



Dragon Syndrome: Introducing a Novel Construct Describing Emotional and Identity-Based Responses to Viewing Valued Personal Items

Grace Peeler, Joshua T. Henderson, Randall Osborne, Payten Altmeyer, & William Murley

1. Department of Psychology, Texas State University

Abstract: Compulsive buying disorder is a behavioral addiction driven by mood regulation through purchasing behaviors. Current research focuses heavily on pre-purchase, and moment of purchase, but vastly ignores the post-purchase emotional experience. Thus, this study introduces the novel construct of Dragon Syndrome, a psychological construct aiming to capture emotional and identity-based responses to the viewing of valued possessions. 185 undergraduate students took a survey, consisting of a pilot Dragon Syndrome Scale, and other scales measuring: compulsive buying, the Big Five traits, narcissism, and self-esteem. To analyze results, an Exploratory Factor Analysis, Correlation Matrix, and Hierarchical Regression was conducted. Through these analyses, the Dragon Syndrome Scale was found to have a strong internal consistency ($\alpha = .86$). Additionally, the EFA found a primarily unidimensional model, with evidence of secondary identity and attachment factors. Dragon Syndrome was found to be moderately associated with compulsive buying disorder, weakly associated with agreeableness and neuroticism, and weak to moderately associated with narcissism. All other personality traits, along with self-esteem, were found to be non-significant. The hierarchical regression identified compulsive buying and narcissism to be the strongest predictors of Dragon Syndrome, with personality traits contributing to minimal variance, and self-esteem being non-predictive. Thus, indicating Dragon Syndrome is more complex than an individual's personality, insecurities, or consumer behavior. Dragon Syndrome shows strong convergent validity, as there are significant correlations to compulsive buying and narcissism, furthermore, there is also strong discriminant validity, as Dragon Syndrome remains distinct from self-esteem, and broad personality traits. These results provide preliminary evidence of this construct and demonstrate its significance for continued research. Dragon Syndrome expands on consumer psychology by asking what process happens post-purchase, which may aid in the understanding of compulsive buying cycles and identity-based attachment to possessions. Moving forward, this construct requires further validation and replication.

Keywords: Dragon Syndrome, Compulsive Buying Disorder, Psychological Attachment to Possessions, Identity and Consumption, Scale Development

INTRODUCTION

Retail therapy is a commonly used phrase suggesting that shopping can improve one's mood. The phrase implies that consumer purchasing often serves as a form of emotion regulation, rather than functioning solely as a practical activity. Research supports this notion, as consumers frequently engage in unplanned purchases as a way to repair negative moods [1]. The emotional state in which an individual begins shopping strongly influences the purchasing behaviors that follow [1, 2]. When a purchase occurs, it can temporarily alleviate

negative emotions through emotional arousal and mood improvement [1, 2]. In some cases, purchasing behavior may also restore a sense of personal control during periods of distress [1]. Together, these psychological benefits help explain why impulsive purchases can regulate emotional states and why purchasing behaviors may become psychologically reinforced over time.

Beyond regulating mood, purchasing behavior can also function as a tool for reinforcing identity. Consumer goods often carry symbolic meaning and may communicate aspects of an individual's self-concept or social identity [3]. Individuals who value status, prestige, and pleasurable lifestyles are more likely to engage in consumption behaviors that reinforce these values, indicating that purchasing may help individuals maintain or express how they view themselves [3]. However, these behaviors are also associated with lower levels of achievement motivation, reduced goal-directed behavior, and diminished self-control [2, 3]. When such purchases occur in moderation and do not conflict with financial stability, they may represent a relatively harmless form of mood regulation. However, when purchasing behaviors occur excessively and without control, they may develop into a behavioral addiction commonly referred to as Compulsive Buying Disorder (CBD) [4-6].

CBD is characterized by several distinct features, including excessive shopping behavior, a strong urge to purchase, loss of control over purchasing, continued purchasing despite negative consequences (chronic debt, bankruptcy, strain relationships), obsessive thoughts about shopping, and emotional reliance on purchasing [4-5]. Importantly, CBD is not simply defined by high levels of consumption. Many individuals may occasionally overindulge in shopping without experiencing any characteristics of CBD behaviors. Rather, the defining feature of CBD lies in an inability to control purchasing impulses, leading to persistent and maladaptive purchasing behaviors [5]. This loss of control can lead to significant negative outcomes, including financial instability and interpersonal difficulties. Despite awareness of these consequences, individuals with CBD often find themselves unable to stop engaging in shopping behaviors [4]. CBD also shares many characteristics with impulse-control disorders and addictive behaviors, which is why it is frequently examined through an addiction framework that emphasizes craving, loss of control, and continued engagement despite harm [6]. Individuals with CBD often experience a recurring behavioral cycle consisting of preoccupation with purchasing, tension prior to making a purchase, gratification following the purchase, and subsequent feelings of guilt or regret, a pattern consistent with other addictive frameworks [4].

Research suggests that CBD is more prevalent than many commonly discussed addictions. Studies estimate that approximately five to six percent of the United States population meet criteria for CBD, while prevalence among college students has been estimated to be higher, at seven to eight percent [4, 7]. These rates exceed the prevalence of several other addictions, including pathological gambling, which affects approximately one and a half percent of the U.S. population, and even some substance use disorders, such as cannabis use disorder, which affects approximately three percent of the population [8-9]. Although CBD can occur across demographic groups, research indicates that it disproportionately affects women (~80% of clinical cases) [4]. The consequences of CBD extend far beyond financial strain. Individuals with CBD frequently experience a wide range of functional and psychological difficulties, including lower relationship satisfaction, reduced life satisfaction, lower optimism, reduced self-esteem, poorer academic performance, and poorer physical health [4, 10-11]. Additionally, CBD is commonly

associated with increased stress and higher rates of psychiatric comorbidities, including anxiety, depression, obsessive-compulsive symptoms, hostility, and somatization [4, 7, 10].

Compulsive buying typically manifests through a cyclical behavioral process. This cycle often begins with the experience of negative mood, distress, or emotional tension. External stressors, interpersonal conflict, or everyday frustrations may initiate this process [4]. Purchasing behavior can temporarily regulate negative emotions, resulting in individuals experiencing distress developing a strong urge to shop. This urge eventually leads to the act of purchasing, which provides immediate gratification and emotional relief. Although the purchase may temporarily alleviate the negative mood, it is often followed by feelings of guilt, regret, or shame. However, because purchasing behavior successfully reduced distress in the moment, the cycle becomes psychologically reinforced and more likely to occur again in the future [4]. Interestingly, individuals with CBD often develop strong preferences for particular categories of items, frequently purchasing similar objects repeatedly, such as clothing, collectibles, or other specific goods [12]. This pattern suggests that the psychological value of the behavior may extend beyond the act of purchasing itself, as ownership of the items may also carry emotional or symbolic meaning, behind the inherent value or price of the item.

