

THE INFLUENCE OF SOCIALIZATION AGENTS AND
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILES ON BRAND CONSCIOUSNESS

A thesis submitted to the Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Master of Science (Management),
Universiti Utara Malaysia

by

Zaharah binti Ghazali

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from Universiti Utara Malaysia, I agree that the University Library may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by my supervisor(s) or, in their absence, by the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to Universiti Utara Malaysia for any scholarly use which may be made of any material from my thesis.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other use of the materials in this thesis, in whole or in part, should be addressed to:

Dean of Graduate School
Universiti Utara Malaysia
06010 UUM Sintok
Kedah Darul Aman

ABSTRAK

Kesedaran jenama boleh dianggap sebagai perhatian atau keutamaan yang lebih terhadap barangan berjenama. Ini bermakna pengaruh jenama, pada umumnya, mempunyai kepentingan dan nilai yang tersendiri iaitu ia menggambarkan suatu lambang keefisyenan atau simbolik. Di Amerika Syarikat, kepentingan terhadap jenama adalah amat kukuh. Walau bagaimanapun, terdapat sedikit jurang fahaman terhadap kepentingan ini di lain-lain negara. Justeru, tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk mengkaji bagaimana agen-agen sosialisasi—media, ibubapa, dan rakan sebaya—mempengaruhi kesedaran jenama di kalangan pelajar, dan bagaimana pengaruh ini berbeza berdasarkan karektor demografik mereka. Responden seramai 230 orang merupakan pelajar semester kedua, yang mengikuti kursus Sarjana Muda Pengurusan Perniagaan di Universiti Utara Malaysia. Keseluruhannya, rakan sebaya dibuktikan sebagai pengaruh utama. Keputusan daripada analisis korelasi Pearson menunjukkan, kesedaran jenama pelajar mempunyai hubungan dengan setiap faktor sosialisasi. Walaupun demikian, bagi pengaruh media, hanya menonton wayang berhubung dengan kesedaran jenama. Dua lagi analisis menunjukkan hubungan di antara pengaruh ibubapa dan rakan sebaya dengan kesedaran jenama. Merujuk kepada hasil kajian, analisis pendedahan terhadap media mendapati wujudnya perbezaan: pelajar perempuan lebih kerap menonton TV, mendengar lagu (radio, CDs), dan melayari internet berbanding lelaki, manakala pelajar Melayu lebih kerap mendengar radio dan melayari internet berbanding Cina, Indian, dan lain-lain (Siam, Singapura, Indonesia, Lain-lain). Bagi pengaruh ibubapa dan rakan sebaya, hanya jantina menunjukkan perbezaan: pelajar perempuan lebih dipengaruhi oleh ibubapa dan rakan sebaya berbanding lelaki. Perbezaan juga wujud pada faktor jantina dan kaum terhadap kesedaran jenama: pelajar perempuan lebih cenderung kepada barangan berjenama berbanding lelaki, manakala pelajar kaum lain-lain lebih cenderung kepada barangan berjenama berbanding Melayu, Cina, dan India. Keluarga dan pakar pengguna perlu menimbangkan keputusan kajian ini sebagai satu panduan untuk pendidikan yang lebih baik berikutan pelajar juga dianggap sebagai pengguna.

ABSTRACT

Brand consciousness is more than simply an awareness or preferences for brand names. It is the understanding that brand names, in general, have personal relevance or value in that they serve as a signal of functional or symbolic value. In the United States, the importance of brand names is well established. However, there is little understanding of the importance brand names hold in other cultures. Therefore, the objective of this study was to investigate how socialization agents—media, parents, and peers—influence on students’ brand consciousness in apparel and influences differ according to students demographic characteristics. Participants were 230 students in second semester, who undertaking Bachelor of Business Administration in Universiti Utara Malaysia. Overall, peers exert the greatest influence. The results by using Pearson correlation coefficients analyses suggested that, the students’ brand consciousness is, significantly correlated to each socialization factor. However, of the media related analysis, only movie viewing shows a significant correlation. The other two have significant correlation with parental influence and peer influence. Moreover, gender and ethnicity differences were also analyzed on socialization agents and brand consciousness. As the results have indicated, media exposure analyses revealed the most significant differences: female students were more likely to watch TV, listen to music (radio, CDs), and spend time online than were males, while Malay students were more likely to listen to music and spend time online than were Chinese, Indian, and other (Siamese, Singaporean, Indonesian, Other). For influence from parents and peers, only gender played a factor: female students were more likely to be influenced by parents and peers than males. Other significant differences were found for brand consciousness across gender and ethnicity: female students were more likely to have higher brand-consciousness than males, while students of other ethnic groups were more likely to be highly brand-conscious than Malay, Chinese, and Indian. Family and consumer educators should consider findings of this study as a guide to give better education to students as consumers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With humility and faith, all the praises and thanks are for Almighty Allah (Subhanahu Wa Taala) whose countless bounties enabled me to accomplish this study successfully, invoke His blessings on the Holy Prophet Mohammed (Sallallahu Alaihe Wasallam) for whom He created this universe.

I deeply appreciate the guidance and patience of Dr. Nor Azila binti Mohd Noor, my supervisor, who consistently provided me with support, understanding and a strong leadership. She always encouraged me to completely finish my Master's project and drive me toward more energetic research in the marketing ground.

