

DECISION MAKING STYLES OF CONSUMERS FOR ELECTRONIC GADGETS

Ubba Savita

Associate Professor, Haryana School of Business
Guru Jambheshwar University of Science
& Technology, Hisar
e-mail: u_savita@yahoo.co.in

Upasana Sheoran

Research Scholar, Haryana School of Business
Guru Jambheshwar University of Science
& Technology, Hisar
e-mail: sheoran24@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

There are a variety of decision making styles and consumers make choices using different decision making styles. These decision making styles provide an idea about behaviour of consumers that help marketers in framing the strategies for the targeted consumers. The present study aims to identify the various decision making styles of Indian consumers and to check the reliability and validity of Consumer Style Inventory (CSI) developed by Sproles and Kendall's (1986). The study makes an attempt in relation to the purchase of electronic gadgets. A sample size of 782 respondents was included. In the study, exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis is used to validate the CSI. The results confirmed the existence of all the eight decision making styles in Indian consumers.

Keywords: Consumer decision making, Consumer style Inventory, India, Electronic gadgets, validity

INTRODUCTION

India is being recognized as one of the rapidly growing economies of the world. Prior to the Economic Policy 1991, India was a conservative economy with nominal progress. There were huge trade barriers and accesses to western imported consumer goods were restricted with heavy taxes and many other restrictions. Most retail stores were smaller in size and family owned. Consumers had no authority to stroll freely inside the retail stores and look at the labels of various brands and make comparisons of it while selecting the goods. The consumers proceeded physically to stores with a pre decided list of items to be purchased, the salesperson then dragged out the required item from racks. In various shops, salesperson asked the shoppers to specify the range of price for spending. Browsing of goods was not done easily. Thus the consumer's shopping experience was restricted by various economic and market factors.

Post the economic changes in 1991; Indian economy experienced an exceptional growth. With the rise in competitive environment, both national and multinational marketers looked for opportunities to improve and create differences in their products by focusing more on existing product lines and expansion. Thus, it created a range of products for consumers and also challenges for their innovativeness. Marketers were constantly managing

to offer huge array of shopping choices to the consumers. The increase in promotional activities and increase in supply chains have contributed to the prevailing consumer bewilderment and pushed consumers to innovate.

It has been recognised that consumers manage all these complications by showing specific shopping styles and using certain shopping strategies (Mitchell and Bates, 1998). The innovative consumers have become very important segment of market (Park, Yu, and Zhou 2010). Moreover, the revenue obtained as of latest products that are purchased by innovative consumers is important to the marketers (Coward, Fox, and Wilson 2008). For this reason, it has become more important to consider consumer decision styles (CDS) as it has perplexing relations with buying behaviour and developed the need to understand the CDS of innovative consumers. The degree to which consumers are receptive to new products, new services, or new practices is consumer innovativeness. Midgley and Dowling (1978) put forward consumer innovativeness to be a latent personality characteristic that is the force behind consumer's preference for new and different experiences. This becomes more evident for the electronic gadget segment where new and innovative products are introduced in the market intermittently.

Consumer decision making styles are "basic buying-decision-making attitudes that consumers adhere to, even when they are applied to different goods, service or purchasing decisions" (Walsh *et al.* 2001). It can also be defined as "a mental orientation characterizing a consumer's approach to making choices" (Sproles and Kendall, 1986). This construct is viewed as "basic consumer personality". The approach of CDS is measured by using the "Consumer Styles Inventory (CSI)" developed by Sproles and Kendall (1986) which aims to identify the mental characteristics of consumers in their decision making process.

The authors anticipated that there are likely differences in the CDS by studying the behaviours of various consumers in cross-cultures. Information is obtained by testing and dealing with CDS and the obtained information will be used further to explain the consumer's drive for consumption preference and also, it has imperative role in planning of effective marketing strategies by the marketers especially for the consumers. The Indian consumer is now getting benefits from various alternatives which were not available many years before. Thus it is essential for the firms to develop the insight for the Indian consumers by considering the dynamic environment as it speaks for a huge buying force in future.

India is a diverse country with cultural values and norms altering according to the places. People have shown different types of shopping styles of different types of products. The present study makes an

attempt to study the shopping styles for buying electronic gadgets in light of the Sproles and Kendall (1986) consumer style inventory.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Before doing any research work it is important to review the prevailing literature for strong base building. Consumer decision making styles have been investigated by many authors. These styles have been reviewed thoroughly to have a better picture. The guiding research questions and the model development were formulated based on these studies.

Consumer Decision Making Styles using Consumer Style Inventory (CSI)

A consumer decision-making style is defined as "a patterned, mental, cognitive orientation towards shopping and purchasing, which constantly dominates the consumer's choices. These traits are ever-present, predictable and central driving forces in decision-making. It is speaking of a relatively enduring consumer personality, analogous to the more general concept of human personality in psychology" (Sproles, 1985).