This cyclical pattern closely resembles models of addiction, further supporting the conceptualization of CBD as a behavioral addiction [13-14]. According to the components model of addiction, addictive behaviors typically involve six core features: salience, mood modification, tolerance, withdrawal, conflict, and relapse [13]. CBD demonstrates these features. For example, salience may be observed in persistent thoughts about shopping, while mood modification occurs when purchasing temporarily improves emotional states. Conflict arises when the behavior produces financial or interpersonal consequences, and relapses occur when individuals return to shopping after attempting to stop. Pickering and Norberg [14] further argue that CBD shares significant similarities with gambling behaviors, reinforcing its classification as a behavioral addiction. These similarities include craving-like urges, reinforcement following the behavior, and compulsive repetition despite negative consequences.

One of the most consistent predictors of CBD is impulsivity and lack of self-control [15-16]. Research demonstrates that individuals with CBD often demonstrate higher levels of impulsivity, greater compulsivity, deficits in response inhibition, and elevated sensation-seeking tendencies [15]. These characteristics provide evidence that CBD may partially stem from an individual's difficulty in regulating impulses. Supporting this idea, Shabbir et al. [16] found that self-control moderates the relationship between online shopping behaviors and compulsive buying tendencies. More precisely, individuals with lower levels of self-control may be more vulnerable to impulsive purchasing behaviors. While emotional regulation motivations may initially drive compulsive purchasing, deficits in impulse control appear to play a central role in maintaining the behavior [1-2, 15-16].

In addition to impulsivity, personality traits may also influence susceptibility to CBD. The Five-Factor Model of personality, commonly referred to as the Big Five, represents one of the most widely used frameworks for understanding stable personality traits [17-18]. This model includes five broad dimensions of personality: extraversion, openness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and agreeableness. These traits represent stable individual differences in emotional, cognitive, and behavioral tendencies [17-18]. CBD is strongly associated with emotional regulation processes and behavioral control, meaning the Big Five

provides a useful framework for understanding personality-based vulnerabilities to compulsive buying behaviors.

Among the five personality traits, neuroticism and conscientiousness both have implications for CBD. Individuals with high neuroticism and low conscientiousness scores have been found to be more vulnerable to CBD [19-21]. Neuroticism reflects a tendency to experience negative emotional states such as anxiety, sadness, irritability, and emotional instability [17-18]. Individuals high in neuroticism are more likely to experience frequent and intense negative emotions, perceive situations as threatening or stressful, and struggle with coping effectively with stress [17-18]. In contrast, individuals low in neuroticism tend to be more emotionally stable, calm, and resilient in the face of stress. Because CBD frequently functions as a strategy for managing negative emotional states, individuals with high levels of neuroticism may be particularly vulnerable to engaging in compulsive purchasing behaviors. Indeed, previous research consistently finds positive associations between neuroticism and compulsive buying tendencies [19-21]. Higher levels of neuroticism may increase sensitivity to emotional stressors, thereby increasing the likelihood that individuals turn to purchasing as a coping mechanism [19-20, 22].

Serving as an opposing function to neuroticism, conscientiousness reflects individual differences in self-discipline, organization, reliability, and goal-directed behavior [17-18]. Individuals high in conscientiousness tend to demonstrate strong impulse control, careful planning, persistence, and responsibility, whereas individuals low in conscientiousness are more likely to exhibit impulsivity, disorganization, poor self-discipline, and difficulty following through with tasks [17-18]. High conscientiousness is often reflected in behaviors such as planning ahead, regulating impulses, and working toward long-term goals. In the context of compulsive buying, conscientiousness may function as a protective factor. Individuals with higher levels of conscientiousness are more likely to manage finances responsibly and regulate impulsive behaviors, making them less vulnerable to developing the impulsive tendencies associated with CBD [23].

Likewise, to personality traits, narcissistic personality traits may also contribute to compulsive buying behaviors. Narcissism is characterized by grandiosity, entitlement, and a strong desire for admiration and social recognition [24]. Material possessions often function as symbols of status and success, hence, individuals high in narcissism may be particularly motivated to acquire goods that enhance their perceived social standing. This connection between narcissism and materialistic values raises the possibility that narcissistic tendencies may increase vulnerability to compulsive buying behaviors, particularly when possessions serve as tools for reinforcing identity and social status [3, 24].

It is important to note that the role of possessions in narcissism may extend past the moment of acquisition itself [3, 24]. Individuals with high levels of narcissism may engage with their valued possessions in ways that reinforce their self-image, such as choosing to display, organize, or revisit their items [3, 24]. These behaviors provide ongoing opportunities for reaffirming self-image, even in the absence of new purchases [24]. This could suggest that the value behind possessions for a narcissistic individual may not be limited to an emotional high at point of purchase but could stem from continued emotional and identity-based reinforcement over time [3, 24]. Thus, narcissistic traits may represent a key factor in understanding why some individuals derive continued gratification from owning and engaging with their possessions beyond the moment of acquisition [1-3, 24].

Finally, self-esteem represents another important psychological factor associated with compulsive buying behavior. Self-esteem refers to an individual's overall evaluation of their self-worth [28]. Villardefrancos & Otero-López [7] argue that individuals with compulsive buying tendencies often report lower levels of self-esteem and reduced life satisfaction, indicating that purchasing behaviors may function as a compensatory strategy for managing feelings of inadequacy or self-doubt. In this sense, acquiring material goods may temporarily enhance self-perception by providing a sense of achievement, identity, or social value.

However, the relationship between self-esteem and consumer behavior may be more complex. While lower self-esteem may increase vulnerability to CBD, not all possession-related behaviors are necessarily driven from deficits in self-worth. Although purchasing may provide short-term relief from negative self-evaluations, individuals may also derive meaning, enjoyment, or identity expression from their possessions independent of self-esteem levels, as material goods can function as symbolic extensions of the self and sources of personal significance [3]. In more extreme cases, however, this attachment to possessions may become maladaptive, such as Hoarding Disorder.

