Appendix A: Fashion-Related Constructs

Table A1. Fashion-Related Studies and Constructs in IS Literature

Author and Year	Major Findings and Inspiration to the Current Study	Key Fashion-Related Constructs	Definition	Measures
Lee and Collar Jr. 2003	This study tested Management Fashion theory in IT context and showed IT fashion waves do exit and the duration of fashion waves is shorter than that of management fashion waves due to the rapid development of information technologies. It confirms the existence of IT fashion waves.	No construct	NA	NA
Hong and Tam 2006	They stressed the importance of psychographic factors for consumer behavior and proposed a construct called need for uniqueness (NU), which is different from social influence. The results showed the NU is also an important determinant of IT adoption. In the consumer setting, factors considered by consumers are much more complicated than the ones in the work setting, because technologies become personal possessions and even part of themselves. In this case, the role of psychographics in adoption behavior needs to be considered. Social influence and need for uniqueness are all important motivations for following IT fashion.	Need for Uniqueness (NU)	NU is defined as the individual's tendency to seek uniqueness through the adoption and use of symbolic products or innovations for the purpose of enhancing the self-concept.	Item 1: I often think of the things I buy and do in terms of how I can use them to shape a more unusual personal image. Item 2: I am often on the lookout for new products or brands that will add to my personal uniqueness. Item 3: I actively seek to develop my personal uniqueness by buying special products or brands. Item 4: Buying and using products that are interesting and unusual assists me in establishing a distinctive image.
		Social Influence	Social influence (SI) is defined as the extent to which users believe that "important others" would approve or disapprove of their performing a given behavior	Item 1: People who are important to me would want me to use MDS. Item 2: People who influence my behavior would think I should use MDS. Item 3: People whose opinions I value would prefer me to use MDS.
Tzou and Lu, 2009	They proposed four antecedents of the intention to adopt fashion technology:	Beauty of Perceived Aesthetics	No definition	Item 1: I think the appearance of Sony Vaio is beautiful.

	perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, pleasure, and beauty. It showed the affective factor and aesthetics are important in the fashion context.			Item 2: I think the appearance of Sony Vaio is outstanding. Item 3: I think the appearance of Sony Vaio is charming.
		Pleasure of Perceived Aesthetics	No definition	Item 1: I think Sony Vaio can satisfy me. Item 2: I think I will be very pleased with Sony Vaio. Item 3: I think Sony Vaio can make me happy.
Wang 2010	This study showed that following fashion can legitimize organizations and executives and that investing in fashion IT can enhance long-term firm performance. It demonstrates the existence of fashion in organizational technologies and the significant influence of fashion on organizations.	NA	NA	NA
Yang and Hsu, 2011	They proposed six antecedents of intention to adopt fashion technology: perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, perceived playfulness, perceived aesthetics, social norms, and perceived critical mass. It showed that both ergonomic factor (perceived aesthetics) and social psychological factor (perceived critical mass) are important determinants of adopting fashion technologies.	Perceived Aesthetics	Perceived aesthetics is defined as the degree to which a person believes that the fashion technology is attractive and pleasurable to the eye.	Item 1: I think the appearance of the Apple iPod is attractive. Item 2: I think the appearance of the Apple iPod is well designed. Item 3: I think the appearance of the Apple iPod is interesting.
		Perceived Critical Mass	No definition	Item 1: I believe many people use the Apple iPod. Item 2: I think many people I communicate with frequently use the Apple iPod. Item 3: In my opinion, there are a lot of people who use the Apple iPod.
Arbore et al. 2014	This study systematically investigated the symbolic value of adoption from the perspective of self-identity and further argued that self-identity is an antecedent of technology adoption intention. It provided	Self-Identity	Self-identity is defined as the symbolic meaning of an innovation	Item 1: Having a mobile TV would reflect my identity. Item 2: Having a mobile TV would reflect who I am. Item 3: Having a mobile TV would express the personality that I want to communicate to others.

	theoretical support for the role of self-identity in fashion.			Item 4: Having a mobile TV would reflect the way that I want to present myself to others. Item 5: Having a mobile TV suits me well.
		Status Gain	The increase in prestige that coincides with the purchase of a PC for home use	Item 1: Having a mobile TV is a status symbol. Item 2: People who have a mobile TV have more prestige than those who do not. Item 3: People who have a mobile TV have a high profile.
Sun et al. 2014	This study studies the influence of IT fashion waves on post-adoption regret and satisfaction. It verifies the existence of IT fashion waves in the context of consumer technologies and their influence on consumer behaviors.	Exposure to Fashion Wave	NA	Whether the customer reviews within 60 days after a new fashionable phone was released.
Choi and Kim 2016	This study shows that vanity and need for uniqueness positively affect hedonic value and perceived self-expressiveness, which affect behavioral intentions.	Vanity	A personal trait is defined as "having an excessive concern, and/or a positive view of, one's physical appearance/personal achievements"	NA

Table A2. Differentiating External and Internal Symbolic Value from Related Constructs

Related constructs	Definition of Related Constructs	Differences from the Constructs in this Study
Image by Moore and Benbasat (1991)	The degree to which the use of an innovation is perceived to enhance one's image or status in one's social system.	The construct image proposed by Moore and Benbasat (1991) focuses on the social status provided by adopting information technologies. External symbolic value in the current study is related but focuses on group membership and social affiliation.
Subjective norm by Venkatesh and Davis (2000), Venkatesh et al. (2003) and Venkatesh et al. (2012):	A person's perception that most people who are important to him think he should or should not perform the behavior in question.	Subjective norm is related to external symbolic value in that they are both the results of social influence. However, external symbolic value is a form of social learning while subjective norms "act as external sanctions inducing negative emotional states when individuals do not

		conform" (Baddeley 2010, p. 285). Subjective norm affects individuals' behaviors by forcing them to change their intentions in response to the social pressure (Venkatesh et al., 2003) and punishment may be executed if they don't obey.
Self-identity by Arbore et al. (2014)	The symbolic meanings of an innovation	The constructs of internal symbolic value and external symbolic value are both related to self-identities but they focus on the specific symbolic values that people can obtain from using fashionable IT products.
Self-expression attitude toward luxury brands by Bian and Forsythe (2012)	An orientation to respond toward luxury brands so as to display individual identity and underlying value and communicate central beliefs.	This construct is related to perceived internal symbolic value in that they are both about the self-expression motivation behind people's behaviors. The difference is that self-expression attitude toward luxury brands is an attitude toward using a product, while perceived internal symbolic value is a belief about the symbolic benefit provided by using the product. In addition, self-expression attitude toward luxury brands mainly focuses on values while perceived internal symbolic values expand onto values, lifestyles, tastes, and personalities.
Self-presentation attitude toward luxury brands by Wilcox et al. (2009) and Bian and Forsythe (2012).	No definition	Self-presentation attitude toward luxury brands (also called social-adjustive function) is defined as a predisposition to use luxury brands to convey social image (Bian and Forsythe 2012; Wilcox et al. 2009). Likewise, this construct is similar to perceived external symbolic value but distinct from it in that the former is an attitude or inclination toward using a product, while the latter is a belief about the symbolic benefit provided by using the product.
IT identity by Carter and Grover (2015)	The extent to which a person views the use of an IT as integral to his or her sense of self.	IT identity is not about the symbolic value provided by using a technology, but instead, it reflects the degree of one's expansion of self-identity to incorporate the technology. Hence, it's completely different from external and internal symbolic value.