After examining decision-making composition, it can be divided in three main approaches: "the psychographic/lifestyle approach" (Wells, 1974), "the consumer typology approach" (Ownbey and Horridge, 1997; Shim and Kotsiopoulos, 1993) and "the consumer characteristics approach" (Sproles and Sproles, 1990; Walsh *et al.* 2001). "The consumer characteristics approach" is most approved by researchers, as this approach is most descriptive and influential amongst these three approaches this approach gives emphasis on cognitive and sensory part of consumer behaviour. This technique works according to customer's common tendency of buying and defining mental orientation of consumers while making purchase decisions (Lysonski *et al.*, 1996). On the basis of various assessments of the CDMS in the prior studies, Sproles (1985) introduced 50 items that were associated to consumers' psychographic and non cognitive adaptations headed towards purchasing process. The researcher supposed that evaluating consumer' broad and common adaptations towards shopping will categorize consumer's decision-making styles. Sproles and Kendall (1986) developed this inventory and consequently build up a more suitable scale consisting of 40 items. The "Consumer Style Inventory (CSI)" developed by Sproles and Kendall (1986) is comprised of the following decision making styles.

Perfectionist, High-Quality Conscious Consumer

Consumers seeking the best quality in products possess this trait. Consumers with high perfectionism are expected to shop more cautiously and more efficiently after comparing all the products in same product category. Time and again, consumers with

such trait are not content with the products which are good enough.

Brand Conscious Consumer

Such consumers buy expensive products of popular brands. They believe that high quality and price are directly related and high priced goods have best quality. Such customers buy according to best advertised brands and top selling goods. The brand conscious consumers are likely to display some level of fashion consciousness.

Novelty, Variety Conscious Consumer

This category belongs to the consumers who find pleasure in buying new things. These consumers' get excitement and enjoyment in exploring new things. Furthermore, they keep themselves updated with new styles; style following is key feature of novelty and variety conscious consumers. These may act as the opinion leaders for others.

Price, Value Conscious Consumer

It identifies the price and value for money consciousness of shoppers. Consumers having this trait are mostly affected by prices; these consumers seek for the products which provide best value for their money. Generally, they focus more on sale prices. These consumers have a tendency to compare the prices before buying the product.

Recreational, Hedonistic Consumer

Consumers with these features find shopping as an amusement process. Shopping is an entertainment task for them and they shop to enjoy the fun involving it. This style is an opposite of the "shopping avider" or "time savour" trait of consumers.

Impulsive, Careless Consumer

These are the consumers who are likely to buy goods spontaneously and seem indifferent about price and quality of the product. These are the unplanned shoppers who indulge into shopping without any prior consideration or planning.

Confused by Over-choice Consumer

Consumers with this attribute are confused with so many brand and shopping stores availability. It creates confusion for consumers what to buy and from where to buy. They tend to get confused as they feel burdened with excess of information available in the market which makes their choice more difficult.

Habitual, Brand-Loyal Consumer

Consumers with this trait follow their preferred brands and stores. They have developed a set routine or habit while choosing the things over and over again. These are the people who do not prefer to make any changes in their brand.

For making consumer decision making process more acceptable it is explored in transversely diverse cultures by testing and validating the results of the CSI in various nations. Hafstrom *et al.* (1992) investigated the relevancy of the CSI in multi-culture. The study shows that five decision making styles, "Brand Consciousness, Quality Consciousness, Recreational Shopping Consciousness, Impulsiveness, and Confused-by-Over-choice," are similar in Korean and U.S. cultures. One more style of time/energy preservation is recommended in the study. Durvasula *et al.* (1993) used a sample of 210 undergraduate students to prove the validity and reliability of CSI scale; the results shows that is highly reliable and valid in New Zealand. In addition to this, to establish multi-cultural relevance of the CSI; sample are drawn from various countries i.e. India, Greece, U.S and New Zealand and consumer decision making styles and shopping styles have been used inter-changeably by different authors (Lyonski *et al.* 1996).

As the consumer behaviour can be determined by various consumer decision styles (CDS); so it is essential for marketers to gain familiarity with consumer's preferences for appropriate market segmentation. Mishra, (2014) validated the presence of the original eight shopping styles by Sproles and Kendall (1986) adopted to study the behaviour of US consumers. The author suggested two new qualities in behaviour of consumers particularly for Indian market, namely, "dissatisfied shopping consciousness" and "store loyalty". Additionally to this, in recent times, many researchers experimented to implement the CSI scale for profiling the consumers according to their decision-making styles; Fan and Xio, (1998) conducted the study in China, and similar study was carried out by Walsh and Vincent (2001) in Germany. Canabel (2002) and Patel (2008) attempted to validate in India. The study in United Kingdom was undertaken by Mitchell and Bates, (1998). All the researchers agreed that same decision making styles can be applied in all the countries.

