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INTRODUCTION

Asian Americans constituted approximately 5.4 percent of the United States population (17.2 million) in 2014 and by 2050, this group is expected to make up 10 percent of the U.S. population (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2015). In 2013, 47 percent of new immigrants were from Asia (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2015). More than half of Asian Americans over 25 years old hold a bachelor's degree or higher level of education, compared to 29.1 percent for all American over 25 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2014). Many young Asian Americans have struggled with their bi-cultural identities because they are expected to hold to multiple sets of norms, and none of them quite fit (Chan, 2013). As a result, Asian Americans complain, “No group has been excluded from the country because of their ‘race’ to the extent that Asian Americans have been” (Kim, 2007, p. 562). In the United States, Asian Americans have become a unique ethnic group with many distinctive characteristics. They are wealthy and highly educated, which makes them a unique market segment (Pew Research, 2012).

The enormous amount of user-generated content on social networking sites has a profound influence on our society that is transforming the existing structure of society and the business world (Lin, Zhang, & Li, 2016). There are millions of users around the globe and they all act differently on social media based on their different personalities and cultural background. Therefore, in this study, Asian Americans’ decision-making styles for purchasing apparel are analyzed in relation to their self-construals and social media behavior.

In order to get more accurate and homogeneous results, this study focused on young female Asian Americans. Research conducted by Mazman and Usluel (2011) indicated that women and men use social networking sites differently and with different frequency. Seock and Bailey (2008) found that male and female participants had significant differences in their
shopping orientations, online information searches, and purchase experiences. Furthermore, women buy a great number of products (Engel, Blackwell, & Miniard, 1995) influencing about 80 percent of all consumer purchases (Popcorn & Marigold, 2001). Therefore, current research focused on the female for the target study sample.

Statement of the Problem

There has been a common belief that people from the Eastern world are more interdependent and people from the Western world are more independent (Hofstede, 1980). Globalization has generated more international business and overseas education between Western and Eastern countries (Varghese, 2008). People from each culture are being influenced by the other, especially Asian Americans, who constantly interface with two cultures (Tsai, Ying, & Lee, 2000). Therefore, it is time to examine this special group's self-construals, social media behavior, and decision-making style in a contemporary social context.

Although young Asian Americans may have been born in the United States, they are influenced by their family members at home, and by Asian international students on campus. This influence has become stronger with the growing number of International students from Asia, especially China. The Department of Homeland Security data shows that there are 1.13 million foreign college students in the United States, an increase of about 50 percent since 2010 (Jordan, 2015). Asian students account for 75.56 percent of all international students (Jordan, 2015). Therefore, it is hard to determine, what are the self-construals of young Asian Americans?

Social media has been a part of people's lives, especially for adolescents and young adults (Drussell, 2012). Shopping is no longer a self-only-decision-making process because having a mobile phone in hand provides an instant social media connection. Social media offers various locations where customers can obtain information when shopping either in-store or online.
EMarketer (2015) stated that social media is the first place retailers target when they want to reach college students. Darren Ross, executive vice president of solutions at a marketing agency said that college students use different channels of social media for different types and styles of communication and they buy fashion when it hits them (EMarketer, 2015). By the year 2012, 88.6 percent of Asian Americans lived in a household with an Internet connection, which was the highest rate among all race and ethnic groups (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2014).

Asian Americans have the highest average annual household income and education level, and are the fastest-growing consumer segment in the United States (Pew Research, 2012). This group is a unique market segment with great purchasing power. With young Asian Americans being the mainstream purchasers among all Asian Americans, their decision-making style in purchasing apparel would be critical to evaluate.

Several types of published research examined the relationship between self-construals and decision-making styles. Also, a few studies have examined relationships between self-construals and social media behavior. However, they did not include social media behavior as a variable in shaping the consumer decision-making styles in a contemporary setting, nor did they include self-construals as an individual characteristic that may influence specific social media platform behavior. The present study addresses the gaps.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purposes of this study were to investigate 1) self-construals of young Asian Americans in a contemporary context, 2) the relationship between self-construals and different types of social media usage of Asian Americans in shaping their apparel purchasing behavior, 3) the relationship between different types of social media usage and young Asian Americans’
decision-making styles in purchasing apparel, and 4) the relationship between self-construals and decision-making styles in young Asian Americans who are purchasing apparel.

In order to measure Asian Americans' self-construals and social media behavior and decision-making styles in purchasing apparel, a questionnaire was designed and distributed to young Asian Americans in college and graduate school. This research investigates how young Asian Americans' self-construals influence their social media behavior and their decision-making styles in purchasing apparel.

Significance to the Field

As Nielsen (2015) specified, Asian Americans have unique consumption and media habits, which are helping to redefine the American mainstream. Furthermore, Asian Americans represent the fastest-growing multicultural segment of society (Nielsen, 2015). With college and graduate students becoming the mainstream purchasing population, this research is relevant and appropriate. Therefore, this study contributes to consumer behavior research and improves understanding of young Asian Americans.

Previous research examined self-construals (e.g. Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989; Cross, 1995), types of social media usage (e.g. Lee, Kim, & Kim, 2012) and decision-making styles (e.g. Sproles & Kendall, 1986; Rezaei, 2015). However, this research has not looked for connections between these three variables. By discovering the relationship among these three constructs, this study could provide the apparel industry companies with a better understanding of how to cater to young Asian American consumers.
Definitions

Self-Construals

The concept of self-construal elaborates the thinking, feeling and acting of an individual about his or her relationship with others (Hahn & Kean, 2009). There are two general constructs of self-construal identified by Singelis (1994), the Independent Self-Construal and the Interdependent Self-Construal (Hahn, 2005). Generally speaking, people from the Western world are independent self-viewers. They put their personal goals in primary then consider their relationships with others. However, people from the Eastern cultures generally view themselves as interdependent and are motivated by norms and duties enforced by the “in-group”; they put the in-group’s interest higher than their own (Hofsede, 1980).

Social Media Usage

Social networking sites can be defined as virtual collections of a member's profiles that could be shared with other users (Hughes, Rowe, Batey, & Lee, 2012). Social networking sites also function as a platform for social media activities, wherein users debate ideas, contextualize news, and communicate with like-minded individuals (Smith & Gallicano, 2015; Hung, Li, & Tse, 2011; Lefebvre, Tada, Hilfiker, & Baur, 2010; Shao, 2009; Voorveld, Neijens, & Smit, 2011). The primary users of social networking sites are young adults who are under the age of 25 (Correa, Hinsley, & De Zuniga, 2010). Similar to the majority of research that analyzes social media, this research also focused on social networking sites in tracking social media usage (Ellison, Steinfeld, & Lampe, 2007; Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008; Ross, Orr, Sisic, Arseneault, Simmering, & Orr, 2009; Zywica & Danowski, 2008; Valenzuela, Park, & Kee, 2009). According to the American Press Institute (2015), the most popular social media platforms for millennials to get information and news are Facebook, YouTube, and Instagram.
Therefore, these three social networking sites were selected as settings for this research. In order to measure usage of these three different sites, this research measured participants’ frequency of usage, frequency of browsing, and attitude on those sites towards opinion-seeking about clothing.

**Consumer Decision-Making Styles**

Sproles and Kendall (1986), defined consumer decision-making style as the "mental orientation characterizing a consumer's approach to making consumer choices" (p. 268). Shopping motivations, value, and consumer decision-making styles are three different but important concepts in the investigation of shopping motivation (Jamal, Davies, Chudry, & Al-Marri, 2006; Rezaei, 2015). Understanding consumer decision-making styles is critical in setting marketing strategy, which include market segmentation, targeting, and positioning (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

In this research paper, eight basic mental characteristics of consumer decision-making styles were adopted from Sproles and Kendall's original research (1986, p. 269):

- Perfectionism or high-quality consciousness
- Brand consciousness
- Novelty-fashion consciousness
- Recreational, hedonistic shopping consciousness
- Price and “value for money” shopping consciousness
- Impulsiveness
- Confusion from overchoice (from a proliferation of brands, stores, and consumer information, for example)
- Habitual, brand-loyal orientation toward consumption
Young Asian American Consumers

In this study, we recognize young Asian American consumers as those who are 18 to 25 years old, born in the United States, with at least one first-generation (immigrant) parent from an Asian country, and people born in Puerto Rico or other U.S. territories with at least one parent born in an Asian country.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, literature is reviewed for the topics of Asian Americans, self-construals, social media usage, and decision-making styles. Articles regarding relationships among those elements are also reviewed. Although many studies examine the relationship among the key variables, there was still not enough literature to study each concept or their relationships within the contemporary young Asian American context.

