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ABSTRACT

Drawing on the theory of dogmatism and personality traits, this research examines the consumers’ shopping behavior and intentions. We propose a model, which incorporates the precepts of stubbornness and retail purchasing conduct. Data were gathered from 446 shoppers in India and analyzed using partial least squares-structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM). The findings indicate that consumers’ personality, purchaser conduct, narrowing conduct, and dependability influence their buying behavior. Moreover, consumers’ purchasing goals are influenced by assurance, customization, brand value, and social appeal. The study has practical implications for marketing managers who are focusing on customers with dogmatic behavior.

1. Introduction

Dogmatism is a personality trait with which a person believes that the information, knowledge, experience, and concepts that he/she has are correct. Their belief is only in their own opinion, despite evidence to the contrary (Laghari et al., 2016; Sarker et al., 2013). Altemeyer (2002) describes it as a generally outlandish, unchangeable conviction. The concept of dogmatism has been widely studied in prior research in the areas of politics (Al Ganidh & Good, 2016; Rathnayake & Winter 2017) and religion (Schnabel, 2018). However, some studies discussed how dogmatism affects customers’ retail shopping behavior (Sidorchuk et al., 2018; Cavisgil et al., 2016). In the context of marketing, dogmatism restricts an individual’s openness to unfamiliar products, services, or ideas (Sharma, 2008). Marketers need to understand trends and psychological thinking in consumer behavior and specifically for young consumers, and in which situations dogmatism could be a milestone for change as they are progressive and concern with product brand status (Kamram, 2012). Understanding customers’ dogmatic behavior is helpful for marketers, as it helps them to understand how to change the opinions of individuals who are against a brand.

This study analyzes the factors affecting dogmatism and the effects of dogmatism on young consumers’ behavioral intentions to shop. We analyze the effects of personality traits of dogmatism and the related variables on consumers’ intentions to buy. More specifically, the study focuses on dogmatism among young consumers, as this segment presents a challenge for many companies. Young customers think and shop differently than their parents in terms of their personality traits, shopping behaviors, preferences, and expectations (Sidorchuk et al., 2018; Mahapatra, 2017; Ameen, Hosany and Tarhini, 2021a). Previous studies highlighted that the behavior of millennial consumers, particularly those young consumers in their 20s, is worth examining when studying buying behavior, as the influential nature of youth tends to bring a shift in the future market scenario (Boisvert & Ashill, 2018; Cavusgil et al., 2018; Gou, 2013; Swoboda et al., 2012). The study offers theoretical contributions as we propose a new model which includes the components that can invoke dogmatism among young consumers. In addition, the study has practical implications for organizations that are focusing on targeting young consumers with tendency to demonstrate dogmatic behavior.

2. Literature review and theoretical foundation

2.1. Theory of dogmatism

In the context of marketing, dogmatism can be defined as the propensity to set standards without considering proof or assessments of other individuals toward a particular brand. Advertising strategists need to comprehend buyers’ decision-making processes in a progressively...
prescient and exhaustive way. Dogmatic consumers may follow their ideas as blindly as some follow a religion, without first acquiring other information about the product or the company (Delener, 1990). These sorts of mental systems underlie various strong feelings and point of views (Gervais, 2015). When associated with dogmatic belief, buying behavior varies among individuals, depending on their ethical and religious backgrounds (Harris, 2014).

Dogmatism influences human behavior, making such people more confident while purchasing. They tend to stick to the same brand and to the belief that the selected brand is the only one that will serve their purpose and satisfy them. Consumers driven by dogmatism do not just purchase for themselves, they also influence others to purchase the same product playing their role in formation of a social norm.

Personality is an outcome of the environment surrounding the individual (Onu & Garvey, 2014). As the environment surrounding changes, the individual’s personality and buying behavior change too. The concept here is that peoples’ buying nature is influenced by the ecosystem and the background they belong to. There is a relationship between individuals’ personalities and their buying behavior, which is essential for companies to understand if they want to rule the market. Kamran (2012) recommended that the suitability of purchaser demonstrating dogmatism predicts purchaser reliability, as they are progressively stressed over and concerned with product and status.