The review based on available literatures at international and national level has provided an incentive to think on various levels about the present study. It has shed light on the problem focussed and helped to determine the scope of the study. The different studies on consumer decision making styles discussed above have mostly explored the validity and the applicability of the consumer inventory style (CSI) in their specific country. Very fewer studies have been conducted in Indian context using the CSI to examine the purchase behaviour of consumers. The review of literature on the Consumer Styles Inventory revealed that most of the studies have been undertaken to study the applicability and the generalizability of the CSI in different countries.

Some studies used the CSI to establish gender differences in consumer decision-making styles. Two distinct studies in India investigated the decision-making styles of youth, one on the South Indian college-going consumers in Coimbatore by Canabel (2002), Moreover Ghodeswar (2007) investigated the decision making style among students of a Business School in Mumbai, India. The young adult segment has gained considerable importance in the area of consumer behaviour research. Many studies have been conducted in India on the youth to understand their diversity and profile youth behaviour based on what interests them and grabs their attention. Studies have attempted to understand their interests and what influences them, their fashion involvement and their behaviour in shopping malls.

India is a diverse country with cultural values and norms altering according to the places. People have shown different types of shopping styles of different types of products. The present study makes an attempt to study the shopping styles for buying electronic gadgets in light of Sproles and Kendall (1986) consumer styles inventory.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The above review of literature, research gaps and corresponding research gaps lead us to the objective of this research paper in the context of Indian consumers.

1. To identify the consumer decision making styles of Indian consumers with regards to electronic gadgets.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The design of research is exploratory cum descriptive in nature, The study is based on consumers and in order to achieve the objectives mentioned above, primary data is collected from respondents having a minimal age of 18 years and having family income of more than Rs 50,000 per month and residing in urban areas. Convenient cum judgement sampling technique is used to collect the information. The study has included a sample of 782 respondents and sample is drawn from Northern India especially National Capital Region of Delhi and Union Territory of Chandigarh. CSI developed by Sproles and Kendal (1986) was adapted for the electronic gadgets in order to carry out the study. The questionnaire was shown to various academicians and practitioners to check its validity and their suggestions were incorporated before administering to the respondents. The questionnaire had 39 statements related to the buying of electronic gadgets. Likert type 5 point scale is used to collect the respondents. Personal interviewing method is used to collect the information from the respondents. Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) has been used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In order to reduce the data and ascertain the underlying structure of observed variables of

consumer style inventory researchers have applied the exploratory factor analysis. The core purpose behind data reduction was to extract the major factors of consumer style inventory. Basically, principal component analysis with varimax rotation was applied to identify the major dimensions of consumer style inventory. In this study, measurement scale of consumer style inventory consisting thirty nine observed variables was subject to exploratory factor analysis. Initially, the Kaiser- Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test value (0.959) confirmed the sampling adequacy. Further, Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was conducted to test if enough correlations exist in the data set. This test came out significant ($p \leq .000$) with approx. Chi-square value of 41178.994 and degrees of freedom at 741 thereby confirming that the enough correlation exist among the observed variables which denoted the appropriateness of data set for factor analysis. Results of these two tests confirmed the suitability of the data set for the exploratory factor analysis.

Table 1: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0.959
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	41178.994
	Df	741
	Sig.	.000

Source: Data Analysis

Principal component analysis of thirty nine observed variables resulted into eight major dimensions of consumer decision making style inventory. Chronbach’s alpha value (.969) confirmed the reliability of the whole scale of consumer style inventory. These major dimensions or sub-scales are nomenclated as:

1. Perfectionist/high-quality consciousness
2. Brand consciousness
3. Impulsive/ carelessness
4. Novelty and fashion consciousness
5. Confusion by over-choice
6. Habitual/brand loyalty
7. Recreational, Hedonism
8. Price conscious/value for money

Perfectionist/high-quality consciousness

This factor of consumer style inventory is named as perfectionist/high-quality consciousness and ranked third on the basis of factor mean (3.8675). Perfectionist/high-quality conscious consumer style inventory was measured by using eight observed variables. The results depicted that the factor loadings of observed variables on this factor varied between 0.837 to 0.892 thereby showing high correlation among observed variables and underlying factor. The strongest correlation is shown by “Getting very good electronic gadgets quality is very important to me” while weakest correlation is shown by “Electronic gadget doesn’t have to be perfect or the best in the market, to satisfy me”. The eigen value of this factor is 17.962 which is significantly higher than the

minimum acceptable value of one. This factor explained 18.241 percent of total variance of consumer style inventory. Communalities or proportion of variances in observed variables

explained by underlying factor lie between .794 and .902. Further, Chronbach's alpha value (0.973) confirmed the reliability aspects of the sub scale of Perfectionist/high-quality consciousness.