Asian American Consumers

The Asian American population grew 46 percent from 2012 to 2014 and is expected to grow 150 percent between now and 2050 (Nielsen, 2015). They are more satisfied with their lives, financial situations, and the government leadership than the general public, and they tend to place a higher value on marriage, parenthood, hard work, and career success than other Americans (Pew Research, 2012). Recently, Asians passed Hispanics as the largest group of new immigrants to the United States and they are distinctive as a whole, especially when compared with all U.S. adults; they exceeded not only in their share of college degrees (49 percent vs. 28 percent), but also in median annual household income ($66,000 vs. $49,800) and median household wealth ($83,500 vs. $68,529) (Pew Research, 2012). With the increasing ethnic diversity in the United States, and the rapid growth of Asian American markets, it is critical to develop marketing strategies specifically targeted to these particular ethnic market
segments (Kang & Kim, 1998). Shea and Yeh (2008) investigated Asian American college and graduate students’ adherence to Asian values, stigma of receiving psychological help, relational-interdependent self-construal, age, and gender in predicting attitudes toward seeking professional psychological help. They found that lower devotion to Asian values, lower levels of stigma, and a higher relational-interdependent self-construal was associated with a more positive help-seeking attitude (Shea & Yeh, 2008). Chang (2013) examined Asian American and European American differences in perfectionism, loneliness, and self-construal schemas as predictors of depressive and anxious symptoms. The results showed greater interdependence, concern over mistakes, parental expectation, parental criticism, doubts about actions, and loneliness for Asian Americans than European Americans (Chang, 2013). Similarly, in Christopher and Skillman’s (2009) research, they found that Asian American college students had more significant interdependent self-construal. Therefore, this study expected to find young Asian Americans having both high interdependent and independent self-construal scores. Regarding social networking sites usage, Asian Americans were more likely to use Facebook than MySpace (Hargittai, 2007). Several published studies examined Asian Americans’ decision-making styles. Fisher (1993) declared that Asian Americans value price as the most important criteria when purchasing food, beverages, and household items. Asian Americans tend to be subject to parental and family influences in purchase decision-making (Zaichkowsky, 1991). Asian Americans are more likely to be influenced by word-of-mouth than other Americans and are also more likely to offer referrals to relatives and friends (Lee & Tse, 1994; Klein, 1990). Furthermore, Asian Americans are loyal to the brands they like and value name brands and well-known companies (Braun, 1991; Fisher, 1993; Ho, 1991; Klein, 1990; Miller, 1993; Henricks, 1992; Romano, 1995; Segal & Sosa, 1983). Based on the literature review, we anticipated that
the findings would demonstrate a significant relationship between social media usage and price conscious decision-making style. The results were also projected to find a positive relationship between social media usage and brand loyal consumer decision-making style.

Self-Construals

Mandel (2003) discovered that individuals who had more interdependent self-construal were more risk seeking when making financial choices and less risk seeking when making social choices than those who had more independent self-construal. Self-construal studies also were conducted in the medical field. Kim, Smith and Gu (1999) found that patients who had more interdependent self-construal would prefer decisions made by the physician, family and joint decision-making. In contrast, independent self-construal patients would prefer making decision themselves or joint decision-making (Kim et al., 1999). Studies have also been done to investigate the relationship between self-construal, reference groups, and brand meaning (Escalas & Bettman, 2005). Research shows that brands with images coherent with an in-group strengthen self-brand connection for all consumers, whereas brands with images that are coherent with an out-group have a stronger negative effect on independent than interdependent self-construal consumers (Escalas & Bettman, 2005). “Cultural beliefs, values, and institutions mold the structure and content of the self” (Cross, 1995, p. 674). Self-construal studies have been conducted primarily with cultural content. It is the norm for people in an individualist culture to be unique, to express their own abilities, and to oppose social pressures (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Cross, 1995). Therefore, individuals in the United States are likely to be independent self-construal (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989; Cross, 1995). On the other hand, people who come from collectivist societies like Asian countries tend to define themselves based on their social roles and memberships and consistently relate themselves to
others (Cousins, 1989; Hofstede, 1980; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988; Cross, 1995). As a result, individuals from collectivist cultures are likely to be interdependent self-construal (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989; Cross, 1995; Han & Shavitt, 1994). Research has shown that East Asian students tend to restrict their self-construal responses to the middle of the scale (Triandis et al., 1988). However, Cross (1995) found that East Asian international graduate students in the United States valued the independent self-construal almost as highly as American students do, but placed more importance on the interdependent self-construal. Self-construals have been identified as a useful set of constructs to make sense of many cross-cultural differences in cognition, affect, and motivation (Okazaki, 1997). According to Morris and Peng (1994), Chinese students would value more situational and contextual factors than American students do in making decisions about the cause of other individuals’ behavior. Since Asian Americans grow up in families with historically Eastern and philosophical cultures (e.g., Confucianism, Collectivism, Buddhism, Taoism), they are more likely to conform to family and social norms (Yeh, 2000; Shea & Yeh, 2008). Similarly, Okazaki (1997) found that Asian Americans show a significantly higher level of interdependent self-construal and lower level of independent self-construal than European Americans. This research re-evaluated Asian Americans’ self-construals based on a contemporary social context.

RQ1: What are the self-construals of young Asian Americans?

Social Media Usage

With 7.2 billion people on the planet, there are around 2.1 billion people that have social media accounts and 1.65 billion people that have active social media accounts (Kemp, 2015). At the same time, the average social media user spends two hours and 25 minutes per day (Kemp, 2015).
Social media is important to most groups especially with millennials (Deloitte, 2015). They found that close to 50 percent of millennials are influenced in their purchases by social media, with 19 percent for all other age groups. Social media has also been adopted by the government, with the Obama administration making social media usage a priority (Lipowicz, 2009; Thibodeau, 2009). Kuzma (2010) stated that around 30 percent of Asian governments used social media for the functions of 1) information dissemination on official government channels, 2) education, and 3) tourism. As of September 2009, 72 percent of young adults aged 18 to 29 and 40 percent of adults over 30 years old engaged in social networking sites in the United State (Lenhart, Purcell, Smith, & Zickuhr, 2010). In order to understand why people behave the way they do on the Internet, personality is a leading factor to examine (Amichai-Hamburger, 2002). Amichai-Hamburger, Kaplan, and Dorpatcheon (2008) discovered extroverted users who frequently surfed nostalgic websites use more social services found on the Internet compared to the introverted users. Schrock (2009) found social and non-social technology cluster use associated with psychological, affective, and behavior factors (extroversion, self-disclosure, computer anxiety and self-efficacy). In academia, higher education teaching faculty are big users and supporters of social media; majority people were aware of social media and more than three-quarters visited social media within the past month for personal usage (Moran, Seaman, & Tinti-Kane, 2011). They also discovered online video was the most common type of social media in class, with 80 percent of faculty reporting some type of class usage of online video (Moran et al., 2011). Asur and Huberman (2010) demonstrated how social media content could be used to predict real-life outcomes. They specifically mentioned that chatter from Twitter.com could be used to forecast box-office revenues for movies. A simple model built from the rate of
creation of tweets about certain topics could outperform market-based predictors (Asur & Huberman, 2010).