Different researchers have described the term dogmatism in different ways, and their results have proven positive many times when tested quantitatively (Blake et al., 1976; Sharma, 2008; Goldsmith et al., 2015; Kossowska et al., 2017). This concept is applied to different contexts such as personality, buying behavior, and religious effects, as dogmatic consumers are now open to new changes (Orji et al., 2017). Individuals who are influenced by dogmatism are usually more concerned with a brand image and product credibility than those who are not influenced by dogmatism (Gaustad et al., 2019). Dogmatism is a personality trait that shows that there is a receptiveness to attempt to embrace new things which are available. Table 1 provides examples of studies that have focused on dogmatism.

Dogmatism has been studied using various means in the existing literature. An assortment of scales has been utilized to quantify it in various settings. For instance, Troldhal and Powell (1965) considered the scale of things dependent on a set form of opinion, trying to explain unyieldingness as a shut psychological style separate from political undertones. Webster and Kruglanski (1994) developed a scale for unyieldingness involving 42 items. The scale included five main areas, specifically, tendency toward demand, tendency for consistency, definitiveness, burden with vulnerability, and close-mindedness. Jarvis and Petty (1996) considered individuals’ needs to assess utilizing a 16-things scale, (e.g., “It is critical to me to hold solid feelings.”). Altemeyer (2002) proposed a scale for measuring stubbornness based on 20 items.

3. Hypothesis development

This section is designed to develop the theoretical model and to derive the hypotheses. Fig. 1 demonstrates the model proposed for use in this study.

3.1. Dogmatism

According to Battaly (2018), dogmatism is a sort of closed-mindedness. It is a reluctance to connect earnestly with available options. Furthermore, customers tend to have a belief about their narrow-mindedness and their resistance for other brands. It also acts as a close intellectual belief about their choices (German, 2019). Swimberghe et al. (2009) found that religious commitment positively influences loyalty to a specific store. Furthermore, Sharma (2008) showed that narrow behavior, personality and dogmatism are positively related to positive buying intention.

Consumer religiosity toward a selected brand is a consequence of consumer activism and makes consumers more loyal toward it (Arli et al., 2020). Leak et al. (2015) found that political stances affect consumers’ brand attitudes, leaving them with the germinating thought of dogmatism (Chan & Ilicic, 2019). This creates negative demeanor among some consumer segments as they focus to some specific attributes only. According to Goldsmith et al. (2015), a dogmatic trait showcases openness and a willingness to adopt new things which is free from any type of influence. Furthermore, Shimp and Sharma (1987) have proposed a positive relationship between ethnocentrism and dogmatism, which encourages the urge to try new things. Therefore, we propose:

H1. There is a significant and positive influence of dogmatic behavior on the purchase intentions of young consumers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Positive or negative effect of dogmatism?</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blake et al. (1970)</td>
<td>Dogmatism and acceptance of new products</td>
<td>Quantitative research</td>
<td>Positive effect</td>
<td>Dogmatism is positively related to the choice of the products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma (2008)</td>
<td>Dogmatism and online consumption</td>
<td>Quantitative research</td>
<td>Positive effect, but for online customers, it is negative</td>
<td>The discoveries of the examination demonstrated a negative connection between dogmatism and online consumption. Results indicated that people with low dogmatism would, in general, take part in online utilization essentially more than people with high dogmatism scores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmith et al. (2015)</td>
<td>Dogmatism and innovativeness</td>
<td>Qualitative research</td>
<td>Positive effect</td>
<td>It seems to be right that the nature of dogmatism is free from any political influence and perfect for a mature population. No significant effect of dogmatism and consumer buying behavior because the customers do not buy the same apparel but try new and update things regularly. Dogmatic customers are easier influenced to buy products and new brands if presented in advertising in an authoritative manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orji et al. (2017)</td>
<td>Impact of personality factors on consumer buying behavior toward textile materials</td>
<td>Qualitative research</td>
<td>Negative effect but accepts new products</td>
<td>No significant effect of dogmatism and consumer buying behavior because the customers do not buy the same apparel but try new and update things regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gherasim and Gherasim (2013)</td>
<td>Client’s characteristics – Behavior factors</td>
<td>Quantitative research</td>
<td>Positive effect</td>
<td>Dogmatic customers are easier influenced to buy products and new brands if presented in advertising in an authoritative manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottati et al. (2015)</td>
<td>The earned dogmatism effects.</td>
<td>Quantitative research</td>
<td>Positive effect</td>
<td>Results strongly supported the earned dogmatism hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rittik (2013)</td>
<td>linking belief inconsistency and religious commitment with dogmatism</td>
<td>Quantitative research</td>
<td>Positive effect</td>
<td>The results are favoring dogmatism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarker et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Influence of personality in buying consumer goods</td>
<td>Quantitative research</td>
<td>Positive effect</td>
<td>There is a high degree of correlation between new products and diversification and accepting new products. The results showcase that uncertain intolerance is positively related to the belief and mindset of dogmatic personalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kossowska et al. (2017)</td>
<td>Many faces of dogmatism</td>
<td>Quantitative research</td>
<td>Positive effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. Personality