Appendix B: Measurement Development Process in Study 1

Table B1 demonstrates the initial item pool. For collective adoption of IT, three previous studies that defined and measured perceived critical mass were referred to (Premkumar et al. 2008; Van Slyke et al. 2007; Yang and Hsu 2011). Eleven preliminary items in total were generated. For social endorsement of IT, no similar constructs were found in the literature. Hence, the domain sampling method was used to generate the items. Based on the definition of endorsement by Dean (1999), twelve items were generated in total. Items for external symbolic value were adapted from the measure of self-presentation attitude toward luxury brands by Bian and Forsythe (2012), Wilcox et al. (2009) and Grewal et al. (2004), the measure of belongingness by Den Hartog et al. (2007) and the measure of social connectedness by Lee and Robbins (1995). Six initial items were generated. For internal symbolic value, there are two related constructs in literature, including the construct called self-expression attitude toward luxury brands or Value-Expressive Function by Wilcox et al. (2009) and Bian and Forsythe (2012) and the construct self-identity by Arbore et al. (2014b). The items for these two constructs were adapted, and 5 items were generated. All the items use 5-point scales, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Table B1. Initial Item Pool

Construct	Definition	Preliminary Items
Collective adoption of IT (11 items) (Premkumar et al. 2008; Van Slyke et al. 2007; Yang and Hsu 2011)	The degree to which one perceives that a discernible proportion of people in the society have adopted the fashionable technology in the center of the IT fashion.	A significant number of people in society use this product.
		A significant portion of society uses this product.
		A large mass in society use this product.
		Many people use this product.
		A large group of people I communicate with use this product.
		A large group of people I don't know use this product.
		Of the people I communicate with regularly, many use this product.
		Many people I communicate with use this product.
		A significant number of my friends use this product.
		A significant number of my family members use this product.
		A significant number of my colleagues use this product.
Social endorsement of IT (12 items) (Dean 1999) and self-developed	The degree to which one perceives that people with prestige or social status use, appreciate, and advocate the technology in the center of the IT fashion.	Prestigious people endorse this product.
		People with social status endorse this product.
		The people I look up to endorse this product.
		Prominent members in my social groups endorse this product.
		Famous people have said good things about this product.
		People with social status use this product.
		The people I look up to use this product.
		People with social status have said good things about this product.
		People with prestige advertise for this product.
		Prestigious people advocate this product.
		People with prestige in my social groups urge other people to buy this product.
		The people I look up to advocate this product.
Perceived internal symbolic value (8	The degree to which one believes that using an IT	This IT product shows other people the characteristics with which I describe myself.

items) (Arbore et al. 2014b; Bian and Forsythe 2012; Wilcox et al. 2009)	can display their personality, values, tastes, and ways of life.	Using this IT product expresses the personality that I want to communicate to others
		Using this IT product expresses my values
		Using this IT product expresses my tastes.
		Using this IT product expresses my lifestyle.
Perceived external symbolic value (6 items) (Bian and Forsythe 2012; Den Hartog et al. 2007; Grewal et al. 2004; Lee and Robbins 1995; Moore and Benbasat 1991; Wilcox et al. 2009)	The degree to which one believes that using an IT can help them obtain affiliation in their social groups.	Using this IT product helps me fit into important social situations.
		I like to be seen using this IT product.
		Because of my use of this IT product, others in my social groups see me as a more valuable person.
		Using this IT product can strengthen my bond with other people.
		Using this IT product give me a sense of belongingness to my social group.
		Using this IT product improves my image in the social group with which I'm affiliated.
Novelty of IT (Tatikonda and Montoya-Weiss 2001)	The degree to which an IT is perceived by one as new, original, and technically advanced compared to alternative technologies.	Please rate the novelty (i.e., new and original, not like anything seen before) of the following features of this IT product compared to other products in the same category on the market:
		Aesthetic design (including color, material, frame shape, etc.)
		Applications (including apps, web browser, intelligent assistant, etc.)
		Operating system (i.e., watchOS)
		Display device/screen (including screen size, brightness, sensors (finger print ID or face scanners))
		Battery features of this product (such as battery life, power saving)
		Storage features
		Camera features
		Other features, like central processing unit, modem, SIM card
		The product overall
Adoption Intention (Arbore et al. 2014a; Venkatesh et al. 2012)	Behavioral intention to adopt an IT.	I predict that I will adopt the IT product in the future.
		I intend to adopt the IT product in the future.
		I expect to adopt the IT product in the future.
Perceived utilitarian value (Arbore et al. 2014a; Venkatesh et al. 2012)	The degree to which a user believes that the use of a given technology may enhance performance in their daily life	To me, the product is very functional.
		Overall, I think that the IT product is useful in my daily life.
		Having this IT product increases my chances of achieving things that are important to me.
		Generally speaking, the product serves its purpose well.

For novelty of IT, both subjective and objective measures have been used to measure product/technology novelty. Participants rate the newness or novelty of a product/technology based on the participants' subjective opinions (Blijlevens et al. 2013; Jeong et al. 2017; Miron-Spektor and Beenen 2015; Tatikonda and Montoya-Weiss 2001; Wells et al. 2010), on the other hand, the novelty value of a product can also be objectively assessed by comparing the product with a reference product (Barclay and Dann 2000; Chakrabarti and Khadilkar 2003). According to Berlyne (1960), whether a stimulus is new depends on one's own experience. What's novel for one person might not be novel to another person. In addition, this study studies how users' perceptions of IT products

affect their behaviors, and users' perceptions of IT innovation novelty vary from person to person. Therefore, this study chooses to use subjective measures instead of objective measures. Among the subjective measures, a few measured the overall novelty of a product/technology (Blijlevens et al. 2013; Jeong et al. 2017; Miron-Spektor and Beenen 2015; Wells et al. 2010), while Tatikonda and Montoya-Weiss (2001) measured the overall newness of a product and the newness of five aspects in product development. In the current study, we argue that the novelty of fashionable technologies could come from both the aesthetic design and functional design of the products, and hence it's more reasonable to decompose the overall novelty of a technology into several components. Seven design features of a smartwatch were identified: aesthetic design, applications, operating system, display device/screen, battery features, storage features, and other features. [1] [2] Participants were asked to rate the novelty of these aspects and the overall novelty of the product. A 5-point scale was used, ranging from not novel at all to extremely novel, and the meaning of novelty is explained in the question based on the definition of the construct (see Table B1).

Lastly, several steps were taken to create measurement items for IT-identity congruity, as suggested by Sirgy (1985). The first step was to generate a highly consensual set of identities associated with the chosen IT product. To do so, 30 students, IT professionals, and IS scholars are recruited. They were asked to write down five characteristic images or stereotypes (including social status, personalities, tastes, lifestyles, political inclination, etc.) that are generally associated with using Apple Watch. Their responses were then subject to content analysis. Ten identities for Apple Watch were found to be highly consensual and hence were selected (see Table B2). Next, the measurement for IT-identity congruity was created based on the selected identities. Please notice that IT-identity congruity consists of two parts: the identities of the product and the corresponding self-image. More specifically, respondents were first asked to rate the likelihood of the specified identities (the ones generated in the first step) to be associated with the use of a technology. The following question is asked, adapted from Sirgy (1985):

What kinds of people are usually associated with the use of an Apple Watch? Describe these kinds of people by checking the likelihood of each personal characteristic listed below. Using an Apple Watch elicits an image of *being:*
(A 5-point scale was used for these items, ranging from very unlikely to very likely)

Next, they were asked to rate the extent to which they see themselves as having the same personal characteristics. The following question is asked:

How do you see yourself? To what extent do you think of yourself as having the personal characteristics listed above? I see myself as being:

A 5-point scale was used for these items, ranging from very much dislike to very much like.

Table B2. Identities for Apple Watch

Active
Business professional
Early adopter
Extroverted
Loyal to Apple
Ostentatious/Like to Impress others
Politically Liberal
Trendy
Upper class
Well-Educated

Finally, IT-identity congruity (IIC) was calculated using the following formula (Sirgy 1985):

[1] Fossbytes, "What's Inside My Smartphone? — An In-Depth Look at Different Components of A Smartphone", https://fossbytes.com/whats-inside-smartphone-depth-look-parts-powering-everyday-gadget/

[2] Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mobile_phone_features

$$IIC_k = 4 - (\sum_{i=1}^{m} |SM_{ik} - ASI_{ik}|)/n$$

Where IIC_k is the IT-identity congruity score for the user (k), n is the number of identities (i), *i* is identity (1, 2, 3, …, n), SM_{ik} is the score of the identity (i) of the user (k), and ASI_{ik} is the actual self-image score of the identity (i) of the user (k). Since we used a 5-point Likert scale, the minimum congruity is 4 (distance between "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree"). We reversed the value to make sure the higher the IIC_k score, the higher the congruity.