**Consumer Decision-Making Style**

Sproles and Kendall (1986) proposed the first eight fundamental consumer decision-making styles model, briefly described above. The eight elements of decision-making styles scale is the most promising and descriptive method for consumer decision-making (Akturan, Tezcan, & Vignolles, 2011). Past studies have focused on consumer decision-making styles based on consumers’ demographic differences and marketing practices (Akturan et al., 2011; Anic, Rajh, & Bevanda, 2012; Anic, Rajh, & Rajh, 2014; Bakewell & Mitchell, 2004; Bakewell & Mitchell, 2006; Granot, Greene, & Brashear, 2010; Hanzaeel & Aghasibeig, 2008; Kwan, Yeung, & Au, 2008; Leo, Bennett, & Hartel, 2005; Solka, Jackson, & Lee, 2011; Yang & Wu, 2006; Rezaei, 2015). Existing research studies have used or modified Sproles and Kendall's (1986) model. Shim (1996) classified the original eight elements into three orientations: 1) Utilitarian, 2) Social/Conspicuous, and 3) Undesirable (Hahn & Kean, 2009). Anic et al. (2014) used Sproles and Kendall’s model to examine the impact of food product involvement and demographic variables, such as gender, age, income, and education, on food-related consumer decision-making styles. Zhou, Arnold, Pereira and Yu (2010) found consumers in inland and coastal China did not differ in utilitarian shopping styles but differed in hedonic shopping styles. Park, Yu, and Zhou (2010) also used Sproles and Kendall’s model to examine the relationship between cognitive and sensory innovativeness and various shopping styles. They found that cognitive innovators tend to show shopping styles such as quality consciousness, price consciousness, and confusion by overchoice (Park et al., 2010). On the other hand, sensory innovators motivate shopping styles such as brand consciousness, fashion consciousness,
recreational orientation, impulsive shopping, and brand loyalty/habitual shopping (Park et al., 2010). Solka, Jackson, and Lee (2011) validated the five factor solution for consumer decision-making style, which included enjoyment, shopping aversion, price consciousness, quality consciousness and brand consciousness. Kavkani, Seyedarvadain, and Saadeghvaziri (2011) further found seven decision-making styles, including perfectionism consciousness, novelty and fashion consciousness, recreational and hedonistic consciousness, confused by over choice, impulsiveness and carelessness, price and value consciousness, and brand loyalty. Akturan, Tezcan, and Vignolles (2011) discovered four segments of consumer decision-making styles--fashion-brand conscious consumers, indifferent consumers, recreation seekers and quality seekers. Kwan, Yeung, and Au (2008) developed seven consumer decision-making styles based on Sproles and Kendall’s model: recreational and hedonistic consciousness, perfectionism consciousness, habitual and brand loyal, confused by overchoice, price and value consciousness, impulsive and careless, and brand fashion consciousness. Dennis, Morgan, Wright and Jayawardhana (2010) stated that utilitarian shoppers believed social shopping websites provided useful information to find price and discount information, which helped with making decisions for purchasing. Mowen et al. (2007) found that value-conscious consumers tended to introduce new brands and products to others and ask other people for product-related information. Impulsive shoppers neither planned for their shopping nor seemed too concerned with the cost or value of the product (Bakewell & Mitchell, 2003; Kamaruddin & Mokhlis, 2003). Consumers who were confused by the quantity of different brand and information available, and scored higher on decision-making styles were confused from overchoice (Bates, 1998). Brand loyal customers were shoppers who had favorite brands and stores in mind and would use them habitually (Bates, 1998). Konus, Verhoef and Neslin (2008) suggested that brand loyal
customers were more likely to concentrate on only one channel when getting information and tended to eliminate other opinions. Shim (1996) grouped high-quality conscious and price conscious decision-making styles into one utilitarian orientation. Those utilitarian oriented consumers emphasized price and quality when making purchasing decisions (Shim, 1996). Consumer seekers were the people who found seeking out new things pleasurable (Bates, 1998). Also, variety seeking was another important factor of novelty conscious consumers (McAlister & Pessemier, 1982). Hedonistic conscious characterized people who were likely to shop simply for fun and liked shopping (Bates, 1998). Kim and Eastin (2012) found hedonistic conscious customers were likely to explore various shopping sites and seek information regularly. Consumers who are brand conscious would be expected to well-known brands, buy expensive, they believe that the higher the product price, the better the product quality (Bates, 1998).

Self-Construals and Social Media Usage

The elaborateness or importance of each self-construal and the choice of which component of the self should direct behavior in various situations depends on different cultural norms and values (Cross, 1995). Van Baaren, Horgan, Chartrand, and Dijkmans (2004) said that consumers with interdependent self-construal were likely to engage in cooperative and supportive behavior such as electronic word of mouth (eWOM) (Lee et al., 2012). Lee et al. (2012) conducted research in an online community and supported the hypothesis that the users’ relational views and eWOM behavioral intentions became salient when their self-construal was considered interdependent. In a Facebook usage study conducted by Kim, Kim, and Nam (2010), they found that interdependent, in contrast to independent self-construal was related with social motivation to use, leading to satisfaction with social networking services. Researchers also discovered the impact of self-construal on choice of enterprise social media for knowledge
sharing, based on a sample of 232 Chinese employees (Liu & Rau, 2014). They found that when sharing with outgroup members, interdependent employees had higher self-efficacy and openness of sharing using wiki than using Q&A (Liu & Rau, 2014). However, no difference between those two social media was discovered in the in-group sharing (Liu & Rau, 2014). In the present study, the relationship between self-construals and different types of social media usage was investigated.

RQ 2: What is the relationship between self-construals and different types of social media usage among Young Asian Americans in purchasing apparel?

Social Media Usage and Consumer Decision-Making Styles

According to the media dependency model, the more an individual is dependent on a certain medium for having his or her needs fulfilled, the more important the medium will be to that individual for other activities (Ball-Rokeach & Defleur, 1976). This model was grounded in sociological literature and first developed by Ball-Rokeach and Defleur (1976). This model has been applied to examine the relationships between individuals and various media types, including newspapers, radio, magazines, and television, to explain how various media have different cognitive, affective, and behavioral effects on individuals’ activities (Ball-Rokeach, 1998; Grant, Guthrie, & Ball-Rokeach, 1991; Skumanich & Kintsfather, 1998). As Nielsen (2015) stated that Asian Americans are the leaders when it comes to mobile technology and social media usage, it is important to examine Asian Americans’ social media usage in relation to purchasing apparel.

Kang, Johnson and Wu (2014) conducted research to find out whether the consumer style inventory (CSI) decision-making styles were related to opinion seeking, using electronic word of mouth (eWOM) in social networking sites (SNS) and consumers’ attitudes toward using social
networking sites for online social shopping; furthermore, whether opinion seeking in SNSs and attitudes mediated the link between decision-making styles and intent to shop online for apparel using SNSs. They discovered novelty/fashion consciousness decision-making style was the most important predecessor of opinion seeking using eWOM; brand consciousness decision-making style was the most important predecessor of favorable attitudes; novelty/fashion consciousness, brand consciousness, and price consciousness decision-making styles had indirect effects on intent to shop apparel online using SNS, intermediated by both opinion seeking and favorable attitudes (Kang et al., 2014).

Social media websites could provide people with both information about latest styles and others’ opinions towards those styles in addition to providing an indication of others’ approval of new products (Mowen et al., 2007), which fulfilled the needs of novelty conscious consumers. Brand conscious consumers also preferred to purchase the best-selling and best-advertised brands (Bakewell & Mitchell, 2003; Kamaruddin & Mokhlis, 2003). Social media websites would provide opinions and information from other users about a brand’s image and reputation (Kang et al., 2014), which met the exact information needed for hedonistic conscious and brand conscious customers.

However, only a limited number of studies analyzed different types of social media platforms in influencing consumers’ decision-making styles. This research explored the relationships between those two variables.

RQ 3: What is the relationship between different types of social media usage and consumer decision-making styles among young Asian Americans in purchasing apparel?
Self-Construals and Decision-Making Styles

Common value associated with self-concept can influence an individual’s consumption motives (Howard & Sheth, 1969; Schwartz & Davis, 1981). Hahn (2005) suggested that individual variables should be examined in addition to cultural variables to understand the underlying causes of behavior. Relationships between self-construals and decision-making styles of Korean college students were investigated by Hahn and Kean (2009), who found that decision-making styles varied based on their self-construals. Korean college students who held a higher interdependent self-construal tended to have price-conscious, impulsive and confused-by-overchoice decision-making styles (Hahn & Kean, 2009). Zhang, Zheng, Jiang, and Zhang (2013) surveyed 260 college students in China, and tested the relationship between self-construal and decision-making styles. Their results showed that there was no significant relationship between interdependent self-construal and decision-making styles, but, there were significant positive relationships between independent self-construal and quality conscious decision-making styles (Zhang et al., 2013). Although these studies all examined the relationship between self-construals and decision-making styles, their studies did not focus on young Asian Americans. This study has attempted to fill the gap in the literature on young Asian Americans’ self-construals and decision-making styles. Therefore, we asked:

RQ4: What is the relationship between self-construals and consumer decision-making styles among young Asian Americans in purchasing apparel?

METHOD

There were four research questions addressed in this study. This study used online questionnaires to collect the responses from young Asian Americans. This section explains the detailed procedures for data collection and analysis.
Setting

This study took place in the United States and data were collected by the data agency, Qualtrics. Direct instructions were given to Qualtrics to address the target audience. Questionnaires were created on Qualtrics.com and then were distributed online.