Personality is a blend of traits or qualities that all structure an individual’s unmistakable character (Paul & Srivastava, 2016). When attempting to understand the buying behavior and intentions of a young consumer, it is important to understand personality traits (Cervone, 2005). For a considerable length of time, interest has been centered around recognizing the elements that determine a buyer’s inclination for local items in contrast to remote items (Fischer & Roth, 2017). Previous studies found that impetuous purchasing is connected to neuroticism (enthusiastic insecurity; Onu & Garvey, 2014), which indicates that buyers who experience passionate unsteadiness, nervousness, grumpiness, and trouble are bound to occupy themselves with reckless purchasing conduct (Shahjehan et al., 2012). According to Bratko et al. (2013), a dogmatic nature leads to rash purchasing inclinations, whereas earlier studies indicated that consumers had restricted choices (Egan & Taylor, 2010; Lin, 2010). Blake et al. (1970) found a positive causal relationship between consumers’ personalities and their adaption to new things on the market which the consumer wishes to purchase.

It is more worthwhile to focus on young consumers as established purchasers in terms of their choices (Chawla & Sondhi, 2016). Character is a prevalent measure for understanding clients’ shopping conduct (Srinivasan et al., 2002). Purchaser character has been studied in different settings using diverse assessment instruments; for example, brand character, store character, and excess (Aaker, 1997; Das, 2014; d’Astous & Levesque, 2003; Sung et al., 2015). Kollat and Reed (2007) explain that impulsive purchasing is practically coincidential conduct when it is related to passionate inclinations in shopping. When assessing buyers’ inclinations toward their most regular purchases, a breakdown of socio-segment factors should be considered, as these play an important role in purchase behavior and dogmatism. For example: age, sexual orientation, level of training, and level of income have been identified as important socio-segment factors (Al Ganideh & Good, 2016; Garcia-Gallego & Mera, 2016; Fernández-Ferrín & Bande-Vilela, 2013; Erdogan & Uzkurt, 2010; Caruana, 1996). Thus, we propose:

**H1a.** There is a significant and positive influence of consumer personality on the dogmatic behavior of young consumers.

3.3. Consumer behavior

It is important to understand how consumers select, buy, use, and services which satisfy their requirements (Ameen, Hosany, & Paul, 2021; Carducci et al., 2020), pp. 581–586; Hill, 2018; Pham and Sun, 2020). Verplanken and Herabadi (2001) found that an inevitable and impulsive buying are the part of one’s character, which leads to impetuous purchasing conduct. In a much-related examination coordinated by Shahjehan et al. (2012), it was seen that impulsive buying was well-connected with neuroticism (enthusiastic unsteadiness). This demonstrates that shoppers who experience insecurity, nervousness, and fractiousness are bound to display impulsive purchasing conduct, and if their satisfaction level was met, this turned to dogmatic tendencies. Sharma (2008) stated that narrow behavior, personality, and dogmatism are positively related to positive buying intentions (Gupta et al., 2021).

Additionally, the way that character is unsparing and enduring can assist advertisers as they can try to use personality types to attract purchasers by perceiving which character traits impact specific shopper reactions (Madzharov, 2019; Badgaiyan & Verma, 2014; Larsen & Buss, 2010). Dogmatism is a personality trait in which sometimes a person’s background is a factor in developing such behavior. The individuals believes that the information, knowledge, experience, and concepts that they carry are accurate, and they also want others to feel the same (Hult et al., 2019; Sarker et al., 2013). Therefore, we propose:

**H1b.** There is a significant and positive influence of consumer buying behavior on the dogmatic behavior of young consumers.

3.4. Narrowing behavior

Narrowing behavior among consumers refers to the level to which buyers narrow their list of choices from the available products and resources (Husain et al., 2016). Such narrowing behavior of consumers helps firms to identify customers’ choices, and they can frame their future policies accordingly. Consumer buying decisions can vary based on consumers’ gender, age, attitude, perception, quality, and motivation (Van der Lans et al., 2016; Oleson, 2004; Schaninger & Danko, 1993).