Validation from Focus Groups

The current study conceptualized IT fashion and proposes the characteristics of fashionable technologies: collective adoption, social endorsement, novelty, and IT-identity congruity. We developed measures for these new constructs from the literature. As previous studies have stated, input from practice in the early stages of conceptualization is also important (Anatchkova and Bjorner 2010; Nassar-McMillan and Borders 2002). Therefore, focus groups were used to triangulate the conceptualization of the construct between literature and practice. Each focus group contained three to five participants. The participants were IT professionals, IS scholars, and normal consumers. At the beginning of the focus group, the participants were told the purpose of the meeting and that they could discuss with each other freely. Then, they were asked to share their definitions and understandings of fashion in general and fashionable technologies. Next, the new constructs' definitions and measures were presented and opinions were asked. The conceptualization of the construct was modified based on the results of the focus groups. Table B3 summarizes those results and explains how the answers inspired the current study.

Table B3. Summary of the Results of Focus Groups

Questions asked	Summary of the Feedback	Implications to the Study and Changes Made
Are there any fashionable technologies for you?	Most participants thought fashionable technologies are the ones that are stylish or aesthetically appealing, such as smart watches, Beats headphones, etc. Some thought smartphones such as iPhone or Samsung are fashionable, but less fashionable than they were several years ago. One person can't associate IT with fashion at all but think that Instagram can be considered fashionable to some extent in that it's being used by many fashion bloggers or icons. One person thinks Fitbit is fashionable to some extent.	Their answers provided evidence for the existence of fashionable technologies, such as iPhones, Fitbit, and Instagram but also proved that many people do not associate fashion with these technologies.
What does fashion mean to you?	Most participants mentioned trendy, style, and beauty. Other participants also mentioned popularity, social status, and personal statement.	Their answers proved that fashion is usually associated with aesthetics and symbolic values.
What does fashion mean in terms of technology? Do fashionable technologies differ from fashionable clothes?	Participants admitted that just like fashionable clothes, fashionable technologies need to be stylish, popular, and cool and signify status. They also thought that fashionable technologies need to be able to provide utilitarian benefits, enhance performance, and make life easier.	Although different people have different understandings of fashion, it's undoubted that utility and functions are important for fashionable technologies.
What do you think of the first characteristic of fashion	While most participants agreed that fashionable technologies are popular, some of them argued	We tried to avoid using words like "many" in the items.

technologies we propose – collective adoption?	that if a product is adopted by too many people, then it becomes less fashionable.	
What do you think of the second characteristic of fashion technologies we propose – social endorsement?	The participants agreed that in most cases, fashionable technologies are endorsed by fashion leaders, the elite, or celebrities, but some people disagreed by using some examples of counter-cultural fashions and argued that these fashions were not endorsed by celebrities or the elite but arose from some non-mainstream social groups.	Fashion leaders do not have to be "certified professionals" (Farennikova and Prinz, 2011), they can be anyone with prestige or creativity from our social group (Sproles, 1979). Thus, we used "people with prestige or social status" to replace "fashion leaders" in the definition and further highlighted the meaning of fashion leaders in the definition.
What do you think of the third characteristic of fashion technologies we propose – novelty?	Participants all agreed that fashionable technologies should have the newest and trendiest aesthetic and functional design.	No changes made
What do you think of the fourth characteristic of fashion technologies we propose – IT-identity congruity?	Specifically, we first asked the participants if they could think of any salient characteristics of typical Apple Watch users. The characteristics they listed included: hipsters, active, tech-savvy, and wealthy. In contrast, we then asked them if they could think of any salient characteristics of typical Dell or HP laptop users. Most participants can't. Lastly, we asked them if they would use a technology that is not compatible with the way they think of themselves. The participants all answered no.	The participants' answers provided evidence that fashionable technologies should have salient symbolic meanings as opposed to non-fashionable technologies, and congruity with their self-identity is an important consideration of adoption intention.

Appendix C: Pre-Tests in Study 1

In the pre-test, a verbal protocol was conducted with four IT professionals and four IS scholars to provide an initial examination of the items' face and content validity (Churchill 1979). Clarity and ambiguity of the constructs' definitions and the measurement items were assessed. Based on the feedback from judges, several items were rephrased to improve clarity and accurately capture the domains of the related constructs. To further examine the construct validity of the scales, three rounds of Q-sorting were conducted, following the procedures recommended by Moore and Benbasat (1991). Only the items of the new constructs, which include collective adoption, social endorsement, novelty, IT-identity congruity, perceived external symbolic value, and perceived internal symbolic value, were incorporated for the card-sorting exercises. Another construct subjective norm that could conceptually overlap with some of the new constructs was also added.[3] Each item was printed on a card and presented to the judges in random order. Then the judges were asked to sort the items into categories. After three rounds of card-sorting exercises, the measurement items were refined based on the judges' opinions. The overall placement ratio was increased to 96.39% after we adjusted the measurement items, with all construct placement percentages above 90%. Thus, we believe that the items have demonstrated good construct validity (Moore and Benbasat 1991).

For the first round, two IS scholars and two IT professionals were asked to sort the items without the construct names and definitions. They were also asked to give each category a name by themselves and provide explanations about why they put the items in a certain category (Moore and Benbasat 1991). This study used the placement ratio of items within the target constructs (i.e., the percentage of placing the items within the intended construct) developed by Moore and Benbasat (1991) to measure inter-rater agreement and construct validity. Table C1 shows the percentages of placing the items under the right construct (the last column) and the overall placement ratio.

Table C1. Result of Round 1 Q-sorting[4]

Construct	CA	SE	NIT	IIC	SN	ISV	ESV	NA/vague	Total	Percentages of Correct Placement
CA	42	2							44	95.45%
SE		46			2				48	95.83%
NIT			32						32	100.00%
IIC				40					40	100.00%
SN		6			3		3		12	25.00%
ISV						20			20	100.00%
ESV						2	22		24	91.67%
Overall ratio										86.85%
* CA: collective adoption, SE: social endorsement, NIT: novelty of IT, IIC: IT-identity congruity, SN: subjective norm, ISV: internal symbolic value, ESV: external symbolic value										

From the result above we can tell that the judges classified the items into 7 constructs, which is what we hoped. No additional construct was suggested. Specifically, we can tell that there was overlap among the items of subject norms, social endorsement, and external symbolic value. Items for collective adoption also have some overlap with social endorsement. Initial adjustment was made based on the results: we removed items in social endorsement that involved the meanings "urge other people to use it" to reduce overlap with subjective norm; we removed the item "I like to be seen using this IT product" from external symbolic value, which was placed in another category. No items were removed from subjective norm despite the overlap because there were already only three items for this construct. Thus, these items were kept for further observation. The second round of Q-sorting was then conducted,

[3] The measurement items for subjective norm were adopted from Venkatesh, V.; Morris, M.G.; Davis, G.B.; and Davis, F.D. User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. MIS Quarterly, 27, 3 (2003), 425-478.

[4] Please notice that judges gave different names for the constructs that the items belong to. In this table I used my own construct names for clarity.

and another four judges were recruited. In this round of Q-sorting, the construct names and definitions were given to the judges. Below is the result of the second round of Q-sorting.

Table C2. Result of Round 2 Q-sorting

Construct	CA	SE	NIT	IIC	SN	ISV	ESV	NA/vague	Total	Percentages of Correct Placement
CA	37	2			5				44	84.09%
SE		43						5	48	89.58%
NIT			32						32	100.00%
IIC				40					40	100.00%
SN					11		1		12	91.67%
ISV						20			20	100.00%
ESV						1	23		24	95.83%
Overall ratio										94.45%

As we can see, giving the judges the construct names and definitions increased the overall placement ratio, but similar problems were exposed. Items for collective adoption, social endorsement, and subjective norm still overlap. Some items for social endorsement didn't fit into any category. We obtained the judges' verbal explanation and made the following adjustments to the items.