Table 2: Exploratory Factor Analysis: Consumer Style Inventory

Factors	Variables	Factor Loading	Communalities	Mean	Factor Mean (Factor Rank)	Factor Eigen Value	Cumulative %age of Variance
Perfectionist/high-quality consciousness (.918)	Getting very good electronic gadgets quality is very important to me.	.892	.902	3.88	3.8675 (3)	17.962	18.241
	I shop quickly, buying the first electronic gadget or brand I find that seems good enough.	.883	.868	3.87			
	My standards and expectations for electronic gadgets I buy are very high.	.880	.860	3.88			
	I really don't give my electronic gadget purchases much thought or care.	.863	.848	3.90			
	In general, I usually try to buy the best overall quality.	.861	.828	3.87			
	When it comes to purchasing electronic gadgets, I try to get the very best.	.854	.830	3.86			
	I take special effort to choose the best quality electronic gadgets products.	.851	.807	3.86			
	Electronic gadget doesn't have to be perfect, or the best in the market, to satisfy me.	.837	.794	3.83			
Brand consciousness (.916)	Nice department and specialty stores offer the best electronic gadgets.	.783	.809	3.86	3.8672 (4)	4.220	30.199
	Higher the price of the electronic gadgets, better is the quality.	.779	.831	3.88			
	The well-known national brands are best for me.	.774	.841	3.86			
	The most advertised electronic gadgets brands are usually my choice.	.773	.870	3.90			
	I prefer buying the best selling electronic gadgets brands.	.759	.768	3.84			
	The more expensive brands are usually my choice.	.717	.764	3.86			
Impulsive carelessness	I take the time to shop electronic gadgets carefully for best buys.	.856	.944	3.77	3.7688 (7)	2.959	41.519
	I am impulsive when purchasing electronic gadgets.	.841	.925	3.76			
	I should plan my shopping more carefully than I do.	.840	.917	3.78			
	Often I make careless electronic gadgets purchases I later wish I had not made.	.811	.889	3.78			
	I carefully watch how much I spend on electronic gadgets.	.806	.868	3.76			
Novelty and fashion consciousness/CSFA	Fashionable, attractive styling is very important to me.	.833	.876	3.84	3.8118 (5)	2.461	52.743
	To get variety, I shop different stores and choose different brands.	.820	.871	3.80			
	I keep myself up-to-date with the changing technology.	.820	.834	3.82			
	I usually have one or more electronic gadgets of the very newest style.	.814	.814	3.81			
	It's fun to buy something new and exciting.	.803	.781	3.78			

confusion by over choice	Sometimes it's hard to choose which electronic gadgets stores to shop at or should purchase online.	.926	.970	3.80	3.7874 (6)	1.901	62.742
	All the information I get on different electronic gadgets confuses me.	.921	.939	3.78			
	The more I learn about electronic gadgets, the harder it is to choose the best.	.920	.960	3.79			
	There are so many electronic gadgets brands to choose from that often I get confused.	.918	.965	3.78			
Habitual/brand loyalty.	Once I find electronic gadgets or brand I like, I stick with it.	.891	.923	3.61	3.6167 (8)	1.623	72.338
	I change the electronic gadgets brands I buy regularly.	.885	.928	3.63			
	I have favorite electronic gadgets brands that I buy over and over.	.868	.893	3.60			
	I go to the same stores each time I shop	.839	.848	3.62			
Recreational and shopping consciousness	Shopping at many stores wastes my time.	.824	.934	3.92	3.9134 (1)	1.529	80.998
	I make my electronic gadgets shopping trips fast.	.814	.916	3.91			
	Going electronic gadgets shopping is one of the enjoyable activities of my life.	.809	.897	3.90			
	I enjoy electronic gadgets shopping just for the fun.	.802	.897	3.93			
Price consciousness & value for money	I look carefully to find the best value for the money.	.817	.882	3.74	3.9134 (2)	1.367	87.237
	I buy electronic gadgets as much as possible at special sale prices.	.800	.884	3.76			
	The lower price electronic gadgets are usually my choice.	.797	.850	3.75			

Source: Primary Data

The number in parenthesis in factors column denotes the cronbach alpha value.

Brand Consciousness

This factor of consumer style inventory is named as brand consciousness and ranked as fourth on the basis of factor mean (3.8672). Brand conscious consumer style inventory was measured by using six observed variables. The eigen value of this factor is 4.220 which is significantly higher than the minimum acceptable value of one. This factor explained 11.959 percent of total variance of consumer style inventory. Communalities or proportion of variances in observed variables explained by underlying factor lie between .764 and .809. Further, Chronbach's alpha value (0.953) confirmed the reliability aspects of the sub scale of brand consciousness.

Impulsive Carelessness

This factor of consumer style inventory is named as impulsive carelessness and ranked seventh based on factor mean (3.7688). Impulsive careless consumer style inventory is measured by using five observed variables. The eigen value of this factor was 2.959 which is significantly higher than the minimum

acceptable value of one. This factor explained 11.320 percent of total variance of consumer style inventory. Communalities or proportion of variances in observed variables explained by underlying factor lie between .868 and .944. Further, Chronbach's alpha value (.974) confirmed the reliability aspects of the sub scale of impulsive carelessness.

