Social               | 0.138      | 0.294      | 0.579      |        |           |                    |
| Attitude             | 0.207      | 0.441      | 0.648      | 0.630  |           |                    |
| Purchase intention   | 0.270      | 0.463      | 0.540      | 0.372  | 0.560     |
model is not achieved across samples because a significant difference exists between M2 and M1 ($\Delta \chi^2 (12) = 31.936, p < 0.01$).

Therefore, the partial metric invariance model was tested by freeing the constraint on one factor loading. In the Chi-squared difference test comparing M3 and M2, the results show an improved model fit, and partial metric invariance is achieved across samples ($\Delta \chi^2 (1) = 16.860, p > 0.05$).

The next step focused on the full scalar invariance (M4). Full scalar invariance is achieved based on the Chi-squared difference test comparing M4 and M3 ($\Delta \chi^2 (7) = 382.139, p > 0.05$). However, a decrease in model fit indices is observed. According to previous studies, full scalar invariance is extremely difficult to achieve in cross-cultural studies (Shukla & Purani, 2012; Steenkamp & Baumgartner, 1998).

Thus, the following stage focused on partial scalar invariance (M5). For the partial scalar invariance model, the invariance constraints on several intercepts were freed. As shown in Table 5, the RMSEA value for the partial scalar invariance model (M5) is 0.064, indicating an improved, good fit. The other model fit measure, CFI, is above the recommended threshold value of 0.8 (e.g., Baumgartner & Homburg, 1996). The difference between M5 and M4 is $\Delta \chi^2 (6) = 204.680, p > 0.05$, suggesting that the partial scalar invariance model (M5) is achieved across the Korean and Dutch samples. Also, the $\chi^2$ difference between M5 and M1 shows that these two models are not significant ($\Delta \chi^2 (12) = 192.535, p > 0.05$). Therefore, partial scalar invariance is achieved across the two samples.

### Hypothesis testing

After testing measurement invariance, this study tested H1–H5 using the structural equation modeling (SEM) analysis with AMOS 24.0 (Table 6). The fit indices for the Korean sample (TLI = .895, NFI = .892, IFI = .916, CFI = .915, RMSEA = .085) and the Dutch sample (TLI = .878, NFI = .873, IFI = .902, CFI = .901, RMSEA = .084) provide a relatively good fit, as suggested by previous studies (e.g., Baumgartner & Homburg, 1996).
### Table 6: Results of structural equation modeling analysis

| Path coefficients | Korea                        | The Netherlands                          |
|-------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
|                   | Standardized coefficients    | S.E.          | C.R.          | Standardized coefficients    | S.E.          | C.R.          |
| Investment value → attitudes | 0.124 (3.113**) | 0.036 | 3.113** | 0.026 | 0.058 | 0.526 |
| Functional value → attitudes  | 0.076 (1.621) | 0.046 | 1.621 | 0.181 | 0.061 | 3.459*** |
| Individual value → attitudes  | 0.692 (8.985***) | 0.088 | 8.985** | 0.478 | 0.130 | 5.548*** |
| Social value → attitudes    | 0.194 (3.679***) | 0.050 | 3.679** | 0.366 | 0.063 | 5.372*** |
| Attitudes → purchase intention  | 0.870 (15.234***) | 0.057 | 15.234** | 0.735 | 0.059 | 11.833*** |

**Goodness-of-fit indices**
- TLI = .895, NFI = .892, IFI = .916, CFI = .915, RMSEA = .085
- TLI = .878, NFI = .873, IFI = .902, CFI = .901, RMSEA = .084

**p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001**
H1 hypothesizes that the perceived investment value of luxury goods positively influences attitudes toward luxury goods among Korean and Dutch millennials. Korean millennials demonstrate a significant level of attitude with respect to perceived investment value ($\beta = 0.124$, $t = 3.113$, $p < 0.01$). However, perceived investment value does not significantly affect attitudes among Dutch millennials ($\beta = 0.026$, $t = 0.526$, $p = 0.599$). Thus, H1 is partially supported.