Moreover, I gratefully acknowledge the members of Master's project committee: they all provided me with helpful advice and support. I would like to thank the Department of Academic Affair, Northern University of Malaysia (UUM), students, staffs, and Faculty of Business Administration. Special appreciation is given to my parents, my sisters, and my brothers, without those support and encouragement I would not have been able to complete this research. My parents provided me endless encouragement.

I wish to also thank to all the Master's project colleagues at UUM for continuous support and assistance which is beyond my description.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this part of my life's work to my loving parents, Hjh. Rugayah and Hj. Abbas. You truly earned this degree as much as I did. Your enduring love and support is the reason for my success. When the challenges of the Master's program became overbearing, both of you were there to encourage me to persevere, to remind me of my ultimate objective, and to help me have some fun along the way. I am eternally grateful for all that you had to sacrifice, and I love you both very much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PERMISSION TO USE.....	i
ABSTRAK.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
DEDICATION.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
LIST OF FIGURES.....	x
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Background of the study.....	2
1.3 Problem statement.....	5
1.4 Purpose of the study.....	6
1.5 Research questions.....	7
1.6 Limitations.....	7
1.7 Definition of terms.....	8
1.8 Significance of the study.....	8
1.9 Organization of the study.....	10
2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	11
2.1 Introduction.....	11
2.2 Meaning of shopping style.....	12
2.3 Importance of brand consciousness.....	13
2.3.1 The reality of brands.....	14
2.3.2 Factors of consumer's brand consciousness.....	15
2.4 Conceptual framework.....	18
2.4.1 Consumer socialization model.....	19
2.4.2 Employment of Moschis' model.....	22
2.5 Review of related studies.....	24

2.5.1	Brand consciousness in apparel	25
2.5.2	Different shopping patterns between male and female consumers	22
2.5.3	Socialization agents	29
2.6	Targeting the student market	33
2.7	Consumer learning process for shopping.....	36
2.8	Hypotheses	37
2.8.1	Differences of demographic factors on socialization agents ...	37
2.8.2	Differences of demographic factors on brand consciousness ..	38
2.8.3	Socialization influences on brand consciousness	39
2.9	Conclusion	41
3	METHODOLOGY	43
3.1	Introduction.....	43
3.2	The population	43
3.3	Sample selection	44
3.4	Description of the instruments	44
3.4.1	Brand consciousness	45
3.4.2	Socialization agents	46
3.5	Pilot testing	48
3.6	Data collection	48
3.7	Data analysis	49
3.7.1	Reliability analysis.....	49
3.7.2	Descriptive statistics	50
3.7.3	Hypotheses testing	50
3.8	Conclusion	51
4	FINDINGS	53
4.1	Introduction.....	53
4.2	Responses rate.....	53
4.3	Descriptive statistics of the samples	54
4.3.1	Demographic description	54
4.3.2	Central tendencies and dispersion.....	56
4.4	Reliability analyses of the measurement scales	57
4.5	Specific analyses related to the research questions.....	58

4.5.1	Differences of demographic factors on socialization agents ...	59
4.5.2	Differences of demographic factors on brand consciousness ..	64
4.5.3	Socialization influences on brand consciousness	66
4.6	Conclusion	68
4.6.1	Differences of demographic factors on socialization agents ...	68
4.6.2	Differences of demographic factors on brand consciousness ..	69
4.6.3	Socialization influences on brand consciousness	70
5	DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS	71
5.1	Introduction.....	71
5.2	Discussion	72
5.2.1	Differences of demographic factors on socialization agents ...	72
5.2.2	Differences of demographic factors on brand consciousness ..	74
5.2.3	Socialization influences on brand consciousness	75
5.3	Implications.....	77
5.3.1	Theoretical implications.....	78
5.3.2	Practical implications.....	78
5.4	Suggestion for additional research.....	80
4.5	Conclusion	80
	REFERENCES	81
	APPENDICES	89
	Appendix 1	89
	Appendix 2.....	92
	Appendix 3.....	93
	Appendix 4.....	94
	Appendix 5.....	95
	Appendix 6.....	96
	Appendix 7.....	99
	Appendix 8.....	101
	Appendix 9.....	102
	Appendix 10.....	103
	Appendix 11	104

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
3.1 Hypotheses testing of differences on socialization agents.....	38
3.2 Hypotheses testing of differences on brand consciousness	39
3.3 Hypotheses testing of relationship	41
4.1 Responses rate.....	53
4.2 Frequency distribution and percentage of gender	54
4.3 Frequency distribution and percentage of ethnicity	55
4.4 Central tendencies and dispersion of variables	57
4.5 Reliability analyses of the measurement scales	58
4.6 Mean values of media exposure, parents, and peers variables by gender.....	60
4.7 Results of independent sample <i>t</i> -test by gender on socialization agents	60
4.8 Mean values of media exposure, parents, and peers variables by ethnicity	62
4.9 Results of one-way ANOVA by ethnicity on socialization agents.....	63
4.10 Results of independent sample <i>t</i> -test by gender on brand consciousness.....	65
4.11 Results of one-way ANOVA by ethnicity on brand consciousness	65
4.12 Pearson correlation coefficients matrix of seven variables	67
4.13 Hypotheses and results of demographic factors on socialization agents	69
4.14 Hypotheses and results of demographic factors on brand consciousness.....	69
4.15 Hypotheses and results of socialization agents on brand consciousness	70

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
2.1 Moschis' consumer socialization model.....	18
2.2 A conceptual model of consumer socialization and brand consciousness.....	23
4.1 Frequency of gender distribution.....	55
4.2 Frequency of ethnicity distribution.....	56
4.3 Frequency of media exposure distribution by gender.....	61
4.4 Frequency of media exposure distribution by ethnicity.....	63

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The first chapter will discuss the background of the research which explains the general ideas on the scope of the study. The research problems are then stated, followed by the purpose and also the significance of the study for the managerial and marketing field, as well as future use.