Hoarding disorder (HD) represents another condition involving maladaptive relationships with possessions and is therefore relevant when examining compulsive acquisition behaviors. HD is characterized by persistent difficulty discarding possessions, regardless of their actual value, resulting in the accumulation of items that clutter living spaces and interfere with daily functioning [25]. Individuals with hoarding tendencies often experience strong emotional attachments to possessions and may perceive objects as holding sentimental, aesthetic, or identity-related value. Prior literature specifies that hoarding behaviors are associated with several personality characteristics, including higher levels of neuroticism and impulsivity, and lower levels of conscientiousness [26]. Emotional attachment to objects may also be influenced by psychological processes such as anthropomorphism and attachment anxiety, or the tendency for individuals to attribute human-like qualities or emotional significance to possessions [27]. Although HD and CBD share some overlapping characteristics like impulsivity and emotional attachment to possessions, they are conceptually distinct. CBD primarily involves excessive acquisition behaviors driven by urges to purchase items, whereas HD is primarily defined by difficulty discarding possessions rather than acquiring them [25]. Nevertheless, the emotional significance individuals attribute to objects in both conditions suggests that possessions themselves may play an important psychological role beyond the act of purchasing.

While research on CBD and HD has provided valuable insight into maladaptive relationships with possessions, much of the existing literature focuses primarily on the acquisition or accumulation of objects rather than the psychological experiences associated with ownership itself. Previous studies have largely examined why individuals feel compelled to purchase items, emphasizing emotional regulation, impulsivity, personality traits, and addiction-like purchasing cycles [1, 4-6]. Similarly, research on hoarding behavior has focused on the inability to discard possessions and the resulting accumulation of items within living spaces [25]. Although both areas of research highlight the importance of emotional attachment to possessions, relatively little work has directly examined the psychological reinforcement individuals may experience from simply owning and viewing valued objects.

Several findings within the existing literature demonstrate that possessions themselves may carry meaningful psychological value, such as material possessions can serve as symbols of identity and social status, allowing individuals to express aspects of their self-concept through the objects they own [3]. Compulsive buyers often develop preferences for specific categories of items, repeatedly purchasing similar goods or building collections over time [12]. These patterns imply that the value of possessions may extend beyond the moment of purchase, potentially providing ongoing emotional gratification through ownership and continued interaction with the items themselves. However, despite these observations, the emotional experience associated with possessing and maintaining valued objects remains largely unexplored within the existing literature.

To address this gap, the present study introduces the novel construct of Dragon Syndrome (DS). There may be a psychological tendency in which individuals derive emotional gratification from possessing and viewing valued objects, calling upon the mythical image of a dragon guarding its treasure. Unlike CBD, which focuses primarily on the act of purchasing and the impulsive acquisition of goods, the novel construct of DS aims to understand the emotional experience that occurs after items have already been obtained. Currently no prior literature has introduced a construct focusing on the extension of CBD to post-purchase, meaning all implications of DS are theory based. This study aims to understand if individuals experience identity affirming feelings, an emotion boost, and feelings of attachment with their prized possessions or collections past the moment of purchase.

Conceptually, DS may intersect with several psychological processes discussed in existing literature. Because CBD is frequently driven by attempts to regulate negative emotional states, it is possible that the emotional reinforcement associated with owning possessions may contribute to the persistence of purchasing behaviors [1, 2]. Additionally, possessions may serve as tools for identity expression or self-evaluation, particularly for individuals who place high importance on material status or personal image [3]. Personality traits may also influence the degree to which individuals derive emotional value from possessions. For example, individuals high in neuroticism may be more likely to rely on external sources, such as possessions, to regulate emotional distress, whereas individuals high in conscientiousness may demonstrate greater impulse control and reduced reliance on material goods for emotional satisfaction [17-21]. Moreover, self-concept variables such as narcissism and self-esteem may influence the degree to which possessions are used to reinforce personal identity or social status [24, 28].

The primary aim of the present study is to examine whether DS represents a meaningful psychological construct within the broader network of consumer behavior and personality variables. Specifically, this study seeks to evaluate the construct validity of the DS Scale by examining its relationships with established psychological variables that have previously been linked to compulsive buying and materialistic behaviors. These variables include compulsive buying tendencies, the Big Five personality traits, narcissistic personality traits, and self-esteem.

Based on prior research, several hypotheses were developed. First, it was hypothesized that DS would be positively associated with compulsive buying tendencies, as individuals who derive emotional gratification from possessions may also be more likely to engage in excessive purchasing behaviors. Second, it was hypothesized that DS would be

associated with, specifically demonstrating a positive relationship with neuroticism and a negative relationship with conscientiousness, given the roles these traits play in emotional regulation and impulse control. Third, DS was hypothesized to be negatively associated with self-esteem, as individuals with lower self-worth may be more likely to rely on possessions as a means of emotional compensation. Finally, DS was expected to be positively associated with narcissistic traits, as possessions can function as symbols of status and identity that reinforce self-image. By examining the relationships between DS and these established psychological constructs, the present study aims to evaluate the validity of the DS Scale and contribute to a broader understanding of emotional attachment to possessions within consumer psychology.

METHODS

A total of 209 undergraduate participants were recruited from the Texas State University SONA (an online research management system) research participation system. Following data screening, 24 participants were excluded due to incomplete responses, evidence of invariant responding, or failure to pass attention checks resulting in a final analytic sample of 185 participants. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 37 years ($M = 20.08$, $SD = 4.93$). Demographic characteristics are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographics of Participants

Characteristics	<i>n</i>	%
Gender		
Female	158	85.4
Male	25	13.5
Nonbinary	1	0.5
Decline to Answer	1	0.5
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	81	43.8
Non-Hispanic	104	56.2
Race		
White	124	67
African American	20	10.8
Asian	16	8.6
Native American	3	1.6
Other	22	11.6
Sexual Orientation		
Heterosexual	135	73
Bisexual	25	13.5
Homosexual	13	7
Other	8	4.3
Decline to Answer	4	2.2
^a $N = 185$.		
^b Participants were on average 20.08 years old ($SD = 4.93$).		

Participants completed a series of self-report measures assessing DS, compulsive buying, personality traits, narcissism, and self-esteem.

