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ABSTRACT

This study was aimed at examining the relationships between culture and brand loyalty across culturally diverse groups in America. Two cultural dimensions were examined: Individualism vs. Collectivism and Masculinity vs. Femininity. The relationships between these two dimensions and brand loyalty were examined across five ethnic groups: Caucasians, African Americans, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic English and Hispanic Spanish. It was hypothesized that 1) ethnic groups that were more collectivist would display higher brand loyalty; and 2) ethnic groups that were more masculine would display higher brand loyalty.

It was found that cultural dimensions are predictors of brand loyalty and that African Americans were the most brand loyal ethnic group.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The United States is home to one of the largest multicultural populations in the world, it is the home of millions of people from varying countries, ethnicities and cultures. International migration over the years has established a foundation for what is now a very multicultural American population not only comprised of immigrants, but this population growth is fueled to a larger extent by several generations who have been born in the United States. This diversity presents a continuous challenge for marketers who constantly try to engage these consumers who represent a growing and increasingly powerful segment of the local market.

Foreign-born Americans and their American born descendants represent a diverse and expanding segment of the American consumer market; as this market grows, it continues to represent untapped potential for business. In order to capitalize on this opportunity however, we need to understand the market, they cannot be treated as one homogenous group but rather distinct sub segments of a larger whole. This in itself represents an enormous challenge for businesses across the country.

While America is home to a variety of ethnic groups, the largest and most recognized groups are Caucasians, Black/African Americans, Asian-Americans and Hispanic Americans. Each of these groups, while comprised of people from various countries and in some cases represent a mixture of races, they have certain common beliefs, values and traditions that make them similar enough to be considered part of a larger ethnic group.

Previous research has looked at the differences between ethnic groups and how these differences manifest themselves in the consumption of goods and services (Doran, 1994; Fisher, 1996; Morse, 2009; Shim & Gehrt, 1996). Past research has also looked at the cultural values of different ethnic groups and how these values influence their decision making processes and their consumption behavior. These include studies on clothing brand loyalty among Korean women (Oh & Fiorto, 2002), cultural differences in consumer decision making in Chinese consumers in Canada (Doran, 1994) and cross cultural similarities and differences in shopping for food (Brunso & Grunert, 1998). I however believe that multicultural research should also look at dimensions of cultures and how they relate to specific consumer behavior when compared across ethnic groups.
In this thesis I intend to explore the dimensions of culture, as identified by Geert Hofstede (Hofstede, 1991) and the possible relationships between these dimensions and brand loyalty. I will also look at the possible relationships between the Individualism vs. Collectivism, Masculinity vs. Femininity and Brand loyalty across major ethnic groups in the United States: Caucasians, African-Americans, Asian/Pacific Islander and Hispanic. While there are originally five dimensions: Individualism vs. Collectivism, Masculinity vs. Femininity, Uncertainty Avoidance, Power Distance and Long Term Orientation, Masculinity vs. Femininity and Individualism vs. Collectivism have been most widely used to differentiate among cultures. As a result, the scope of this initial research has been restricted these two dimensions. The data for this research was collected using an online multicultural survey that was conducted by DMS Insights and had a sample size of 2,500 respondents divided almost equally across the ethnic groups mentioned above.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The American Consumer Market

The United States Census Bureau (Humes, Jones & Ramirez, 2011) estimates that on April 1, 2010 there were 308.7 million persons residing in the United States, this is an increase of 27.3 million (9.7 %) over the population in 2000. Of this total, 50.5 million were Hispanics who represented 16% of the total population, 194.5 million (64%) were Caucasians, 38.9 million (13%) were Black/African American alone, 14.7 million (5%) were Asian, 0.5 million (0.2%) were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders, 19.1 (6%) million were from some other race and 9 million (3%) were from two or more races (Humes, Jones & Ramirez, 2011).

In the past decade, the multicultural population has grown at rates that exceed the Non-Hispanic White population, in fact, according to the 2010 Census (Humes, Jones & Ramirez, 2011), the Hispanic population alone grew by 15.2 million persons, accounting for over half of the total population growth of 27.3 million. The non-Hispanic population by comparison, grew by 5% (Humes, Jones & Ramirez, 2011).

The ethnic diversity of the United States is expected to significantly increase in the next 40 years with net international migration playing an important role in shaping changes in the size, growth rate, age structure and racial and ethnic composition of the United States population (Ortman & Guarneri, 2009). The Hispanic population is expected to more than double between 2000 and 2050 and the Asian population is expected to increase by 79% in the same period and the populations from other countries are also expected to continue to experience growth (Ortman & Guarneri, 2009). The Non-Hispanic white population is expected to decrease as a percentage of the overall population (Ortman & Guarneri, 2009). Ethnic groups normally considered minorities are on the path to becoming the majority; this means that they will represent a significant share of the market businesses need to target if they wish to be successful.

This diversity presents a challenge of US marketers; there are several ethnic groups in the United States and while some are larger than others, the fact that these groups are distinct and different will mean more research and more work to connect with them. Although this research
looks at four ethnic groups: Caucasians, Asians, Hispanics and Black/African American, there are many other ethnic groups that represent considerable market segments that merit further study.

**Race & Ethnicity in the US**

What constitutes these ethnic groups? Who are these people? What do they look like? Despite the racially-skewed names of the groups being investigated, it should be understood that ethnicity is not the same as race. Traditionally race has been a biological concept that is used to explain certain common physical characteristics which are passed on through generations. The term has however been misused and in some cases, race has become synonymous with class (Knight, 1996). Knight (1996) in his arguments against the stereotypical interpretations of the word made reference to the definition of race taken from the New Columbia Encyclopedia

“...the term race is inappropriate when applied to national, religious, geographic, linguistic, or cultural groups, nor can the biological criteria of race be equated with any mental characteristics such as personality or character”

Stern (1999) in a review of several articles in a special edition of the Journal Advertising, also found that multicultural researchers have not only rejected the biological definition of race, they go even further to question whether or not it can be even considered to be an easily identifiable physical attribute. Dawkins (2009) goes even further to suggest that race does not exist, which I believe is a sound argument. This evolution theorist purports that humans have evolved from animals and varying physical attributes are a function of adaptation to our natural environments over time. Multicultural researchers argue that race is not physical but ideological; blacks, they argue, are no more a race than Hispanics or Asians as they do not look the same, hail from various countries and different cultures (Stern, 1999). This perspective is one I fully support; one, I believe that is supported by not just the literature referenced above but also in the differences that are quite visible on a daily basis.

According to Knight (1996), considering ethnicity instead of race may help us to further our understanding of these groups. An ethnicity, loosely defined, is any group bound together by common ties such as language, race, nationality, culture or skin color who might feel themselves to be, or are considered to be an ethnic group (Knight, 1996). While some people from a specific ethnic group may have similar skin colors, and hail from the same country, this is by no means always case. Knight’s (1996) definition underlines the idea that there are many characteristics
that could possibly constitute ethnic group membership. It also draws our attention to the idea that ethnicity is both subjective and objective. While distinctive characteristics such as language and religion can be used as input into ethnic classifications, self-perception is equally important. Personal perceptions of belonging to a certain group will play a major role in ethnic group identification as people adopt the values, attitudes and behaviors of the groups to which they feel they belong; this may differ from the groupings that are normally done based on demographic characteristics such as language or race.

Stern (1996) also identified with an overlap between the subjective and objective schools of thought in current research; self-perception is seen as a major contributor to ethnic group identification but other demographic variables that are more objective, such as language or religion are also used as bases for ethnic groupings.

If we accept that ethnicity is more about shared meanings than physical characteristics or even nationalities, we can begin to understand why ethnicity and culture go hand in hand; shared cultural values is an important foundation of ethnic groups. Shim and Gehrt (1996) see ethnicity as a social structural variable that influences socialization processes and outcomes, which basically means that becomes the lens through which we interpret the world around us. Stern (1996) aptly describes its effects: “different cultural groups bring different interpretive styles to the media and that verbal/visual cues are decoded differently by various individuals”. In accepting that culture influences our perceptions, thought process and ultimately our behavior, we can now look at cultural dimensions.

**Cultural Dimensions**

There have been many definitions of culture over the years as researchers try to assess one of the most influential but elusive phenomena in Marketing. Fairchild (1970) defines culture as a set of socially acquired behavior patterns common to the members of a particular society or ongoing, large-scale human group. Rice (1993) developed a similar definition “the values, attitudes, beliefs, artifacts and other meaningful symbols represented in the pattern of life adopted by people that help them interpret, evaluate and communicate as members of a society”. Hofstede (1991) was able to coin a similar concept of culture in his definition “the collective mental programming of the people in an environment”.
Culture is comprised of many facets, both tangible and intangible; these include symbols, rituals, heroes and values (Hofstede, 1991). Values are the foundation of a culture and form the building blocks of the expression and embodiment of culture in heroes, rituals and symbols. Tangible expressions of culture are achieved through material objects that are common or significant to a particular culture such as food, dress and housing (Royce, 1982).

Culture refers to a collective and not to an individual; people reflect aspects of the culture to which they belong even though individual personalities will mediate the extent to which this takes place. Consumers are products of their culture and it cannot be separated from the individual (De Mooij, 2004). Brunso and Grunert (1998) in their research on the behavior of British, German, French and Danish consumers when shopping for food showed that although aspects of a product are accorded varying levels of importance, there are both similarities and differences among the consumers in these countries. As expected in the case of low involvement purchases such as groceries, price was the most important aspect in all countries. However, although all countries had fairly high scores, Danish and German respondents showed greater interest in the availability of product information than the French and British who had lower levels of interest. British respondents had the most positive attitude towards advertising while Germans had the least favorable attitudes. Danish and French respondents displayed the highest level of shopping enjoyment and were most likely to shop in specialty shops than respondents from the other nations; in fact, Germans derived the least pleasure from shopping while the British were the least likely to shop in specialty shops. The German and Danish respondents were most likely to make shopping lists and plan shopping in advance, while the British do the least planning for shopping. This indicates that despite differences in personalities and accounting for individual shopping orientations, persons from the same country displayed similar behaviors which can be credited to their respective cultures.