1.2 Background of the study

As every person is a consumer, it is certainly reasonable to inquire about shopping behaviors, such as the motivations underlying where people shop and what they buy. Shopping centers and mall developments provide consumers with increased shopping alternatives within a localized central business district. Consumers are expected to derive greater utility from larger areas because of larger product classification, even though they are likely to spend more money and incur increased indisposition by traveling more distant shopping areas (Bell, 1999).

During the 1980's, three-fourths of the national consumer population, in the United States, went to shopping malls at least once a month (Stoffel, 1998). Dual incomes increased flexible spending in this population, but individuals had less time for shopping (Kotler & Amstrong, 2001). Today, consumers

REFERENCES

- Atkins, C. (1984). The effects of alcohol advertising. *Advances in Consumer Research*. 11, 688-693.
- Babin, B. J., Darden, W. R., & Griffin, M. (1994). Work and/or fun: measuring hedonic and utilitarian shopping value. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 20(4), 644-656.
- Backman, G. R., John, R. D., & Rao, A. R. (1993). Children's susceptibility to peer group purchase influence: an exploratory investigation. *Advances in Consumer Research*. 20, 446-450.
- Bandura, A. (1969). *Principles of Behavior Modification*. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston: New York.
- Barbara, S., Laroche, M., Sadd, G., Cleveland, M., & Browne, E. (2000). Gender differences in information search strategies for a Christmas gift. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*. 17(6), 500-524.
- Batra, R. & Ahtola, O. T. (1991). Measuring the hedonic and utilitarian sources of consumer attitudes. *Marketing Letters*. 2, 159-170.
- Bearden, W. O. & Randall, R. L. (1990). Attention to social comparison information: an individual difference factor affecting consumer conformity. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 16, 461-471.
- Bell, S. J. (1999). Image and consumer attraction to intraurban retail areas: an environmental psychological approach. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*. 6, 67-78.
- Berning, C. A. & Jacoby, J. (1974). Patterns of information acquisition in new product purchases. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 1, 18-22.
- Best, D. L. & Williams, J. E. (1997). Sex, gender, and culture, in J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall, & C. Kagitcibasi 2nd eds. *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology*. 3. Social behavior and applications. Viacom Company: Needham Heights.
- Buss, D. (1990). Evolutionary social psychology: prospect and pitfalls. *Motivation and Emotion*. 14, 265-286.
- Carlson, L. & Grossbart, S. (1988). Parental style and consumer socialization of children. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 15(1), 77-94.
- Cavana, R. Y., Delahaye, B. L., & Sekaran, U. (2001). *Applied business research: Qualitative and quantitative methods*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Childers, T. L. & Rao, A. (1992). The influence of familial and peer based reference group on consumer decisions. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 19, 198-210.
- Cleaver, J. Y. (1985). Brand names rattle retail shelves. *Advertising Age*. 14, 28-29.
- Cobb & Hoyer. (1985). Direct observation of search behavior. *Psychology & Marketing*. 2, 161-179.
- Darley, W. K. & Smith, R. E. (1995). Gender differences in information procession strategies: an empirical test of the selective model in advertising response. *Journal of Advertising*. 24(1), 41-56.
- d'Astous, A. & Gargouri, E. (2001). Consumer evaluations of brand imitations. *European Journal of Marketing*. 35, 153-167.
- Dotson, M. J. & Hyatt, E. M. (2005). Major influence factors in children's consumer socialization. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*. 22(1), 35-42.
- Doyle, P. & Dibb, S. (2001). *Marketing concepts and strategies*. 4th ed. Houghton Mifflin: Boston.
- Economic Planning Unit (2001). *Eighth Malaysian Plan, 2000-2005*. Prime Minister's Department, Kuala Lumpur.
- Escalas, J. E. (2004). Narrative processing: building consumer connection to brands. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*. 14(1&2), 168-180.
- Fan, J. X. & Xiao, J. J. (1998). Consumer decision-making style of young adults Chinese. *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*. 32, 275-294.
- Farquhar, P. H., Han, J. Y., Herr, P. M., & Ijiri, Y. (1992). Strategies for leveraging master brands. *Marketing Research*. 4, 32-43.
- Feldman, J. (1999). Back-to-school buying guide. *Money*. 28(9), 165-168.
- Feltham, T. S. (1998). Leaving home: brand purchase influences on young adults. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*. 15(4), 372-385.
- Financial Assist (2005). *Student Affair Department*. Retrieved Jan 20, 2006, from <http://www.uum.edu.my/hea.htm>.
- Fischer, E. & Arnold, S. J. (1994). Sex, gender, identity, gender role attitudes, and consumer behavior. *Psychology and Marketing*. 12(2), 163-182.
- Fitzerald, K. (1994, August 22). Casual means in price, too. *Advertising Age*. 65(35), 26-27.
- Flack, J. (2000, May 18). Family planning: children have a lot of purchasing power, but products-such as Sunny delight, Walkers and Clarks-enjoy the most

