



Results

~~For the formal survey, We collected a total of 208 valid formal surveys questionnaires were collected~~ from consumers who had bought 3C products in Taipei City, Taiwan. ~~Specifically, we collected, via e-mail, (Time 1, 800 surveys at Time 1 questionnaires were collected; Time 2, and 208 questionnaires surveys at Time 2 were gathered via e-mail, for a response rate of 26%).~~

~~Approximately Regarding gender (i.e., biological sex),~~ 38% of respondents were female (n = 79) and 62% were thus male (n = 129). ~~Roughly Regarding age,~~ 3.85% of respondents were aged ~~at most~~ 19 years old (n = 8), 66.83% were between 20 and -29 years old (n = 139), 22.12% were between 30 and -39 years old (n = 46), 5.77% were between 40 and -49 years old (n = 12), and 1.44% were ~~over~~ 50 years old or older (n = 3). ~~Finally, regarding educational background, Roughly~~ 18.27% of respondents had a master's degree or Ph.D. ~~degree~~ (n = 38), 77.40% had a bachelor's degree but no higher degree (n = 161), and 4.33% had only a high-school degree (n = 9).

~~The An Taiwan official report issued by the Taiwanese government in 2009 stated indicated that the main users group of 3C products usage in Taiwan is were males and between 20 and -29 years old people (Ministry of the Interior, Republic of China, 2009). Likewise, in the present study, we This study also found that the main users of 3C products in Taiwan were male samples and 20-to-29-year-old malesamples are the major group of 3C products consumers. As for education, we found that most of this young male cohort held (held what? held at least an undergraduate degree?). This~~

latter finding reflects the fact that ~~Besides, the higher education~~ higher-education degrees have become ~~is~~ more and more ~~common popular recently~~ in Taiwan in recent years (Ministry of Education Republic of China, 2009). ~~Additionally, the~~ Our ANOVA test showed that ~~none of the three respondent traits (i.e., gender, age, and education)~~ had ~~ve~~ a ~~no~~ significantly ~~impact effect~~ on post-purchase dissonance, state anxiety, trait anxiety, specific self-confidence, ~~and or~~ generalized self-confidence ($p > 0.05$).

Validity and Reliability

~~In conducting the present This~~ study, ~~we adopted applied~~ the analytical method developed by Kohli, Shervani, and Challagalla (1998). First, ~~we performed an~~ exploratory factor analysis (EFA) ~~was applied~~ to determine how well the scale items, ~~when~~ grouped together, ~~would serve as a~~ measured of underlying concepts. Then, ~~we performed a~~ confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) ~~was performed~~ to ~~assess analyze~~ the measurement model. Finally, ~~we analyzed~~ ~~of the~~ unidimensionality, convergent validity, discriminant validity, and composite reliability of ~~the given~~ scales ~~were conducted~~.

~~After completing our~~ EFA ~~of was applied to all the~~ survey data ($n = 102$), ~~we performed~~. ~~The five factors were extracted using a~~ principal components analysis ~~using~~ ~~the~~ ~~with~~ direct oblimin ~~rotation~~. ~~method~~ ~~From these analyses, we extracted five factors.~~ ~~This study~~ We retained items ~~whose with~~ factor loadings ~~were greater than~~ > 0.5 (Duhachek, 2005; Handelman & Arnold, 1999; Menon, Bhardwaj, Adidam, & Edison, 1999).

~~Our~~ CFA ~~of was then applied to~~ all items in the formal survey ($n = 208$) ~~revealed that~~. ~~The~~ model had acceptable fit; ~~based on~~ $\chi^2/df = 1.197$, ~~the~~ goodness-of-fit index (GFI) = 0.94, ~~the~~ adjusted goodness-of-fit ~~index~~ (AGFI) = 0.91, ~~the~~ comparative-fit index (CFI) =

0.99, the normed fit index (NFI) = 0.97, the non-normed fit index (NNFI) = 0.99, and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = 0.032 (see Table 1).

Gerbing and Anderson (1988) and Kohli et al. (1998) recommended that researchers examining study scales for unidimensionality. Hence, we initially performed An EFA was initially applied to on all scale items and, then on at-one scale item at a time. In this way, we sought to determine whether or not items for a construct shared a single underlying factor (i.e., are were unidimensional). Next, we performed a CFA was applied to on each scale to assess whether or not a one-factor model adequately accounted for any covariances among the subsets of items for within each construct. In each case, a single the one-factor measurement-model had not provided acceptable fit to the data, implying that the measures are were unidimensional (see Table 2) (Kohli et al., 1998).

We assessed Cconvergent validity was assessed by examining whether the significance of all factor loadings are significant and (> 0.5), and we tested whether or not ; average variance extracted (AVE) exceeded 0.5 (Brady & Cronin, 2001; Fornell & Larcker, 1981). All factor loadings were exceeded > 0.5 ($p < 0.01$) and as did AVE exceeded 0.5 (see Table 1).

As for Ddiscriminant validity, we was assessed it by examining whether confidence intervals (± 1.96 standard errors) around correlation estimates between any two factors. All Tthe correlation estimates between any two factors were less than or equal to ≤ 0.85 , and in no case did the confidence intervals contain 1.00, thereby indicating that discriminant validity had been achieved was upheld (see Table 1) (Jöreskog & Sörbom 1993; Menon et al. 1999; Jöreskog & Sörbom 1993).

Finally, our Ccomposite Rreliability (CR) score exceeded 0.6, indicating that the five constructs had satisfactory levels of internal consistency (see Table 1) (Brown, Dev, & Lee, 2000; Homburg & Pflesser, 2000).