Participants

The participants were female Asian Americans who are 18 to 25 years old, born in the United States. Participants who were not born in the United States were excluded from this study to maintain cultural homogeneity.

Instrument

Three scales were used in this research to measure participants’ self-construals, social media usage, and decision-making styles. Before completing the questions on those three instruments and after signing the consent form, participants were asked demographic questions to screen out those who were not the target audience. By the end of the survey, the participants had answered questions about job status, frequency of shopping per month both online and in brick-and-mortar stores, and money spent per month online and in brick-and-mortar stores.

Self-Construals

The Independent and Interdependent Self-Construal Scale (SCS; Singelis, 1994) was used in this research to measure participants’ self-construals (Table 1). There are 24 items on this scale. The first 12 items were used to measure participants’ interdependent self-construal, and the remaining 12 items were used to measure the independent self-construal. The instrument was based on a 5-point Likert-style scale (1= Strongly disagree, 5= Strongly agree) (A few examples of items for interdependent self-construal include “I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact”, and “My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me”; for
independent self-construal—“My personal identity is independent of others in many respects”, and “I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people I’ve just met” (Singelis, 1994). SCS has been used across multiethnic groups including Asian samples (e.g., Kwan, Bond, & Singelis, 1997; Kim, 2005). The SCS has demonstrated adequate internal consistency in prior studies, with alpha coefficients ranging from .71 to .73 (Sato & McCann, 1998; Singelis & Sharkey, 1995; Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995; Cheung & Park, 2010).

*Social Media Usage*

Social media usage was measured based on social media usage measurements by Davenport, Bergman, Bergman, and Fearrington (2014) and Kang et al. (2014). The questions were modified and asked about three different types of social media.

*Active Usage*

Participants responded to two questions: “How often do you update your Facebook/Instagram/YouTube?”, and “How often do you browse Facebook/YouTube/Instagram to look at other people’s updates?” (5-point scale, ranging from “never” to “all the time”) (Davenport et al., 2014).

*Opinion Seeking*

Participants were asked to answer the following questions: “When I consider new products, I search on/ask my contacts located on Facebook/Instagram/YouTube for advice”, “I feel comfortable choosing products when I have gotten opinions from Facebook/Instagram/YouTube”, and “When choosing products, opinions on Facebook/Instagram/YouTube are not important to me (reversed question)”, (5-point scale, ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”) (Kang et al., 2014).
**Decision-Making styles**

Sproles and Kendall’s (1986) CSI measure was used to assess Asian American and European Americans’ decision-making styles for apparel shopping (Table 2). Each item was measured by a 5-point Likert-type scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree). Some examples of items were as follows: Perfectionism or high-quality consciousness: “Getting very good quality is very important to me”; Brand consciousness: “The well-known national brands are usually my choice”; Novelty-fashion consciousness: “I usually have one or more outfits of the very newest style”; Recreational, hedonistic shopping consciousness: “Shopping is a pleasant activity to me”; Price and “value for money” shopping consciousness: “I buy as much as possible at sale prices”; Impulsiveness: “I should plan my shopping more carefully than I do”; Confusion from overchoice: “There are so many brands to choose from that I often feel confused”; Habitual, brand-loyal orientation toward consumption: “I have favorite brands I buy over and over” (Sproles & Kendall, 1986). CSI has been used to characterize consumers’ decision-making styles for purchasing consumer products, including apparel, and it has been confirmed as useful across different cultures (Kim, 2005).

**Demographic Information**

Participants were required to fill out the demographic information. They provided information regarding their gender, age, ethnicity background, and country of birth.

**Procedure**

The institutional review board (IRB) application regarding this research was evaluated by Kent State University before any data collection. Once the researcher received the IRB approval, the questionnaire was sent to Qualtrics to collect data. The online survey began with the consent form. Within the consent form, participants were notified that their response was voluntary and
they could stop any time during the process; researchers would not disclose any of their personal information to a third party; data would be deleted after two years; purpose of the study; risks and discomforts; and procedures. After collecting all of the data, the researcher evaluated the instruments’ reliability, and then conducted data analysis. All the data was stored safely in the researcher’s personal computer with password to access. Two years after the data collection date, all data will be destroyed.

After participants agreed to the consent form, demographic questions regarding gender, age, country of birth, and ethnic background were asked to screen out people who were not female Asian Americans, aged 18 to 25, born in the United States. Then, the participant was directed to the social media usage questions.

In order to measure three types of social media usage, participants were first asked to choose the platform/s that they used at least once per month to look for information on clothing. Five choices available: “Facebook”, “Instagram”, “YouTube”, “Other”, and “None of the above”. If a participant had a single choice besides “Other” and “None of the above”, she was directed to the social media questions regarding the platform she chose. If she chose more than one platform besides “Other” and “None of the above”, she was randomly directed to the questions regarding one of the social media platforms of her choice. The computer automatically adjusted the choice of platform to ensure each platform had one third of the total sample. Overall, there were 210 completed surveys; 71 participants filled out Facebook platform questions, 69 participants filled out Instagram platform questions, and 70 participants filled out the YouTube platform questions.
Then, participants were requested to answer 24 self-construal questions and 40 decision-making styles questions. By the end of the survey, every participant had filled out their employment status and general shopping habits.

Data Analysis
This research primarily explored the relationship among three concepts: self-construal, types of social media usage, and decision-making styles of young Asian Americans. Descriptive statistics, principal component factor analysis with Varimax rotation, reliability coefficients analysis, and Simple Linear Regression were used to analyze the data. First, principal components analysis and reliability coefficients analysis were conducted to verify the two self-construal scales, social media opinion seeking scale, and decision-making styles.

RESULTS
Participants
A total of 450 people filled out the survey, of which 210 were usable. As mentioned earlier, in order to obtain a more homogeneous sample, all of the recruited participants were female. Table 1 provides a review of the demographics and general shopping behaviors. Overall, the average age of the sample was 21 (ranging from 18 to 25 years; standard deviation [SD] 2.39; n = 210). The majority of respondents were either not working (44.3%) or had a part time job (36.2%), and only 19.5% worked full time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Percentage (n = 210)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location: U.S.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frequency of shopping online per month for clothing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 times</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 4 times</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency of shopping in brick-and-mortar stores per month for clothing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 times</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 4 times</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Money spent per month online for clothing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $100</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 - $200</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$201 - $300</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$301 - $400</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $400</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Money spent per month in brick-and-mortar stores for clothing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $100</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 - $200</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$201 - $300</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$301 - $400</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $400</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-Construals

Principal components analysis with Varimax rotation was conducted to assess how 24 self-construal items clustered. Leench, Barrett and Morgan (2015) indicated that loadings of |.40| or greater are typically considered high. Therefore, this study omitted items with loadings less than .40 to improve clarity. Out of the 24 items, 4 items were excluded from the original scale. They are “I would offer my seat in a bus to my professor.”; “If my brother or sister fails, I feel responsible.”; “Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me.”; and “I feel comfortable using someone's first name soon after I met them, even when they are much older than I am.”. Principal components analysis with Varimax rotation was conducted again with 20 items to find out numbers of component and component score based on each items’ coefficient value.
The Scree plot in Figure 1 showed that after the first two components, the drop between components declined and the curve flattened. Therefore, this study adopted two components from the 20 self-construal items. Component 1 was independent self-construal; all 10 items came from Singelis’ (1994) original independent self-construal scale and had a reliability score of .77. Component 2 was interdependent self-construal; all 10 items came from Singelis’ (1994) original interdependent self-construal scale and had a Cronbach’s α of .75. Table 2 displays the items, component loadings for the rotated components, and coefficient value of each item. Each participant would have one Component 1 (independent self-construal) factor score and Component 2 (interdependent self-construal) factor score. This study used weighted sum score for each factor score. DiStefano, Zhu and Mindrila (2009) explained the mathematically method of calculation of that score. They said each score is a sum score that was generated where the factor score coefficient of each item was multiplied by the scaled score for each item before summing. Figure 2 shows the component plot in rotated space, which provides a visual representation of the loadings plotted in a 2-dimensional space. According to Leench et. al. (2015), this plot shows all independent items loaded highly and positively on the first component (independent self-construal) and all interdependent items loaded highly and positively on the second component (interdependent self-construal). These results suggest that independent self-construal and interdependent self-construal are not correlated with each other. Also, participants had both high independent and interdependent self-construal scores.
Figure 1. Scree Plot of Principal Components Analysis of Self-Construals
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Table 2. Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax rotation of Self-Construals Scales (N = 210)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Independent Self-Construal with Coefficient Value</th>
<th>Interdependent Self-Construal with Coefficient Value</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects.</td>
<td>0.671 (.189)</td>
<td>0.197 (.043)</td>
<td>0.770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people I've just met.  
My personal identity independent of others in many respects.  
I am the same person at home that I am at school.  
I act the same way no matter who I am with.  
Speaking up during a class is not a problem for me.  
I value being in good health above everything.  
Having a lively imagination is important to me.  
I am comfortable with being singled out for praise or rewards.  
I'd rather say "No" directly, than risk being misunderstood.  
I will sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of the group I am in.  
It is important to me to respect decisions made by the group.  
It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group.  
I often have the feeling that my relationships with others are more important than my own accomplishments.  
My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me.  
I will stay in a group if they need me, even when I'm not happy with the group.  
Even when I strongly disagree with group members, I avoid an argument.  
I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact.  
I should take into consideration my parents' advice when making education/career plans.  
I respect people who are modest about themselves.