- success when their advertising targets parents as well. *Marketing Weeks*. 41-45.
- Grassl, W. (1999). The reality of brands: towards an ontology of marketing. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*. 58(2), 313-360.
- Gorn, G. J. (1985). The effect of music in advertising on choice behavior: a classical conditioning approach. *Journal of Marketing*. 6, 94-101.
- Gunin, J. (1998, June 1). Yankelovich: fit shopping around lifestyle. *Home Textiles Today*. 19, 13-14.
- Harstrom, J. L., Chae, J. S., & Chung, Y. S. (1992). Consumer decision-making styles: comparison between United States and Korean young consumers. *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*. 26(1), 146-158.
- Henrikson, I. & Flora, J. A. (1999). Third-person perception and children. *Communication Research*. 26, 643-666.
- Hirschman, E. C. & Holbrook, M. B. (1982). Hedonic consumption: emerging concepts, methods, and propositions. *Journal of Marketing*. 46(3), 92-101.
- Hite, C. F. & Hite, R. E. (1995). Reliance on brand by young children. *Journal of the Market Research Society*. 37(2), 185-194.
- Hogg, K. M., Bruce, M., & Hill, A. J. (1998). Fashion brand preferences among young consumers. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*. 26(8), 293-300.
- Huck, S. W. (2000). *Reading statistics and research*. Longman: New York.
- Huddleston, P. & Cassill, N. (1990). Female consumer's brand orientation: the influence of quality and demographics. *Home Economics Research Journal*. 18(3), 255-262.
- Jacoby, J., Olson, J. C., & Haddock, R. A. (1971). Price, brand name, and product composition characteristics as determinants of perceived quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 55, 570-579.
- John, D. (1999). Consumer socialization of children: a retrospective look at twenty-five years of research. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 26, 183-213.
- Johnson, K. K. P., Schofield, N. A., & Yurchisin, J. (2002). Appearance and dress as a source of information: a qualitative approach to data collection. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*. 20, 125-137.
- Kamaruddin, A. R. & Mokhlis, S. (2003). Consumer socialization, social structural factors and decision-making styles: a case study of adolescents in Malaysia. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*. 27, 145-156.

- Kapferer, J. N. (1997). *Strategic brand management*. 2nd ed. Kogan Page: London.
- Kapferer, J. N. & Laurent, G. (1985). *Brand sensitivity: a new concept for brand management*. Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the European Marketing Academy.
- Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 24, 163-204.
- Keillor, B. D., Parker, R. S., & Schaefer, A. (1996). Influences on adolescent brand preferences in the United States and Mexico. *Journal of Advertising Research*. May/June, 47-56.
- Keller, K. L. (1998). *Strategic brand management*. Prentice-Hall: New Jersey.
- Kempf, D., Palan, K. M., & Laczniak, R. (1997). Gender differences in information processing confidence in an advertising context: a preliminary study. *Advances in Consumer Research*. 24, 443-449.
- Koester, A. W. & May, J. K. (1985). Profiles of adolescents' clothing practices. *Teenager*. 20, 97-113.
- Kotler, P. (1997). *Marketing management*. 9th ed. Prentice Hall: New Jersey.
- Kotler, P. & Armstrong, G. (2001). *Principles of marketing*. 9th ed. Prentice-Hall: New Jersey.
- Kumar, V. (2000). *International Marketing Research*. Prentice Hall: New Jersey.
- Lachance, M. J., Beaudoin, P., & Robitaille, J. (2003). Adolescents' brand sensitivity in apparel: influence of the three socialization agents. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*. 27, 47-57.
- Lee, M. & Burns, L. D. (1993). Self-consciousness and clothing purchase criteria of Korean and United States college women. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*. 11(4), 32-40.
- Levine, J. (1988). Today's college students: wealthy, wise... elusive. *Incentive*. 162(3), 24-30.
- Liebeck, L. (1996). BTS survey: school's in at discount. *Discount Store News*. 35(17).
- Lindstrom, M. & Seybold, P. B. (2003). *Brand child: remarkable insights into minds of today's global kids and their relationship with brands*. Kogan Page: London.
- Macklin, M. G. (1996). Preschoolers' learning of brand names from visual cues. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 23(3), 251-261.