The findings of H1 can be explained with the results of H1a. This study expects that the positive effect of perceived investment value on attitudes toward luxury goods is more pronounced among Korean millennials than among Dutch millennials. Thus, the results support H1a. In line with previous literature, Korean consumers are more conscious than the Dutch (Dawson & Bamossy, 1990) of the perceived investment value of luxury goods (Jun et al., 2021; Turunen & Pöyry, 2019), which is reflected in the recent open-run phenomenon to resell luxury goods at a higher price premium (Jun et al., 2021).

H2 hypothesizes that the perceived functional value of luxury goods positively influences attitudes toward luxury goods among Korean and Dutch millennials. Dutch millennials demonstrate a significant influence ($\beta = 0.181$, $t = 3.459$, $p < 0.001$). However, perceived functional value does not significantly affect attitudes among Korean millennials ($\beta = 0.076$, $t = 0.621$, $p = 0.105$). Therefore, H2 is partially supported.

The findings of H2 are further explained with H2a. This study expects that the positive effect of perceived functional value on attitudes toward luxury goods is more pronounced among Dutch millennials than among Korean millennials. Thus, the results support H2a. This finding corroborates previous literature that Western consumers, like the Dutch, emphasize functional value perceptions more than Asian consumers, like Koreans (Shukla & Purani, 2012).

H3 hypothesizes that the perceived individual value of luxury goods positively influences attitudes toward luxury goods among Korean and Dutch millennials. The results show that perceived individual value has a significant positive effect among Korean millennials ($\beta = 0.692$, $t = 8.985$, $p < 0.001$) and Dutch millennials ($\beta = 0.478$, $t = 5.548$, $p < 0.001$). Thus, H3 is supported. This finding confirms extant research that millennials put great importance on perceived individual value (Moreno et al., 2017; Ordun, 2015) and have a strong desire to possess and consume luxury goods (Burnasheva et al., 2019).

For H3a, this study proposes that the positive effect of perceived individual value on attitudes toward luxury goods is more pronounced among Dutch millennials than among Korean millennials. Unexpectedly, the results reveal that H3a is not supported: Korean millennials exhibit a much stronger positive effect than Dutch millennials. This finding contrasts with previous findings that perceived individual value is more important among Western consumers than Asian consumers (Aliyev & Wagner, 2018; Chattalas & Shukla, 2015; Shukla & Purani, 2012). In light of recent studies, Korean millennials place greater importance on individual value perceptions than previous consumer generations (Burnasheva et al., 2019; Faschan et al., 2020).

H4 hypothesizes that the perceived social value of luxury goods positively influences attitudes towards luxury goods among Korean and Dutch millennials. The
results show that perceived social value has a significant positive effect among both Korean millennials ($\beta=0.194$, $t=3.679$, $p<0.001$) and Dutch millennials ($\beta=0.366$, $t=5.372$, $p<0.001$), which supports H4. This finding confirms that social value perceptions are of great importance among millennials (Burnasheva et al., 2019; Ordun, 2015).

H4a hypothesizes that the positive effect of perceived social value on attitudes toward luxury goods is more pronounced among Korean millennials than among Dutch millennials. However, the results reveal that Dutch millennials exhibit a more positive effect from perceived social value on attitudes than Korean millennials. Therefore, H4a is not supported. Contrary to extant literature that Asian consumers are more sensitive than Western consumers to social value perceptions (Faschan et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2018), this study reveals that perceived social value has a stronger influence on attitudes among Dutch than Korean millennials. This finding corroborates previous findings that status consumption is crucial for influencing luxury goods consumption among the Dutch (Nelissen & Meijers, 2011).

H5 hypothesizes that attitudes toward luxury goods positively influence purchase intention toward luxury goods among Korean and Dutch millennials. The results reveal the positive influence of attitudes on the purchase intention for luxury goods among Korean millennials ($\beta=0.870$, $t=15.234$, $p<0.001$) and Dutch millennials ($\beta=0.735$, $t=11.833$, $p<0.001$). Thus, H5 is supported.

**Individualism and collectivism in both countries**

To measure the four dimensions of individualism and collectivism among Korean and Dutch millennials, this study conducted a $t$-test analysis (Table 7). H6 proposes that Korean and Dutch millennials are significantly different on the four dimensions of cultural values (HI, VI, HC, and VC). The results show that significant differences do exist between the two countries across the four dimensions. Among the four dimensions, HI is the strongest, followed by HC. For Korean millennials, VI is the third strongest and VC is the weakest cultural dimension. For Dutch millennials, VC is the third strongest and VI is the weakest cultural dimension. Thus, H6 is supported.