Note. Factor loadings > .40 are in boldface with its coefficient value.
Self-Construals and Types of Social Media Usage

Types of social media usage were measured by three dimensions, including frequency of updating (one question), frequency of browsing (one question), and attitude towards opinion seeking (three questions). Opinion seeking questions were adopted from Kang, Johnson, and Wu’s (2014) social media usage measurements. Principal components analysis and coefficient reliability tests were conducted to validate the instrument. As the results show in Table 3, one...
A factor, opinion seeking, explained 66.68% of the total variance and had a reliability score of .75. Factor loadings ranged from .71 to .87. An opinion seeking factor was created as an average index by averaging scores from the three questions. The other two dimensions about social media usage regarding frequency of updating and frequency of browsing were each measured by one question on a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

Table 3. Factor Analysis and Reliabilities of Young Asian Americans’ Opinion Seeking Dimensions (N = 210)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and Items</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Opinion seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I consider new clothing, I search on “Name of the social media platform” or ask my contacts on “Name of the social media platform” for advice.</td>
<td>3.30 (1.16)</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>66.68</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel comfortable choosing clothing when I have gotten opinions from “Name of the social media platform”.</td>
<td>3.42 (1.07)</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When choosing clothing, opinions on “Name of the social media platform” are not important to me.</td>
<td>2.82 (1.12)</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. “Name of the social media platform” was the name of the platform for which the participant was assigned to fill out the questions.

In order to answer research question two (What is the relationship between self-construals and different types of social media usage among Young Asian Americans?), simple linear regression analysis was conducted to explore the relationship between self-construals and frequency of updating, self-construals and frequency of browsing, and self-construals and seeking advice on three different types of social media platforms. Independent self-construal score and interdependent self-construal score were put into regression analysis as independent variables. Frequency of updating, frequency of browsing and seeking advice on each platform
were put into regression analysis as dependent variables. Regression analysis was conducted between each self-construal variable and each social media usage variable on each individual social media and on all three social media together.

**Self-Construals and Frequency of Updating**

Table 4 explains the relationship between self-construals and frequency of updating on each of the social media and the three social media together. There was a slight positive relationship between independent self-construal and frequency of updating on three social media together, $F(1, 208) = 8.32, p < .05$. There was also a positive association between independent self-construal and frequency of updating on YouTube $F(1, 68) = 4.43, p < .05$.

**Table 4. Self-Construals and Frequency of Updating on Social Media**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Types of social media</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Self-construal</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.196*</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent Self-construal</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. All = three social media together.  
* $p < .05.*

**Self-Construals and Frequency of Browsing**

Table 5 describes the relationship between self-construals and frequency of browsing on each social media tool and three social media together. There was no significant relationship found between self-construals and frequency of browsing on any social media.

**Table 5. Self-Construals and Frequency of Browsing on Social Media**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Types of social media</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Self-construal</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent Self-construal</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Self-Construals and Opinion Seeking on Social Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Types of social media</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Self-construal</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent Self-construal</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. All = three social media together.*

Decision-Making Styles

In order to make sure Sproles and Kendall’s (1986) eight factor decision-making styles were used accurately in the current study, principal components analysis with Varimax rotation was conducted for 40 items. According to the Figure 3 Scree Plot, four components were discovered. Within the fourth component, item “I take the time to shop carefully for best buys.” was found to be confusing because participants had different interpretations of this question. Some people interpreted “best buys” as “the best quality product”, and other people interpreted it as “the cheapest price for that product”. Therefore, this item was dropped from further analysis.

Principal components analysis with Varimax rotation was conducted again with the remaining 39 items. Figure 4 Scree Plot illustrated that after three components, the drop off between variables became flat. Therefore, this study adopted three components instead of eight.
from Sproles and Kendall’s (1986) model. Table 7 illustrated the items, component loadings for the rotated components, and coefficient values for each item. The cut off point for loadings was .40 according to the standard from Leench et. al (2015). Component 1 was interpreted as hedonic/fashion forward decision-making style. It contained 12 items with a Cronbach’s Alpha .845. For example, “Going shopping is one of the enjoyable activities of my life”, and “I keep my wardrobe up-to-date with the changing fashions”. People who scored high in this decision-making style like to shop for fun and always look for the latest trendy product. Component 2 was interpreted as heuristic decision-making style; it included 11 items and had a Cronbach’s Alpha of .825. For example, “There are so many brands to choose from that often I feel confused”, and “The well-known national brands are usually my choices”. This type of consumer tends to feel overwhelmed and confused by product information; they have low self-confidence in making choices; they want to exert low effort in making decisions and they use easy methods to make their choices. For example, they might go to a nice department store to shop, choose the best advertised and best selling brand, and become loyal. Component 3 was interpreted as perfectionism decision-making style and had 9 items with a Cronbach’s Alpha of .827. For example, “A product doesn’t have to be perfect, or the best, to satisfy me (reversed question)” and “I make special effort to choose the very best quality products”. People who scored high on this decision-making style tend to exert more effort in finding products with the best quality. Again, weighted sum score (DiStefano et al., 2009) was created in order to run statistical analyses for research question 3 and 4.
Figure 3. Scree Plot for 40 Decision-Making Styles Items