Novelty and Fashion Consciousness

This factor of consumer style inventory is named as novelty and fashion consciousness and ranked as fifth based on factor mean (3.8118). Novelty and fashion conscious consumer style inventory was measured by using five observed variables. The eigen value of this factor was 2.461. This factor explained 11.224 percent of total variance of consumer style inventory. Communalities or proportion of variances in observed variables explained by underlying factor lie between .781 and .876. Further, Chronbach's alpha value (.950) confirmed the reliability aspects of the sub scale of novelty and fashion consciousness.

Confusion by Over-choice

This factor of consumer style inventory is named as confusion by over-choice and ranked sixth based on factor mean (3.7874). Confusion by over-choice consumer style inventory is measured by using four observed variables. The results depict that the factor loadings of observed variables on this factor varied between 0.918 and 0.926, thereby showing high correlation among observed variables and underlying factor. The eigen value of this factor is 1.901 which is significantly higher than the minimum acceptable value of one. This factor explained 9.999 percent of total variance of consumer style inventory. Communalities or proportion of variances in observed variables explained by underlying factor lie between .965 and .970. Further, Chronbach’s alpha value (.985) confirmed the reliability aspects of the sub scale of Confusion by over-choice.

Habitual/brand Loyalty

This factor of consumer style inventory is named as habitual/brand loyalty orientation towards consumption and ranked eighth based on factor mean (3.6167). Habitual/brand loyalty consumer style inventory is measured by using four observed variables. The results depict that the factor loadings of observed variables on this factor varied between 0.839 and 0.891 thereby showing high correlation among observed variables and underlying factor. The eigen value of this factor is 1.623 which is significantly higher than the minimum acceptable value of one. This factor explained 9.596 percent of total variance of consumer style inventory. Communalities or proportion of variances in observed variables explained by underlying factor lie between .848 and .923. Further, Chronbach’s alpha value (.962) confirmed the reliability aspects of the sub scale of Habitual/brand loyalty.

Recreational and Shopping Consciousness

This factor of consumer style inventory is named as recreational and shopping consciousness and ranked first based on (3.9134). Recreational and shopping conscious consumer style inventory was measured by using four observed variables. The results depicted that the factor loadings of observed variables on this factor varied between 0.802 and 0.824 thereby showing high correlation among observed variables and underlying factor. The eigen value of this factor is 1.529 which is significantly higher than the minimum acceptable value of one. This factor explained 8.660 percent of total variance of consumer style inventory. Communalities or proportion of variances in observed variables explained by underlying factor lie between .897 and .934. Further, Chronbach’s alpha value (.967) confirmed the reliability aspects of the sub scale of recreational and shopping consciousness.

Price Conscious/Value for Money

This factor of consumer style inventory is named as price conscious/value for money ranked second based on factor mean (3.9134). Price conscious/value for money consumer style inventory was measured by using three observed variables. The results depicted that the factor loadings of observed variables on this factor varied between 0.797 and 0.817 thereby showing high correlation among observed variables and underlying factor. The eigen value of this factor was 1.367 which is significantly higher than the minimum acceptable value of one. This factor explained 6.239 percent of total variance of consumer style inventory. Communalities or proportion of variances in observed variables explained by underlying factor lie between .850 and .882. Further, Chronbach’s alpha value (.925) confirmed the reliability aspects of the sub scale of price conscious/value for money.

First Order Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Consumer Style Inventory (CSI)

On the basis of exploratory factor analysis latent factors are extracted. After extraction of the factors confirmatory factor analysis is applied to validate the scales with the help of AMOS 21.

Table 3: Model Validity Measures

Factors	CR	AVE	MSV	ASV	Square Root of AVE
Price consciousness/value for money	0.926	0.806	0.321	0.244	0.897
Perfectionist/high-quality consciousness	0.973	0.817	0.298	0.182	0.903
Brand consciousness	0.953	0.773	0.381	0.302	0.879
Novelty and fashion consciousness	0.950	0.792	0.387	0.249	0.889
Impulsive carelessness	0.974	0.883	0.364	0.254	0.939
Habitual/brand loyalty	0.962	0.864	0.270	0.184	0.929
Recreational and shopping consciousness	0.967	0.881	0.387	0.260	0.938
Confusion by over choice	0.985	0.944	0.187	0.139	0.971

The validity of scales are assessed by different validity measures i.e., Factor Loading, Correlations, Composite Reliability (CR), Average Variance Extracted (AVE) and Square root of AVE as shown in table. For the better convergent validity the value of factor loadings of every variable should be >0.5. Similarly, the average variance extracted (AVE) values should be greater than 0.5 and CR must be greater than AVE. The value of composite reliability above 0.70 (Fornell and Larcker, 1981) is required for

good internal consistency and construct reliability. In this measurement model; factor loadings of all variables of all constructs are found significantly more than 0.5. AVE values for constructs were Price conscious/value for money (0.806), perfectionist/high-quality consciousness (0.817), brand consciousness (0.773), novelty and fashion consciousness (0.792), impulsive carelessness (0.883), habitual/brand loyalty (0.864), recreational and shopping consciousness (0.881), and confusion by over choice (0.944) are found greater than 0.5. These statistics evidence the better convergent validity.