- Mangleburg, T. F., Grewal, D., & Bristol, T. (1997). Socialization, gender, and adolescent's self-reports of the generalized use of products labels. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*. 3(2), 255-278.
- Marx, W. (1995). Marketing 101. *Management Review*. 84(9).
- Mascarenhas, O. A. & Higby, M. A. (1993). Peer, parent, and media influences in teen apparel shopping. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. 21(1), 53-58.
- McLeod, J. M. & O'Keefe, G. J. Jr. (1972). The socialization perspective and communication behavior, in *Current perspectives in mass communication research*. Kline, G. & Tichenor, P. eds. Sage: Beverly Hills. 121-168.
- McNeal, J. U. (1987). *Children as consumers: insights and implications*. Lexington Books: Lexington.
- McNeal, J. U. (1990). Children as consumers. *American Demographic*. 12(9), 36-39.
- McNeal, J. U. (1991). *A bibliography of research and writing on marketing and advertising to children*. Lexington Books: New York.
- McNeal, J. U. & Ji, M. F. (1999). Chinese children as consumers: an analysis of their new product information sources. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*. 16(4), 345-364.
- Meyer, P. (2001). Brands need to understand mindset of echo-boomers in order to survive. *Kids Marketing Report*. 1(28), 14.
- Meyer, D. J. C. & Anderson, H. C. (2000). Preadolescents and apparel purchasing: conformity to parents and peers in the consumer socialization process. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*. 15, 243-257.
- Moschis, G. P. (1978). Teenagers' responses to retailing stimuli. *Journal of Retailing*. 54(4), 80-93.
- Moschis, G. P. (1981). Patterns of consumer learning. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. 9, 110-124.
- Moschis, G. P. (1987). *Consumer socialization: a life-cycle perspective*. Lexington Books: Lexington.
- Moschis, G. P. & Churchill, G. A. Jr. (1987). Consumer socialization: a theoretical and empirical analysis. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 15, 599-609.
- Moschis, G. P. & Mitchell, L. G. (1986). Television advertising and interpersonal influences on teenagers' participation in family consumer decisions. *Advances in Consumer Research*. 13, 181-186.

- Moschis, G. P. & Moore, R. L. (1978). An analysis of the acquisition of some consumer competencies among adolescents. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*. 12(Winter), 277-279.
- Moschis, G. P. & Moore, R. L. (1983). A longitudinal study of television advertising effects. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 9, 279-286.
- Moschis, G. P., Moore, R. L., & Stanley, T. J. (1984). An exploratory study of brand loyalty development. *Advances in Consumer Research*. 1, 412-417.
- Moschis, G. P., Moore, R. L., & Stephens, L. F. (1979). Purchasing patterns of adolescent consumers. *Journal of Retailing*. 53, 19-26.
- Moses, E. (2000). *The \$100 allowance*. John Wiley & Son, Inc: New York.
- Nelson, M. R. & McLeod, L. E. (2005). Adolescent brand consciousness and product placements: awareness, liking and perceived effects on self and others. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*. 27(1), 1-14.
- Nisbett, R. E. (1990). Evaluation psychology, biology, and cultural evaluation. *Motivation and Emotion*. 14, 255-263.
- Othman, M. N. & Sim, O. F. (1993). Leisure activities of young, urban, Malaysian adults: implications for marketers. *Malaysian Management Review*. 28(March), 33-52.
- Parks, L. (1997). Understanding the 20-something shopper. *Drug Store News*. 19(13).
- Peters, J. F. (1989). Youth clothes shopping behavior: an analysis by gender. *Teenager*. 24, 575-580.
- Riesman, D. (1995). *Careers and consumer behavior*. New York University Press: New York.
- Scandinavia-Japan Research. (2000). *The motivation for purchasing brand clothes and accessories among Japanese*. Retrieved Jan 2, 2006, from <http://www.sjr.dk/brand.htm>.
- Sherry, J. F. Jr. (1990). A socialcultural analysis of a midwestern flea market. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 17, 13-30.
- Shim, S. Y. (1996). Adolescent consumer decision-making styles: the socialization perspective. *Psychology and Marketing*. 13(6), 547-569.
- Shim, S. Y. & Gehrt, K. C. (1996). Hispanic and native American adolescents: an exploratory study of their approach to shopping. *Journal of Retailing*. 72(3), 307-324.

- Shim, S. & Koh, A. (1997). Profiling adolescent consumer decision-making styles: effects of socialization agents and social-structure variables. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*. 15(2), 50-59.
- Sistruck, F. & McDavid, J. W. (1971). Sex variable in conforming behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 17, 72-82.
- Solomon, M. R. (2002). *Consumer behavior: buying, having, and being*. 5th ed. Prentice-Hall: New Jersey.
- Sproles, G. B. & Kendall, E. L. (1986). A methodology for profiling consumer's decision-making styles. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*. 20(2), 267-279.
- Stijn, M. J., Osselaer, V., & Alba, J. W. (2000). Consumer learning and brand equity. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 27, 1-16.
- Stobart, P. (1994). *Brand power*. New York University Press: New York.
- Stoffel, J. (1998). Where America goes for entertainment. *New York Times*. 11.
- Stokes, D. (2002). *Marketing*. Continuum: London.
- Thomas, J. B., Cassill, N. L., & Forsythe, S. M. (1991). Underlying dimensions of apparel involvement in consumers' purchase decisions. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*. 9, 45-48.
- Tsuruoka, D. (1992). Hey big spender: Malaysia's consumers worry economic planners. *Far Eastern Economic Review*. 155(July 9), 58.
- Vogt, W. P. (1999). *Dictionary of statistics and methodology*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Wanke, M., Bohner, G., & Jurkowitsch, A. (1997). There are many reasons to drive a BMW: does imagined ease of argument generation influence attitudes? *Journal of Consumer Research*. 24, 170-177.
- Ward, S. (1974). Consumer socialization. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 1, 1-14.
- Ward, S., Wackman, D. (1971). Family and media influences on adolescent consumer learning. *American Behavior Scientist*. 14(3), 415-427.
- Ward, S., Wackman, D. (1972). Children's purchase influence attempts and parental yielding. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 9, 316-319.
- Ward, S., Wackman, D., & Wartella, E. (1977). *How children learn to buy: the development of consumer information processing skills*. Sage: Beverly Hills.
- Wechsler, P. (1997). Hey, kid, buy this! *Business Week*. June 30, 62-67.