Figure 4. Scree Plot for 39 Decision-Making Styles Items
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Hedonic / Fashion Forward Decision-Making Style</th>
<th>Heuristic Decision-Making Style</th>
<th>Perfectionism Decision-Making Styles</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Going shopping is one of the enjoyable activities of my life.</td>
<td>.715 (.149)</td>
<td>.149 (-.013)</td>
<td>.165 (-.020)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy shopping just for the fun of it.</td>
<td>.713 (.152)</td>
<td>.078 (-.029)</td>
<td>.174 (-.017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I keep my wardrobe up-to-date with the changing fashions.</td>
<td>.660 (.144)</td>
<td>.174 (-.003)</td>
<td>.062 (-.043)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashionable, attractive styling is very important to me.</td>
<td>.632 (.120)</td>
<td>.184 (.000)</td>
<td>.242 (.007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's fun to buy something new and exciting.</td>
<td>.624 (.123)</td>
<td>.142 (-.009)</td>
<td>.222 (.003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping the stores wastes my time. (R)</td>
<td>.607 (.134)</td>
<td>-.058 (-.052)</td>
<td>.194 (-.001)</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually have one or more outfits of the very newest style.</td>
<td>.580 (.122)</td>
<td>.217 (.012)</td>
<td>.059 (-.037)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping is not a pleasant activity to me. (R)</td>
<td>.540 (.116)</td>
<td>-.125 (-.064)</td>
<td>.254 (.021)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get variety, I shop different stores and choose different brands.</td>
<td>.496 (.099)</td>
<td>.082 (-.014)</td>
<td>.177 (.003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am impulsive when purchasing.</td>
<td>.491 (.121)</td>
<td>.294 (.037)</td>
<td>-.231 (-.106)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make my shopping trips fast. (R)</td>
<td>.474 (.094)</td>
<td>-.072 (-.048)</td>
<td>.291 (.036)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I should plan my shopping more carefully than I do.</td>
<td>.352 (.081)</td>
<td>.329 (.053)</td>
<td>-.187 (-.083)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I change brands I buy regularly. (R)</td>
<td>-.264 (-.071)</td>
<td>.059 (.029)</td>
<td>.039 (.033)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look carefully to find the best value for the money.</td>
<td>-.250 (-.080)</td>
<td>.152 (.048)</td>
<td>.119 (.052)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I carefully watch how much I spend. (R)</td>
<td>.187 (.067)</td>
<td>-.183 (-.051)</td>
<td>-.122 (-.047)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are so many brands to choose from that often I feel confused.</td>
<td>-.220 (-.097)</td>
<td>.714 (.173)</td>
<td>-.013 (.009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the information I get on different products confused me.</td>
<td>-.145 (-.069)</td>
<td>.691 (.164)</td>
<td>-.103 (-.021)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The more I learn about products, the harder it seems to choose the best.</td>
<td>-.090 (-.070)</td>
<td>.648 (.149)</td>
<td>.094 (.027)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The well-known national brands are usually my choices.</td>
<td>.216 (.005)</td>
<td>.618 (.124)</td>
<td>.097 (.001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes it's hard to choose which stores to shop.</td>
<td>-.115 (-.071)</td>
<td>.589 (.138)</td>
<td>.072 (.024)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer buying the best-selling brands.</td>
<td>.344 (.031)</td>
<td>.570 (.104)</td>
<td>.198 (.017)</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most advertised brands are usually very good choices.</td>
<td>.214 (.009)</td>
<td>.570 (.113)</td>
<td>.081 (-.002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice department and specialty stores offer me the best product.</td>
<td>.325 (.026)</td>
<td>.544 (.099)</td>
<td>.214 (.023)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often I make careless purchases I later wish I had not.</td>
<td>.277 (.058)</td>
<td>.472 (.090)</td>
<td>-.236 (-.090)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once I find a product or brand I like, I stick with it.</td>
<td>.118 (-.009)</td>
<td>.448 (.092)</td>
<td>.108 (.014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The higher the price of a product, the better its quality.</td>
<td>.210 (.022)</td>
<td>.433 (.083)</td>
<td>.016 (-.018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have favorite brands I buy over and over.</td>
<td>.280 (.023)</td>
<td>.382 (.066)</td>
<td>.243 (.036)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I buy as much as possible at sale prices.</td>
<td>-.078 (-.034)</td>
<td>.366 (.087)</td>
<td>-.083 (-.018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go to the same stores each time I shop.</td>
<td>.027 (-.003)</td>
<td>.332 (.073)</td>
<td>-.126 (-.038)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A product doesn't have to be perfect, or the best, to satisfy me.</td>
<td>.023 (-.048)</td>
<td>-.108 (-.032)</td>
<td>.693 (.181)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A product doesn't have to be perfect, or the best, to satisfy me.</td>
<td>-.024 (-.055)</td>
<td>-.168 (-.042)</td>
<td>.683 (.183)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make special effort to choose the very best quality products.</td>
<td>.200 (-.026)</td>
<td>.258 (.039)</td>
<td>.668 (.156)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I usually try to buy the best overall quality.</td>
<td>.205 (-.021)</td>
<td>.238 (.035)</td>
<td>.641 (.148)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When it comes to purchasing products, I try to get the very best or perfect choice.</td>
<td>.226 (-.016)</td>
<td>.280 (.043)</td>
<td>.615 (.139)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My standards and expectations for products I buy are very high.</td>
<td>.205 (-.016)</td>
<td>.219 (.031)</td>
<td>.601 (.138)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting very good quality is very important to me.</td>
<td>.194 (-.014)</td>
<td>.184 (.024)</td>
<td>.571 (.131)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I shop quickly, buying the first product or brand I find that seems good enough. (R)</td>
<td>-.080 (-.055)</td>
<td>-.214 (-.048)</td>
<td>.564 (.157)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really don't give my purchases much thought or care. (R)</td>
<td>.059 (-.032)</td>
<td>-.034 (-.016)</td>
<td>.562 (.143)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lower price products are</td>
<td>-.242 (-.039)</td>
<td>.178 (.058)</td>
<td>-.356 (-.074)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
usually my choice.

Note. Factor loadings > .40 are in boldface with its coefficient value. (R) means reversed items; coding was reversed prior to data analysis.

Types of Social Media Usage and Decision-Making Styles

The current study explored three different types of social media usage among young Asian Americans. In order to answer research question 3 (What is the relationship between different types of social media usage and consumer decision-making styles among young Asian Americans in purchasing apparel?), simple linear regression was conducted for each decision-making style and each social media usage dimension for each social media tool. Each decision-making style was analyzed as an independent variable and each social media usage dimension was analyzed as a dependent variable.

Frequency of Updating and Decision-Making Styles

Table 8 explains the relationship between decision-making styles and frequency of updating on each social media tool and three social media together. There was a statistically positive relationship between hedonic/fashion forward decision-making style and frequency of updating on three social media together, $F(1, 208) = 11.08$, $p < .01$. Also, there was a statistically significant positive relationship between hedonic/fashion forward decision-making style and frequency of updating on YouTube, $F(1, 68) = 8.50$, $p < .01$.

Table 8. Decision-Making Styles and Frequency of Updating on Social Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Types of social media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All $R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonic/Fashion Forward DMS</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic DMS</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionism DMS</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All = three social media together. DMS = decision-making style. **$p < .01$. **
**Frequency of Browsing and Decision-Making Styles**

There was only one association found between frequency of browsing on social media and decision-making styles. As Table 9 display, hedonic/fashion forward decision-making style had a positive relationship with frequency of browsing on three social media together, $F(1, 208) = 4.11, p < .05$.

| Table 9. Decision-Making Styles and Frequency of Browsing on Social Media |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Variable                                        | All $R^2$ | Facebook $R^2$ | Instagram $R^2$ | YouTube $R^2$ |
| Hedonic/Fashion Forward DMS                     | \( .019 \) | \( .037 \)  | \( .019 \)  | \( .006 \)  |
| Heuristic DMS                                   | \( .003 \) | \( .022 \)  | \( .005 \)  | \( .011 \)  |
| Perfectionism DMS                               | \( .002 \) | \( .014 \)  | \( .000 \)  | \( .038 \)  |
| $n$                                             | 210       | 71             | 69             | 70             |

*Note. All = three social media together. DMS = decision-making style  
*p < .05.*

**Opinion Seeking and Decision-Making Styles**

Table 10 explains the relationship between decision-making styles and advice seeking on each social media and three social media together. Statistically significant relationships were found between hedonic/fashion forward decision-making style and opinion seeking on three social media together, $F(1, 208) = 18.86, p < .001$, heuristic decision-making style and opinion seeking on three social media together, $F(1, 208) = 7.05, p < .01$, and perfectionism decision-making style and opinion seeking on three social media together, $F(1, 208) = 16.02, p < .001$. As for each individual social media tool, positive association was discovered between hedonic/fashion forward decision-making style and opinion seeking on Facebook, $F(1, 69) = 6.58, p < .05$. Perfectionism decision-making style also had a positive relationship with opinion seeking on Facebook, $F(1, 69) = 9.04, p < .01$. When looking at opinion seeking on Instagram, only
heuristic decision-making style had a positive association with it, \( F(1, 67) = 8.17, p < .01 \).

Regarding opinion seeking on YouTube, it had similar situation to Facebook. Hedonic/fashion forward decision-making style had a slightly positive relationship with opinion seeking on YouTube, \( F(1, 68) = 5.80, p < .05 \). Perfectionism decision-making style also had a positive correlation with opinion seeking on YouTube, \( F(1, 68) = 9.94, p < .01 \).

**Table 10. Decision-Making Styles and Opinion Seeking on Social Media**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Types of social media</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>Instagram</th>
<th>YouTube</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonic/Fashion Forward DMS</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.288***</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.295*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic DMS</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.181**</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionism DMS</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.267***</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.340**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. All = three social media together. DMS = decision-making style*

*\( p < .05 \), **\( p < .01 \), ***\( p < .001 \).*

**Self-Construals and Decision-Making Styles**

In order to answer research question 4, simple linear regression was used to test the relationship between self-construals and decision-making styles (see Table 11). Independent self-construal and interdependent self-construal were used as independent variables. Three decision-making styles were used as dependent variables. This research found that independent self-construal was positively related to hedonic/fashion forward decision-making style, \( F(1, 208) = 5.73, p < .05 \). Independent self-construal was also positively correlated with perfectionism decision-making style, \( F(1, 208) = 12.92, p < .001 \). Interdependent self-construal had statistically significant relationship with hedonic/fashion forward decision-making style, \( F(1, 208) = 5.43, p < .05 \).