Our novel Study Specific Scale, also referred to as the DS Scale, was developed to assess emotional, identity-based, and cognitive-behavioral responses to the post-acquisition viewing of valued possessions. The scale consisted of 15 items designed to capture key dimensions of the construct, including emotional comfort, identity reinforcement, and cognitive or behavioral engagement with possessions. An example item reflecting emotional comfort is “I feel a sense of accomplishment when I add to my collection,” whereas an item reflecting identity-based processes is “I enjoy organizing my collection in a specific manner.” An example item reflecting cognitive or behavioral engagement is “I am uncomfortable when I am separated from my prized possessions.” Participants responded to each item on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 4 (strongly disagree). All items were reverse scored so that higher values consistently reflected greater DS tendencies. Item responses were averaged to create composite scores, with higher scores indicating greater endorsement of DS.

To evaluate the latent structure of the DS Scale, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted using principal axis factoring with oblimin rotation. An oblique rotation was selected to allow for correlations among factors. The number of factors to retain was determined based on eigenvalues greater than 1.00 and inspection of the scree plot. All 15 items were included in the analysis. Internal consistency of the full scale was strong ($\alpha = .86$). Construct validity was examined through correlations with related constructs, including compulsive buying, narcissism, and self-esteem.

Descriptive statistics were computed to contextualize scores on the DS Scale. For the emotional attachment component, participants reported moderate levels ($M = 2.56$, $SD = 0.59$), indicating that emotional engagement with possessions was relatively common in this sample. In contrast, scores on the identity-based component were lower ($M = 2.19$, $SD = 0.64$), suggesting that participants were less likely to strongly associate their possessions with their sense of identity.

Given that the scale ranged from 1 to 4, these findings indicate that emotional aspects of DS were more strongly endorsed than identity-related aspects within this undergraduate sample.

Compulsive buying was assessed using a shortened version of the Ridgway Compulsive Buying Scale [5]. The scale consists of six items designed to assess compulsive purchasing behaviors, including urges to buy and difficulty controlling spending. An example of an item in this scale is “I consider myself an impulse purchaser.” Participants responded to these items on a 7-point Likert-type scale. Items were scored, where higher scores are indicative of greater compulsive buying tendencies. With the sample used, the scale displayed good internal consistency ($\alpha = .84$).

The second measure used in the present study was the Ten-Item Personality Inventory (TIPI), which was used to assess the Big Five personality traits: extraversion, openness to experience, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and agreeableness [29]. The TIPI consists of 10 items, with each trait measured by two items, one positively keyed, and one reverse keyed. Participants responded to all items using a 7-point Likert-type scale, with higher scores indicating higher levels of the corresponding personality trait. Trait scores

were computed by reverse-coding the appropriate items and averaging the two items associated with each trait.

Although the TIPI is intentionally brief, and internal consistency estimates for its subscales are typically modest due to the two-item structure, the measure demonstrates acceptable convergent and discriminant validity in prior research. Given the exploratory nature of the present study, the focus on assessing broad personality dimensions rather than fine-grained trait facets, and the need to minimize participant burden within a multi-construct survey design, the TIPI was deemed an appropriate measure of Big Five personality traits for this phase of the project.

Narcissism was assessed using the narcissism subscale of the Short Dark Tetrad [30]. This subscale consists of seven items designed to assess traits related to grandiosity, entitlement, and self-importance, such as “I have a unique talent for persuading people.” Participants responded to these items on a 5-point Likert-type scale and were scored such that higher scores represented higher levels of narcissism. In the current sample, the subscale demonstrated acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = .73$).

The final construct examined was self-esteem. To measure this, the Rosenbergs Self-Esteem scale was used [28]. Rosenberg’s scale consists of 10 items designed to assess global self-worth and self-acceptance. An example of an item on this scale is “I feel that I have a number of good qualities.” Participants responded to items using a 4-point Likert-type scale. After reverse-scoring relevant items, responses were scored such that higher values indicated higher levels of self-esteem. In the current sample, the scale demonstrated good internal consistency ($\alpha = .87$).

After providing informed consent, participants completed the study’s scales. On average, it took students nine minutes to complete the survey. Course credit was provided as compensation for students who completed the survey. All procedures received approval from the Institutional Review Board.

Two types of analysis were planned. First, a correlation matrix, to examine associations between DS and the other surveyed constructs. The second analysis planned was a hierarchical linear multiple regression. In the regression, DS scores were assessed as the outcome variable, Big Five personality traits entered as predictors, and then, compulsive buying, narcissism, and self-esteem, to see if these three variables predicted DS above and beyond Big Five personality traits.

RESULTS

Prior to hypothesis testing, assumptions for the Pearson correlations matrix and hierarchical linear multiple regression were evaluated. Visual inspection and descriptive statistics indicated that all variables were approximately normally distributed, with skewness and kurtosis values within ± 1 . Relationships between variables were linear; observations were independent, and residuals indicated no substantial violations of homoscedasticity. Multicollinearity was assessed using VIF and tolerance values. All VIF values were below 10, and tolerance levels were above 0.1, indicating no significant multicollinearity between the independent variables. These analyses aimed to answer the following hypotheses; H1: predicted a significant positive relationship between compulsive buying and DS, H2: predicted a non-significant relationship between the Big Five measures and DS, H3:

predicted significant positive relationship between narcissism and DS, and H4: predicted significant negative relationship with self-esteem and DS.

Descriptive statistics for all variables are provided in Table 2. Additionally, all measures demonstrated acceptable internal consistency; see Methods.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Scales

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Dragon Syndrome	2.3	0.5
Compulsive Buying	24.3	8.2
Narcissism	5.4	0.7
Self-Esteem	18.6	5.2
Extraversion	4.1	1.6
Openness	2.8	1.0
Conscientiousness	2.8	1.2
Agreeableness	3.3	1.0
Neuroticism	4.2	1.3
^a <i>N</i> = 185.		

An EFA using principal component analysis with oblimin rotation was conducted on the 15-item DS Scale. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .88, and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant, $\chi^2(105) = 1073.99$, $p < .001$, indicating that the data were appropriate for factor analysis.

Initial eigenvalues suggested a three-component solution accounting for 55.05% of the total variance. The first component accounted for 39.34% of the variance, while the second and third components accounted for 9.50% and 7.21%, respectively. Inspection of the component matrix indicated that the majority of items loaded strongly onto the first component (see Table 3), indicating a dominant general factor underlying DS.

A smaller subset of items demonstrated moderate loadings on a second factor, potentially reflecting identity-based aspects of ownership. The third factor was defined primarily by four items, indicating that it did not represent a stable or interpretable factor. Overall, these findings indicate that the DS Scale is largely unidimensional with some evidence of secondary structure. Thus, the preliminary analyses indicated that the data were suitable for further analysis.