- Wee, M. (Feb, 2002). *Youth vs young adults*. Retrieved Dec 20, 2005, from http://www.thefiltergroup.comad_voice2.php.htm.
- Wilson, J. D. & MacGillivray, M. S. (1998). Self-perceived influences of family, friends, and media on adolescent clothing choice. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*. 26(4), 425-443.
- Worchel, S. & Cooper, J. (1976). *Understanding social psychology*. Dorsey Press: Homewood, IL.
- Yohalem, K. C. (1995). Causal trends present apparel opportunity. *Sporting Goods Business*. 28(7), 118.
- Zeithaml, V. (1985). The new demographics and market fragmentation. *Journal of Marketing*. 49, 64-75.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Financial assist provided by UUM to undergraduate students

SCHOLARSHIP LOAN FACILITIES

The values of education loan/scholarship allocated for students who study in NUM under first degree programme.

i. UUM scholarship	RM 6,500.00
ii. PTPTN loan	RM 6,500.00
iii. JPA loan	RM 5,090.00
iv. State government	RM 3,000.00 to RM 5,000.00
v. Private bodies	
PETRONAS	RM 6,000.00
MAYBANK	RM 5,500.00
TELEKOM	RM 5,500.00
BSN	RM 5,000.00
SHELL	RM 6,000.00
vi. long term loan	RM 3,000.00
vii. short term loan	RM 500.00
viii. religious council	RM 1,500.00 and above
ix. NUM loan scheme	RM 6,000.00

All applicants of the scholarship/loan stated above, must fill in the forms that can be obtained from UKKP. Date of issue will be announce by UKKP from time to time. Announcement is patched on announcement board around the campus.

STUDENTS AFFAIR DEPARTEMENT (ASD) trust fund

RM 50,000.00 is allocated for one session to assist the students who do not have any sponsor. The value of assist is between RM 200.00 to RM 1,000.00.

BAKTI trust fund

BAKTI also allocated an amount of RM 52,000.00 for NUM students who have financial problem to continue their studies. Values of assist is between RM 500.00 to RM 1,000.00.

Students' welfare

The welfare students' scheme is formed to offer financial assistance and facilities to students. The values of assist:

Emergency Fund

a. student's death	RM 1,000.00
b. student's parent death (peninsular)	RM 300.00
c. student's parent death (Sabah/Sarawak)	RM 500.00
d. special cases such as flood, fire, accidents depending on the case	

Group TAKAFUL benefits

All NUM students are covered by SKIM TAKAFUL MALAYSIA with the benefits stated as below:

Suicidal case, illegal racing, drug addiction and other similar cases are not covered by the insurance scheme.

i. student's death	RM 7,500.00	RM 7,500.00
ii. permanent disabilities		RM 7,500.00
iii. medical treatment		RM 1,000.00 (maximum)
iv. ward allowance		RM 20.00 per day

Detailed information of the PTPTN loan

All students are qualified to get the PTPTN loan facilities. The facilities are based on the matters stated below:

- applicants must use the form obtained from UAKP and must pay RM 5.00.
- successful applicants must fill in the education loan agreement and other related notices which will be announced to students at the notice board.
- 4% loan interest rates (service charge) will be charged to all the loans granted.
- students must pay back the education loan after 3 months completing their study.
- the sponsors will credit the money into the student's account bank and students must pay the studies fees to the university management.
- NUM management chooses Bank of Islam to manage the PTPTN education loan. The sponsors will credit the money into student's account bank through Bank of Islam. Students are advised to open their account with Bank of Islam before their registration as new students in NUM.
- the method of loan payment to old students through other banks such as Bank Muamalat, Bumiputera Commers and other banks still remains.
- PTPTN management will draw down payment of RM 1,500.00 through warrant and students can cash it at any places as mentioned by the PTPTN management.
- Any students rejecting the offer must write a letter to the PTPTN management.

MONTHLY ESTIMATION FOR A STUDENT'S EXPENSES IN NUM SINTOK

Daily expenses

1. breakfast	RM 1.50
2. lunch	RM 3.00
3. dinner	RM 3.00
4. tea break/supper	RM 2.00
Total = RM 9.50 x 30 = RM 285.00	

Other expenses for a month

1. telecommunication	RM 70.00
2. recreation/ outing	RM 50.00
3. photostats, stationery, book and others	RM 100.00
4. dooby	RM 24.00 (RM 6.00 x 4 kali)
TOTAL = RM 244.00	
GRAND TOTAL = RM 529.00	

STUDENT'S INCOME

PTPTN education loan	RM 6,500.00
Expenses	
Study fees	RM 1,100.00 (add RM 200.00 if IT course)
Medical services	RM 50.00
Student's welfare	RM 133.00
Accommodation	RM 540.00 (room for 2 person)
Library	RM 60.00
Dental services	RM 30.00
Sport	RM 40.00
Computer	RM 75.00
TOTAL = RM 2,028.00	

BALANCE FOR STUDENT = RM 4,472.00

Monthly estimation for a student's expenses in NUM, Sintok.