- Removed the items in collective adoption that involved the words "my family or my friends" to reduce overlap with subjective norm.
- Avoid using the phrases "people I look up to", "people with prestige in my social groups" and "prominent people in my social groups" for social endorsement to avoid confusion.
- Dropped the ambiguous items for social endorsement that did not fit into any category.
- Dropped a few redundant items for collective adoption.
- One item "Because of my use of this IT product, others in my social groups see me as a more valuable person" in external symbolic value was reworded.

A third-round Q-sorting was conducted after the adjustment. The overall placement ratio was increased to 96.39% after we adjusted the measurement items, with all construct placement percentages above 90%, and no significant problems emerged in this round of Q-sorting (see Table C3). Thus, we believe that the items have demonstrated good construct validity (Moore and Benbasat 1991).

Table C3. Result of Round 3 Q-sorting

Construct	CA	SE	NIT	IIC	SN	ISV	ESV	NA/vague	Total	Percentages of Correct Placement
CA	22				2				24	91.67%
SE		27			1				28	96.43%
NIT			32						32	100.00%
IIC				40					40	100.00%
SN					11		1		12	91.67%
ISV						20			20	100.00%
ESV						1	19		20	95.00%
Overall ratio										96.39%

Appendix D: Pilot Test of Study 1

The purpose of the pilot test is to further refine the survey instrument. 50 responses were collected by the survey company Qualtrics. Reliability and construct validity were assessed to further refine the items. According to Sirgy and Samli (1985), no internal consistency testing is necessary for the IT-identity congruity items, in that such testing is theoretically meaningless. Instead, the only criterion for reliability and validity is nomological validity (Sirgy and Samli 1985). The empirical test of the research model would automatically demonstrate the nomological validity of the measure for IT-identity congruity. All the constructs' composite reliability values were over 0.7, and all the constructs' Cronbach's Alpha values were over 0.8, except perceived utilitarian value, which was very close to 0.8 (see Table D1), indicating that the scales are reliable (Bagozzi and Yi 1988; Nunnally and Bernstein 1994).

Table D1. Reliability Values and AVE

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Adoption intention	0.982	0.988	0.966
Collective adoption	0.843	0.885	0.577
External symbolic value	0.914	0.936	0.746
Internal symbolic value	0.917	0.933	0.635
Novelty of IT	0.881	0.904	0.544
Social endorsement	0.869	0.899	0.563

Next, we used factor loadings and Average Variance Explained (AVE) to assess convergent validity. Items' factor loadings should be over 0.707 and AVEs should be greater than 0.5 (Barclay et al. 1995; Fornell and Larcker 1981). From Table D1 we can see that AVEs were all greater than 0.5. Then we check the item loading on their associated constructs (see D3). Three items' loadings were found to be lower than 0.707: item 6 for collective adoption (loading = 0.351), item 1 for social endorsement (loading = 0.574), and item 1 for internal symbolic value (loading = 0.671). Those items were carefully examined to make sure that content validity wouldn't suffer if they were deleted. Then these items were dropped. Lastly, discriminant validity was assessed using two criteria. The square roots of AVE for all the constructs should be greater than the correlations between the construct and other constructs (Chin 1998; Compeau et al. 1999). Second, item loadings on their associated constructs should be higher than their loadings on other factors. Table D2 demonstrates the comparison of square roots of AVEs and correlations, and Table D3 shows loadings and cross-loadings, which prove that both criteria are met, indicating desired discriminant validity. Nevertheless, item 3 for perceived utilitarian value has high cross-loadings on external symbolic value and internal symbolic value. By examining the meaning of this item, we believe that there is a conceptual overlap between this item and the two symbolic value constructs. Thus, we decided to drop this item. Table D4 shows all the items after the adjustment performed in the pilot test.

Table D2. Square Roots of AVE and Correlations

Construct	AI	CA	ESV	ISV	NIT	SE
Adoption intention	*0.983*					
Collective adoption	0.600	*0.760*				
External symbolic value	0.640	0.592	*0.864*			
Internal symbolic value	0.650	0.477	0.798	*0.797*		
Novelty of IT	0.403	0.443	0.435	0.532	*0.737*	
Social endorsement	0.389	0.586	0.505	0.334	0.297	*0.750*
*Square root of AVE along diagonals.						

Table D3. Loadings and Cross Loadings for the Measurement Model

Construct	AI	CA	ESV	ISV	NIT	SE
AI1	**0.979**	0.574	0.637	0.637	0.424	0.396
AI2	**0.984**	0.611	0.602	0.625	0.411	0.378
AI3	**0.985**	0.585	0.647	0.654	0.353	0.373
CA1	0.364	**0.724**	0.307	0.268	0.375	0.390
CA2	0.471	**0.813**	0.574	0.482	0.309	0.420
CA3	0.575	**0.775**	0.584	0.461	0.331	0.478
CA4	0.498	**0.897**	0.471	0.353	0.416	0.535
CA5	0.540	**0.866**	0.389	0.294	0.362	0.573
CA6	0.106	0.351	0.183	0.206	0.270	0.191
ESV1	0.471	0.499	**0.799**	0.650	0.336	0.386
ESV2	0.614	0.637	**0.916**	0.756	0.376	0.509
ESV3	0.540	0.395	**0.908**	0.708	0.371	0.414
ESV4	0.473	0.421	**0.782**	0.565	0.319	0.363
ESV5	0.635	0.561	**0.905**	0.745	0.461	0.484
ISV1	0.547	0.433	0.470	0.671	0.500	0.317
ISV2	0.446	0.326	0.574	**0.754**	0.303	0.208
ISV3	0.506	0.359	0.692	**0.845**	0.374	0.151
ISV4	0.562	0.311	0.571	**0.762**	0.460	0.217
ISV5	0.506	0.368	0.751	**0.851**	0.392	0.291
NIT1	0.283	0.408	0.385	0.365	**0.656**	0.346
NIT 2	0.433	0.340	0.257	0.323	**0.791**	0.259
NIT 3	0.271	0.349	0.355	0.338	**0.804**	0.341
NIT 4	0.295	0.284	0.305	0.293	**0.791**	0.247
NIT 5	0.313	0.332	0.297	0.430	**0.648**	0.030
NIT 6	0.240	0.247	0.290	0.408	**0.804**	0.078
NIT 7	0.127	0.136	0.114	0.319	**0.653**	0.056
NIT 8	0.369	0.411	0.438	0.591	**0.728**	0.230
SE1	0.236	0.319	0.391	0.251	0.043	0.574
SE2	0.203	0.445	0.244	0.195	0.177	**0.738**
SE3	0.265	0.288	0.233	0.115	0.177	**0.733**
SE4	0.413	0.574	0.519	0.398	0.282	**0.762**
SE5	0.334	0.488	0.426	0.268	0.301	**0.857**
SE6	0.302	0.393	0.379	0.262	0.241	**0.828**
SE7	0.172	0.473	0.289	0.123	0.279	**0.726**