The value of composite reliability (CR) above 0.70 and AVE (Fornell and Larcker, 1981) is required for good internal consistency and construct reliability. CR values for constructs were price consciousness/value for money (0.926), perfectionist/high-quality consciousness (0.973), brand consciousness (0.953), novelty and fashion consciousness (0.950), impulsive carelessness (0.974), habitual/brand loyalty (0.974), recreational and shopping consciousness (0.985), and confusion by over choice (0.944) are found significantly above 0.70 and more than AVE of all latent variables indicating better internal and construct reliability.

Construct validity is used in measuring to which extent a set of observed variables represent the latent construct. The factor loadings and standardized regression weights of all measured items are more than 0.5 which shows that observed items are significantly representing the latent constructs.

The discriminant validity is the extent to which particular construct variables differ from their latent construct (Sekaran, 2000). The discriminant validity reports the existence and nonexistence of cross loading within or between the constructs. The nonexistence of cross-loading is an indication of discriminant validity (Hair, Gabriel, and Patel, 2014). Prerequisite for discriminant validity is the correlation between each pair of the latent construct should be less than 0.85 (Moolla and Bisschoff, 2013). The square root of AVE should be greater than the correlation among constructs is another way to measure the discriminate validity. The square root of AVE for price consciousness/value for money (0.897), perfectionist/high-quality consciousness (0.903), Brand consciousness (0.879), Novelty and fashion consciousness (0.889), Impulsive carelessness (0.939), habitual/brand loyalty (0.929), recreational and shopping consciousness (0.938), and confusion by over choice (0.971) more than correlations (highest correlation 0.510) among constructs and indicating better discriminate validity and supported measurement model. For the better discriminate and divergent validity measure maximum shared variance (MSV) and average shared variance (ASV) must be less than the average variance extracted (Kline, 2005 and Hair et al., 2006). Average variance extracted

(AVE) were found more than maximum shared variance (MSV) and average shared variance (ASV) of all latent variables (table 3). According to above statistics these scales or constructs were found valid and reliable in all the conditions

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Acknowledging the different shopping styles by the marketing manager help them to decide market segments and to formulate the retail strategies. Along with this better and effective promotional activities can be planned with deeper understanding of different shopping styles. The present study will help the marketers to understand the shopping styles of customers while shopping e-gadgets.

The study shows that the customers exhibit the recreational and shopping consciousness the most. The marketers need to understand that while choosing a particular location for the store, they can consider a site where the recreational needs of the customers can be taken care of.

Moreover it is seen that people are price consciousness. Hence the e-gadgets companies need to come up with products that can offer value for money. Apart from this people are high quality conscious and brand conscious. Thus the marketers need to acknowledge this by providing quality e-gadgets and coming up with branded gadgets. The marketers need to come up with the gadgets having novelty and new features as per the technology. The customers have reported that novelty and fashion consciousness is a consideration while shopping for e-gadgets.

CONCLUSION

During the consumer decision-making process, consumers make decisions on the basis of various factors like type of products, quality of products, price of products, etc. Consumers make decisions to satisfy their needs and every consumer has different shopping styles to choose the products. This study shows the decision making styles adopted by the consumers while purchasing e-gadgets. This is a relatively new area of research as electronic goods are studied more but e-gadgets are comparatively less studied. The results are drawn by conducting a study on the decision making styles of e-gadgets on a sample drawn from Northern India, UT of Chandigarh and Delhi in India.

This study identifies that Indian consumer's decision making styles are pretty similar to Consumer Style Inventory (CSI) by Sproles and Kendall (1986). The study verifies the generalizability of CSI in context of Indian Consumers. The results confirmed the existence of all Eight Decision Making Styles in Indian consumers although some difference in factor loadings is there. Recreational and shopping consciousness style is the strongest factor of shopping styles according to the mean rank of the study. It has

more effect while buying e-gadgets. Second most important factor according to the mean rank is price consciousness. Consumers are price conscious with respect to electronic gadgets. The third strongest factor of shopping style is quality consciousness. Quality plays important role in the buying process of e-gadgets. In this study the fourth factor of decision making style is brand consciousness, consumers prefer to choose branded products while buying electronic gadgets. Fifth factor of decision making style is novelty and fashion consciousness. Consumers tend to choose novel and fashionable electronic gadgets. According to the study sixth factor decision making style is confused by over choice. In this study seventh factor of decision making style is carelessness and impulsiveness. Consumers choose the e-gadgets haphazardly. Last decision making style is with lowest mean value and lowest mean rank is habitual/ brand loyalty. The findings of this research will help marketers to target their customers, optimise the cost of segmenting and positioning optimally

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND SCOPE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

A limitation of this study is that the findings of the study cannot be generalized to the broader population in India as it is conducted on only Northern India and UT Chandigarh and Delhi. Wider geographical area is not covered in the city because of some financial and Time restraint.