Appendix 2

Six items of brand consciousness scale used in current study

Instructions: This section contains statements on different interests and priorities some consumers have on apparel purchasing. Please read each statement and circle the number next to the response indicating how much you agree or disagree with the statement as a description of you. You should only check one box per statement. By completing this survey, you are providing your consent to participate in this study.

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
1. I pay attention to the brand names of the clothes I buy.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Brand names tell me something about the quality of the clothing.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Brand names tell me something about how 'cool' an item of clothing is.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Sometimes I am willing to pay more money for clothing because of its brand name.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Brand name clothes that cost a lot of money are good quality.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I pay attention to the brand names of most of the products I buy.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix 3

Single item of media exposure instrument with four subitems

During a typical week, how much time do you spent in the following activities? Please circle the appropriate answer.

	<i>Very Often</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
1. Watching TV	1	2	3	4	5
2. Listening to CDs / tapes / radio	1	2	3	4	5
3. Spending time online	1	2	3	4	5
4. At the movies	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix 4

Ten items of parental influence scale used in current study

How agreed have you on each of the following 5–point rating scales. Indicate your response by circling one of the ranking from ‘Strongly Disagree’ (1) to ‘Strongly Agree’ (5) of each statement.

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
1. I make buying decisions on items for the whole family.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Low price is more important than brand name when buying clothes.	1	2	3	4	5
3. My parents/guidance and I agree on what I should wear.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My parents/guidance choose the clothes they buy for me.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I think my parents/guidance should have a say in what I buy.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I like to go shopping with my parents/guidance.	1	2	3	4	5
7. What my parents/guidance think is more important than what my friends think.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I buy the same brands as my parents/guidance.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I value my parents/guidance’ opinions on what I buy.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I talk to my parents/guidance about products.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix 5

Ten items of peer influence scale used in current study

How agreed have you on each of the following 5–point rating scales. Indicate your response by circling one of the ranking from ‘Strongly Disagree’ (1) to ‘Strongly Agree’ (5) of each statement.

		<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
1.	It bothers me when my friends have something I don't have.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	My parents let me buy the brand of shoes I want.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I like commercials with sports stars.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	It is important for me to fit in with my friends.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	I buy the same brands as my friends.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	What my friends think is more important than what my parents think.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	I like to wear what my friends are wearing.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	I know how to get my parents to buy me what I want.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Being popular is important.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Successful people wear name brands.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix 6

Reliability analyses of the measurement scales

Scale of brand consciousness

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.859	6

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Brand names of clothes	3.15	.978	230
Quality of clothing	3.04	.888	230
How cool an item of	3.30	.967	230
Sometimes I am willing	3.17	.932	230
Brand name clothes	3.24	.945	230
Brand names of most	3.12	.968	230

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Brand names of clothes	15.88	13.417	.639	.838
Quality of clothing	15.99	13.733	.673	.832
How cool an item of	15.73	13.658	.609	.843
Sometimes I am willing	15.85	13.576	.656	.835
Brand name clothes	15.78	13.568	.645	.837
Brand names of most	15.90	13.231	.679	.830

Scale of parental influence

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.814	10

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Make buying decision	2.98	.969	230
Low price important	2.90	.956	230
My parents and I agree	3.31	.819	230
My parents choose	3.23	.853	230
My parents have a say	3.23	.821	230
Shopping with my parents	3.13	.765	230
My parents important	3.26	.825	230
Same brands as parents	3.13	.852	230
Value parents' opinion	3.22	.900	230
Talk about products	3.25	.817	230

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Make buying decision	28.65	22.158	.499	.797
Low price important	28.73	23.942	.298	.821
My parents and I agree	28.32	23.248	.473	.800
My parents choose	28.40	22.372	.563	.790
My parents have a say	28.40	23.098	.492	.798
Shopping with my parents	28.50	23.037	.548	.792
My parents important	28.37	23.257	.466	.800
Same brands as parents	28.50	22.801	.507	.796
Value parents' opinion	28.41	21.893	.587	.787
Talk about products	28.38	22.779	.539	.793

Scale of peer influence

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.826	10

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
It bothers me	3.12	.934	230
My parents let me buy	3.06	.837	230
I like commercials	3.33	.874	230
It is important for me	3.36	.828	230
I buy the same brands	3.25	.947	230
What my friends think	3.17	.926	230
I like to wear	3.24	.917	230
I know how to get	3.17	.864	230
Being popular is important	3.28	1.007	230
Successful people	3.31	1.018	230

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
It bothers me	29.18	27.239	.475	.814
My parents let me buy	29.24	28.646	.379	.822
I like commercials	28.97	26.890	.561	.805
It is important for me	28.93	27.598	.512	.810
I buy the same brands	29.04	26.234	.578	.803
What my friends think	29.13	27.351	.468	.814
I like to wear	29.05	26.539	.568	.804
I know how to get	29.12	28.422	.388	.822
Being popular is important	29.02	25.519	.610	.799
Successful people	28.98	25.912	.559	.805