Table D4. Measurement Items Used in Study 1

Construct	Definition	Items
Collective adoption of IT	The degree to which one perceives that a discernible proportion of people in the society have adopted the fashionable technology in the center of the IT fashion.	CA1: A significant number of people I don't know use this product. CA2: A significant number of people in society use this product. CA3: A large mass in society use this product. CA4: Many people use this product. CA5: A large group of people I communicate with use this product.
Social endorsement of IT	The degree to which one perceives that people with prestige or social status use, appreciate, and advocate the technology in the center of the IT fashion.	SE2: Prestigious people endorse this product. SE3: People with social status endorse this product. SE4: Famous people have said good things about this product. SE5: People with social status have said good things about this product. SE6: People with prestige advertise for this product. SE7: Prestigious people advocate this product.
Internal symbolic value	The degree to which one believes that using an IT can display their personality, values, tastes, and ways of life.	ISV2: Using this IT product expresses the personality that I want to communicate to others. ISV3: Using this IT product expresses my values. ISV4: Using this IT product expresses my tastes. ISV5: Using this IT product expresses my lifestyle.
External symbolic value	The degree to which one believes that using an IT can help them obtain affiliation in their social groups.	ESV1: Using this IT product helps me fit into important social situations. ESV2: If I use this product, others in my social groups will see me as a more valuable person. ESV3: Using this IT product can strengthen my bond with other people. ESV4: Using this IT product give me a sense of belongingness to my social group. ESV5: Using this IT product improves my image in the social group with which I'm affiliated.
Adoption Intention	Behavioral intention to adopt an IT.	AI1: I predict that I would adopt the IT product in the future. AI2: I intend to adopt the IT product in the future. AI3: I expect to adopt the IT product in the future.
Novelty of IT	The degree to which an IT is perceived by one as new, original, and technically advanced compared to alternative technologies.	Please rate the novelty (i.e., new and original, not like anything seen before) of the following features of this IT product compared to other products in the same category on the market: NIT1: Aesthetic design (including color, material, frame shape, etc.) NIT2: Applications (including apps, web browser, intelligent assistant, etc.) NIT3: Operating system (i.e., watchOS) NIT4: Display device/screen (including screen size, brightness, sensors (fingerprint ID or face scanners)) NIT5: Battery features of this product (such as battery life, power saving) NIT6: Storage features

		NIT7: Other features, like central processing unit, modem, SIM card NIT8: The product overall

Appendix E: Results of the Full Test in Study 1

Table E1. Sample Demographics

Factor	Value	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	1: Male	132	51.6%
	2: Female	124	48.4%
Age	1: Under 20	25	9.8%
	2: 20-30	79	30.9%
	3: 31-40	78	30.5%
	4: 41-50	67	26.2%
	5: 51 or over	7	2.7%
Education	1: No school	0	0.0%
	2: Less than high school	2	0.8%
	3: High school	118	46.1%
	4: College	117	45.7%
	5: Master's degree	17	6.6%
	6: Doctoral degree	2	0.8%
Income	1: Less than $25,000	46	18.0%
	2: $25,000-$49,999	119	46.5%
	3: $50,000-$74,999	55	21.5%
	4: $75,000 or over	36	14.0%

Table E2. Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Reliability Values

Construct	Mean	SD	AI	CA	ESV	ISV	NIT	SE	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	AVE
AI	2.850	1.191	*0.969*						0.982	0.988	0.938
CA	3.291	0.864	0.534	*0.815*					0.843	0.885	0.664
ESV	2.403	0.901	0.576	0.465	*0.855*				0.914	0.936	0.731
ISV	2.407	0.893	0.660	0.433	0.760	*0.857*			0.917	0.933	0.735
NIT	1.425	0.662	0.463	0.388	0.384	0.386	*0.801*		0.881	0.904	0.641
SE	3.375	0.850	0.317	0.487	0.445	0.403	0.368	*0.813*	0.869	0.899	0.661

*Square root of AVE along diagonals.
*AI: adoption intention, CA: collective adoption, ESV: external symbolic value, SE: social endorsement, ISV: internal symbolic value, NIT: novelty of IT

Table E3. Loadings and Cross Loadings for the Measurement Model

Construct	AI	CA	ESV	ISV	NIT	SE
AI1	**0.960**	0.537	0.578	0.630	0.472	0.289
AI2	**0.978**	0.528	0.552	0.643	0.456	0.342
AI3	**0.967**	0.486	0.542	0.645	0.415	0.288
CA1	0.353	**0.790**	0.304	0.230	0.319	0.410
CA2	0.498	**0.845**	0.470	0.450	0.323	0.376
CA3	0.495	**0.815**	0.426	0.441	0.311	0.281

CA4	0.386	**0.830**	0.347	0.291	0.323	0.474
CA5	0.404	**0.795**	0.298	0.281	0.312	0.490
ESV1	0.512	0.455	**0.827**	0.723	0.358	0.402
ESV2	0.510	0.453	**0.879**	0.682	0.346	0.416
ESV3	0.499	0.359	**0.893**	0.642	0.311	0.367
ESV4	0.441	0.332	**0.788**	0.540	0.289	0.293
ESV5	0.492	0.372	**0.882**	0.640	0.330	0.407
ISV2	0.540	0.413	0.638	**0.793**	0.423	0.421
ISV3	0.548	0.356	0.688	**0.869**	0.281	0.279
ISV4	0.598	0.379	0.614	**0.877**	0.330	0.352
ISV5	0.551	0.312	0.642	**0.856**	0.262	0.303
NIT1	0.322	0.312	0.328	0.296	**0.732**	0.264
NIT2	0.428	0.321	0.344	0.326	**0.845**	0.311
NIT3	0.347	0.264	0.286	0.286	**0.759**	0.318
NIT4	0.414	0.335	0.315	0.335	**0.846**	0.315
NIT5	0.343	0.298	0.261	0.266	**0.781**	0.274
NIT6	0.308	0.279	0.307	0.263	**0.802**	0.244
NIT7	0.33	0.29	0.216	0.249	**0.791**	0.231
NIT8	0.433	0.367	0.369	0.403	**0.839**	0.371
SE2	0.187	0.414	0.278	0.275	0.313	**0.791**
SE3	0.191	0.336	0.302	0.286	0.252	**0.833**
SE4	0.332	0.449	0.453	0.464	0.282	**0.785**
SE5	0.323	0.42	0.412	0.347	0.331	**0.866**
SE6	0.216	0.338	0.352	0.283	0.304	**0.842**
SE7	0.231	0.381	0.302	0.228	0.32	**0.753**

AI: adoption intention, CA: collective adoption, ESV: external symbolic value, SE: social endorsement, ISV: internal symbolic value, NIT: novelty of IT

Table E4. Second-Order Construct Validity

Second-Order Construct	First-Order Construct	Outer Weighting	T Statistics	P Value	Outer Loadings	VIF
PSITF	CA	0.641	16.907	0.000	0.891	1.304
	SE	0.518	14.008	0.000	0.828	1.304
PFIT	IIC	0.553	8.629	0.000	0.663	1.022
	NIT	0.756	13.185	0.000	0.837	1.022

*CA: collective adoption, SE: social endorsement, NIT: novelty of IT, PSITF: perceived societal-level IT fashion, PFIT: perceived fashionableness of IT

Appendix F: Pre-Tests in Study 2

Table F1. Results of Focal Technology Selection (N = 29)

IT products	Fashionable	Not Fashionable	Neutral	Not Sure
Tesla	93.1%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%
TikTok	89.7%	6.9%	3.4%	0.0%
Meta Quest	75.9%	3.4%	20.7%	0.0%
Instagram	75.9%	10.3%	13.8%	0.0%
Smart Assistant: Alexa, Siri, Cortana	62.1%	17.2%	20.7%	0.0%
GoPro	58.6%	24.1%	17.2%	0.0%
DJI Drone	55.2%	3.4%	17.2%	24.1%
Fitbit	51.7%	34.5%	13.8%	0.0%
Bumble	51.7%	17.2%	17.2%	13.8%
SHEIN	51.7%	10.3%	3.4%	34.5%
Nintendo Switch	48.3%	37.9%	10.3%	3.4%
Pinterest	44.8%	41.4%	13.8%	0.0%
Zoom	37.9%	37.9%	24.1%	0.0%
Elden Ring	37.9%	20.7%	17.2%	24.1%
Netflix	34.5%	37.9%	27.6%	0.0%
Microsoft Excel	31.0%	37.9%	31.0%	0.0%
Facebook	17.2%	72.4%	10.3%	0.0%
League of Legend	17.2%	41.4%	20.7%	20.7%

* Results are based on the question: *How do you think of the following IT products*? Participants were asked to label the 18 IT products with one of the four categories: *fashionable, not fashionable, neutral,* and *not sure.*