For future research, to check the applicability it should be test in wider geographical area. The study only obtained the shopping styles in context of Electronic Gadgets it should be measured on various other product categories as well. Furthermore, another discernment factors such as level of income and other features should also be studied to inspect in case these variables cause difference in decision making styles. Further studies may focus on personal values and individual attitudes impact on various decision making styles.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J.C. and Gerbing, D.W. (1988), Structural equation modelling in practice: a review and recommended two-step approach, *Psychological Bulletin*, 103 (3), 411-23.
- Bagozzi, R.P. and Foxall, G.R. (1996), Construct validation of a measure of adaptive innovative cognitive styles in consumption, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 13 (1), 201-213.
- Bentler, P.M. and Bonnet, D.G. (1980), Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures, *Psychological Bulletin*, 88 (3), 588-606.
- Bettman, J.R. and Zins, M.A. (1977), Constructive processes in consumer choice, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 4 (2), 75-85.
- Bloch, P.H. (1995), Seeking the ideal form: product design and consumer response, *Journal of Marketing*, 59 (3), 16-29.
- Brislin, R.W. (1970), Back translation for cross-cultural research, *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 1 (3), 185-216.
- Byrne, B. M. (2013). *Structural equation modeling with Mplus: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. Routledge 2nd ed.
- Cronbach, JL Lindzey, G Lee J. Cronbach(1989) *A history of psychology in autobiography*. 8. Stanford, CA Stanford University Press, 6493.
- Cacioppo, J.T., Kao, C.F., Petty, R.E. and Rodriguez, R. (1986), Central and peripheral routes to persuasion: an individual difference perspective, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51 (5), 1032-1043.
- Cotte, J. and Wood, S. (2004), Families and innovative consumer behaviour: a triadic study of siblings and parents, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31 (1), 78-86.
- Canabal, M. E. (2001). *Decision Making Styles of Young South Indian Consumers: an Exploratory Study*. *College Student Journal*, 36 (1), 12-19.
- Cowart, K.O., Fox, G.L. and Wilson, A.E. (2008), A structural look at consumer innovativeness and self congruence in new product purchases, *Psychology & Marketing*, 25 (12), 1111-1130.
- Durvasula, S., Lysonski, S. and Andrews, J.C. (1993), Cross-cultural generalizability of a scale for profiling consumers' decision-making styles, *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 27 (1), 55-65.
- Fan, J. X., Xio, J. J. & Xu, Y. (1997). *Decision-Making Styles of Young-Adult Chinese Consumers: An International Comparison*. *Consumer Interests Annual*, 43, 76-82.
- Fan, J.X. and Xiao, J.J. (1998), Consumer decision-making styles of young-adult Chinese, *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 32 (2), 275-294.
- Fornell, C. and Larcker, D. (1981), Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1), 39-50.

- Gehrt, K.C. and Carter, K. (1992), An exploratory assessment of catalogue shopping orientations: the existence of convenience and recreational segments, *Journal of Direct Marketing*, 6, 29-39.
- Goldsmith, R.E. (1983), Psychographics and new product adoption: an exploratory study, *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 57, 1071-1076.
- Goldsmith, R.E. and Newell, S.J. (1997), Innovativeness and price sensitivity: managerial, theoretical, and methodological issues, *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 6 (3), 163-174.
- Goldsmith, R.E., Freiden, J.B. and Eastman, J.K. (1995), The generality/specificity issue in consumer innovativeness research, *Technovation*, 15 (10), 601-611.
- Gonen, E. & Osetete, E. (2006). Decision-Making Styles of Young Turkish Consumers, *Journal of the Home Economics Institute of Australia*, 13 (1), 26-33.
- Hafstrom, J.L., Chae, J.S. and Chung, Y.S. (1992), Consumer decision-making styles: comparison between United States and Korean young consumers, *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 26 (1), 146-58.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). SEM: confirmatory factor analysis. Multivariate data analysis. Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, 770-842.
- Hair, J. F., Gabriel, M., & Patel, V. (2014). AMOS covariance-based structural equation modeling (CB-SEM): Guidelines on its application as a marketing research tool. *Brazilian Journal of Marketing*, 13(2), 44-55.
- Hirschman, E.C. (1980), Innovativeness, novelty seeking, and consumer creativity, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 7 (3), 283-295.
- Hirschman, E.C. (1984), Experience seeking: a subjectivist perspective of consumption, *Journal of Business Research*, 12 (1), 115-136.
- Hirunyawipada, T. and Paswan, A.K. (2006), Consumer innovativeness and perceived risk: implications for high technology production adoption, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 23 (4), 182-198.
- Hui, A. S. Y., Siu, N. Y. M., Wang, C. C. L. & Chang, L. M. K. (2001). An Investigation of Decision-Making Styles of Consumers in China. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 35 (2), 326-345.
- Hurt, H.T., Joseph, K. and Cook, C.D. (1977), Scale for the measurement of innovativeness, *Human Communications Research*, 4 (1), 58-65.
- Ho, R. (2006). Handbook of univariate and multivariate data analysis and interpretation with SPSS. CRC press.
- H.M. and Houston, M.B. (2007), Does innate consumer innovativeness relate to new product/ service adoption behavior? the intervening role of social learning via vicarious innovativeness, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 35 (1), 63-75.
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modelling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6 (1), 1-55.
- Im, S., B. L. Bayus, and C. H. Mason. 2003. An empirical study of innate consumer innovativeness, personal characteristics, and new-product adoption behavior. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31 (1), 61-73.
- Jaiyeoba, O. O., & Opeda, F. O. R. (2013). Impact of consumer innovativeness on shopping styles: a case-study of Limkokwing university students. *Business and Management Horizons*, 1(2), 107-117.
- Kavas, A. & Yesilada, F. (2007). Decision Making Styles of Young Turkish Consumers. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, 9, 73-85.
- Kenson, K. M. (1999). A Profile of Apparel Shopping Orientation Segments among Male Consumers. Unpublished MA thesis, California State University Long Beach.
- Kline, T. J. (2005). Psychological testing: A practical approach to design and evaluation. Sage Publications.
- Lysonski, S., Durvasula, S. and Zotos, Y. (1996), Consumer decision-making styles: a multi-country investigation, *European Journal of Marketing*, 30 (12), 10-21.