In addition, H7 expects that Korean and Dutch millennials would have the strongest horizontal individualism (HI) among the four dimensions of cultural values (HI, VI, HC, and VC). In line with the results of H6, HI has the highest value among the

|                      | Korea  | The Netherlands | $t$ value | $p$ value |
|----------------------|--------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|
| Horizontal individualism | 5.232  | 5.452           | −3.347    | 0.001**   |
| Vertical individualism  | 4.976  | 4.405           | 7.296     | 0.000***  |
| Horizontal collectivism | 4.989  | 5.164           | −2.554    | 0.011*    |
| Vertical collectivism  | 4.777  | 4.569           | 2.992     | 0.003**   |

* $p<0.05$; ** $p<0.01$; *** $p<0.001$
four dimensions in both Korean ($M_{SK}=5.232$) and Dutch ($M_{NL}=5.452$) millennials. Confirming previous literature, equality is seen as very important by Korean and Dutch millennials (Bahk, 2020; Jung, 2021; Sivadas et al., 2008). Millennials also greatly value self-expression, which further supports previous literature (e.g., Burnasheva et al., 2019). The increasing importance of individual value perceptions (e.g., hedonism and self-satisfaction) is linked to increasing individualistic values (Bian & Forsythe, 2012). Therefore, the results support H7.

H8 hypothesizes that Korean and Dutch millennials have stronger horizontal cultural values (HI and HC) than vertical cultural values (VI and VC). HC appears to be the second strongest cultural dimension among Dutch ($M_{NL}=5.164$) and Korean ($M_{SK}=4.989$) millennials. This finding supports the finding by Cho et al. (2013) that Korean millennials are horizontal collectivistic. Moreover, the feminine culture of the Netherlands would be another explanation for the HC value (Hofstede Insights, 2022). For the Dutch, rather than competing with others or reaching for one’s own success, caring not only for themselves but also for others is essential (Hofstede Insights, 2022). These cultural characteristics explain the stronger HC among the Dutch than among Koreans. These results support H8.

Additionally, the results reveal that VI is higher for Korean millennials ($M_{SK}=4.976$) than Dutch millennials ($M_{NL}=4.405$). However, VI exhibits a lower value than HI and HC. Although hierarchy remains important within Korean society (Hofstede Insights, 2022), the results confirm the recent finding by Job Korea (Bahk, 2020) that hierarchy is less important among Korean millennials.

Meanwhile, VC appears to be the weakest cultural dimension among Korean millennials ($M_{SK}=4.777$), but it is slightly higher than that of the Dutch ($M_{NL}=4.569$). This is aligned with previous research showing that in Korean culture, group conformity is considered less important among millennials (Hofstede Insights, 2022). The results also confirm previous findings that VC is weaker than horizontal cultural values among the Dutch (Oppenheimer, 2004).

**Discussion**

As a result of globalization, millennials share behavioral characteristics, resulting in this generation being called a global cohort. Perceived values are crucial antecedents for influencing consumption behavior for luxury goods among millennials. Reflecting the millennials’ trends and characteristics, it remains unclear which novel value perceptions influence millennial consumers’ behavior for luxury goods. This cross-cultural study explored the similarities and differences between Korean and Dutch millennials by examining the influence of perceived (investment, functional, individual, social) values of luxury goods on their attitudes and purchase intention. Interestingly, the findings demonstrate both similarities and differences between Korean and Dutch millennials’ perceived values of luxury goods.

Among the four perceived values of luxury goods, perceived individual value has the strongest influence on attitudes toward luxury goods among millennials in both countries. This confirms previous findings that the emphasis on individual value perceptions is increasing among Asian consumers (Burnasheva et al., 2019;
Zhang & Zhao, 2019), like Korean millennials. In contrast to previous literature (Chattalas & Shukla, 2015; Shukla & Purani, 2012), this study reveals that individual value is much stronger among Korean than Dutch millennials. This means that Korean millennials’ individual value perceptions, like hedonism and materialism, are more crucial for influencing attitudes toward luxury goods than they are for Dutch millennials.