**Table 11. Self-Construals and Decision-Making Styles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Decision-Making Styles</th>
<th>Hedonic/Fashion Forward</th>
<th>Heuristic</th>
<th>Perfectionism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

### Self-Construals

The first research question tests the interdependent and independent self-construal of young Asian Americans. Young Asian Americans hold both high independent and interdependent self-construal. Current study confirms Shea and Yeh’s (2008) statement that although people are highly acculturated to the mainstream cultural behaviors in the United States (e.g. eating American food, having many Americans friends, speak native English), they might be still hold a high level of adherence to their homegrown culture. This may be due to their constant influences from both their family and society. This result also is in line with Chang’s (2013) study result that Asian Americans hold higher interdependent self-construal score than European American, but no difference on independent self-construal score. This result conflicts with the traditional view of individuals’ self-construals, that people from the United States are likely to be independent self-construal rather than interdependent self-construal (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989; Cross, 1995). Furthermore, Singlie (1994) found that Asian Americans are more likely to hold interdependent rather than independent self-construal. One possible explanation for the difference might be due to the generation difference. The current research sample is solely second-generation Asian Americans rather than first-generation Asian Americans as in previous studies. Ho and Lau’s (2011) found that second-generation Asian Americans score higher on independent self-construal than first-generation Asian Americans. Therefore, it is not
surprising to see in this study that young Asian Americans hold both high independent self-construal and interdependent self-construal scores.

Self-Construals and Social Media Usage

Independent self-construal has a positive relationship with frequency of updating on three social media together. The higher a young Asian American scores on independent self-construal, the more frequently she updates her social media platform in general. This pattern is especially true for YouTube users. Interdependent self-construal shows no statistically significant relationship with frequency of updating any social media. One of the possible reasons could be that people having high independent self-construal are inclined to express their own opinions without considering opinions of others. However, interdependent self-construal holders tend to consider more other people’s opinions towards their posts, therefore, they are hesitant to post things online. Notably, Chen and Marcus (2012) say because social networking sites greatly emphasize normative and publicly judged standards, interdependent self-construal holders are more likely to post less information compared to independent self-construal holders. This result also confirms Long and Zhang’s (2014) research finding that people who hold more interdependent self-construal are more concerned about maintaining privacy. In other words, they might not be likely to update their profiles often. Another research finding is that interdependent self-construal holders value other people’s opinions on YouTube while they are purchasing apparel. This result may be explained by the nature of interdependent self-construal, which is associated with a collectivistic culture, where people like to make decisions and adjustments based on other people’s opinions, regardless of their own preferences (Chatman & Barsade, 1995). No other relationships were found between interdependent self-construal and social media usage.
Social Media Usage and Decision-Making Styles

This study suggests three consumer decision-making styles in the context of young Asian Americans for purchasing apparel that could be called: (1) hedonic/fashion forward, (2) heuristic, and (3) perfectionism. Interesting results discovered when relating the three decision-making styles and the three aspects of social media usage. For instance, all three type of shoppers use social media for opinion seeking in purchasing apparel. The study confirmed the importance of social media influence on customers’ purchase behaviors, consistent with previous findings by Jacobs (2009), who stated that social media is an inevitable channel for customer support, and by Williamson (2010), who observed that social media is no longer a trend for marketers but a reality.

Hedonic/fashion forward shoppers actively use social media for browsing, updating and opinion seeking in purchasing apparel. This result was consistent with Pöyry, Parvinen and Malmivaara’s (2013) finding that hedonic motivations are positively related to participating and browsing behavior. Social media provide an environment in which participants are exposed to sensory stimulation through new ideas, multimedia content, and information related to their areas of interest (Pöyry et. al, 2013). Such features are all related to hedonic shopping motivations including seeking of fun, fantasy and experience and latest fashion trends (e.g. Dhar & Wertenbroch, 2000; Voss, Spangenberg, & Grohmann, 2003). Furthermore, this study shows Facebook and YouTube are the most important platforms for hedonic/fashion forward shoppers to seek opinions when making apparel purchase decision.

Heuristic shoppers mainly use Instagram when they are seeking opinions for making apparel purchase decisions. There are no positive relationships between heuristic decision-making style and frequency of updating and browsing social media. This finding might be due
to the nature of heuristic shoppers, who state that too much information is overwhelming. Therefore, they might use social media when they need advice for making apparel purchase decisions. Notably, Özgen and Kurt’s (2013) research found that opinion seekers tend to buy best-selling and well-known national brands. In other words, heuristic shoppers like to seek opinions on social media, which is consistent with our research finding.

Similar to hedonic/fashion forward shoppers, perfectionist shoppers primarily use Facebook and YouTube when they seek opinions for making apparel purchase decisions. However, because they have a heuristic decision-making style, perfectionist decision-makers do not have associations with frequency of updating and browsing social media. Perfectionist shoppers use social media mainly for opinion seeking in making apparel purchase decisions.

Self-Construals and Decision-Making Styles
In general, independent self-construal has more associations than interdependent self-construal with different types of decision-making styles regarding purchasing apparel. If young Asian Americans are affected by situations that make them display more independent self-construal, they are more likely to be hedonic and perfectionist shoppers. It appears that young Asian Americans who hold higher independent self-construal scores express their uniqueness and independence by searching for trendy, high quality apparel, and consider shopping fun. This result is similar to Hahn and Kean (2009) research results, which focused on Korean college students. It shows that young Asian Americans who hold high independent self-construal had similar apparel decision-making styles with young Koreans. Same as independent self-construal, young Asian Americans who hold high interdependent self-construal are likely to be perfectionist shoppers as well. Therefore, both self-construals holders are likely to be
perfectionist shoppers. Castro and Rice (2003) found that Asian Americans had significant higher perfectionism scores than Caucasian and African Americans do.

Implications

This research contributes to current academic literature about self-construals of young Asian Americans. The results differ from the traditional view that Asian Americans have more interdependent, but not independent, self-construal (Singlie, 1994). Instead, they have adopted both at-home culture and society culture and hold both high independent and interdependent self-construal. This study proposed three shopping orientation decision-making styles that might be suitable for young Asian Americans in purchasing apparel, as opposed to 8 orientations that were developed by Sproles & Kendall (1986). This research also adds to the literature about young Asian Americans’ social media usage on three most popular social networking sites and their different apparel advice seeking behavior on different social media. Furthermore, the relationships between social media usage and self-construals as well as decision-making styles are examined in the context of young Asian Americans.

It has been a challenge for companies to connect with tech-savvy Asian American millennials and choose the best media platform for interaction (Nielsen, 2015). Every social media platform has its unique traits, appropriate content on one platform might not work on another (Folger, n.d.). Practically, this study is especially useful for apparel companies in marketing their products to young Asian American consumers with different decision-making styles on different social media. It is important for apparel company to have a presence on all social media when targeting hedonic/fashion forward customers. Companies could come up with creative, interactive, online activities to engage the participation of hedonic/fashion forward young Asian Americans. However, when promoting a product, companies should focus effort on
Facebook and YouTube in attracting hedonic/fashion forward and perfectionist consumers. They could create messages that provoke an overall feeling about the brand by using humor, cute characters or show the pleasant experience when using the product to attract hedonic shoppers (Lantos, 2015). In order to attract perfectionist consumer, retailers or well-known brands could create promotion messages that reflect the price point of their high quality product (Mafini, Dhurup, & Mandhlazi, 2014). On the contrary, companies should target Instagram if they want to attract heuristic shoppers. For heuristics shopper, companies’ promotion effort should focus on the main criterion of the product (Lantos, 2015). Department stores and well-known brand companies could consider launching their product features advertisements on Instagram to appeal young Asian American who want to pay less effort in choosing products and do not want to be confused by too many products and/or brand information.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

There are several limitations regarding this study. Firstly, the current study is limited in terms of the generalizability of the convenience sample. It focused on results from young female Asian Americans. Therefore, it could not reflect both female and male Asian Americans’ responses to self-construals, social networking sites behavior, and decision-making styles. Furthermore, although data was collected by data agency using screening questions to improve data accuracy, the researcher still had little control over selecting and monitoring the authenticity of the participants. Also, there are many ethnic groups within the Asian American population and this research did not separate the responses based on participants’ ethnic groups. As a result, this study only provides an idea for Asian Americans and cannot represent any specific ethnic group. For social media usage, this research analyzed three most popular social networking sites instead
of all social media. Therefore, the results might not be able to apply for any other specific social networking sites.