Another important concept is that culture is adaptive i.e. faced with different conditions, a society changes (Royce, 1982). Culture is not static, it adapts to changes in technology and the global environment, as a result, consumer tastes have evolved over time; hence the changes in dress, communication, transportation and even interaction through the years. Advertisers attempt both to reflect culture and to create culture. Reflecting culture makes a product relevant to the target audience, when customers can identify with a product, service or idea, they are more likely to buy into it, as it is consistent with previously formed attitudes. Advertisers, also attempt to
incorporate their products into culture by creating symbols and establishing rituals. McCracken (1988) had a similar view, “advertising works as a potential method of meaning transfer by bringing the consumer good and a representation of the culturally constituted world together within the frame of a particular advertisement”. What should be understood however is that while there are visible adaptations of a culture the core values very rarely change and are not easily eroded, certainly not over a few generations. This therefore means that in order to work as a method of meaning transfer, understanding the core values must come first.

Schiffman and Kanuk (1997) describe culture as a powerful regulator of human behavior and therefore a powerful regulator of consumer behavior (De Mooij, 2004; De Mooij and Hofstede, 2002; Doran, 1994); Wallace (1965) describes culture as the all-encompassing force that forms personality, which in turn is the key determinant in consumer behavior. Doran (1994) introduced the concept of consumption culture, which is a combination of an individual’s core culture with the consumption setting, including interactions with the dominant culture at the consumption setting. This underlines the concept that both culture and socialization in shape individual consumer decision making.

Geert Hofstede developed a model of national culture comprised of five dimensions, which are used to distinguish among cultures. These five dimensions: **Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Long Term versus Short Term Orientation, Individualism versus Collectivism, and Masculinity versus Femininity**, are measured on a scale of 0 to 100 and is based on research done in 75 countries and regions. These dimensions have been used in studies over the years and have been replicated over the years by researchers across the world and have been found to be consistent over time (Naumov & Puffer, 2000; Lam, 2007). This study is limited to two of those five dimensions; a brief explanation of these dimensions is taken from De Mooij (2004), a highly recognized researcher in the application of these dimensions to global marketing.

**Individualism** is the extent to which one looks after him or herself and immediate family only, and want to be different from others. **Collectivism** is the extent to which people belong to groups and value loyalty to each other. People in collectivist cultures desire to conform to group norms instead of being different, there is a strong interdependence among group members and the self cannot be separated from the group. North Americans and Northern Europeans are highly individualistic people while Asians, Africans and Latin Americans are collectivists.
**Masculinity** is the extent to which achievement and success are highly valued. Similar to the high power distance countries, status products and brands are important for demonstrating success and men and women have clearly defined, distinct roles. Despite the strained relations between China and Japan, Chinese perceive Japanese electronics to be the best and consequently purchase Japanese electronics as a status symbol. In fact, Japanese electronics are somewhat of a fashion in China as it shows you have money (Doran, 1994). **Femininity** is the extent to which caring for others and quality of life are highly valued. Feminine cultures are people oriented, status is of less importance and gender roles are not so clearly defined. Masculine cultures include the United States, Great Britain, Italy, Mexico and Japan; feminine cultures include Portugal, Spain, Chile and Thailand.

There are differences between regions and also among country scores within regions, but they largely fall in either the low or the high category for each dimension along with their neighbors, these differences and similarities are believed to extend to consumption behavior.

Hofstede’s cultural dimensions have been used in intercultural management and marketing over the years; Marieke De Mooij has been a key player in the application of cultural dimensions to marketing, advertising and consumer behavior. Her recent works over the past decade, some in conjunction with Geert Hofstede, have looked at the application of these dimensions to international marketing (De Mooij, 2000), international retailing (De Mooij and Hofstede, 2002), global branding, advertising strategy and research (De Mooij, 2003; De Mooij and Hofstede, 2010).

De Mooij (2000; 2004; De Mooij & Hofstede 2002), addressed the purported convergence of consumer behavior as predicted by Harvard Professor Levitt and other researchers who believe that converging national incomes, media and technology will lead to converging needs, habits and tastes among consumers. One example is De Mooij’s (2000) citation from Levitt’s 1983 article “The globalization of markets” in which he stated “the world’s needs and desired have irrevocably homogenized”. De Mooij however proposed that the opposite was true; as consumer incomes across countries converge, culture will become a major differentiating factor in consumer behavior (De Mooij, 2000; De Mooij and Hofstede, 2002). De Mooij has maintained that there is no evidence to support this expected convergence in consumption behavior and that this was a “myth of international marketing”. De Mooij’s
research (2004) also reiterated that value systems, which form the building blocks of culture, are very resistant to change.

In a study of the differences in percentage of consumption expenditure allocated to various product and services in 13 European countries, De Mooij and Hofstede (2002) found that the percentage of consumption expenditure was negatively correlated to individualism. Food has an important function in collectivist cultures; it is very important to have food in the home, not just to provide for their families, but in case guests come to call. It is also believed that people from collectivist cultures spend more time preparing meals at home, as opposed to convenience. This is consistent with the portrayal of the traditional Hispanic family, in which the mother prepares “fresh” meals daily for her family (Morse, 2008). Consumption of processed food is also negatively correlated with uncertainty avoidance as processed foods are seen as unhealthy and could shorten one’s life (De Mooij and Hofstede, 2002).

The purchase of private label brands is believed to also be influenced by collectivism as consumers from these cultures rely on extrinsic cues and so prefer well known national or global brands (De Mooij and Hofstede, 2002). These well-known brands serve the purpose of demonstrating one’s social status or rightful place in society. Of the ethnic groups living in the US, Asian-Americans are most likely to fall into this group as conformity and group harmony and welfare are stressed (Morse, 2008), they are therefore more likely to purchase and continue purchasing the brands that their friends, neighbors and family members do. Doran (1994) provides support for this theory as respondents in her study were found to rely heavily on personal sources for sources of information on brands that are good or bad; persons in their reference group therefore become influencers on brand choice in purchase decisions. This means they are likely to purchase brands that are similar to those in their reference groups so to preserve harmony, even if they can afford a more expensive brand. One of the participants in Doran’s (1994) study stated “I want to buy at least as high as my neighbors but not too high, or I may embarrass them” this is consistent with the need for harmony and conformance that Morse (2008) suggests. According to Morse (2008), in Japan, children are taught very early that the nail sticking up will be hammered down, again, stressing the importance of conformance and harmony. Korzenny & Korzenny (2005) also suggest that similar values exist among Hispanics who do use extrinsic cues such as family members as a frame of reference for purchase decisions and also value conformity.
In masculine cultures, where brands function as manifestations of success, members are likely to consume luxury items or any brand that is perceived to be a status symbol (De Mooij 2000; DeMooij and Hofstede, 2002). Mineral water consumption, which was traditionally seen as an indicator of uncertainty avoidance because mineral water has traditionally been perceived as cleaner and therefore healthier, was also found to be related to Masculinity vs. Femininity (De Mooij 2000; DeMooij and Hofstede, 2002). In the American context, Black/African American consumers are thought to display some masculine characteristics. According to Fisher (1996), young African Americans are likely to buy brands that not only make them feel that they have achieved a certain economic status, but also that display this achievement to others. Additionally, while they may be unable to afford their perceived ideal symbol of accomplishment such as the dream house, they will substitute for other material possessions that are more attainable status symbols such as cars, clothing, etc. (Fisher, 1996). Historically, income has influenced car ownership but this has not been so for more than a decade (De Mooij, 2000; De Mooij and Hofstede, 2002). Ownership of more than one car is described as a status symbol and is positively related to masculinity and power distance (De Mooij, 2000; De Mooij and Hofstede, 2002). Persons from masculine cultures can therefore be thought to be more materialistic than those from feminine cultures and are more likely to be loyal to brand name products.

Even the use of credit is also affected by culture; long-term orientation is negatively correlated with credit card use. Long-term orientation cultures are believed to be cash cultures, Asian cultures being one such example (De Mooij and Hofstede, 2002). Chinese consumers value thrift and so rarely approve the use of debt. In her study on cultural differences in consumer decision making using Chinese consumers in Montreal Canada, Doran (1994) found that all participants saved in advance for relatively costly purchases (the study looked at purchase of VCRs) and impulse buying was just not done for products in that category. While credit cards were used for convenience and safety, all participants paid off their entire balances at the end of the month.

Internet usage, depending on the purpose was also found to be mediated by different dimensions: the predictor for daily business use is small power distance, the predictor for daily educational and scientific use is femininity, for email usage is weak uncertainty avoidance and for personal or leisure purposes are femininity and weak uncertainty avoidance (De Mooij,
Long term orientation also suggests less receptivity to e-commerce (De Mooij and Hofstede, 2002).

These applications provide evidence that cultural dimensions do impact consumer decision making processes as well as choice of brand and the likelihood that consumers will be brand loyal. The literature cited above however, primarily focuses on national culture and the correlations that exist between those dimensions and purchases of products in certain categories instead of specific consumer behavior constructs. Morse (2008) and Doran (1999) provide good insight into ethnic groups within larger cultures but did not go as far as to compare these groups in the context of specific cultural dimensions. This research attempts to make that connection between the cultural dimensions that give rise to these values and a specific consumer behavior: brand loyalty.

**Brand Loyalty**

In an age when new brands are born every day and others disappear with equal regularity, companies realize that long-term success of their brands lie in building loyalty among their consumers- a mammoth task that requires reaching brand loyal customers and consistently satisfying them (Oh & Fiorito, 2002). The importance of brand loyalty has long been accepted as an important aspect of consumer behavior, one that is of vital importance to companies, Aker (1991) describes brand loyalty as the core of a brand’s equity; Reichheld and Teal (2001) in their study found a correlation between customer loyalty and profitability. It is widely agreed in marketing circles that it is less expensive to retain current customers than to attract new ones, making loyalty not only a means of increasing profits but also of reducing costs (Reichheld and Teal, 2001).

The concept of loyalty was coined by Copeland (1923) and has precipitated many more definitions and studies to identify the most efficacious method of measuring this consumer behavior construct. These studies are yet to be exhausted and to date there is still no single accepted definition or measure of brand loyalty (Knox & Walker, 2001).

Until the 1950s, loyalty was defined merely as the behavior of the customer and researchers and marketers have focused on behavioral definitions and measurement of loyalty with repeat purchase being the single indicator (Punniyamoorthy & Raj, 2007). These measures included consumer purchase sequence, frequency of purchase, proportion of purchase and
probability of purchase (Jacoby & Chestnut, 1978); other researchers have considered this definition to be one-dimensional (Dick & Basu, 1994) and have challenged these models.

Since then, it has been suggested that a more multidimensional model may be more appropriate for measuring brand loyalty (Andreassen & Linstead, 1998). Jacoby and Chestnut (1978) proposed that brand loyalty composes of both behavioral and attitudinal properties and developed a method of measurement in keeping with their theory. Park (1996) similarly proposed that attitudinal loyalty and involvement are independent determinants in the prediction of brand loyalty.