A Pearson correlation matrix was conducted to examine relationships between DS and the Big Five personality traits. There were no significant associations with extraversion ($r = -.08$, $p = .290$), openness ($r = .04$, $p = .559$), conscientiousness ($r = .033$, $p = .654$). In contrast, agreeableness ($r = .19$, $p = .010$) and neuroticism ($r = .16$, $p = .036$) showed a significant weak positive relationship with DS.

The relationships between DS and the study variables were also examined. Results indicated a significant moderate positive relationship between DS and compulsive buying ($r = .49$, $p < .001$). There was also a significant weak positive relationship between DS and narcissism ($r = .25$, $p < .001$). In regard to the relationship between DS and self-esteem, a non-significant relationship was found ($r = -.09$, $p = .313$).

Table 3: Results From a Factor Analysis of the Dragon Syndrome scale Questionnaire

DSS Item	Factor Loading		
	1	2	3
Factor 1: Emotional Reuptake			
6. I feel a sense of accomplishment when I add to my collection. (R)	.83	.04	-.06
5. I feel confident when I view my collection. (R)	.81	-.08	.00
4. I experience the same good feelings when I view my collection as when I purchase a new luxury item. (R)	.70	.05	.07
7. I perceive my collection as a reflection of personal success. (R)	.53	.18	.15
10. I enjoy organizing my collection in a specific manner. (R)	.49	.07	.11
13. I avoid visiting luxury item stores. (R)	-.20	-.10	.03
Factor 2: Identity Affirmation			
12. I am more likely to be friends with people who wear shiny pieces of jewellery. (R)	.02	.79	-.12
14. I find it difficult to resist purchasing luxury items that fit my collection. (R)	.07	.58	.05
15. I enjoy when others covet my collection. (R)	.11	.48	.35
11. I sometimes find myself looking at shiny objects (e.g., jewelry, metal, or trophies) for extended periods of time. (R)	.08	.35	.21
8. Having lots of luxury items makes me feel powerful. (R)	.28	.29	.14
Factor 3: Emotional Attachment			
2. I am uncomfortable when I am separated from my prized possessions. (R)	-.13	.12	.68
3. I find comfort in my collection, especially during challenging times. (R)	.38	-.15	.60
1. I feel less anxious/stressed when I view my collection. (R)	.27	-.11	.53
9. I have emotional connections to my most prized possessions. (R)	.21	.03	.44
^a N = 185.			
^b Principal axis factoring with oblimin rotation (Kaiser normalization) was used.			
^c Factor loadings above .30 are presented in bold. Higher scores indicate greater Dragon Syndrome tendencies.			
^d Reverse-scored items are denoted with an (R).			

As a secondary analysis, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to assess whether the Big Five personality traits predicted DS above and beyond compulsive buying, narcissism, and self-esteem. The first model included five predictors: extraversion, openness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and agreeableness. The second model included eight predictors, adding compulsive buying, narcissism, and self-esteem to the Big Five personality traits.

Results for Model 1 indicated that the model was statistically significant and accounted for a small proportion of variance in DS, ($R^2 = .08$, $F(5, 178) = 2.88$, $p = .016$), suggesting that the Big Five personality traits explained a modest amount of variance in DS scores (see Table 4). Within this model, agreeableness ($\beta = .23$, $p = .003$) emerged as a significant positive predictor, whereas the remaining Big Five traits were not significant.

The addition of compulsive buying, narcissism, and self-esteem in Model 2 resulted in a significant improvement in model fit, ($\Delta R^2 = .23$, $\Delta F(3, 175) = 18.76$, $p < .001$). The full model was statistically significant, ($R^2 = .30$, $F(8, 175) = 9.38$, $p < .001$), explaining 31% of the variance in DS scores.

In Model 2, compulsive buying ($\beta = .43$, $p < .001$), narcissism ($\beta = .22$, $p = .002$), and agreeableness ($\beta = .15$, $p = .024$) were significant positive predictors of DS. Self-esteem and the remaining Big Five personality traits were not significant predictors in the full model (see Table 4).

Table 4: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Results for the Prediction of Dragon Syndrome

Independent variable		<i>b</i>	CI	<i>SE</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>p</i> -value	Semi-partial <i>r</i>
Step 1							
	Extraversion	-0.02	-0.06, 0.03	0.02	-0.06	.393	-.06
	Openness	-0.02	-0.09, 0.06	0.04	-0.03	.676	-.03
	Conscientiousness	-0.01	-0.07, 0.05	0.03	-0.02	.760	-.02
	Neuroticism	0.06	0.00, 0.11	0.03	0.15	.052	.14
	Agreeableness	0.11	0.04, 0.18	0.04	0.23	.003	.21
Step 2							
	Extraversion	0.02	-0.03, 0.06	0.02	0.05	.499	.04
	Openness	0.02	-0.05, 0.08	0.03	0.03	.646	.03
	Conscientiousness	-0.01	-0.07, 0.04	0.03	-0.04	.610	-.03
	Neuroticism	0.02	-0.03, 0.08	0.03	0.06	.409	.05
	Agreeableness	0.07	0.01, 0.14	0.03	0.15	.024	.14
	Compulsive Buying	0.03	0.02, 0.03	0.00	0.43	< .001	.41
	Narcissism	0.16	0.06, 0.26	0.05	0.22	.002	.19
	Self-Esteem	0.00	-0.02, 0.01	0.01	-0.04	.617	-.03

^a*N* = 185. CI = confidence interval; *SE* = standard error.

Overall, results from the Pearson correlation matrix indicated that agreeableness and neuroticism were positively associated with DS. Extraversion, openness, and conscientiousness were not significantly related to DS.

With respect to the study specific constructs, results indicated significant positive associations between DS scores and both compulsive buying and narcissism. In contrast, no significant association was observed between DS and self-esteem.

Consistent with these findings, hierarchical multiple regression analyses indicated that compulsive buying and narcissism uniquely predicted DS scores, whereas self-esteem did not. Although the Big Five personality traits as a set accounted for a small proportion of variance in DS, agreeableness remained a significant positive predictor in the final model. Overall, compulsive buying and narcissism accounted for substantially more variance in DS than personality traits alone.