Personal choices of dogmatic customers are not influenced by their income or other parameters (Adams & Jiang, 2017; DellaPost et al., 2015), whereas narrowing behavior creates rigidness in the pattern of consumption (Klostad et al., 2012; Eastwick et al., 2009). Previous studies show a high degree of consistency and rigidness in the choices as many studies are conducted in Western countries; however, dogmatism is a global phenomena (Aspelund et al., 2013; Caprara et al., 2006; Piurko et al., 2011). Hence, we propose:

**H1c.** There is a significant and positive influence of narrowing behavior on the dogmatic behavior of young consumers.

3.5. Trustworthiness of brand

The trustworthiness of a brand refers to the consumers’ belief about the product. Such a belief can lead to dogmatic nature in the consumer. McGinnies and Ward (1980) explained that a reliable communicator is more persuasive than an unreliable one, regardless of whether he/she is an expert or not. Jain and Posavac (2001) contemplated that source believability affects the receipt of experience claims. The believability, dependability, and ability of the association emphatically affect customers’ frame of mind toward advertising (Goldsmith et al., 2015; Lafferty et al., 2002; Lafferty & Goldsmith, 1999).

Credibility refers to the quality and other attributes that a brand
possess, which indirectly affect the overall demand of the brand and customers’ purchase intentions (Hillenbrand et al., 2019; Amos et al., 2008; Lafferty et al., 2002). Believability comprises of four components: skill, trustworthiness, credibility, and reliability, to establish a separate critical factor for buyers’ intentions (Pecher & van Dantzig, 2016; Tsoumakas et al., 2014). This shows that customers tend to trust their own choices. Therefore, we propose:

**H1d.** There is a significant and positive impact of the trustworthiness of a brand on the dogmatic conduct of young consumers.

### 3.6. Assurance

Assurance supplements the impact of affirmation on the buyer’s side to have a strong belief in certain products. Also, it let them to buy them blindly. Assurance is the keen determination to buy a specific product due to reasons such as price, convenience, and need. Swaid and Wigand (2009) explained that it is necessary to study assurance, personalization, and consumer behavior to extend the relationship with customers. Assurance proclaims guarantee and mollify buyers that assistance will be provided, and that shoppers’ concerns and issues will be settled. Arcand et al. (2007) argue that assurance is an essential instrument in helping online customers and making them loyal toward a specific product or brand (Herhausen et al., 2019; Chung et al., 2018). Kimery and McCord (2002) consented to apply the outsider’s models and utilize explicit innovation. Assurance is a critical aspect that is utilized in website content to influence the buyers and their decisions. Therefore, we propose:

**H2a.** There is a significant and positive influence of assurance on the purchase intentions of youth consumers.

### 3.7. Customization

Customization refers to the alteration made to a product or service to suit customers’ specific needs and preferences (Ameen, Hosany, & Paul, 2021; Kim & Han, 2014; Teeny et al., 2020). This can lead to dogmatic customer behavior, where they will have the exact product of their choice. Here, promoting products should be based on the consumer’s buying behavior, which fits as per their needs increase brand loyalty (Hughes, 2019). Accordingly, both buyers and sellers gain brand loyalty, which helps the customer to regularly shop from a particular brand (Lim et al., 2021; Molesworth et al., 2017; Park & Chen, 2007). Goldsmith et al. (2015) proposed that brands can succeed quickly if they adjust to the clients’ perspective, however, the behavior of dogmatic customers does not shift quickly. Purchase intentions are required for the acknowledgment of individual conditions, where brands have the chance to influence customers’ behavior (Ameen et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2013). Therefore, we propose:

**H2b.** There is a significant and positive influence of customization on the purchase intention of the youth.

### 3.8. Brand value

A brand’s value can be measured in terms of how much extra people will pay, or how often they choose one brand over the alternatives. It assesses worth, and such worth sometimes creates a demand for a product in the eyes of customers who could become dogmatic in nature.