- Manning, K. C., Bearden W. O., and Madden T. J., (1995), Consumer innovativeness and the adoption process. *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 4 (4), 329-345.
- Midgley, D.F. and Dowling, G.R. (1978), Innovativeness: the concept and its measurement: a questionable assumption, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 4 (4), 229-242.
- Midgley, D.F. and Dowling, G.R. (1993), A longitudinal study of product form innovation: the interaction between predispositions and social messages, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19 (1), 611-625.
- Mitchell, V. W., and L. Bates. (1998), UK consumer decision-making styles. *Journal of Marketing Management* 14 (1-3), 199-225.
- Mittelstaedt, R.A., Grossbart, S.L., Curtis, W.W. and Devere, S.P. (1976), Optimal stimulation level and the adoption decision process, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 3 (2), 84-94.
- Moolla, Ahmed I., and Christo A. Bisschoff (2013), An empirical model that measures brand loyalty of fast-moving consumer goods, *Journal of Economics* 4 (1), 1-9.
- Ownbey, S. F. & Horridge, P. E. (1997), Acculturation levels and shopping orientations of Asian-American consumers. *Psychology & Marketing*, 14 (1), 1-18.
- Patel, V. (2008). Consumer decision making styles in shopping malls: an empirical study. *New Age Marketing: Emerging Realities*, Excel Books, New Delhi, 627-637.
- Park, J. E., J. Yu, and J. X. Zhou. (2010), Consumer innovativeness and shopping style, *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 27 (5), 437-446.
- Roehrich, G. (2004), Consumer innovativeness: concepts and measurements, *Journal of Business Research*, 57 (6), 671-677.
- Rogers, E.M. and Shoemaker, F.F. (1971), *Communication of innovations: a cross-cultural approach*, 2nd ed., The Free Press, New York, NY.
- Shim, S. & Kotsiopulos, A. (1993). A typology of apparel shopping orientation segments among female consumers. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 12 (1), 73-85.
- Siu, N.Y.M., Wang, C.C.L., Chang, L.M.K. and Hui, A.S.Y. (2001), Adapting consumer style inventory to Chinese consumers: a confirmatory analysis approach, *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 13 (2), 29-47.
- Sproles, G.B. and Kendall, E.L. (1986), A methodology for profiling consumers' decision-making styles, *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 20 (2), 267-78.
- Sproles, E. K. & Sproles, G. B. (1990). Consumer decision-making styles as a function of individual learning styles. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 24 (1), 134-147.
- Sternberg, R.J. and Grigorenko, E.L. (1997), The cognitive costs of physical and mental ill health: applying the psychology of the developed world to the problems of the developing world, *Eye on Psi Chi*, 2 (1), 20-27.
- Venkatraman, M.P. and MacInnis, D.J. (1985), An investigation of the epistemic and sensory exploratory behaviors of hedonic and cognitive consumers, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 12 (1), 102-107.
- Venkatraman, M.P. and Price, L.L. (1990), Differentiating between cognitive and sensory innovativeness, *Journal of Business Research*, 20 (4), 293-315.
- Walsh, G., Mitchell, V. W., and Thurau, T. H. (2001). German consumer decision making styles. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 35(1), 73-95
- Walsh, G., & Vincent, W. (2001). German market mavens' decision-making styles. *Journal of Euro-Marketing*, 10 (4), 83-108.
- Wells, W. D. (1974), *Life Style and Psychographics*, Chicago: American Marketing Association.