Two definitions that encompass both behavioral and attitudinal properties have been included for the purposes of this research. Jacoby and Chestnut (1978) define brand loyalty as “the biased behavioral response expressed over time by some decision-making unit with respect to one or more alternative brands out of a set of brands and is a function of psychological processes”. Oliver (1999) describes brand loyalty as “a deeply held commitment to rebuy or patronize a preferred product/service causing repetitive same-brand or same brand-set purchasing, despite situational influences and marketing efforts are having potential to cause switching”. Brand loyalty is believed to be a process, which includes involvement, strong attitudes to a brand and a resistance to change in preference as well as a commitment to the brand (Punniyamoorthy & Raj 2007).

While there have been a multitude of consumer behavior research, there have not been many that have isolated and quantitatively measured brand loyalty by itself. More often however, it has been examined as a component of larger concepts. Shim and Gehrt (1986) explored proneness to brand loyalty as a part of a study that looked at the relationship between ethnicity and shopping orientation in adolescents. In their study, Shim and Gehrt (1986) define proneness to brand loyalty as “an orientation characterized by the degree to which a consumer repetitively chose the same brand and stores” and was investigated as one of shopping several orientations covered in their research. They proposed that shopping orientation was the result of consumer socialization processes and include cognitive, affective and behavioral aspects of consumer behavior. Through socialization, consumers acquire points of reference which include peer groups, media, parents etc. These points of reference influence consumers’ opinions of good and bad as well as desirable and undesirable product attributes and hence their ultimate purchase behavior.
Ethnicity was found to play a major role in adolescents’ shopping orientation and Hispanic and Black/African American adolescents were found to be more influenced by brand names than Non- Hispanic White adolescents who were less materialistic and more price and quality conscious. Blacks/ African American adolescents were found to use brand name as a criteria in their purchase decisions and Hispanic adolescents were found to be more brand loyal than Caucasians and were more likely to make purchases based on status and image (Shim & Gehrt, 1986). Korzenny &Korzenny (2005) also alluded to the idea that Hispanics are strongly influenced by the consumption patterns of other Hispanics and so are likely to be loyal to the same brands as family members and close friends.

Lam (2007) referred to the work done by Shim and Gehrt (1986) in his later study and went on to propose that proneness to brand loyalty can be viewed as synonymous to the degree of brand loyalty. In this research therefore, proneness to brand loyalty is considered to be the same as brand loyalty. Lam’s (2007) study of the correlation between cultural dimensions proneness to brand loyalty among individuals found that collectivism and uncertainty avoidance had significant correlations with brand loyalty. This is consistent with previous literature on these dimensions as collectivist individuals are more likely to conform to group norms and individuals with high uncertainty avoidance are less likely to switch brands as they prefer the security offered by known brand names (De Mooij and Hofstede, 2002).

Lam (2007) however, did not find statistically significant correlations between proneness to brand loyalty and masculinity, although previous literature on this dimension suggested this. This study however focused on individual differences and so did not group respondents in any way. The study was also limited by a relatively small sample size of 228 business undergraduate students. It was also limited by low reliability of some of the indices used to measure cultural dimensions which may have been due in part to the removal of some variables after pre-screening.

This research, while investigating similar concepts, differs from Lam’s work in two ways: this study will gather data from a larger, more heterogeneous sample size (n=2,539) and the selected dimensions will be compared across ethnic groups rather than across individuals. Although this study looks at only two of the five original cultural dimensions, I believe that it will provide sufficient evidence of possible relationships and can be further investigated in the future.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH PURPOSE AND HYPOTHESES

Hofstede (1991) suggested that cultural dimensions could be applied for individual and within culture comparisons of sub cultures in a larger national culture. Several researchers have sought to look at the differences in cultural dimensions across individuals (Dorfman & Howell, 1988; Robertson & Hoffman, 2000; Lam, 2007) but the model is yet to be used for comparing ethnic groups on these dimensions within countries.

Due to the desire to express/display similarities to members of their in- groups and the value placed on interdependence and conformity displayed by persons from cultures scoring low in individualism, members of these groups are more likely to conform to the consumption habits of their families, friends or other reference groups. They are therefore more likely to prefer and consume products that are brand name. This is the basis for the first hypothesis:

H₁: Ethnic groups that are more collectivist will display higher levels of brand loyalty

People from masculine cultures value success and use brands as status symbols. They are more likely to purchase brands that have reputations of being the best and so will signify their material success and position in society. This leads to the second hypothesis:

H₂: Ethnic groups that are more masculine will display higher levels of brand loyalty

The scope of this research will be limited to the investigation of the two cultural dimensions identified above.
CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY & DATA COLLECTION

Data for this study was collected through primary research. This study was carried out as part of a larger multicultural survey. A questionnaire was collaboratively designed by a group of graduate students at Florida State University, with each student designing the instrument to be used for his/her particular topic of interest.

Brand loyalty was measured using three questions adopted from Lam (2006) in his study of culture’s influence on proneness to brand loyalty. The items were developed by Sproles and Kendall (1986) and were also adopted by Shim and Gehrt (1996). These were a series of statements for which agreement was measured on a six point Likert scale ranging from 0 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree).

- I have favorite brands I buy over and over.
- Once I find a product or brand I like, I stick with it.
- I change brands that I buy regularly

Due to the fact that the index used in these previous studies had only three questions, which reduces the reliability of the index, two additional questions were added which had been used in previous studies on brand loyalty and, based on literature, were thought to be possible indicators of proneness to brand loyalty (Oh & Fiorto, 2002). These additional questions were tested to see if they could be added to the already existing index.

- Store brands or generic products have the same quality as brand name products.
- If the store I am shopping at does not have my favorite brand, I would go to a different store to find it.

Cultural dimensions were measured using questions developed by Dorfman & Howell (1988) for comparing individual cultural differences and have been replicated by Robertson & Hoffman (2000) and Lam (2007). These items were measured on a six point Likert scale that asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with the statements presented ranging from 0 (Completely Disagree) to 5 (Completely Agree).

**Individualism-Collectivism**

- Group welfare is more important than individual rewards.
- Group success is more important than individual success.
• Being accepted by the members of your work group is very important. Employees should only pursue their goals after considering the welfare of the group.
• Managers should encourage group loyalty even if individual goals suffer.
• Individuals may be expected to give up their goals in order to benefit group success.

**Masculinity-Femininity**

• Meetings are usually run more effectively when they are chaired by a man.
• It is more important for men to have a professional career than it is for women to have a professional career.
• Men usually solve problems with logical analysis; women usually solve problems with intuition.
• Solving organizational problems usually requires an active forcible approach which is typical of men.
• It is preferable to have a man in a high level position rather than a woman.

These questions were interspersed with the other attitudinal questions in the questionnaire. The demographic variables as well as questions related to this paper are also included in the appendices.

The data for this study was collected in an online survey conducted by DMS Insights. English speaking respondents were originally sampled via the Opinion Place online "river" methodology. This method has also been referred to as "RDD for the web" as it uses broadcast promotional intercepts to generate a flow of respondents to the Opinion Place site. Respondents were screened and assigned to surveys in real-time, and are not considered registered panelists since most do not return to the site for ongoing survey participation. The Spanish-speaking sample respondents were invited from Tu Opinión Latina, a bilingual online Hispanic panel. All participants were required to be at least 18 years old and younger than 75.

Given the quota requirements for this study (see the quotas in the Appendices), a random sample of respondents was selected based on their demographic characteristics and invited to participate in this special survey opportunity via a custom email invitation. Quotas were closed when filled. The quotas were derived from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey data by gender, age, ethnicity, and region of the country. Beyond the approximate quotas detailed
in the Appendix, DMS Insights controlled for region of the country to enhance representativeness.

Respondents completed the survey by clicking on a link in the email invitation, which connected them with the online questionnaire. Respondents obtained a $1 credit to a PayPal account, miles in the American Airlines AAdvantage program, $1 towards a gift card for Amazon.com, among other incentives. Data collection took place during March 2011 and actual number of completes by ethnic group were:

- n=531 Caucasians
- n=500 Hispanic (English version)
- n=501 Hispanic (Spanish version)
- n=504 African Americans
- n=503 Asians
CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS

Before testing the hypotheses, the key demographic variables this study were examined. These included ethnicity, gender and education. These results are discussed below.

Demographics

A total of 2,539 respondents participated in the survey, of which 45.4% (n=1,152) were male and 54.6% (n=1,387) were female. Of the sample respondents, 20.9% were Caucasian, 19.9% African American, 19.8% Asian/Pacific Islander, 19.7% were Hispanic who spoke English and 19.7% were Hispanic who spoke Spanish this is shown in table 1 below.

Of the 531 Caucasian sample respondents, 47.5% were male and 52.5% were female, 46.4% of the 504 African American respondents were male and 53.6% were female. Among Asian/Pacific Islander respondents (n=503), 47.5% were male and 52.5% were female; 52% of the 500 Hispanic English respondents were male and 45% were female. Among 501 Hispanic Spanish respondents, 33.3% were male and 66.7% were female, these are also displayed in table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Total Respondents</th>
<th>% of Ethnic Group Male</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Ethnic Group Female</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Ethnic Group Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>19.85%</td>
<td>234 (46.40%)</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>53.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>19.81%</td>
<td>239 (47.50%)</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>52.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>20.91%</td>
<td>252 (47.50%)</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>52.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic English</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>19.69%</td>
<td>260 (52.00%)</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>48.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Spanish</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>19.73%</td>
<td>167 (33.30%)</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1152 (45.4%)</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 below shows that 2,517 survey participants reported the highest level of education completed; 22 respondents preferred not to answer and were treated as missing. Of the valid participants who disclosed the highest level of education completed, 74.6% had higher than high school education. The respondents who reported to having completed high school and lower levels of education were truncated into one variable that has been names “High school or lower”; these represent a combined 25.4% of total sample respondents. The largest percentage of respondents (36%) completed Some College or Technical School, 26.8% completed a Bachelor’s/ 4 Year Degree and 11.8% completed a Graduate Degree. Overall, the majority of respondents had some post-secondary education and so represents a relatively educated sample population.

When compared by gender, 28% of females had achieved high school or lower, 37.3 % had achieved some college or technical school, 23.6% had achieved a bachelor or four year degree and 11% had achieved a graduate degree. Among male respondents, 22.3% had achieved high school or lower, 34.5 had achieved some college or technical school, 30.6% had achieved a bachelor or four year degree and 12.6% had achieved a graduate degree. This denotes that a greater percentage of males achieved a bachelor’s degree or higher than females who had a larger percentage of participants achieving some college or technical school or lower.