Appendix 7

Results of independent-samples *t*-test by gender on socialization agents

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Watching TV	Male	63	3.16	1.066	.134
	Female	167	3.53	1.186	.092
Listening CDs/tapes/radio	Male	63	3.52	1.075	.135
	Female	167	3.92	1.103	.085
Spending time online	Male	63	3.22	1.007	.127
	Female	167	3.72	1.113	.086
At the movie	Male	63	2.95	1.023	.129
	Female	167	2.86	1.281	.099
MeanParent	Male	63	3.0111	.62479	.07872
	Female	167	3.2204	.47282	.03659
MeanPeer	Male	63	2.9762	.56217	.07083
	Female	167	3.3251	.54780	.04239

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Watching TV	Equal variances assumed	7.196	.008	-2.192	228	.029	-.374	.171	-.711	-.038
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.301	123.429	.023	-.374	.163	-.696	-.052
Listening CDs/tapes/radio	Equal variances assumed	.105	.747	-2.459	228	.015	-.398	.162	-.718	-.079
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.487	114.253	.014	-.398	.160	-.716	-.081
Spending time online	Equal variances assumed	5.091	.025	-3.092	228	.002	-.496	.160	-.813	-.180
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.236	122.611	.002	-.496	.153	-.800	-.193
At the movie	Equal variances assumed	9.233	.003	.534	228	.594	.096	.180	-.258	.451
	Equal variances not assumed			.591	138.961	.555	.096	.163	-.225	.418
MeanParent	Equal variances assumed	.191	.663	-2.729	228	.007	-.20925	.07667	-.36033	-.05817
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.411	90.113	.018	-.20925	.08680	-.38170	-.03680
MeanPeer	Equal variances assumed	.901	.344	-4.278	228	.000	-.34896	.08158	-.50970	-.18822
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.228	109.142	.000	-.34896	.08254	-.51255	-.18536

Appendix 8

Results of one-way ANOVA by ethnicity on socialization agents

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Watching TV	Between Groups	4.401	3	1.467	1.084	.357
	Within Groups	305.986	226	1.354		
	Total	310.387	229			
Listening CDs/tapes/radio	Between Groups	29.406	3	9.802	8.806	.000
	Within Groups	251.555	226	1.113		
	Total	280.961	229			
Spending time online	Between Groups	11.363	3	3.788	3.187	.025
	Within Groups	268.567	226	1.188		
	Total	279.930	229			
At the movie	Between Groups	4.215	3	1.405	.952	.416
	Within Groups	333.615	226	1.476		
	Total	337.830	229			
MeanParent	Between Groups	1.241	3	.414	1.506	.214
	Within Groups	62.075	226	.275		
	Total	63.316	229			
MeanPeer	Between Groups	1.557	3	.519	1.598	.191
	Within Groups	73.422	226	.325		
	Total	74.979	229			

Appendix 9

Results of independent-samples *t*-test by gender on brand consciousness

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MeanBrand	Male	63	2.9788	.80794	.10179
	Female	167	3.2435	.68052	.05266

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
MeanBrand	Equal variances assumed	.161	.688	-2.495	228	.013	-.26468	.10607	-.47369	-.05567
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.309	97.032	.023	-.26468	.11461	-.49214	-.03722

Appendix 10

Results of one-way ANOVA by ethnicity on brand consciousness

ANOVA

MeanBrand

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	12.521	3	4.174	8.732	.000
Within Groups	108.030	226	.478		
Total	120.551	229			

Appendix 11: Pearson correlation coefficient analysis

Correlations

		Watching TV	Listening CDs/tapes/ radio	Spending time online	At the movie	MeanParent	MeanPeer	MeanBrand
Watching TV	Pearson Correlation	1	.249(**)	.157(*)	.252(**)	.015	.017	-.081
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.017	.000	.825	.799	.218
	N	230	230	230	230	230	230	230
Listening CDs/tapes/radio	Pearson Correlation	.249(**)	1	.474(**)	-.065	.251(**)	.109	-.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000	.326	.000	.098	.765
	N	230	230	230	230	230	230	230
Spending time online	Pearson Correlation	.157(*)	.474(**)	1	.067	.143(*)	.254(**)	.067
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.017	.000	.	.309	.030	.000	.314
	N	230	230	230	230	230	230	230
At the movie	Pearson Correlation	.252(**)	-.065	.067	1	-.366(**)	-.315(**)	-.369(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.326	.309	.	.000	.000	.000
	N	230	230	230	230	230	230	230
MeanParent	Pearson Correlation	.015	.251(**)	.143(*)	-.366(**)	1	.368(**)	.134(*)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.825	.000	.030	.000	.	.000	.043
	N	230	230	230	230	230	230	230
MeanPeer	Pearson Correlation	.017	.109	.254(**)	-.315(**)	.368(**)	1	.486(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.799	.098	.000	.000	.000	.	.000
	N	230	230	230	230	230	230	230
MeanBrand	Pearson Correlation	-.081	-.020	.067	-.369(**)	.134(*)	.486(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.218	.765	.314	.000	.043	.000	.
	N	230	230	230	230	230	230	230

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

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