Table F2. Result of Q-Sorting

Construct	PSITF	PFIT	NIT	Adoption	Total	Percentages of Correct Placement
PSITF	18	2	0	0	20	90%
PFIT	2	18	0	0	20	90%
NIT	1	0	14	0	15	93.33%
Adoption	0	0	0	15	15	100%
Overall ratio						93.33%

*PSITF: perceived societal-level IT fashion, PFIT: perceived fashionableness of IT, NIT: novelty of IT

Table F3. Loadings and Cross-Loadings of Pre-Test 2 (N = 98)

Construct	CA	ESV	PFIT	ISV	NIT	SE	PSITF
CA1	**0.954**	0.245	0.202	0.024	0.120	0.129	0.327
CA2	**0.969**	0.256	0.207	0.027	0.069	0.130	0.342
CA3	**0.753**	0.157	0.108	-0.051	-0.116	0.181	0.293
CA4	**0.936**	0.253	0.173	0.059	-0.026	0.143	0.343
CA5	0.602	0.323	0.121	0.06	0.028	0.102	0.202
ESV1	0.279	**0.911**	0.600	0.586	0.475	0.330	0.378
ESV2	0.194	**0.874**	0.647	0.654	0.488	0.434	0.384
ESV3	0.229	**0.888**	0.564	0.685	0.295	0.336	0.376
ESV4	0.284	**0.942**	0.649	0.669	0.406	0.337	0.393
ESV5	0.286	**0.929**	0.607	0.581	0.408	0.403	0.414
PFIT1	0.115	0.578	**0.915**	0.628	0.605	0.346	0.572
PFIT2	0.194	0.539	**0.910**	0.533	0.670	0.348	0.557
PFIT3	0.224	0.705	**0.969**	0.746	0.643	0.39	0.531
PFIT4	0.187	0.699	**0.947**	0.769	0.604	0.391	0.475
ISV1	0.020	0.753	0.727	**0.908**	0.507	0.558	0.423
ISV2	-0.097	0.506	0.574	**0.895**	0.347	0.410	0.309
ISV3	0.079	0.673	0.686	**0.924**	0.586	0.472	0.297
ISV4	0.08	0.602	0.637	**0.945**	0.487	0.542	0.331
NIT1	0.091	0.479	0.672	0.536	**0.836**	0.244	0.475
NIT2	0.004	0.402	0.567	0.461	**0.942**	0.296	0.347
NIT3	-0.059	0.336	0.551	0.415	**0.917**	0.302	0.295
SE1	0.153	0.483	0.464	0.515	0.339	**0.814**	0.549
SE2	0.010	0.279	0.321	0.384	0.229	**0.863**	0.466
SE3	0.306	0.220	0.284	0.384	0.203	**0.784**	0.440
SE4	0.118	0.232	0.179	0.433	0.145	**0.865**	0.393
SE5	0.171	0.405	0.363	0.529	0.314	**0.847**	0.525
SE6	0.062	0.399	0.351	0.503	0.320	**0.941**	0.471
PSITF1	0.393	0.278	0.345	0.342	-0.001	0.546	**0.893**
PSITF2	0.225	0.284	0.271	0.254	0.062	0.471	**0.740**
PSITF3	0.367	0.425	0.290	0.431	0.237	0.504	**0.923**
PSITF4	0.240	0.493	0.386	0.427	0.109	0.440	**0.907**

*CA: collective adoption, ESV: external symbolic value, PFIT: perceived fashionableness of IT, ISV: internal symbolic value, SE: social endorsement, PSITF: perceived societal-level IT fashion, NIT: novelty of IT

Based on the results of loadings and cross-loading, CA5 is dropped in the main test of Study 2 due to its low loading. One item for NIT, NIT1: “The design of this IT product is attractive and pleasurable to the eye” is dropped due to for clarity of the definition.

Next, we develop the identity of the focal IT products to be used to measure IT-identity congruity. The identities of the focal IT products were defined based on (1) the description of the product's official website, and (2) Google search results of "who uses Excel/Meta Quest". Please also note that the participants in Study 2 also had the option to propose other identities carried by the IT and rate the extent to which they see themselves as having the same personal identities.

Table F4. Finalized New Items in Study 2

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Items</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Perceived Societal-Level IT Fashion (PSITF)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">PSITF1: It is widely accepted in society that Excel/Oculus Quest is fashionable nowadays.
PSITF2: Using Excel/Oculus Quest is a prevailing trend in society now.
PSITF3: Most people in society would agree that Excel/Oculus Quest is trendy, innovative, and contains symbolic meanings.
PSITF4: Using Excel/Oculus Quest is perceived as a fashion right now in society.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Novelty of IT (NIT)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">NIT2: Compared to existing technologies, Excel/Oculus Quest is seen as novel, unique, and highly advanced.
NIT3: I think Excel/Oculus Quest is novel, unique, and technologically sophisticated.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Perceived Fashionableness of IT(PFIT)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">PFIT1: Overall, Excel/Oculus Quest is fashionable to me.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">PFIT2: I think Excel/Oculus Quest brings a sense of being trendy to me.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">PFIT3: Using Excel/Oculus Quest can make me feel fashionable.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">PFIT4: I can have a sense of being fashionable when using Excel/Oculus Quest.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Identities Associated with the IT (used to calculate IT-identity congruity)</td></tr>
<tr><td>MS Excel (8 pre-defined images)</td><td>Meta Quest (8 pre-defined images)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Business professional, well-educated, high-skill positions, analyst, manager, administrative positions</td><td>Active, early adopter, extroverted, Ostentatious/like to impress others, trendy, tech enthusiast, video game player, tech geek, well-educated</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Willingness-to-Pay (WTP)</td></tr>
<tr><td>MS Excel (A slider question with a range of 0 - 300 USD)</td><td>Meta Quest (A slider question with a range of 0 - 600 USD)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assuming there is a new, generic spreadsheet product SpreadsheetOne that:
• just became available on the market
• meets your specific needs
• has the exact same functions as Microsoft Excel

If the market price for SpreadsheetOne is $150, what would you pay for Microsoft Excel (if you have to pay by yourself)?</td><td>Assuming there is a generic virtual reality headset product VROne that:
• just became available on the market
• meets your specific needs
• has the exact same functions as Oculus Quest 2

If the market price for VROne is $300, what would you pay for Oculus Quest 2 (if you have to pay by yourself)?</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">*Items for the rest of the constructs in Study 2 were consistent with the finalized items in Study 1
*Direct measures of WTP were also developed and captured in Study 2. Sample items include "I would like to pay for MS Excel/Meta Quest." Participants indicated the extent to which they agree or disagree with each statement on a 7-point Likert scale (from strongly disagree to strongly agree).</td></tr>
</table>

Appendix G: Results of the Full Test in Study 2

Table G1. Demographic Statistic (N =236)

Factor	Value	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	1: Male	97	41.1%
	2: Female	133	56.4%
	3: Prefer not to answer	6	2.5%
Age	1: 18-24	53	22.5%
	2: 25-34	83	35.2%
	3: 35-44	49	20.8%
	4: 45-54	29	12.3%
	5: 55-64	14	5.9%
	6: 65 or over	8	3.4%
Education	1: Some high school or less	2	0.8%
	2: High school diploma or GED	27	11.4%
	3: Some college, but no degree	63	26.7%
	4: Associates or technical degree	30	12.7%
	5: Bachelor's degree	83	35.2%
	6: Graduate or professional degree	30	12.7%
	7: Prefer not to say	1	0.4%
Household Income	1: Less than $25,000	38	16.1%
	2: $25,000-$49,999	58	24.6%
	3: $50,000-$74,999	51	21.6%
	4: $75,000-$99,999	38	16.1%
	5: $100,000-$149,999	29	12.3%
	6: $150,000 or more	15	6.4%
	7: Prefer not to say	7	3.0%