Table 2: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Highest Level of Education Achieved by Survey Respondents by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>HIGH SCHOOL OR LESS</th>
<th>SOME COLLEGE/TECHNICAL SCHOOL</th>
<th>BACHELORS/ 4-YEAR DEGREE</th>
<th>GRADUATE</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>2517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>% within Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Highest Level of Education Achieved by Survey Respondents by Gender
Index Construction and Reliability Testing

In order to test the study hypotheses, indices were created for Brand Loyalty, Individualism vs. Collectivism (Collectivism Index) and Femininity vs. Masculinity (Masculinity Index). After excluding missing values listwise, factor analyses and reliability analyses were conducted on the variables of interest. Principal components were extracted based on Eigen values greater than one and factors were subjected to oblimin rotation with a delta of -0.8. Excepting brand loyalty, only one factor was extracted and the component matrices showing loadings greater than 0.7 with the principal factors extracted. For brand loyalty however, two factors were extracted. Of the five variables used in the procedure, two variables adapted from Lam (2006) combined with one of the two newer variables added to the index to increase its robustness loaded on one factor. The other two variables, one previously excluded by Lam (2006) and the other of the two variables that had been added formed another factor, indicating that those items were not appropriate additions to the brand loyalty index.

The reliability of the indices created was tested by computing the Cronbach’s alpha for each index. The indices Individualism vs. Collectivism and Femininity vs. Masculinity indices both reported Cronbach’s alphas greater than 0.8. According to Reinard (2006), Cronbach’s alphas of .80 -.89 indicates good reliability and so they indices created were thought to be reliable. The brand loyalty index, although based on only three variables had a Cronbach’s Alpha of .706 and based on Reinard (2006), can be interpreted as being fairly reliable. The number of items in each index and the Cronbach’s Alpha for each are reported in table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Initial # of Items in Index</th>
<th>Final # of Items in Index</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha of Final Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism Index</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity Index</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Reliability of the Individualism vs. Collectivism, Femininity vs. Masculinity and Brand Loyalty Indices Created
The reliability of the indices in table 4 for brand loyalty and the selected cultural dimensions were compared to those achieved by Lam (2007). A more robust index for Individualism vs. Collectivism was achieved utilizing all the questions originally tested by Lam (2007), it was not necessary to exclude any of the variables, as had been done by Lam (2007). As a result the indices for Individualism vs. Collectivism and Femininity vs. Masculinity were computed using more variables and as a result observed greater reliability than was reported in Lam (2007). Since the indices in this study were created using more items than Lam (2007), these indices are not directly comparable. Additionally, no test of significance was comparing the computed alphas and the alphas reported by Lam. Table 4 below however provides a picture of the reliability of the indices and the number of items used to create each as opposed to Lam (2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Current Results</th>
<th>Lam (2007)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final # of Items in Index</td>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha of Final Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism Index:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity Index:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity- Masculinity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The indices were created using standardized variables and so have a mean of zero and standard deviation of 1. Responses to the questions that constitute the Femininity vs. Masculinity index were measured on a scale for which stronger agreement indicated greater levels of masculinity; as a result, the index is named “Masculinity Index” in order to represent this. Values below zero for Masculinity vs. Femininity indicate femininity and values above zero indicate masculinity. Similarly, values below zero for Individualism vs. Collectivism (Collectivism Index) indicate individualism while values above zero indicate collectivism.
Correlations among Indices and Demographic Variables

An initial exploratory analysis of the correlations among the indices was conducted by computing the Pearson Product Moment and the Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients for the variables of interest. The results of both tests were very similar and so only the Person Product Moment Correlations were reported in table 5 below. There were positive correlations between brand loyalty and the indices derived for the cultural dimensions being examined; there were correlations of .414 and .286 (p<0.01) with the Individualism vs. Collectivism (Collectivism Index) and Femininity vs. Masculinity (Masculinity Index) dimensions which indicate that higher scores on either index will result in higher scores in brand loyalty. These correlations however account for only 17% and 6% of variance the accounted for in each index and so while a relationship is present, its effect size is relatively low.

A significant positive correlation between the two cultural dimensions was expected as Hofstede (1984) had found a correlation of 0.16 between the two dimensions. In this study there was a significant positive correlation of .407 (p<.01) between the two indices. This correlation was larger than Hofstede’s even after adjusting the oblimin delta to -0.8. It should be noted that the effect size was 16.5%. There were also significant correlations between the demographic variables and the cultural dimensions. As expected, gender was found to be negatively correlated with the masculinity index (r =-.264, p <.01). Similarly, a negative correlation was observed between gender and collectivism (r = -.162, p <.01), indicating that males are slightly more likely to be collectivist than females. There was also a negative correlation between gender and education (r=-.082; p<.01) indicating that males had higher levels of education than females, and is consistent with previous assertions based on the demographic profile. Positive correlations were also observed between education and collectivism (r=.093, p <.01) as well as between education and masculinity (r=.141, p < .01) which ties in with the correlations found between gender and education. Education was also found to be positively correlated with brand loyalty (r=.055, p<.01), indicating that persons who have achieved higher levels of education are more likely to be brand loyal.

While these results are significant at the .01 alpha level, it should be noted that these correlations are very low and so account for less than 2% of the variance accounted for in most of the indices examined. In the case of gender and education, education and collectivism and
education and brand loyalty, the correlations were less than .1, and were significant because of the relatively large sample (n=2,539). Small correlations, accounting for relatively little variance, can still be statistically significant if the samples are large.

Prior to testing the hypotheses for this study, additional exploratory analyses were conducted in an attempt to replicate Lam’s (2007) prior research findings. Specifically, multiple regression analyses were conducted using the cultural dimensions to predict brand loyalty, after controlling for gender and education. These results are displayed in Table 6.

Prior to testing the hypotheses for this study, additional exploratory analyses were conducted in an attempt to replicate Lam’s (2007) prior research findings. Specifically, multiple regression analyses were conducted using the cultural dimensions to predict brand loyalty, after controlling for gender and education. These results are displayed in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculinity Index: Feminine to Masculine</th>
<th>Collectivism Index: Individualism to Collectivism</th>
<th>Gender (Male to Female)</th>
<th>Truncated Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masculinity</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.407**</td>
<td>-.264**</td>
<td>.093**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Index: Feminine to Masculine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collectivism Index:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism to Collectivism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.414**</td>
<td>-.162**</td>
<td>.141**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Loyalty</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.055**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender (Male to Female)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.082**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Truncated Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
The regression analyses yielded a multiple correlation of .429, which accounted for an adjusted $R^2$ of .183. Significant positive standardized regression coefficients were observed for the Femininity vs. Masculinity ($R=.155, p<.001$) and the Individualism vs. Collectivism indices, ($R=.352, p<.001$) predicting brand loyalty. This indicates that holding other variables constant, Individualism vs. Collectivism and Femininity vs. Masculinity do predict brand loyalty in this study.

These findings are inconsistent with results from Lam (2007). Firstly, in predicting brand loyalty a significant positive regression coefficient was found using Femininity vs. Masculinity. Lam (2007) found no significant relationship. Secondly, Lam (2007) hypothesized and found that Individualism was a positive predictor of brand loyalty; the results of this study suggest the exact opposite. Collectivism is positively related to brand loyalty in this study. It is unclear what accounts for these inconsistent findings. Part of the answers may be found in the potential for multicollinearity to attenuate relationships between predictor and predicted variables. In this study the indices were created using an oblimin rotation, delta of -0.8, which minimized the relationship between the two predictor indices. Had this not been done in this study, a stronger correlation would have been observed between the two indices and multiple regression analyses would not have found a significant coefficient for the Masculinity index. The implications will be further discussed in the section on future research.
Hypothesis Testing

The following procedures and analyses were used to test the two hypotheses in this study:

**H₁**: Ethnic groups that are more collectivist will display higher levels of brand loyalty

**H₂**: Ethnic groups that are more masculine will display higher levels of brand loyalty

In order to array the sample ethnic groups along the individual to collective and feminine to masculine dimensions, analysis of covariance procedures were initially used, controlling for gender and education. Table 7 summarizes the ANCOVA results indicating the rank ordered adjusted means for the Individualism vs. Collectivism and the Femininity vs. Masculinity indices by ethnic groups. For the Individualism vs. Collectivism Index, Asian/Pacific Islanders were ranked first, Hispanic Spanish were ranked second, African Americans were ranked third, Hispanic English were ranked fourth and Caucasians were ranked fifth. For the Femininity vs. Masculinity Index, Asian/Pacific Islanders were ranked first, Hispanic English were ranked second, African Americans were ranked third, Hispanic Spanish were ranked fourth and Caucasians were ranked fifth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean Rank</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Spanish</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic English</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>-0.265</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the ranked ethnic groups, Means Tests for Linearity were initially conducted using brand loyalty means that were not adjusted for gender or education. These means are presented.
in tables 8 (collectivism) and 11 (masculinity). Using the Collectivism index, the test for linearity was statistically significant \( (F = 6.008, df = 1, 2444, p = .014) \), these results are reported in table 9. Similarly, using the Masculinity index, the test for linearity was, again, statistically significant \( (F = 4.274, df = 1, 2444, p = .039) \), these results are reported in table 12 below. Both of the linear tests however, accounted for only about 1% of the variance in brand loyalty (see tables 10 and 13 below). The most notable deviations from linearity in the unadjusted means for both indices appear for the African American ethnic group.