Future research can be done using representative samples to confirm the findings. Nielsen (2015) indicated that about 80% of Asian American adults are immigrants or foreign-born. Therefore, a study could be conducted using samples from different generations of Asian Americans to examine the difference between generations’ self-construal, social media usage and decision-making styles. Also, samples could be expanded to include different ethnic Americans and make comparisons between groups. Gender differences could be analyzed in the future as well, and additional social media platforms could be included for comparison. Huffpost Business (2015) indicated that about 40% of Asian Americans are located in Los Angeles, New York, and San Francisco. More demographic information, for example, residence and household annual income, could be added to the questionnaire to better understand which are the potential factors that influence Asian Americans with different decision-making styles. More specifically, multiple regression could be conducted using demographic information and self-construals as independent variables in understanding what are the factors shaping a person’s decision-making style. Asian Americans are the nation’s fastest growing ethnic group with purchasing power projected to reach $1 trillion by 2018 and they lead the way in technology, including mobile and social media adoption and adaption (Nielsen, 2015). Joinville (2016) also indicated that online media is the best channel to launch multi-cultural marketing campaign to reach Asian Americans. Therefore, it is critical to conduct more research to better understand their social media usage and purchasing behavior.
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APPENDIX

Questionnaire:

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Study Title: Self-Construals, Types of Social Media Usage and Consumer Decision Making Styles - A Study of Young Asian Americans

Principal Investigator: Dr. Kim Hahn, Kent State University; Qiong Tao, Kent State University

You are being invited to participate in a research study. This consent form will provide you with information on the research project, what you will need to do, and the associated risks and benefits of the research. Your participation is voluntary. Please read this form carefully. It is important that you ask questions and fully understand the research in order to make an informed decision.

Purpose: The purposes of this study were to investigate 1) self-construals of young Asian Americans in a contemporary context, 2) the relationship between self-construals and different types of social media usage of Asian Americans in shaping their purchasing apparel behavior, 3) the relationship between different types of social media usage and young Asian Americans’ decision-making styles in purchasing apparel, and 4) the relationship between self-construals and decision-making styles in purchasing apparel among young Asian Americans.

Procedures: Participant will be asked to answer questions about her social media behavior; thinking, feeling and acting of an individual in respect to her relationship with others; decision-making styles in purchasing apparel and basic demographic information.

Risks and Discomforts: There are no anticipated risks beyond those encountered in everyday life.

Privacy and Confidentiality All documented information regarding participants are anonymous, and their responses will be kept securely in a locked computer by the Principal Investigator’s
office, which is located in Rockwell Hall room 226B at Kent State University. All the data will be destroyed after two years. Voluntary Participation Taking part in this research study is entirely up to you. You may choose not to participate or you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You will be informed of any new, relevant information that may affect your health, welfare, or willingness to continue your study participation.

Contact Information: If you have any questions or concerns about this research, you may contact Investigator Qiong Tao at qtao3@kent.edu.

This project has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or complaints about the research, you may call the IRB at 330.672.2704. Consent Statement I have read this consent form and have had the opportunity to have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. My completion and return of this survey be indicative of my consent to participate in this research study. I may print a copy of this consent statement for future reference.

Q1 What is your gender?
- Male (1)
- Female (2)

Q2 How old are you?
- Under 18 (10)
- 18 (1)
- 19 (2)
- 20 (3)
- 21 (4)
- 22 (5)
- 23 (6)
- 24 (7)
- 25 (8)
- Over 25 (9)

Q3 Please select the country where you were born.
- USA (1)
Q4 What is your ethnic or cultural background?
○ White (1)
○ Black or African American (2)
○ American Indian or Alaska Native (3)
○ Asian (4)
○ Other (6) ________________

Q5 Which of the following social media platforms do you use at least once per month to look for information on clothing?
☐ Facebook (1)
☐ Instagram (2)
☐ YouTube (3)
☐ Other (4) ________________
☐ None of the above (5)

Q6 Active usage of Facebook/Instagram/YouTube

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Sometimes (3)</th>
<th>Often (4)</th>
<th>All of the time (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you update your Facebook/Instagram/YouTube? (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you browse Facebook/Instagram/YouTube to look at other people's updates? (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7 How well do the following statements describe how you feel?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When I consider new clothing, I search on Facebook/Instagram/YouTube or ask my</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
contacts on Instagram for advice. (1)  
I feel comfortable choosing clothing when I have gotten opinions from Facebook/Instagram/YouTube. (2)  
When choosing clothing, opinions on Facebook/Instagram/YouTube are not important to me. (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8 How well do the following statements describe how you feel?</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact. (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group. (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me. (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would offer my seat in a bus to my professor. (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I respect people who are modest about themselves. (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of the group I am in. (6)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often have the feeling that my relationships with others are more important than my own accomplishments. (7)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I should take into consideration my parents' advice when making education/career plans. (8)

It is important to me to respect decisions made by the group. (9)

I will stay in a group if they need me, even when I'm not happy with the group. (10)

If my brother or sister fails, I feel responsible. (11)

Even when I strongly disagree with group members, I avoid an argument. (12)

I'd rather say "No" directly, than risk being misunderstood. (13)

Speaking up during a class is not a problem for me. (14)

Having a lively imagination is important to me. (15)

I am comfortable with being singled out for praise or rewards. (16)

I am the same person at home that I am at school. (17)

Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me. (18)

I act the same way no matter who I am with. (19)

I feel comfortable using someone's
first name soon after I met them, even when they are much older than I am. (20)

I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people I've just met. (21)

I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects. (22)

My personal identity independent of others in many respects. (23)

I value being in good health above everything. (24)

Q9 How well do the following statements describe how you feel when purchasing apparel?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting very good quality is very important to me. (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When it comes to purchasing products, I try to get the very best or perfect choice. (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I usually try to buy the best overall quality. (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make special effort to choose the very best quality products. (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really don't give my purchases much thought or care. (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My standards</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and expectations for products I buy are very high. (6)
I shop quickly, buying the first product or brand I find that seems good enough. (7)
A product doesn't have to be perfect, or the best, to satisfy me. (8)
The well-known national brands are usually my choices. (9)
The higher the price of a product, the better its quality. (10)
Nice department and specialty stores offer me the best product. (11)
I prefer buying the best-selling brands. (12)
The most advertised brands are usually very good choices. (13)
A product doesn't have to be perfect, or the best, to satisfy me. (14)
I usually have one or more outfits of the very newest style. (15)
I keep my wardrobe up-to-date with the changing
fashions. (16)
Fashionable, attractive styling is very important to me. (17)
To get variety, I shop different stores and choose different brands. (18)
It's fun to buy something new and exciting. (19)
Shopping is not a pleasant activity to me. (20)
Going shopping is one of the enjoyable activities of my life. (21)
Shopping the stores wastes my time. (22)
I enjoy shopping just for the fun of it. (23)
I make my shopping trips fast. (24)
I buy as much as possible at sale prices. (25)
The lower price products are usually my choice. (26)
I look carefully to find the best value for the money. (27)
I should plan my shopping more carefully than I do. (28)
I am impulsive when purchasing. (29)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often I make careless purchases I later wish I had not.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take the time to shop carefully for best buys.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I carefully watch how much I spend.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are so many brands to choose from that often I feel confused.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes it's hard to choose which stores to shop.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The more I learn about products, the harder it seems to choose the best.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the information I get on different products confused me.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have favorite brands I buy over and over.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once I find a product or brand I like, I stick with it.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go to the same stores each time I shop.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I change brands I buy regularly.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 What best describes your job status?
- Part-time job (1)
- Full-time job (2)
- Not working (3)

Q11 How many times per month do you typically shop online for clothing?
- Never (1)
- 1-2 times (2)
- 3-4 times (3)
- Over 4 times (4)

Q12 How many times per month do you typically shop in brick-and-mortar stores for clothing?
- Never (1)
- 1-2 times (2)
- 3-4 times (3)
- Over 4 times (4)

Q13 How much do you typically spend per month online for clothing?
- Less than $100 (1)
- $100-$200 (2)
- $201-$300 (3)
- $301-$400 (4)
- Over $400 (5)

Q14 How much do you typically spend per month in brick-and-mortar stores for clothing?
- Less than $100 (1)
- $100-$200 (2)
- $201-$300 (3)
- $301-$400 (4)
- Over $400 (5)