(Crjri et al., 2017). Shoppers are more likely to set up long-term relationships with brands if these brands deliver value (Brakus et al., 2009). Brand esteem is the general assessment of the value of an extravagant brand (Caridael et al., 2019; Johnson et al., 2019; Lee & Watkins, 2016; Miller & Mills, 2012; Paul, 2020; Joshi and Garg, 2021). Brands are increasingly positioning themselves as entities embodied in pronounced values, and the buyers’ brand esteem fit is evident in customers’ endeavors to maintain a specific image (Sichtmann et al., 2019; Sodergen, 2021).

According to Hollebeek et al. (2014), it is essential to study brand value. Brand value and usefulness are necessary for consumers while purchasing. In addition, the value and satisfaction that a consumer receives helps the customer to drive their unchangeable behavior toward their choices (Blessing & Natter, 2019; Halkias et al., 2016; Dimoff et al., 2008). Value from products influences experiences, similar to the way that pre-led factors, such as price and brand image influence a specific purchase (Gielens & Steenkamp, 2019; Moreira et al., 2017). Combining brand worth and brand-client relationships quantifies customers’ views of extravagant brands. Brand extravagance demonstrates shoppers’ impressions of emblematic glory. Therefore, we propose:

**H2c.** There is a significant influence of brand value on the purchase intentions of youth consumers.

### 3.9. Social appeal

Social appeal is as an influential uniqueness that leads to preferences among the products and also the buying patterns are influenced by social identities and perception (Persaud et al., 2017; Tariq et al., 2019). The social appeal of a product is one of the publicizing methodologies that advertising experts use to convince individuals to purchase an item, or to pay for assistance. If such behavior can convince customers, they will be more loyal to that particular brand. Lynn and Harris (1997) revealed that social appeal can influence customers’ buying behavior. Zahid et al. (2018) recommended understanding consumers’ purchasing decisions while strategizing the market (Oliver & Lee, 2010). This conforms to the changing conduct within an age that shows that customers are more committed to their choices (Pickett-Baker & Ozaki, 2008). Consumers’ purchase intention has a significant impact on their dogmatic behavior while buying (Pickett-Baker & Ozaki, 2008; Pickett-Baker & Ozaki, 2008) and it develops a definite tendency in their minds.

Zahid et al. (2018) proposed that consumer conduct concerning items, decisions, and utilization is extraordinarily impacted by the assessments of others (Bearden & Rose, 1990). Shoppers tend to create and understand the usefulness of items when they communicate with others and accumulate dogmatic-related data (Oliver & Lee, 2010). This change is social appeal agrees with the changing conduct within an age (Pickett-Baker & Ozaki, 2008; Pickett-Baker & Ozaki, 2008), and may frame a contributing component toward the inclination for dogmatic products (Banerjee, 1992). For instance, green and recyclable products are important to environmentally conscious customers and it is part of their way of living (Pickett-Baker & Ozaki, 2008; Pickett-Baker & Ozaki, 2008). Therefore, we hypothesize:

**H2d.** There is a significant influence of social appeal on the purchase intentions of young consumers.

### 4. Method

We adopted a quantitative approach within which data is collected via a survey. The respondents were selected by Judgmental Sampling. This was additionally founded on reactions gathered from primary respondents, and afterward, references were taken from them. Responses were collected from shoppers in shopping centers in the National Capital Region of India as it has highest number of small and large shopping centers (Sharma et al., 2020). A total of 1266 polls was disseminated in this examination. Out of these, 446 useable surveys were created. Incomplete responses were eliminated from the analysis.

### 5. Data analysis

A self-report questionnaire was used to collect data from the respondents simultaneously; therefore, after inspecting the measurement model, a common method variance test was applied to ensure that there was no common method bias. All the variables were loaded on a single
factor to evaluate the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) model’s fitness. Harman’s (1967) single factor test was employed to identify the possible presence of variance owing to the common method. The results indicated that a single factor accounted for 26% of the variance, which was less than 50% (the limit recommended by Podsakoff et al. (2003), indicating the non-presence of common method variance in data.

We assessed the normality of the data distribution through the skewness and kurtosis of every item using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Kwon & Trail, 2003).

We initially utilized exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to remove any irrelevant components identified with shopping thought processes and to affirm the number of elements removed by eigenvalues (Hair et al., 2011). A sum of 36 items from unyielding shopping inspirations was utilized. This brought 10 components with 32 items, and the remaining four factors were illuminated due to low factor loadings. These 10 elements altogether explained 69.8% of the variance.