Table 8: Unadjusted Brand Loyalty Means for Ethnic Groups Ranked by Adjusted Collectivism Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Groups Ranked on Brand Loyalty Using Adjusted Collectivism Means</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.0127476</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>0.9579490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 Hispanic Spanish</td>
<td>0.0001217</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>1.0787332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 African American</td>
<td>0.163546</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>0.94781662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 Hispanic English</td>
<td>-0.0277006</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>1.00365264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00 Caucasian</td>
<td>-0.1416486</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>0.98853386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.0000000</td>
<td>2449</td>
<td>1.00000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Test of Linearity of Unadjusted Brand Loyalty Means using Ethnic Groups Ranked on Collectivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA Table</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty by Ranked Collectivism (Combined)</td>
<td>23.906</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.977</td>
<td>6.026</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked Collectivism Linearity</td>
<td>5.959</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.959</td>
<td>6.008</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index: Ethnic Groups Deviation from Linearity</td>
<td>17.947</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.982</td>
<td>6.032</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked Using Adjusted Collectivism Means Total</td>
<td>2424.094</td>
<td>2444</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 11: Effect Size of Collectivism in Predicting Brand Loyalty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Association</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Squared</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty by Ranked Collectivism Index:</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnic Groups Ranked Using Adjusted Masculinity

Table 10: Unadjusted Brand Loyalty Means for Ethnic Groups Ranked Using Adjusted Masculinity Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>.0127476</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>.95975490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 Hispanic English</td>
<td>-.0277006</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>1.00365264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 African American</td>
<td>.1633546</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>.94781662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 Hispanic Spanish</td>
<td>.0001217</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>1.07873332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00 Caucasian</td>
<td>-.1416486</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>.98853386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.0000000</td>
<td>2449</td>
<td>1.00000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Test of Linearity of Unadjusted Brand Loyalty Means using Ethnic Groups Ranked on Masculinity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA Table</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty by Ranked Masculinity: (Combined)</td>
<td>23.906</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.977</td>
<td>6.026</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked Masculinity</td>
<td>4.239</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.239</td>
<td>4.274</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index: Ethnic Groups</td>
<td>19.667</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.556</td>
<td>6.610</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked Using Adjusted Within Groups</td>
<td>2424.094</td>
<td>2444</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2448.000</td>
<td>2448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Effect Size of Masculinity in Predicting Brand Loyalty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Association</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Squared</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty by Ranked Masculinity Index:</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnic Groups Ranked Using Adjusted Masculinity Means
The analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) procedure was used next to compute the adjusted means for brand loyalty based on the ethnic group rankings for Individualism vs. Collectivism, controlling for gender and education. Using ANCOVA, the adjusted means appear in Table 14. The highest mean observed was for African Americans (mean = .179) followed by Hispanic Spanish (mean = .018). Negative means were observed for Asian/Pacific Islanders (mean = -.009), Hispanic English (mean = -.018) and Caucasian (mean = -.138).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Groups Ranked Using Adjusted Collectivism Means</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>-.009a</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.100 - .082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Spanish</td>
<td>.018a</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.072 - .108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>.179a</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.091 - .267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic English</td>
<td>-.018a</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.106 - .070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>-.138a</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.223 - -.052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| a. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Gender = 1.55, Education = 4.2571. |

Table 15 reports the test of significance, indicating that after controlling for gender and education, there was a statistically significant difference in the brand loyalties for the five ethnic groups (F = 6.591; df = 4, 2424, p < .001). However, counter to hypothesis, the adjusted means did not decrease steadily along the Collectivism rankings of the ethnic groups.

In three of five cases, the order of the means was consistent with the rankings the ethnic groups on the Individualism vs. Collectivism. Hispanic Spanish (2), Hispanic English (4) and Caucasians (5) maintained their original rankings but Asian/Pacific Islanders who were expected to have the highest mean score for the Individualism vs. Collectivism dimension, reported a negative mean and was ranked third of the five groups. African Americans who were ranked third on this dimension had the highest mean score for brand loyalty. The hypothesized order (H₁) is partially supported among Hispanic Spanish, Hispanic English and Caucasian ethnic groups.
Table 15: Test of Significance of Differences in Brand Loyalty by Ethnic Groups Ranked on Collectivism Controlling for Gender and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Hypothesis .799</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>153.411</td>
<td>135.550</td>
<td>1.132a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Hypothesis 4.187</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.187</td>
<td>4.316</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2351.434</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>.970b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truncated Education</td>
<td>Hypothesis 6.701</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.701</td>
<td>6.907</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2351.434</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>.970b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked Collectivism</td>
<td>Hypothesis 25.574</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.394</td>
<td>6.591</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2351.434</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>.970b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. .030 MS(COL_RANK) + .970 MS(Error) b. MS(Error)

The location of the significant differences was further tested using the Bonferroni adjustment, the results of which are presented in table 9 below. African Americans were the only ethnic group found to be significantly more brand loyal compared to the other four groups. They were significantly more brand loyal than Caucasians with a mean difference of .317 (p<.05) and a standard error of .062 around that difference. They were also significantly more brand loyal than Hispanic English with a mean difference of .197 (p<.05) and a standard error of .063 around that difference. African Americans were also significantly more brand loyal than Asian/Pacific Islanders with a mean difference of .188 (p<.05) and a standard error of .065 around the difference. These results are inconsistent with H1.
## Pairwise Comparisons Based on the Bonferroni Adjustment of Brand Loyalty by Ethnic Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Ethnic Groups</th>
<th>(J) Ethnic Groups</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Difference</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Hispanic Spanish</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>- .212</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 Hispanic</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>- .371</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 African American</td>
<td>Hispanic English</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>- .173</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 Hispanic English</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>- .051</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00 Caucasian</td>
<td>Hispanic English</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>- .145</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00 Hispanic English</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>- .145</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00 Caucasian</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>- .056</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) procedure was also used to compute the adjusted means for brand loyalty based on the ethnic group rankings for Femininity vs. Masculinity. Using ANCOVA, the adjusted means appear in Table 17 below. The highest mean observed was for African Americans (mean = .179) followed by Hispanic Spanish (mean = .018). Negative means were observed for Asian/Pacific Islanders (mean = -.009), Hispanic English (mean = -.018) and Caucasian (mean = -.138).

### Table 17: Adjusted Brand loyalty means for Ethnic Groups Ranked on Masculinity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Groups Ranked Using Adjusted Masculinity Means</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>-.009a</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic English</td>
<td>-.018a</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>.179a</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Spanish</td>
<td>.018a</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>-.138a</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.223</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Gender = 1.55, Education = 4.2571.

Table 18 reports the test of significance, indicating that after controlling for gender and education, there was a statistically significant difference in the brand loyalties for the five ethnic groups (F = 6.591; df = 4, 2424, p < .001). However, counter to hypothesis, the adjusted means did not decrease steadily along the masculinity rankings of the ethnic groups.

In four of five cases, the order of these means was not consistent with the rankings the ethnic groups on either dimension. Caucasians (5) maintained their original rankings but Asian/Pacific Islanders who were expected to have the highest mean score for the Femininity vs. Masculinity dimension, reported a negative mean and was ranked third of the five groups. Hispanic English who were ranked second on the masculinity index were ranked fourth among the adjusted means for brand loyalty and Hispanic Spanish who were expected to rank 4th were ranked 2nd. African Americans who were ranked third on this dimension had the highest mean...
score for brand loyalty. Since only one group conformed to the rankings assigned, H<sub>2</sub> is therefore not supported.

Table 18: Test of Significance of Differences in Brand Loyalty between Ethnic Groups Ranked on Masculinity Controlling for Gender and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept H&lt;sub&gt;0&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>0.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>153.411</td>
<td>135.55</td>
<td>1.132a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Hypothesis</td>
<td>4.187</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.187</td>
<td>4.316</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2351.434</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>.970b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truncated Education H&lt;sub&gt;0&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>6.701</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.701</td>
<td>6.907</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2351.434</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>.970b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked Masculinity H&lt;sub&gt;0&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>25.574</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.394</td>
<td>6.591</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2351.434</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>.970b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0.030 MS(MASC_RANK) + .970 MS(Error) b. MS(Error)

When the location of significant differences was tested using the Bonferroni adjustment, the results replicated those found for Individualism vs. Collectivism in table 9. When ordered along the Femininity to Masculinity dimension, African Americans were the only ethnic group found to be significantly more brand loyal than others. Again, these results are inconsistent with H<sub>2</sub>. 
CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION

The results of the study support the theory that Individualism vs. Collectivism and Femininity vs. Masculinity dimensions are predictors of brand loyalty. It also supports the theory that ethnic groups differ significantly from each other on these cultural dimensions. Education and gender were also found to be related to the cultural dimensions under investigation. Males were found to be slightly more likely to be masculine and collectivist than females. While the finding for masculinity is not surprising, the finding that they are more collectivist than females is since females are perceived to be the nurturers, taking care of their families. The low correlations however indicate that the effect size is very low and it is possible that with a smaller sample size, no significant correlations would have been found.

Education was found to be positively correlated to Masculinity, Collectivism and brand loyalty. This is also consistent with the previous finding on gender’s relationship with brand loyalty since the male sample respondents had achieved higher levels of education than females. Since higher levels of education normally equals higher income, the finding about education’s relationship with the cultural dimensions and brand loyalty support DeMooij’s (2000) argument that as income increases, consumer behavior will reflect their cultural foundations. This suggests that people who have achieved higher levels of education are more likely to be influenced by their cultural values and are more likely to be brand loyal. While this does not provide marketers with an incentive to target more affluent consumers, it does suggest that persons that are less constrained by income do represent potential loyal customers. Even though the results are supported by DeMooij (2000), it should be noted however that the correlations for this variable were less than 0.1 and so accounts for very little of the variability.

Not only did the results show a positive relationship between cultural dimensions and brand loyalty, the ANCOVA results enabled ranking of ethnic groups on the cultural dimensions. The results confirm that Asian/Pacific Islanders are most collectivist and masculine and that Caucasians are least collectivist and masculine. It should be noted that while Caucasians were expected to be the least collectivist, literature suggests that they are highly masculine, all ethnic groups were from masculine cultures but it was expected that some groups would be more masculine than others, the results of the initial ANCOVA procedure support this.
The hypothesis tests show that despite the relationship between the cultural dimensions and brand loyalty, with the exception of African Americans, the dimensions cannot be used to differentiate brand loyalty levels among persons from different ethnic groups. The findings for the Individualism vs. Collectivism dimension suggest support for the first hypothesis but does not fully support it. The second hypothesis was not supported as only Caucasians behaved as hypothesized.

The finding that African Americans were most brand loyal when compared to other ethnic groups, even though they ranked only third on the Masculinity and Collectivism indices is an interesting finding. African Americans when compared to the other ethnic groups represented the greatest percentage of persons who had achieved lower levels of education and so contradict the previous finding of the positive correlation between education and brand loyalty. They also had the second highest percentage of female respondents compared to the other ethnic groups but there was no significant correlation found between gender and brand loyalty. The research did not reveal any possible explanations as to why this group was more brand loyal than the others.

The results pertaining to this ethnic group are however very useful as while it had been accepted that the African American population were not the same as Caucasians and that they were more collectivist and brand loyal than Caucasians, previous research had not been able to classify this ethnic groups on the cultural dimensions presented or compare them with the other ethnic groups of interest on the dimensions specified. The results suggest some similarity to the Hispanic Spanish respondents on both cultural dimensions. These findings are very useful to marketers who are still struggling to understand the root of the differences between African Americans and Caucasians. These finding point to strong collectivist and masculine values among people from this ethnic group that endure despite their lower levels of education compared to other ethnic groups. They are significantly more brand loyal than other ethnic groups but this thesis was not able to address other influencers of this brand loyalty outside of the variables explored. The cultural dimensions explored, based on the results of the correlation and regression analysis seem to play a role in the brand loyalty level for this group but the findings suggest that there may be an even stronger influencer than the variables tested and does warrant further study.