Table G2. Correlations, Square root of AVE, and Cronbach's Alpha

Construct	CA	ESV	PFIT	ISV	NIT	SE	PSITF	Alpha
CA	*0.894*							0.922
ESV	0.275	*0.893*						0.936
PFIT	0.109	0.628	*0.917*					0.937
ISV	0.091	0.550	0.643	*0.885*				0.908
NIT	0.011	0.422	0.653	0.515	*0.871*			0.917
SE	0.420	0.582	0.459	0.369	0.360	*0.812*		0.896
PSITF	0.258	0.520	0.686	0.444	0.537	0.612	*0.882*	0.905

* Square root of AVE along diagonals. CA: collective adoption, ESV: external symbolic value, PFIT: perceived fashionableness of IT, ISV: internal symbolic value, SE: social endorsement, PSITF: perceived societal-level IT fashion, NIT: novelty of IT

Table G3. Loadings and Cross Loadings for the Measurement Model

Construct	CA	ESV	PFIT	ISV	NIT	SE	PSITF
CA1	**0.932**	0.305	0.135	0.109	0.032	0.417	0.271
CA2	**0.944**	0.281	0.131	0.111	0.095	0.413	0.270
CA3	**0.744**	0.149	0.024	-0.004	0.001	0.295	0.138
CA4	**0.907**	0.199	0.059	0.038	-0.007	0.351	0.211
ESV1	0.333	**0.887**	0.536	0.441	0.323	0.559	0.490
ESV2	0.260	**0.867**	0.541	0.393	0.369	0.474	0.421
ESV3	0.174	**0.844**	0.549	0.519	0.340	0.483	0.409
ESV4	0.261	**0.930**	0.570	0.509	0.393	0.549	0.514
ESV5	0.241	**0.936**	0.608	0.559	0.393	0.532	0.487
PFIT1	0.148	0.518	**0.916**	0.603	0.554	0.358	0.622
PFIT2	-0.040	0.518	**0.883**	0.584	0.600	0.367	0.600
PFIT3	0.151	0.629	**0.939**	0.564	0.498	0.472	0.649
PFIT4	0.148	0.635	**0.927**	0.606	0.509	0.479	0.640
ISV1	0.135	0.540	0.609	**0.875**	0.391	0.358	0.408
ISV2	0.212	0.552	0.562	**0.877**	0.337	0.385	0.421
ISV3	-0.068	0.409	0.564	**0.897**	0.377	0.261	0.377
ISV4	0.025	0.437	0.538	**0.892**	0.372	0.293	0.360
NIT2	0.008	0.370	0.570	0.385	**0.962**	0.313	0.472
NIT3	0.088	0.414	0.560	0.418	**0.960**	0.353	0.489
SE1	0.346	0.398	0.252	0.221	0.302	**0.728**	0.409
SE2	0.354	0.438	0.314	0.233	0.298	**0.835**	0.515
SE3	0.171	0.433	0.466	0.353	0.294	**0.831**	0.552
SE4	0.254	0.467	0.413	0.308	0.310	**0.887**	0.548
SE5	0.544	0.548	0.334	0.237	0.201	**0.772**	0.449
SE6	0.493	0.564	0.430	0.411	0.279	**0.810**	0.494
PSITF1	0.296	0.468	0.608	0.383	0.392	0.592	**0.914**
PSITF2	0.369	0.495	0.503	0.346	0.375	0.613	**0.864**
PSITF3	0.069	0.412	0.615	0.426	0.531	0.464	**0.873**
PSITF4	0.160	0.460	0.690	0.407	0.472	0.491	**0.878**

Table G4. Descriptive Statistics for the Two Focal Technologies

Construct	Excel		Meta Quest		Combined	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Collective adoption	5.515	0.963	3.500	1.173	4.508	1.472
Social endorsement	4.384	1.145	3.928	1.106	4.156	1.146
Perceived societal-level IT fashion	3.729	1.440	4.034	1.361	3.881	1.406
Novelty of IT	4.410	1.312	5.175	1.061	4.792	1.251
IT-identity congruity	1.581	0.756	1.391	0.645	1.486	0.708

Internal symbolic value	2.886	1.408	3.443	1.463	3.164	1.460
Perceived fashionableness of IT	3.074	1.587	3.572	1.450	3.323	1.537
External symbolic value	3.024	1.489	2.747	1.327	2.886	1.414
Willingness-to-pay ($)	110.690	65.549	290.680	112.461	200.680	128.723
Hedonic value	3.322	1.490	5.475	1.185	4.398	1.723
Utilitarian value	5.664	0.936	4.667	1.165	5.165	1.167

Appendix H: Robustness Check

To check the robustness of PLS-SEM results, we analyzed our model using a maximum likelihood parameter estimation in CB-SEM via Stata 17.

In Study 1, the model fit was overall on the borderline (Byrne 2016), and some fit indices are below the typical cutoffs for a good fit (χ^2 = 3035.85, df = 581, χ^2 / df = 5.225, CFI = 0.657, RMSEA = 0.128, SRMR = 0.340). The model accounts for 19.1% of the variance in PFIT, 31.6% of the variance in ESV, 77.6% of the variance in ISV, and 58.0% of the variance in the outcome adoption.

Table H1 summarizes the hypothesis testing. The results are largely consistent with our PLS findings.

Table H1. Robustness Check using CB-SEM (Study 1)

Hypothesis	Path Coefficient and P Value	Hypothesis Confirmed?
Cross-Level Influence		
H1: PSITF -> PFIT	0.628(ns)	Yes
Influence of Object-Based Perceptions on Behavioral Perception		
H2: PSITF-> ESV	0.641***	Yes
H3: PFIT -> ISV	0.290**	Yes
H4: PFIT-> ESV	0.430***	Yes
H5: ESV -> ISV	0.001(ns)	No
Influence of IT Fashion on Consumer Behavior		
H6a: ESV -> Adoption	0.219***	Yes
H6b: ISV -> Adoption	0.338**	Yes
* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001; ns (not significant) p ≥ 0.05		

In Study 2, for the Microsoft Excel dataset, overall, the goodness-of-fit indices suggest an acceptable to good fit of the model to the data (Byrne 2016). While some values like CFI and SRMR are closer to the threshold, none of the indices suggests a poor fit (χ^2 = 641, df = 413, χ^2 / df = 1.553, CFI = 0.926, RMSEA = 0.068, SRMR = 0.083). The model accounts for 47.7% of the variance in PSITF, 59.5% of the variance in PFIT, 44.8% of the variance in ESV, 64.6% of the variance in ISV, and 50.9% of the variance in the outcome WTP.

For the Meta Quest dataset, the model fit was overall on the borderline, and some fit indices are below the typical cutoffs for a good fit (χ^2 = 746, df = 417, χ^2 / df = 1.790, CFI = 0.892, RMSEA = 0.092, SRMR = 0.122). The model accounts for 63.0% of the variance in PSITF, 57.2% of the variance in PFIT, 54.2% of the variance in ESV, 62.0% of the variance in ISV, and 40.5% of the variance in the outcome WTP.

For the combined dataset, the model fit was overall borderline, and some fit indices are below the typical cutoffs for a good fit (χ^2 = 2787, df = 417, χ^2 / df = 2.947, CFI = 0.870, RMSEA = 0.091, SRMR = 0.181). The model accounts for 39.2% of the variance in PSITF, 60.7% of the variance in PFIT, 50.0% of the variance in ESV, 63.3% of the variance in ISV, and 38.9% of the variance in the outcome WTP.

Table H2 summarizes the hypothesis testing for Study 2. The results are largely consistent with our PLS findings.