DISCUSSION

This study aimed to find preliminary evidence for further investigation of the novel construct of DS. DS was proposed as a unique concept intending to capture emotional, identity-based, and cognitive/behavioral responses to the post-acquisition viewing of valued items. More specifically, the study evaluated the construct validity of the DS Scale by examining its relationships with compulsive buying, the Big Five personality traits, narcissism, and self-esteem. Hypotheses were chosen not to show significance between constructs, but more importantly to determine whether DS would relate to theoretically relevant constructs in a way that supports its conceptual meaning while also suggesting sufficient distinctiveness from existing variables. Ultimately, the goal was to evaluate whether DS shows meaningful links with theoretically adjacent variables while also displaying enough specificity to avoid redundancy with broader or well-established constructs like compulsive buying disorder [4-6]. The analysis indicated a positive relationship with compulsive buying and the Big Five personality traits, neuroticism and agreeableness, and narcissism. There were no significant

correlations between the Big Five traits of extraversion, openness, and conscientiousness, and the construct self-esteem. Taken together, the results provide preliminary support for DS as a meaningful construct candidate, while also indicating that additional evidence is needed to determine whether it is clearly distinct from nearby possession-related constructs.

The four hypotheses were chosen to provide evidence that DS relates to theoretically adjacent constructs in a way that supports its conceptual relevance while simultaneously supporting its potential distinctiveness. This potential distinction would allow for further investigation beyond the first wave of research. Compulsive buying was selected as a comparable construct because DS relates to established possession-based consumer behavior [1-3]. If no evidence of a relationship had been found, it would suggest that the proposed construct was disconnected from the existing literature. Thus, a positive relationship would support convergent validity. The Big Five was also investigated to test whether DS was too heavily correlated with CBD, if DS reflected differing results from CBD in its association to the Big Five, it would support the idea that there is something more specific to investigate [17-18]. In regard to narcissism, this construct was investigated due to the notion that possessions may serve symbolic, identity-reinforcing, or self-enhancing functions [3, 24]. A positive relation with narcissism supports the claim that the novel construct is not only based on behavioral outcomes or emotional regulation but may also serve as identity-related functions. Self-esteem was predicted to have a negative correlation because such a finding could imply that the emotional and cognitive processes associated with DS are related to lower self-worth. At the same time, a weak or null relationship would indicate that DS is not simply another expression of low self-esteem, insecurity, or emotional compensation. Thereby, results would help provide preliminary evidence that DS is unique, novel, and worthy of further investigation.

If DS is truly novel and has a basis for further investigation, the following would be expected. First, convergent validity is expected in the findings; or more specifically, a positive relation with compulsive buying disorder and narcissism, indicating that the scale yields result consistent with the conceptual background from which DS was derived [4-6, 24]. Second, sufficient discriminant validity, providing support that DS does not yield results identical to already known constructs such as self-esteem or broad Big Five personality patterns found in prior research. Specifically, an aim to understand the distinction between DS and compulsive buying, as these concepts are the most similar [4-6]. By finding a moderate correlation with compulsive buying, a positive association with narcissism, a weak or null relationship with self-esteem, and selective rather than broad personality associations, this would provide enough preliminary evidence to continue pursuing validation of the novel scale and construct.

A single study cannot definitively establish DS as a fully distinct psychological construct; however, it can provide preliminary evidence regarding whether the construct appears psychometrically coherent and theoretically meaningful. In general, support for a new construct would require several forms of evidence. First, the scale should demonstrate internal coherence, indicating that its items function together as a unified measure. In the present study, the DS Scale demonstrated strong internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha of .86, suggesting that the items worked together well as a broader measure.

Second, the construct should show some interpretable internal structure. Here, factor analytic findings indicated that the DS Scale was characterized by a dominant primary

factor, accounting for the largest proportion of variance, suggesting a strong general dimension underlying the construct. At the same time, two additional factors emerged that were conceptually interpretable. A second factor appeared to reflect identity-based and social aspects of ownership, while a third factor captured emotional attachment and regulation of processes related to possessions. Together, these findings suggest that although DS demonstrates a strong general factor, it may also consist of meaningful subdimensions. Third, a valid construct should demonstrate convergent validity by relating to variables it should theoretically be associated with, and discriminant validity by showing enough specificity to suggest that it is not merely another expression of existing constructs. Ultimately, stronger evidence is still needed before DS could be considered clearly established, including replication, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), direct tests of discriminant validity against closely related constructs, and incremental validity analyses demonstrating that DS predicts something unique above and beyond nearby variables.

When looking at all findings regarding the presented hypotheses, the present findings provide excellent preliminary support for DS as a meaningful construct candidate. Yet it is important to note that they do not yet fully establish it as a clearly distinct construct. On the supportive side, the scale demonstrated strong internal consistency, and the factor analysis inferred that the measure captures a broad underlying dimension rather than a random collection of possession-related items. Additionally, DS showed a theoretically coherent pattern of associations: it was positively related to compulsive buying and narcissism, unrelated to self-esteem, and only selectively associated with personality traits. This pattern is important because it means that DS is meaningfully connected to relevant constructs in consumer behavior and self-related functioning, while also showing some degree of specificity rather than simply reflecting low global self-worth or broad personality structure [1-3, 7, 11]. Further, hierarchical regression results showed that compulsive buying, and narcissism accounted for substantially more variance in DS than personality traits alone, with agreeableness emerging as the only Big Five trait to remain significant in the full model. At the same time, the present study should be interpreted as an initial validation step rather than definitive proof of construct distinctiveness. The factor structure remains preliminary; direct comparisons with closely related constructs such as hoarding, collecting, and materialism have not yet been conducted, and incremental validity has not yet been established [25]. Accordingly, the present study provides evidence that DS is promising and worthy of continued investigation, while also making clear that additional psychometric and theoretical work is still necessary.

Through the analyses conducted for this study, a moderate association was found between DS and compulsive buying, and compulsive buying also served as a strong predictor in the regression model. This provides evidence that DS belongs within a broader domain of possession-related and consumer-behavior processes [1-3, 4-6]. Conceptually, compulsive buying disorder helps explain why individuals experience extreme urges to buy, along with impulsive decision-making, reckless spending habits, and guilt after purchasing [4-6]. This correlation shows that DS has grounds to expand on this literature by shifting the focus to the post-acquisition process [1, 4-6]. More specifically, it highlights the emotional comfort and instant gratification that may occur when viewing one's valued possessions, as well as the continued engagement with possessions after purchasing [1-2]. The moderate correlation indicates that these concepts share important similarities, suggesting they may

be rooted in related underlying cognitive processes, while also differing enough for DS to warrant further investigation.