The results of this research do present useful implications for marketers who are still trying to understand the cultural groups in the United States. Research on the cultural dimensions
delves into the motivations and values of the consumer market which is very useful in understanding the differences in behavior that have been observed between ethnic groups. It not only confirms that these groups are different from each other but provides possible reason why that could lead to a deeper understanding of the values and beliefs of these groups. While this research does not show that these cultural dimensions are major differentiating factor for brand loyalty among most of these ethnic groups, it does prove that the cultural dimensions are general predictors of brand loyalty and that at least one ethnic group is more brand loyal than others.
CHAPTER SEVEN

LIMITATIONS

Firstly, although the sampling method employed is thought to increase the quality of the participants attracted, the participants were still drawn from a convenience sample. Although efforts were made to ensure that the sample distribution was similar to that of the population, it was not a simple random sample. The results this study therefore may not be suitable for making generalizations about the total population.

Due to difficulties in finding a general scale for measuring brand loyalty, the instrument utilized to test brand loyalty has only three items and although the reliability of the index was greater than 0.7, a more robust index may have achieved more accurate results.

The results of the research were also limited by the gender composition of the sample for at least one ethnic group. For Hispanic Spanish respondents, 66.7% of respondents were female which is significantly more than the proportion of males to females for the other ethnic groups. This may have affected the results for this ethnic group. The results of this thesis would have been strengthened if income and employment level could have been tested as covariants along with education and gender but the instrument used to collect the data resulted in truncated data and so these variables could not be tested.
CHAPTER EIGHT

FUTURE STUDIES

Future research in this area should focus on developing a more robust index for measuring brand loyalty. It has also been argued that brand loyalty varies across product categories; future research should focus on the relationship between cultural dimensions and brand loyalty for specific brand or product categories across ethnic groups.

The high levels of brand loyalty for African Americans warrant further study as this research was not able to identify the factors that are the strongest influencers of the high levels of brand loyalty observed for this group.

The research findings were not consistent with those found by Lam (2007). Since there was no identifiable reason for the variation in results, this topic warrants further study in order to validate the results found.

This research focused on only two cultural dimensions, future research in this area could examine the five main cultural dimensions established by Hofstede and their relationship with brand loyalty across ethnic groups.
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APPENDIX B

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

This study is being conducted by members of a graduate course on Multicultural Marketing Communication at Florida State University. The results may eventually be published as a report or in a publication. The goal of the project is to better understand attitudes, media habits, and opinions about shopping, and other related topics. The results will be made available to you. We greatly appreciate your time and participation.

Please note that you are under no obligation to do this survey, and if you start you may stop at any time. Please note that this survey is confidential to the extent permitted by law and that the data will not be linked to any personal information. The completed questionnaires will not be seen by anyone but only the data collected. Only the confidential data file will be used for data analysis with no personal identification.

Further, completion of this study is voluntary and we truly appreciate your participation. If you have questions about this study please contact Dr. Felipe Korzenny at 850 644 8766, or the University’s Institutional Review Board at (850) 644 8633.

Specifications:

- **Subject Line:** Tell Us What You Think
- **n=2500 completes**
  - n=500 Hispanic (English version)
  - n=500 Hispanic (Spanish version) (max n=500)
  - n=500 Caucasians
  - n=500 African Americans
  - n=500 Asians

**SCREENER**

(Q1, Q2, Q3a AND Q3b ON SAME PAGE)

1. **First, what is your gender?**
   - 1 Male
   - 2 Female

2. **What is your age?**
3a. Are you of Hispanic/Latino/Spanish descent?
   1 YES [QUALIFY AS HISPANIC QUOTA and skip to qualifying page]
   2 NO

3b. Which of the following best describes your ethnic background or heritage?
   1 Caucasian/White [QUALIFY AS CAUCASIAN QUOTA]
   2 African American/Black [QUALIFY AS AFRICAN AMERICAN QUOTA]
   3 Asian or Pacific Islander [QUALIFY AS ASIAN QUOTA]
   4 Other [TERMINATE]
   5 Prefer not to answer [TERMINATE]

CREATE A COMPOSITE VARIABLE: ETHNIC WITH VALUES, HISPANIC ENGLISH, HISPANIC SPANISH, AFRICAN AMERICAN, ASIAN, CAUCASIAN

QUALIFICATION PAGE

Great, thanks for telling us a little about yourself. Below is some information on today's survey:

The survey is about Online habits, attitudes, and other consumer behaviors
Spend approximately 15 minutes
Win a sweepstakes entry and win cash prizes
Thank you in advance for your opinions.
Let's get started!

[Skip to Real survey]

NON-QUALIFIERS EXIT PAGES

Non-Qualify Page

Thank You for Your Time!
We’re sorry we don’t have a survey for you today that fit your qualifications.

Non-Qualify Exit Page
5. Now, please think about the language you use for the activities below. In an average week, approximately how many hours do you spend….? (Enter the number of hours, not a range, in each space. If you do not spend any time, enter a zero “0”) 

[GRID; ROTATE; NUMERIC ANSWER] [ALLOW UP TO 3 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-168]

In English

In another language

1. Listening to CD’s
2. Listening to the radio
3. Listening to MP3’s on any device including an iPod or mobile phone
4. Listening to music on television
5. Playing video games on any device
6. Using social media like Facebook or Twitter
7. Listening to Internet radio like Pandora or Last.fm
8. Talking with friends

6. Which of the following do you …. (For each column, select all that apply)

[GRID; ROTATE]

Have

Plan to have within the next year for the first time

Do not have and do not plan to have within the next year for the first time

1. A blog
2. A personal website of my own
3. A smart phone
4. An unlimited data plan
5. An “e-reader” or electronic book reader like a Kindle or a Nook
6. A tablet, like an iPad, GalaxyTab, etc.

7. How important is each of the following in influencing the music you listen to? (From 0 = not at all important to 5 = extremely important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Recommendations from friends
2. Watching music videos
3. Browsing by genre
4. Listening to radio, be it online, broadcast, or satellite
5. Browsing album covers
6. Online ads
7. Television, radio, or magazine ads

8. How often do you “Like” or “follow” clothing brands on Facebook or Twitter?
8a. How often do you “Like” or “follow” technology brands on Facebook or Twitter?

2. Very often
1. Sometimes
0. Never

9. Please tell us how important are to you the following reasons for using social networking sites like Facebook or Twitter? Use a scale of “0” Not important at all, to “5” Extremely important.

(a) Keeping up with new trends
(b) Finding information about products or services
(c) Finding deals on brands I like
(d) Asking friends and relatives about their opinions on products to buy

10. What are the genres of music you listen to the most? Check all that you listen to the most often.

a. Rock
b. Blues
c. Rap/Hip Hop
d. R & B
e. Techno/Electronic
f. Jazz
g. Classical
h. Country
i. Bluegrass
j. Folk
k. Metal
l. Pop
m. Reggae
n. Latino/Hispanic Music of any kind
o. Religious
p. Other

11. How often do you do each of the following?
[ROTATE]
a. Purchase music on physical CD’s
b. Purchase MP3’s online
c. Share music with friends and relatives
2. Very often
1. Sometimes
0. Never

12. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. (From 0 = completely disagree to 5 = completely agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[BREAK INTO TWO OR THREE SETS AFTER RANDOMIZING LIST, THEN RANDOMIZE WITHIN SET]

1. Group welfare is more important than individual rewards
2. Group success is more important than individual success
3. Being accepted by the members of your work group is very important.
   Employees should only pursue their goals after considering the welfare of the group.
4. Managers should encourage group loyalty even if individual goals suffer.
5. Individuals may be expected to give up their goals in order to benefit group success.
6. Meetings are usually run more effectively when they are chaired by a man.
7. It is more important for men to have a professional career than it is for women.
8. Men usually solve problems with logical analysis; women usually solve problems with intuition.
9. Solving organization problems usually requires an active forcible approach which is typical of men.
10. It is preferable to have a man in a high level position rather than a woman.
11. I have favorite brands I buy over and over.
12. Once I find a product or brand I like, I stick with it.
13. I change brands that I buy regularly.
14. Store brands or generic products have the same quality as brand name products.
15. I have a special bond with the brands that I like.
16. I consider my favorite brands to be a part of myself.
17. I often feel a personal connection between my brands and me.
18. Part of me is defined by important brands in my life.
19. I feel as if I have a close personal connection with the brands I most prefer.
20. I can identify with important brands in my life.
21. There are links between the brands that I prefer and how I view myself.
22. My favorite brands are an important indication of who I am.
23. If the store I am shopping at does not have my favorite brand, I would go to a different store to find it.
24. Humans are severely abusing the environment
25. Plants and animals have as much right as humans to exist
26. The balance of nature is strong enough to cope with the impacts of modern industrial nations
27. The so-called “ecological crisis” facing humankind has been greatly exaggerated
28. The earth is like a spaceship with very limited room and resources
29. Humans were meant to rule over the rest of nature
30. The balance of nature is very delicate and easily upset
31. If things continue on their present course, we will soon experience a major ecological catastrophe
32. Shopping online for clothing is more convenient than shopping in a physical store.
33. Shopping online for technology is more convenient than shopping in a physical store.
34. I can get the clothing I like from online retailers.
35. The information I find on brands from social networking sites like Facebook or Twitter is trustworthy.
36. The customer comments I find on social networking sites like Facebook or Twitter are very important in my purchase decisions.
37. I prefer to buy from a brand that has a page on a site like Facebook or Twitter.
38. I frequently ask for advice from others on sites like Facebook or Twitter regarding products I want to buy.
39. I recycle whenever possible.
40. I am replacing old light bulbs with energy efficient ones.
41. I buy ecologically friendly products for my home.

13. Do you play a musical instrument? Yes ____ No ____
13a. About how many concerts do you attend per year?
[NUMERIC ANSWER] [ALLOW UP TO 2 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-90]
13b. About how many miles away are you willing to go to see your favorite musical artist live?
[NUMERIC ANSWER] [ALLOW UP TO 3 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-500]
14. On a typical month how much money do you spend on purchasing music? If you do not buy music enter “0” zero.
[NUMERIC ANSWER] [ALLOW UP TO 3 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-500]
14a. On a typical month about how much money do you spend on video games? If you do not buy video games enter “0” zero.
[NUMERIC ANSWER] [ALLOW UP TO 3 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-500]
14b. On a typical month about how much money do you spend on entertainment overall? If you do not spend any money on entertainment enter “0” zero.
[NUMERIC ANSWER] [ALLOW UP TO 4 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-2000]
15. How important are each of the following to you. Please use a number between “0” for Not Important At All and a “5” for Extremely Important.