Perceived social value has the second strongest influence on attitudes toward luxury goods among millennials in both countries. This confirms previous findings that there is a strong need for social comparison among millennials (Ordun, 2015). Surprisingly, Dutch millennials’ attitudes toward luxury goods are more influenced by social value perceptions than Korean millennials’ attitudes. This disagrees with prior literature, as studies have found perceived social value to be more pronounced among Asians than Westerners (Faschan et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2018). Even though millennials from both countries strongly emphasize social value perceptions like status consumption and social treatment, Dutch millennials depict higher levels of perceived social value than Korean millennials (Nelissen & Meijers, 2011).

The findings demonstrate that perceived investment value positively influences attitudes toward luxury goods among Korean millennials. This finding is reflected in the open-run phenomenon in Korea, where consumers feel assured that a luxury good is a good investment that can be sold secondhand (Jun et al., 2021). This means that Korean millennials put a premium on the resale value of luxury goods as a financial investment (Jun et al., 2021). However, findings show that perceived investment value does not influence attitudes toward luxury goods among Dutch millennials. Findings from this study show that Dutch millennials usually purchase more affordable luxuries than Korean millennials do; these in general have a much lower resale value than limited editions and well-known premium luxury brands (Turunen & Pöyry, 2019). This corroborates previous findings that consumers who purchase premium-priced luxury goods more seriously consider reselling them (Lee et al., 2015).

Furthermore, perceived functional value has a positive effect on attitudes among Dutch millennials. This corroborates previous findings that Western consumers, like the Dutch, value functional perceptions more than Asian consumers, like Koreans (Lee et al., 2018; Shukla & Purani, 2012). Adding to existing literature (Faschan et al., 2020), this study provides evidence that millennials pay less attention to the functional aspects of luxury goods.

Influences from globalization, national culture, and previous generations explain the differences between Korean and Dutch millennials’ perceived values of luxury goods (Kapferer & Valette-Florence, 2022). Verticality strongly represents Koreans (Shavitt et al., 2011), while horizontality strongly represents the Dutch (Oppenheimer, 2004), which corroborates previous literature about their national culture. However, findings from this study reveal that HI strongly represents millennials’ values in both countries. This new finding suggests that, to a greater degree than Dutch millennials, Korean millennials are strong horizontal individualists who accentuate independence, equality, and quality of life. Globalization could be the most crucial reason for this increase in individualism (Bian & Forsythe, 2012; Sobol et al., 2018).
Although millennials are referred to as a global cohort (Moreno et al., 2017; Ordun, 2015), these findings suggest some significant differences among Korean and Dutch millennials. This research expands existing literature on luxury goods consumption, millennial consumer behavior, and especially the theory of perceived values of luxury goods. The findings provide a new understanding of changes in cultural aspects among millennials in these two countries. Also, because there is little research on luxury goods consumption behavior among Dutch millennials, and the Netherlands in general, these findings contribute significantly to the extant literature.

This study also offers important managerial implications for marketers who are targeting existing and potential millennial luxury consumers in these two countries. First, marketers should emphasize individual values, such as hedonism, materialism, and self-reward. Social values, like social status, social superiority, and social treatment, should also be considered. This provides the opportunity for marketers to standardize their marketing campaigns using individual and social value perceptions.

Moreover, luxury practitioners should accentuate the investment value of luxury goods when targeting Korean millennials. On the other hand, functional value perceptions of luxury goods, such as superior quality, durability, and uniqueness, should be highlighted in marketing campaigns that target Dutch millennials. For Korean millennials, emphasizing these perceived functional values of luxury goods will not increase positive attitudes toward luxury goods.

Both Korean and Dutch millennials have strong horizontal individualistic values (emphasizing independence, equality, and expressing uniqueness) and horizontal collectivistic values (emphasizing caring for others and being part of a community). However, significant differences are found across the four dimensions of cultural values; therefore, marketers should adapt their campaigns based on these differences when they target millennial consumers in Korea and the Netherlands.

Along with its contributions, this research has some limitations. First, this study used only a limited sample size, so the generalizability of the results is limited. Future research should include other countries and a larger sample. Second, the income level of the respondents was not included in this study. Future studies should include income levels and the proportion of income spent on luxury goods. Because of COVID-19, consumer behavior has been changing. Therefore, additional research is needed to obtain insight into the effect of COVID-19 on the luxury market.
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