Findings involving the Big Five personality traits were more limited and selective than the findings for compulsive buying and narcissism. At the correlational level, DS was significantly positively associated with agreeableness and neuroticism, while extraversion, openness, and conscientiousness were not significantly related. In the hierarchical regression, the Big Five accounted for a modest amount of variance in DS, but this contribution was substantially smaller than the variance explained once compulsive buying, narcissism, and self-esteem were added to the model. This pattern shows that DS is not broadly explained by general personality structure alone [17-18]. Rather, the construct appears to be more strongly tied to possession-related reinforcement and self-relevant meaning than to broad dispositional traits [1-3]. In this sense, the personality findings are informative because they suggest that DS is not simply a repackaged Big Five profile but may instead reflect a more specific pattern of emotional and identity-based responses to valued possessions.

An especially noteworthy and unexpected finding was that agreeableness emerged as a significant positive predictor of DS, even in the full regression model. This result is interesting because agreeableness was not one of the strongest theoretical focal points of the study, yet it remained significant even after accounting for compulsive buying, the other Big Five traits, narcissism, and self-esteem. One possible explanation is that individuals higher in agreeableness may be more likely to form emotionally warm or sentimentally meaningful attachments to valued possessions [27]. In this sense, some possessions may not only be rewarding because they are owned, but also because they represent comfort, connection, or personal meaning. It is also possible that agreeable individuals may experience their valued possessions in a more relational or affectionate way, which could help explain why DS is not solely rooted in status or impulsive consumer behavior. At the same time, this finding should be interpreted cautiously, as it was not the central theoretical prediction of the present study. Accordingly, the positive relationship with agreeableness should be viewed as an intriguing clue that may point to a sentimental or emotionally warm component of DS, rather than as a firmly established defining feature of the construct.

Although neuroticism was positively associated with DS at the correlational level, it did not remain a significant predictor in the full regression model. These results indicate that emotional vulnerability or distress may be related to DS in a broad sense, but that this association may overlap with stronger and more proximal predictors, particularly compulsive buying, and narcissism [17-18]. More precisely, while individuals higher in neuroticism may be more likely to report DS-related experiences, neuroticism does not appear to uniquely explain the construct once other relevant variables are considered. This is an important distinction because it implies that DS should not just be understood as a distress-based or neuroticism-driven phenomenon [19-21]. Instead, the findings indicate that although emotional processes may still play a role, DS is better explained by a combination of possession-related reinforcement and identity-based meaning than by general emotional instability alone.

The definition of DS proposes that the construct is not only rooted in emotional regulation but also serves as an identity-related function. In this sense, DS may operate not only as an emotional booster, but also as a mechanism through which individuals reinforce

and express their sense of self. Valued possessions can function as symbols of status, success, or personal meaning [3]. Owning such items may enhance one's sense of identity, as luxury goods or curated collections can serve as extensions of the self and elevate perceived status [3]. This interpretation further differentiates DS from compulsive buying disorder, as the construct reflects not only the impulsive and emotion-regulating aspects of purchasing, but also the symbolic meaning attached to owning and maintaining the so-called "dragon's treasure." This idea was supported by the results as a positive relationship between DS and narcissism was found, and narcissism remained significant as a unique predictor for DS in the regression model [24].

A null relationship between DS and self-esteem was also found, which further supports the need for continued investigation of the construct. This finding indicates that the processes and behaviors associated with DS are not simply driven by low global self-esteem [7, 11]. Thus, the emotional and behavioral patterns tied to DS do not appear to be reducible to insecurity or general deficits in self-worth [7, 11]. If a strong relationship had emerged, particularly given the identity-based portion of the construct definition, it may have suggested that the phenomenon under investigation was primarily a reflection of self-esteem concerns rather than a distinct construct. Instead, the absence of a significant association supports the idea that a more specific process may be operating. DS may therefore be more closely tied to identity-based meaning, contingent self-worth, symbolic self-processes, or possession-based self-relevance than to global self-esteem.

Preliminary psychometric findings also supported the reliability of the DS Scale. The full scale demonstrated strong internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha of .86, indicating that the items functioned well together as a broader measure of the construct. The scale was designed to assess emotional, identity-based, and cognitive-behavioral responses to the post-acquisition viewing of valued possessions, meaning the reliability score suggest the items were capturing a reasonably coherent underlying idea rather than functioning as unrelated possession-based attitudes. Although this evidence alone is not enough to fully establish DS as a validated construct, it does provide promising support for the scale's consistency and offers a strong starting point for future validation work.

The EFA revealed a three-factor structure within the study-specific survey. The first factor comprised of items related to emotional regulation; specifically, how item purchase serves as an extension of the emotional reuptake processes often observed in CBD. The second factor aligned with the identity-based components of the construct definition. Items loading onto this factor assessed how item possession reinforces an individual's self-concept, thereby increasing the likelihood of engaging in collecting behaviors. The third factor was more conceptually complex, characterized by items involving attachment anxiety and distress regarding separation from objects. However, weak variance from the second and third factor loadings indicates that the survey may require further refinement to capture identity reinforcement and emotional attachment more effectively in relation to DS. The overall three-factor model provides empirical support for conceptualization of DS. Specifically, these results demonstrate that post-acquisition item engagement functions to alleviate negative affect, reinforce personal identity, and foster intense object attachment.

Several limitations should be considered when considering the findings of DS. First, the sample consisted exclusively of undergraduate students. Given that CBD is prevalent in this population, this restriction may have influenced the observed relationships and limits

the generalizability of the study's findings to a broader and more diverse population [4, 7]. Individuals outside of college may differ in financial independence, life experiences, and purchasing behaviors, which may influence both CBD tendencies, and therefore emotional attachment to possessions [31]. Additionally, with purchasing being an emotional reuptake behavior, older age may diminish this behavior, as intense emotions tend to diminish with age [1-3, 31]. This provides a basis for investigating whether undergraduate students are the most vulnerable demographic for DS. Moving forward, future research should examine DS with a more diverse age group and socioeconomic background, to aid in determining how generalizable these findings are.

Second, this study represents the first application of the DS Scale. As a newly developed measure, its psychometric properties require further validation, and findings should be interpreted with caution until replicability is established. Although the scale demonstrated strong internal consistency and a largely unidimensional structure, additional analyses such as CFA, test-retest reliability, and measurement invariance across groups are necessary to fully establish its reliability and validity. Without this additional validation, it remains unclear whether the scale consistently captures the intended construct across contexts and populations.