[ROTATE - GRID]
   a) Get recognition for good performance
   b) Have pleasant people to work with
   c) Live in a desirable area
d) Have chances for promotion

e) Have sufficient time for your personal or home life

f) Have security of employment

g) Do work that is interesting

h) Have a job respected by your family and friends

i) Buying environmentally friendly products

j) Replacing my current car with one that is more energy efficient

16. Do you play video games? Yes ________  No __________

IF YES

17. Which devices or consoles do you play video games on most often? Check all you play on most often: [ROTATE]
   a. Xbox 360
   b. Nintendo Wii
   c. PS3
   d. Nintendo DS
   e. PSP
   f. PC Games
   g. Mass Multiplayer Online
   h. Social Networking Games
   i. Electronic Handheld
   j. Cell phone games
   k. Other

18. About how many hours per week do you spend playing video games?
   [NUMERIC ANSWER] [ALLOW UP TO 3 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-168]

19. Please check the types of games that you play most often:
   [ROTATE]
   a. Action Adventure/quests
   b. RPG
   c. Sports
   d. First Person Shooter
   e. Shooter
   f. Puzzle
   g. Simulation
   h. Card
i. Strategy
j. Fighting
k. Racing
l. Arcade
m. Party
n. Other

20. In an average month about how much money do you spend making purchases online?
[NUMERIC ANSWER] [ALLOW UP TO 4 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-3000]

20a. About what percentage of your clothing purchases in a year are made online?
NUMERIC ANSWER] [ALLOW UP TO 4 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-100%]

20b. About what percentage of your electronics purchases in a year are made online?
NUMERIC ANSWER] [ALLOW UP TO 4 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-100%]

20c. And, in an average month about what percentage of your overall purchases are made online?
NUMERIC ANSWER] [ALLOW UP TO 4 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-100%]

20d. Do you use shopping apps? Yes _________   No __________

20e. Please write in the names of the shopping apps you use the most: ___________________
[MAXIMUM OF 6 FIELDS]

20f. Are you a member of Groupon?  Yes  _____  No ________

IF YES

20g. In the past month, about how many Groupon offers did you buy?

We are almost done. Please indicate your answers for the following questions. The following questions are for classification purpose only

21. What is your marital status?
[DROP DOWN MENU]

1 Single
2 Married
3 Divorced
4 Widowed
5 Separated
6 Living with someone
7 Prefer not to answer

22. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
[DROP DOWN MENU]
1. Elementary school
2. Middle School
3. High school
4. Some college/technical school
5. Bachelors/4-year degree
6. Graduate
7. Prefer not to answer

23. What is your employment status?

[DROP DOWN MENU] [ALLOW MULTIPLE ANSWERS]
1. Employed full time
2. Employed part time
3. Student
4. Not employed
5. Prefer not to answer

24. What is your household income before taxes?

[DROP DOWN MENU]
1. $19,999 or less
2. $20,000 to 29,999
3. $30,000 to 39,999
4. $40,000 to 49,999
5. $50,000 to 59,999
6. $60,000 to 69,999
7. $70,000 to 79,999
8. $80,000 to 89,999
9. $90,000 to 99,999
10. $100,000 to 124,999
11. $125,000 to 149,999
12. $150,000 or more
13. Prefer not to answer

25. Are you the parent or guardian of any children 17 or younger living in your household?
1. Yes
2. No

[ASK Q78 IF Q77=1]

26. How many children 17 years of age or younger live in your household? _______
27. What is the total number of people including you living in your household? ________

28. Were you born in the US?
   1  Yes [SKIP TO END]
   2  No

29. In what country were you born? ______

30. How many years have you lived in the US if not born here? ______ [ALLOW UP TO 2 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-75]

As we mentioned at the beginning of the survey, if you wish to read a summary of the results, please visit http://hmc.comm.fsu.edu. The reports will be available starting in October 2011.

Now, please click “next” to complete the survey and receive your incentive!
Este estudio es llevado a cabo por miembros del curso de posgrado Comunicación de Mercadotecnia Multicultural de Florida State University. Los resultados podrían ser publicados eventualmente en un reporte o una publicación. El objetivo del proyecto es lograr una mejor comprensión de las actitudes, hábitos respecto a medios de comunicación, opiniones de los consumidores y otros temas relacionados. Usted tendrá acceso a los resultados. Agradecemos enormemente su tiempo y participación.

Por favor tome en cuenta que usted no tiene ninguna obligación de contestar esta encuesta y una vez que comience, puede suspenderla en cualquier momento. Por favor considere que esta encuesta es confidencial en la medida que lo permite la ley y los datos no serán vinculados con ninguna información personal. Los cuestionarios contestados no serán vistos por nadie, solamente los datos recolectados. Únicamente el archivo de datos confidenciales será utilizado para el análisis de datos sin ninguna identificación personal.

Completar la encuesta es voluntario y agradecemos enormemente su participación. Si tiene preguntas respecto a este estudio, por favor contacte al Dr. Felipe Korzenny al teléfono (850) 886 8766, o a la Junta de Revisión Institucional de la Universidad, al (850) 664 8633.

------------------------------------------

Specifications:

- **Subject Line:** Cuéntenos qué opina
- **n=2500 completes**
  - n=500 Hispanic (English version)
  - n=500 Hispanic (Spanish version) (max n=500)
  - n=500 Caucasians
  - n=500 African Americans
  - n=500 Asians

------------------------------------------

**SCREENER**

1. Primero que nada, es usted:
3 Hombre
4 Mujer

2. ¿Qué edad tiene?
   _____ [ALLOW 2 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 18-75] [IF LESS THAN 18 OR MORE THAN 75, TERMINATE]

3a. ¿Es usted de descendencia Hispana/Latina/Española?
   3 SÍ [QUALIFY AS HISPANIC QUOTA and skip to qualifying page]
   4 NO

3b. ¿Cuál de las siguientes opciones describe más adecuadamente su herencia u origen étnico?
   6 Caucásico/Blanco [QUALIFY AS CAUCASIAN QUOTA]
   7 Afroamericano/Negro [QUALIFY AS AFRICAN AMERICAN QUOTA]
   8 Asiático o de las Islas del Pacífico [QUALIFY AS ASIAN QUOTA]
   9 Otro [TERMINATE]
   10 Prefiero no contestar [TERMINATE]
Lamentablemente, hoy no tenemos ninguna encuesta que concuerde con sus características.

Non-Qualify Exit Page

¡Esperamos verlo de nuevo pronto!

Haga clic aquí para salir

[Skip to Real survey]

5. Ahora, por favor piense en el idioma que utiliza para realizar las siguientes actividades. En una semana típica, ¿aproximadamente cuántas horas dedica a...? (Ingrese el número de horas específico, no un rango de tiempo, en cada espacio. Si no dedica nada de tiempo a alguna actividad, ingrese un cero “0”)

[GRID; ROTATE; NUMERIC ANSWER] [ALLOW UP TO 3 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-168]

En inglés

   En otro idioma

   1. Escuchar CDs
   2. Escuchar la radio
   3. Escuchar MP3s en cualquier otro aparato, incluyendo un iPod o un teléfono movil
   4. Escuchar música en la televisión
   5. Jugar juegos de video en cualquier aparato
   6. Usar sitios web de redes sociales como Facebook o Twitter
   7. Escuchar la radio a través de la Internet, como a través de Pandora o Last.fm
   8. Hablar con sus amigos

6. ¿Cuál de los siguientes… (Para cada columna, seleccione todas las opciones que sean aplicables)

[GRID; ROTATE]

   Tiene actualmente

   Planifica tener por primera vez dentro del año siguiente

   No tiene y no planifica tener por primera vez dentro del año siguiente

53
1. Un blog
2. Un sitio web personal
3. Un teléfono celular inteligente “smartphone”
4. Un plan de datos ilimitado para su teléfono celular
5. Un “e-reader” o lector electrónico de libros como un Kindle o un Nook
6. Una tableta electrónica o “tablet” como un iPad o un GalaxyTab

7. ¿Qué tan importante es cada uno de los siguientes factores en influir el tipo de música que usted escucha? (Desde 0 = para nada influyente, a 5 = extremadamente influyente)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Para nada influyente</th>
<th>Extremadamente influyente</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Recomendaciones de sus amigos
2. Ver videos musicales
3. Buscar música por género
4. Escuchar la radio, ya sea por la Internet, satélite, o de manera tradicional
5. Ver cubiertas de álbumes
6. Anuncios en la Internet
7. Anuncios en la televisión, en la radio o en revistas

8. ¿Qué tan frecuentemente le “Gusta/Like” una marca de ropa en Facebook o “sigue/follow” una marca de ropa en Twitter?
8a. ¿Qué tan frecuentemente le “Gusta/Like” una marca de electrónicos en Facebook o “sigue/follow” una marca de electrónicos en Twitter?

[GRID; ROTATE]

2. Muy frecuentemente
1. A veces
0. Nunca

IF USE SOCIAL NETWORKING SITES [NON ZERO AT QUESTION 5 ITEM 6]

9. Por favor díganos que tan importantes son para usted las siguientes razones para usar redes sociales como Facebook o Twitter? Use una escala en la cual 0 significa “para nada importante” y 5 significa “extremadamente importante”.
a. Mantenerme al tanto de las nuevas tendencias
b. Encontrar información acerca de productos o servicios
c. Encontrar buenas ofertas en las marcas que me gustan
d. Consultar con mis amigos y familiares acerca de sus opiniones sobre la compra de productos

10. ¿Cuáles géneros de música escucha con frecuencia? Indique todos los géneros que escucha a menudo.

**[ROTATE]**

q. Rock
r. Blues
s. Rap/Hip Hop
t. R & B
u. Techno/Electronica
v. Jazz
w. Classical
x. Country
y. Bluegrass
z. Folk
aa. Metal
bb. Pop
cc. Reggae
dd. Música Latina
e. Religiosa
ff. Otro

11. ¿Qué tan frecuentemente hace cada una de las siguientes actividades?