Table H2. Robustness Check using CB-SEM (Study 2)

Hypothesis	Excel Dataset		Quest Dataset		Combined Dataset	
	Path Coefficient and P Value	Hypothesis Confirmed?	Path Coefficient and P Value	Hypothesis Confirmed?	Path Coefficient and P Value	Hypothesis Confirmed?
First-Order Constructs -> Second-Order Constructs						
CA -> PSITF	0.184*		0.284**		0.007$^{(ns)}$	
SE -> PSITF	0.584***		0.579***		0.697***	
NIT -> PFIT	0.333***		0.284**		0.328***	
IIC -> PFIT	0.152*		0.314***		0.232***	
Cross-Level Influence						
H1: PSITF -> PFIT	0.580***	Yes	0.496***	Yes	0.542***	Yes
Influence of Object-Based Perceptions on Behavioral Perception						
H2: PSITF-> ESV	0.196**	No	0.093***	Yes	0.180**	Yes
H3: PFIT -> ISV	0.536***	Yes	0.086**	Yes	0.517***	Yes
H4: PFIT-> ESV	0.509**	Yes	0.703*	Yes	0.542***	Yes
H5: ESV -> ISV	0.193**	Yes	0.383**	Yes	0.211**	Yes
Influence of IT Fashion on Consumer Behavior						
H7a: ESV -> WTP	-0.101$^{(ns)}$	No	0.206$^{(ns)}$	No	-0.120$^{(ns)}$	No
H7b: ISV -> WTP	0.190*	Yes	0.195$^{(ns)}$	No	0.617$^{(ns)}$	No
* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$; ^{ns} (not significant) $p \geq 0.05$						

References cited in the Appendixes:

Anatchkova, M. D., and Bjorner, J. B. 2010. "Health and Role Functioning: The Use of Focus Groups in the Development of an Item Bank," *Quality of Life Research* (19:1), pp. 111-123.

Arbore, A., Graziani, R., and Venturini, S. 2014a. "Understanding Personal Mobile Technologies: Decomposing and De-Averaging the Value of a Smartphone," *Journal of Information Systems* (28:1), pp. 167-185.

Arbore, A., Soscia, I., and Bagozzi, R. P. 2014b. "The Role of Signaling Identity in the Adoption of Personal Technologies," *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (15:2), pp. 86-110.

Baddeley, M. 2010. "Herding, Social Influence and Economic Decision-Making: Socio-Psychological and Neuroscientific Analyses," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* (365:1538), pp. 281-290.

Bagozzi, R. P., and Yi, Y. 1988. "On the Evaluation of Structural Equation Models," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* (16:1), pp. 74-94.

Barclay, D., Higgins, C., and Thompson, R. 1995. "The Partial Least Squares (Pls) Approach to Casual Modeling: Personal Computer Adoption Ans Use as an Illustration," *Technology Studies* (2:2), pp. 285-324.

Barclay, I., and Dann, Z. 2000. "New-Product-Development Performance Evaluation: A Product-Complexity-Based Methodology," *IEE Proceedings-Science, Measurement and Technology* (147:2), pp. 41-55.

Berlyne, D. E. 1960. *Conflict, Arousal, and Curiosity*. New York, NY, US: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Bian, Q., and Forsythe, S. 2012. "Purchase Intention for Luxury Brands: A Cross Cultural Comparison," *Journal of Business Research* (65:10), pp. 1443-1451.

Blijlevens, J., Mugge, R., Ye, P., and Schoormans, J. P. 2013. "The Influence of Product Exposure on Trendiness and Aesthetic Appraisal," *International Journal of Design* (7:1), pp. 55-67.

Byrne, B. M. 2016. *Structural Equation Modeling with Amos: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming*, (Third Edition ed.). Routledge.

Chakrabarti, A., and Khadilkar, P. 2003. "A Measure for Assessing Product Novelty," *Proceedings of ICED 03, the 14th International Conference on Engineering Design,* A. Folkeson, K. Gralen, M. Norell and U. Sellgren (eds.), Stockholm, Sweden: Design Society, pp. 159-160.

Chin, W. W. 1998. "The Partial Least Squares Approach to Structural Equation Modeling," *Modern Methods for Business Research* (295:2), pp. 295-336.

Churchill, G. A. 1979. "A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing Constructs," *Journal of Marketing Research* (16:1), pp. 64-73.

Compeau, D., Higgins, C. A., and Huff, S. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory and Individual Reactions to Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study," *MIS Quarterly* (23:2), pp. 145-158.

Dean, D. H. 1999. "Brand Endorsement, Popularity, and Event Sponsorship as Advertising Cues Affecting Consumer Pre-Purchase Attitudes," *Journal of Advertising* (28:3), pp. 1-12.

Den Hartog, D. N., De Hoogh, A. H., and Keegan, A. E. 2007. "The Interactive Effects of Belongingness and Charisma on Helping and Compliance," *Journal of Applied Psychology* (92:4), p. 1131.

Fornell, C., and Larcker, D. F. 1981. "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *Journal of Marketing Research* (18:1), pp. 39-50.

Grewal, R., Mehta, R., and Kardes, F. R. 2004. "The Timing of Repeat Purchases of Consumer Durable Goods: The Role of Functional Bases of Consumer Attitudes," *Journal of Marketing Research* (41:1), pp. 101-115.

Jeong, S. C., Kim, S.-H., Park, J. Y., and Choi, B. 2017. "Domain-Specific Innovativeness and New Product Adoption: A Case of Wearable Devices," *Telematics and Informatics* (34:5), pp. 399-412.

Lee, R. M., and Robbins, S. B. 1995. "Measuring Belongingness: The Social Connectedness and the Social Assurance Scales," *Journal of counseling psychology* (42:2), p. 232.

Miron-Spektor, E., and Beenen, G. 2015. "Motivating Creativity: The Effects of Sequential and Simultaneous Learning and Performance Achievement Goals on Product Novelty and Usefulness," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* (127), pp. 53-65.

Moore, G. C., and Benbasat, I. 1991. "Development of an Instrument to Measure the Perceptions of Adopting an Information Technology Innovation," *Information Systems Research* (2:3), pp. 192-222.

Nassar-McMillan, S. C., and Borders, L. D. 2002. "Use of Focus Groups in Survey Item Development," *The Qualitative Report* (7:1), pp. 1-12.

Nunnally, J. C., and Bernstein, I. 1994. *Psychometric Theory (Mcgraw-Hill Series in Psychology)*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
Premkumar, G., Ramamurthy, K., and Liu, H.-N. 2008. "Internet Messaging: An Examination of the Impact of Attitudinal, Normative, and Control Belief Systems," *Information & Management* (45:7), pp. 451-457.
Sirgy, M. J. 1985. "Using Self-Congruity and Ideal Congruity to Predict Purchase Motivation," *Journal of Business Research* (13:3), pp. 195-206.
Sirgy, M. J., and Samli, A. C. 1985. "A Path Analytic Model of Store Loyalty Involving Self-Concept, Store Image, Geographic Loyalty, and Socioeconomic Status," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* (13:3), pp. 265-291.
Tatikonda, M. V., and Montoya-Weiss, M. M. 2001. "Integrating Operations and Marketing Perspectives of Product Innovation: The Influence of Organizational Process Factors and Capabilities on Development Performance," *Management Science* (47:1), pp. 151-172.
Van Slyke, C., Ilie, V., Lou, H., and Stafford, T. 2007. "Perceived Critical Mass and the Adoption of a Communication Technology," *European Journal of Information Systems* (16:3), pp. 270-283.
Venkatesh, V., Thong, J. Y., and Xu, X. 2012. "Consumer Acceptance and Use of Information Technology: Extending the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology," *MIS Quarterly* (36:1), pp. 157-178.
Wells, J. D., Campbell, D. E., Valacich, J. S., and Featherman, M. 2010. "The Effect of Perceived Novelty on the Adoption of Information Technology Innovations: A Risk/Reward Perspective," *Decision Sciences* (41:4), pp. 813-843.
Wilcox, K., Kim, H. M., and Sen, S. 2009. "Why Do Consumers Buy Counterfeit Luxury Brands?," *Journal of Marketing Research* (46:2), pp. 247-259.
Yang, C., and Hsu, Y.-C. 2011. "Impact of Ergonomic and Social Psychological Perspective: A Case Study of Fashion Technology Adoption in Taiwan," *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* (27:7), pp. 583-605.