Furthermore, CFA was applied to confirm the extracted elements. The analysis of the data through CFA confirmed the four proposed components to quantify narrow-minded shopping intentions. Finally, we adopted partial least squares-structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) to assess our proposed model.

5.1. Profile of respondents

Table 2 shows the profile of the respondents. The participants’ age ranged from 17 to 29 years. In addition, 56.3% were males, while 43.7% were females. Furthermore, 29.8% of the participants were married, while 70.2% were single.

5.2. Measurement model

The structural model was assessed using Smart PLS 3.0 software (Ringle et al., 2005; Dash & Paul, 2021). Table 3 shows that there are no issues in terms of reliability as the composite reliability and Cronbach’s alpha values were above 0.70 (Hair et al., 2011).

In addition, the factor loadings were found to be higher than 0.70 as per acceptable limits (Hair et al., 2017). The outcomes introduced in Table 3 show that all the factor loadings have more than 0.7, aside from variables NB1, CB4, SA3 and PI3 with lower values, so that they were from the further analysis. The average variance extracted (AVE) value was measured to access the convergent validity and the results were found to be above then threshold value of 0.5 (Bagozzi et al., 1991). The estimation of AVE ranges between 0.538 and 0.720, which is more than the cutoff estimation of 0.5 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Factor loadings and reliability are reported in Table 3. Discriminant validity results are given in Table 4.

Results of the structural model estimates are reported in Table 5, whereas Table 4 portrays discriminant legitimacy, which shows that the relationship between developing relationship esteem was not exactly the square foundation of the AVE for that build. Aside from this, the outcomes likewise indicated that there is a positive relationship among all the dormant factors. This is determined by contrasting the normal differences clarified (AVE) with the squared connection for each of the develops (Hair et al., 2011).

5.3. Structural model

For the way investigation, we applied an underlying condition demonstrating; i.e., PLS displaying utilizing SmartPLS 2.0 (Ringle et al., 2005). Because of its strength, the factor weighing meant inward weighing (Henseler & Chin, 2010). Thus, the outcomes show that the proposed model has sufficient informative force. The normalized root implies that the square remaining (standardized root mean residual; SRMR) was discovered to be 0.069, which is beneath the basic estimation of 0.085, bringing about the great informative intensity of the model (Henseler & Chin, 2010).

The consequences of Table 5 portrayed that overbearing conduct had a huge and positive effect on young people’s aims to search for all the sub-gatherings. Subsequently, H1 was acknowledged. Results likewise showed that reliability has a huge and positive effect on opinionated shopping conduct. Subsequently, H1a was acknowledged. Consequences of the way examination indicated that there was a...


Table 4
Discriminant validity results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>PER</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>CUST</th>
<th>BV</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>PI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRUST</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N B</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>–0.131</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>–0.069</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>–0.021</td>
<td>–0.118</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>–0.136</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUST</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>–0.035</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>–0.002</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>–0.032</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>–0.006</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Diagonal values are the square root of AVE.

Table 5
Results of the structural model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std β</td>
<td>t-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1 Dogmatic behavior → Purchase intention</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>3.377**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1a Trustworthiness → Dogmatism</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>2.587**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b Narrowing Behavior → Dogmatism</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>2.152*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1c Personality → Dogmatism</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>2.984**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1d Consumer Behavior → Dogmatism</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>2.537*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a Assurance → Purchase intention</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>2.724*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b Customization → Purchase intention</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>2.184*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2c Brand value → Purchase intention</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>2.649**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2d Social Appeal → Purchase intention</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>2.094*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Significant at the p < 0.05 level; **significant at the p < 0.01 level.

The huge effect of narrowing conduct over the firm conduct of clients due to rigidity in the choices and consistency as per dogmatic behavior. Consequently, H1b was acknowledged. The consequences of way examination indicated that the character of a shopper has critical and positive effects on one-sided shopping conduct. Therefore, H1c was acknowledged. Further, results indicated that shopper conduct has a critical and positive effect on clients’ obstinate conduct. Thus, H1d was acknowledged.

Moreover, confirmation was found to have a critical and positive effect on the buying expectations of a purchaser while purchasing. In this way, H2a was acknowledged. After-effects of the way investigation likewise uncovered that customization has a critical and positive effect on adolescents’ buy expectations. Accordingly, H2b was acknowledged. Ultimately, the outcomes portrayed that there is a critical and positive effect of brand worth and social allure on the buying expectations of the shopper to purchase. Henceforth, H2c and H2d were acknowledged as well.