**[ROTATE]**

a. Comprar música en un CD
b. Comprar MP3s por la Internet
c. Compartir música con amigos y familiares

2. Muy frecuentemente
1. A veces
3. Nunca

12. Por favor indique qué tan de acuerdo o en desacuerdo está con las siguientes afirmaciones. (Desde 0 = completamente en desacuerdo, a 5 = completamente de acuerdo)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completamente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Completamente de acuerdo</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[BREAK INTO TWO OR THREE SETS AFTER RANDOMIZING LIST, THEN RANDOMIZE WITHIN SET]

1. El bienestar del grupo es más importante que los beneficios individuales.
2. El éxito del grupo es más importante que el éxito del individuo.
3. Es muy importante ser aceptado por los miembros de su grupo de trabajo. Los empleados solo deben perseguir sus metas después de considerar el bienestar del grupo.
4. Los gerentes deben reforzar la lealtad al grupo aunque esto perjudique las metas del individuo.
5. Los individuos pueden esperar a renunciar a sus objetivos en beneficio de éxito del grupo.
6. Las reuniones son más eficientes cuando son lideradas por un hombre.
7. Es más importante que los hombres tengan una carrera profesional que las mujeres.
8. Los hombres normalmente resuelven problemas usando el análisis lógico; las mujeres normalmente resuelven problemas usando la intuición.
9. El resolver problemas en organizaciones generalmente requiere una fuerza activa típica de los hombres.
10. Es preferible que un hombre ocupe un puesto alto que una mujer.
11. Tengo marcas favoritas que compro repetidamente.
12. Una vez que encuentro un producto o una marca que me gusta, sigo comprándolo.
13. Yo cambio las marcas que compro con regularidad.
14. Los productos genéricos tienen la misma calidad que los productos de marca.
15. Siento un vínculo especial con las marcas que me gustan.
16. Considero que mis marcas favoritas son parte de mí mismo.
17. Frecuentemente siento una conexión personal con mis marcas favoritas.
18. Una parte de mi está definida por las marcas importantes en mi vida.
19. Siente como si tuviera una conexión personal con las marcas que más prefiero.
20. Puedo identificarme con las marcas importantes en mi vida.
21. Existen vínculos entre las marcas que prefiero y el cómo me veo a mi mismo.
22. Mis marcas favoritas son una indicación importante de quien soy.
23. Si la tienda en la que estoy de compras no tiene mi marca favorita me voy a otra tienda para encontrarla.
24. Loshumanos están abusando del medio ambiente de manera severa.
25. Las plantas y los animales tienen tanto derecho a existir como los humanos.
27. La así llamada “crisis ecológica” que encara a la humanidad ha sido grandemente exagerada.
28. La tierra es como una nave espacial con recursos y espacio muy limitados.
29. Los humanos están destinados a dominar el resto de la naturaleza.
30. El balance de la naturaleza es delicado y fácil de romper.
31. Si las cosas continúan en su curso presente, pronto experimentaremos una catástrofe ecológica de mayores dimensiones.
32. Comprar ropa por la Internet es más conveniente que comprarla en una tienda.
33. Comprar productos tecnológicos por la Internet es más conveniente que comprarlos en una tienda.
34. Puedo conseguir ropa que me gusta a través de tiendas en la Internet.
35. La información que encuentro acerca de marcas en sitios de redes sociales como Facebook o Twitter es confiable.
36. Los comentarios que otros compradores escriben en sitios web de redes sociales como Facebook o Twitter son muy importantes en mis decisiones de compras.
37. Prefiero comprar productos de una marca que tiene una página en un sitio web de redes sociales como Facebook o Twitter.
38. Frecuentemente le pido consejos a otros usuarios de sitios web de redes sociales como Facebook o Twitter acerca de productos que quiero comprar.
39. Yo reciclo siempre que puedo.
40. Estoy reemplazando mis focos o bombillas viejas con otros que ahorran energía.
41. Yo compro productos ecológicos para mi hogar.

i. ¿Usted toca algún instrumento musical? Sí  No

13a. ¿En un año, aproximadamente a cuántos conciertos va?

[NUMERIC ANSWER] [ALLOW UP TO 2 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-90]

13b. ¿Cuántas millas está dispuesto a viajar para ver un concierto de su artista favorito en vivo?

[NUMERIC ANSWER] [ALLOW UP TO 3 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-500]

ii. ¿Normalmente, cuánto dinero gasta comprando música en un mes? Si no compra música escriba “0.”

[NUMERIC ANSWER] [ALLOW UP TO 3 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-500]

14a. ¿Normalmente cuánto dinero gasta en juegos de video en un mes? Si no compra juegos de video escriba “0.”

[NUMERIC ANSWER] [ALLOW UP TO 3 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-500]

14b. ¿Normalmente cuánto dinero gasta en su entretenimiento total en un mes? Si no gasta dinero en entretenimiento escriba “0.”

[NUMERIC ANSWER] [ALLOW UP TO 4 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-2000]

iii. Por favor indique que tan importantes le parecen las siguientes condiciones. Utilice una escala en la cual 0 significa “para nada importante” y 5 significa “extremadamente importante.”

[ROTATE - GRID]

a. Ser reconocido por hacer las cosas bien
b. Trabajar con gente agradable
c. Vivir en un área deseable
d. Tener oportunidades de ser promovido
e. Tener suficiente tiempo para su vida personal y para su hogar
f. Tener un trabajo seguro
g. Hacer trabajo interesante
h. Tener un trabajo que sus amigos y familiares respeten
i. Comprar productos buenos para el ambiente
j. Reemplazar su automóvil actual por uno que sea más eficiente en cuanto a energía

iv. ¿Usted juega juegos de video? Sí  no

IF YES
v. ¿En qué aparatos o consolas juega juegos de video con mayor frecuencia? Indique todos los aparatos o consolas con los cuales juega frecuentemente: [ROTATE]
   a. Xbox 360
   b. Nintendo Wii
   c. PS3
   d. Nintendo DS
   e. PSP
   f. Juegos para la PC
   g. Mass Multiplayer Online
   h. Juegos de sitios web de redes sociales (Social Networking Games)
   i. Juegos electrónicos portátiles
   j. Juegos de teléfono celular
   k. Otros

vi. Normalmente, ¿Cómo cuantas horas juega juegos de video cada semana?
    [NUMERIC ANSWER] [ALLOW UP TO 3 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-168]

vii. Por favor indique los tipos de juegos que juega con mayor frecuencia:
    a. Aventura/Acción
    b. RPG
    c. Deportes
    d. Shooter de primera persona
    e. Shooter
    f. Acertijos/Puzzle
    g. Simuladores/Simulation
    h. Cartas
    i. Estrategia
    j. Pelea
    k. Carreras
    l. Arcade
    m. Fiesta
    n. Otros

viii. Normalmente, ¿cuánto dinero gasta haciendo compras por la Internet cada mes?
20a. ¿Aproximadamente, en un año que porcentaje de sus compras de ropa son hechas por la Internet?

20b. ¿Aproximadamente, en un año que porcentaje de sus compras de electrónicos son hechas por la Internet?

20c. Normalmente, ¿qué porcentaje de sus compras totales hace por la Internet cada mes?

20d. ¿Usted utiliza aplicaciones de celular para hacer compras?  Si       No

20e. Por favor escriba los nombres de las aplicaciones de celular para hacer compras que utiliza con mayor frecuencia:

20f. ¿Usted es miembro de Groupon?  Si       No

IF YES

20g. ¿Aproximadamente cuántas ofertas de Groupon compró el mes pasado?

Ya casi terminamos. Por favor conteste unas cuantas preguntas más. Las siguientes preguntas sólo serán utilizadas para clasificar.

ix. ¿Cuál es su estado civil?

[DROP DOWN MENU]
1. Soltero/a
2. Casado/a
3. Divorciado/a
4. Viudo/a
5. Separado/o
6. Vivo con mi pareja
7. Prefiero no contestar

x. ¿Cuál es el mayor nivel de educación que ha completado?

[DROP DOWN MENU]
1. Escuela primaria
2. Escuela secundaria (middle school)
3. Preparatoria (high school)
4. Algo de universidad/escuela técnica
5. Licenciatura/título de cuatro años
6. Estudios de posgrado
7. Prefiero no contestar

23. ¿Cuál es su situación laboral?
[DROP DOWN MENU] [ALLOW MULTIPLE ANSWERS]
   1. Empleado de tiempo completo
   2. Empleado de tiempo parcial
   3. Estudiante
   4. No empleado
   5. Prefiero no contestar

24. ¿Cuál es su ingreso familiar anual antes de sustraer los impuestos?
[DROP DOWN MENU]
   1. $19,999 o menos
   2. $20,000 a 29,999
   3. $30,000 a 39,999
   4. $40,000 a 49,999
   5. $50,000 a 59,999
   6. $60,000 a 69,999
   7. $70,000 a 79,999
   8. $80,000 a 89,999
   9. $90,000 a 99,999
  10. $100,000 a 124,999
  11. $125,000 a 149,999
  12. $150,000 o más
  13. Prefiero no contestar

25. ¿Es usted padre o guardián de algún niño de 17 años o menos que viva en su hogar?
   1. Sí
   2. No
[ASK Q78 IF Q77=1]
26. ¿Cuántos niños de 17 años o menos viven en su hogar? ______
27. ¿Cuál es el número total de personas que viven en su hogar, incluyéndolo/a a usted? ______
28. ¿Nació usted en los Estados Unidos?
   1. Sí [SKIP TO END]
   2. No
29. ¿En qué país nació? ______
30. ¿Cuántos años ha vivido en los Estados Unidos si no nació aquí? ______ [ALLOW UP TO 2 DIGITS] [RANGE IS 0-75]

Como se mencionó al principio de esta encuesta, si desea leer un resumen de los resultados, por favor visite http://hmc.comm.fsu.edu (en inglés). Los reportes estarán disponibles a partir de Octubre del 2011

Ahora, por favor haga clic en “continue” para completar la encuesta ¡y recibir su incentivo!
## APPENDIX C

### SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell Name</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON HISPANIC WHITE</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Males 18-34</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Males 35-54</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Males 55+</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Females 18-34</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Females 35-54</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Females 55+</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>African American</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Males 18-34</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Males 35-54</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Males 55+</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Females 18-34</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Females 35-54</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Females 55+</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian/Pacific Islander</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Males 18-34</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Males 35-54</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Males 55+</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Females 18-34</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Females 35-54</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Females 55+</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic English</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Males 18-34</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Males 35-54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Males 55+</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Females 18-34</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Females 35-54</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Females 55+</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic Spanish</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Males 18-34</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Males 35-54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Males 55+</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Females 18-34</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Females 35-54</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Females 55+</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>2500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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