5.4. Common method bias test

A self-report questionnaire was used to collect data from the respondents simultaneously; therefore, after inspecting the measurement model, a common method variance test was applied to ensure that there was no common method bias. All the variables were loaded on a single factor to evaluate the CFA model’s fitness. Harman’s (1967) single factor test was employed to identify the possible presence of variance owing to the common method. Results indicated that a single factor accounted for 26% of the variance, which was less than 50% (the limit recommended by Podsakoff et al., 2003), indicating the non-presence of common method variance in data.

6. Discussion

The aim of this study is to identify the factors affecting young consumers buying behavior and to recognize the most persuasive components of dogmatic behavior among these consumers. The results show that personality, consumer buying behavior, and trustworthiness are found to be the most important factors, and it also helps in narrowing down the conduct of an individual thus marketers will have a better chance of survival and profit in the market. Clients look for personality, consumer buying behavior, trustworthiness, and narrowing of ideas to assist them in accelerating the sales process.

According to Onu and Garvey (2014), personality is the outcome of the environment, and as the environment changes, people’s personalities can change too. Consumers’ dogmatic behavior is an outcome of certain personality types. Vakola et al. (2004) state that extraversion, openness, attitude changes, and control of emotions are the constituents of personality, and such traits help marketers to have significant insights to establish marketing strategies (Blake et al., 1970). The relationship between a dogmatic personality trait and the acceptance of a new product on the market by the consumer always depends upon the nature of the product which the consumer wishes to buy. The second most important factor is consumer buying behavior, which varies from one person to another (Larsen & Buss, 2010).

Furthermore, Larsen and Buss (2010) explain that advertisers cannot simply change the buying behavior of customers regarding the products available in the market. Badgaiyan and Verma (2014) show that one can impact customers’ buying behavior only if they can relate the product to their personality of some celebrity or influential person. This gives significance to the concept that personality is a trait of dogmatism, and that while formulating marketing strategies, one cannot ignore its importance.

Trustworthiness had a significant effect on dogmatism as it impacts consumers’ frames of mind toward the publicizing of the brand (Lafferty & Goldsmith, 1999). Similarly, credibility indirectly affects the general demeanor of consumers toward the brand, and buyers’ purchase expectations (Lafferty et al., 2002). Believability comprises two components: skill and trustworthiness.

Dogmatism is the behavior of stating one’s opinions firmly and not being easily influenced by anyone else, although these choices can be modified by the passage of time. In general, the young consumers are reluctant to change their behavior, and in the future, the strategies which are currently being used by marketers will be obsolete for dogmatic prospective customers, such as the young consumer segment. Marketers need to adopt strategies where promotion and marketing are performed while keeping in mind the dogmatic nature of current customers, and also factors like personality, consumer buying behavior, trustworthiness, and narrowing of ideas. This will give them a new edge of vision where people are dogmatic and do not want to shift their choices easier, and this could help marketers better influence other customers and potential customers too.

7. Theoretical contributions and practical implications

7.1. Theoretical contributions

The theoretical contributions of this study can be summarized as
follows. It has addressed a gap in the literature, in terms of understanding the effect of dogmatism among young consumers on their purchase intentions. This research has proposed a new conceptual model integrating the factors affecting dogmatism among this segment of consumers, along with other factors that can directly affect customers’ purchase intentions along the lines of Higgins et al. (2019). The DOG Scale, as per Altemeyer (2002), need for closure scale (Webster & Kruglanski, 1994), need to evaluate (Jarvis & Petty, 1996), and dogmatism scale (Trolldahl & Powell, 1965) formed the basis of the proposed theoretical model. Our findings contribute to the existing literature by identifying and assessing the effects of the antecedents of dogmatism among young consumers: namely, personality, consumer behavior, narrowing behavior, and trustworthiness. Furthermore, our findings indicate that assurance, customization, brand value, and social appeal should also be taken into consideration when studying customers’ purchase intentions.

7.2. Managerial implications

This research shows that dogmatism is a significant factor for the user’s consumption and emerging marketing terminology where the revelations exhibit that young shoppers’ buying objectives are impacted by affirmation, customization, brand worth, and social allure. Our research calls for further attention to dogmatism and expanding consciousness of dogmatism among organizations to give more freedoms to sell. This research helps advertisers to acquire an alternate point of view for taking a different approach for convincing their customers’ tendencies and necessities, and it can assist them with effectively changing over it into monetary profit.

Advertisers with a desire to build deals can utilize the findings of this research to assist them with building up the best technique with regards to selling items in virtual universes and genuine commercial centers. To plan a successful technique, advertisers should concentrate on empowering clients to encounter firmness when they are purchasing products for themselves and other people while being available in a genuine market universe. This will go a long way to build their desire to buy items. Also, advertisers should consider the impact of social influence, since other clients’ convictions and demeanor go a long way in influencing clients’ decisions to buy items. Customization of the decision while remembering the unyielding conduct of purchasers also ought to be encouraged as this enables clients to satisfy their requirement for self-articulation and offers them the opportunity to have personal involvement with the market. Lastly, a simple, precise method for obtaining items in the market could be formulated with new horizons as a customized product market in any nation ought to be encouraged. This should be possible, for instance, by making an intuitive brand nearness in which clients can communicate both domestic and international products where different customers are looking forward toward different products, clients may then experience greater pleasure and perceive the tremendous conceivable outcomes for symbol customization with unreasonable conduct, which can emphatically influence their aim to shop in the forthcoming business sector situation.

8. Limitations and directions for future research

Despite the significance of this study, it has some limitations, which can be addressed in future studies. Firstly, our study is based on data from customers in shopping malls. Future researchers could collect data from young customers online, and assess the effect of dogmatism on their use of different technologies as part of their shopping experience. Furthermore, this research adopted a cross-sectional approach, where data was collected just at one point in time. Future researchers could adopt a longitudinal approach, where data is collected at different points in time and the results are compared. While the focus of this research has been young customers due to their significance in the market, future researchers could study the effects of dogmatism on older customers’ purchase intentions and compare the results.

Further, it was found that dogmatic consumers are more stable in their choice of the brand they are associated with and are capable of trying new options. Such characteristics of dogmatic consumers could be examined by the sellers when incorporating strategies for different areas, different consumers and different products will only generate profits for them. This study is based on young consumers because the youth constitute a critical group of consumers. Sellers need to strategize their marketing policies based on personality, consumer buying behavior, trustworthiness, and narrowing down the conduct of an individual. This will help them to survive for a longer period and be more profitable.

9. Conclusion

Based on buying behavior among consumers, we can conclude that dogmatic behavior is an important trait of young consumers. This study has identified the factors that can affect dogmatic traits among young consumers, which in turn will prove to be a changing agent in the market. Furthermore, this study provides a plethora of opportunities for targeting the buying behavior of dogmatic consumers in emerging markets. This has the potential to set the benchmark for marketing in developing countries that are offering major portfolios of sales for both buyers and consumers, who need to be targeted strategically.
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Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Measurement items</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrowing</td>
<td>I buy a product made in the home country</td>
<td>Guerrero et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavior</td>
<td>I prefer home countries product first, last and foremost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are you purchasing foreign products in your home country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>Do you Purchase Only native brands</td>
<td>Guerrero et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We should purchase products manufactured in our country instead of letting other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>countries get rich off us</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A true patriot should buy home country products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>I am extravert</td>
<td>Badgaiyan and Verma (2014); Onuand Garvey, (2014), Swaid and Wigand (2009); Mugge et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am open to experiment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I control my emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I change my attitude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am serious while shopping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Constructs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Measurement items</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sources</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customization</strong></td>
<td>customized products/services meet my needs better than standard ones</td>
<td>Margarita et al. (2006); Swaid and Wigand, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assurance</strong></td>
<td>The company has adequate security features</td>
<td>Swaid and Wigand (2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand value</strong></td>
<td>I feel a personal connection to the product of a particular brand</td>
<td>Hollebeeck et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social appeal</strong></td>
<td>The company behind the site is reputable</td>
<td>Lynn and Harris (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumer behavior</strong></td>
<td>New products hold no unique appeal for me</td>
<td>Hollebeeck et al. (2014); Eastman et al. (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purchase Intentions</strong></td>
<td>If I were going to purchase a product, I would consider buying this brand</td>
<td>Bian and Forsythe, S. (2012). Cha (2011) and Pavlou, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dogmatism</strong></td>
<td>A product is more valuable to me if it has some snob appeal</td>
<td>Ray (1970). Schulze (1962).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Note: The table above lists constructs in the order presented in the main text.*