Third, the use of self-report methods introduces the possibility of response biases, including social desirability and subjective interpretation of items. DS involves personal and potentially identity-relevant experiences, meaning participants may have differed in how they interpreted or responded to scale items. This limitation is specifically relevant to key terms such as "collection," which is not an explicitly defined construct in the study materials. This may have resulted in a potential variability on what participants considered a valued possession or collection. Future research would benefit from a clearer operational definition, including a behavioral or observational measure to add a new layer of control to the self-report data.

The subsequent phase of DS research will involve administering the current scale to a similar sample to establish test-retest reliability and evaluate the stability of the construct. Beyond this initial validation, a primary objective is the continued refinement of the DS Scale. With integration of clearer construct definitions with results from the EFA, future research can revise or eliminate items to better align with the factor loadings found. This iterative process of item development and evaluation will be essential for improving the scale's psychometric strength and ensuring that it accurately captures the intended construct.

Additionally, to the revision of the scale, future research should prioritize further construct validity testing. This includes conducting a CFA to verify the factor structure identified in the present study. Furthermore, discriminate validity must also be further investigated, through direct comparisons with closely related constructs, as done with this study. Establishing whether DS predicts unique variance beyond these related constructs will be critical for determining whether it represents a distinct psychological phenomenon.

Finally, expanding to consider more psychological variables examined may provide further insight into the construct. Incorporating measures of anxiety, attachment, or neurodevelopmental conditions may help clarify whether DS is associated with broader emotional or cognitive processes could be beneficial. Together, these directions will be

essential for determining the validity, structure, and theoretical significance of DS within the broader literature on consumer behavior and psychological attachment to possessions.

To conclude, the present study provides preliminary support for DS as a promising and theoretically meaningful construct. The DS Scale demonstrated strong internal consistency, some evidence of coherent internal structure, and a pattern of findings that aligned with its proposed conceptual basis, particularly through its associations with compulsive buying and narcissism [1-6, 24]. Concurrently, the absence of an association with self-esteem, coupled with the selective pattern of personality findings, suggests that DS reflects a more specific construct rather than a manifestation of low self-worth or broad personality traits [7-11]. Although the present study does not fully establish DS as a clearly distinct construct, it does provide an important first step in demonstrating its conceptual and psychometric potential.

Beyond these findings, the present study contributes to a broader understanding of consumerism behavior, and how collecting behaviors could be conceptualized. Existing literature has largely focused on the motivations behind purchasing but has not expanded past the point of acquisition itself [1-6]. The present study, however, suggests that the psychological reinforcement of purchasing may extend past this into ownership. Through the examination of emotional and identity-based responses to viewing valued possessions, this research highlights the potential importance of understanding the unexplored phenomenon of the post-acquisition process. DS may additionally function as a previously overlooked mechanism within the broader domain of possession or attachment related behavior. While CBD, has been conceptualized as a cyclical process driven by emotional regulation and impulsive acquisition, the present study introduces the possibility of continued engagement with possessions playing an essential role in maintaining the cycle over time [4-6]. By extending the framework of emotional reinforcement associated with ownership rather than acquisition alone, DS offers a novel idea to understand how people's possessions, and the way they interact with them, may greatly impact one's identity and mood. Additionally, the present study has practical implications to take into account. In a clinical context, results may indicate when treating CBD; it may be beneficial to address not only the purchasing impulse, but also the emotional reinforcement derived from ownership and interaction with said items. Understanding how individuals relate to their own possessions could also help broader research topics such as identity development, materialism, and consumer engagement, especially where possessions play a role as extensions of the self.

In the future, DS should continue to be evaluated in regard to its structure and validity. Particularly with an emphasis on replication, CFA, and direct comparisons with related constructs such as compulsive buying, hoarding, and collecting behavior. Establishing if DS predicts unique outcomes beyond these constructs is essential in determining its role in broader research pertaining to consumer psychology and psychological attachment to possessions. While the findings of the present study are preliminary, they provide a meaningful foundation for continuing the investigation of DS as a distinct psychological construct. Emphasizing the emotional and identity-based significance of ownership expands current perspectives of consumer behavior. Additionally, the results highlight not only why individuals are choosing to purchase certain items, but why they continue to engage with them post-purchase.

REFERENCES

1. Atalay, A. S., & Meloy, M. G. (2011). Retail therapy: A strategic effort to improve mood. *Psychology & Marketing*, 28(6), 638-659. (60313792). <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20404>
2. Xie, J. (2019). Discussion on the Mechanism of Irrational Online Shopping Behavior—Based on the Perspective of Mental Accounting Theory. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(5), 53-71. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2019.75004>
3. Uzarska, A., Czerwiński, S. K., & Atroszko, P. A. (2021). Shopping Addiction Is Driven by Personal Focus Rather than Social Focus Values but to the Exclusion of Achievement and Self-Direction. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 19(3), 837-849. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-019-00193-z>
4. Black, D. W. (2007). A review of compulsive buying disorder. *World Psychiatry*, 6(1), 14-18.
5. Ridgway, N. M., Kukar-Kinney, M., & Monroe, K. B. (2008). An Expanded Conceptualization and a New Measure of Compulsive Buying. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35(4), 622-639. <https://doi.org/10.1086/591108>
6. Grant, J. E., & Chamberlain, S. R. (2024). Compulsive buying disorder: Conceptualization based on addictive, impulsive, and obsessive-compulsive features and comorbidity. *Psychiatry Research Communications*, 4(4), 100199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychom.2024.100199>
7. Villardefrancos, E., & Otero-López, J. M. (2016). Compulsive buying in university students: Its prevalence and relationships with materialism, psychological distress symptoms, and subjective well-being. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 65, 128-135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsy.2015.11.007>
8. Potenza, M. N., Fiellin, D. A., Heninger, G. R., Rounsaville, B. J., & Mazure, C. M. (2002). Gambling: An addictive behavior with health and primary care implications. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 17(9), 721-732. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1525-1497.2002.10812.x>
9. Zehra, A., Burns, J., Liu, C. K., Manza, P., Wiers, C. E., Volkow, N. D., & Wang, G.-J. (2018). Cannabis Addiction and the Brain: A Review. *Journal of Neuroimmune Pharmacology*, 13(4), 438-452. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11481-018-9782-9>
10. Harvanko, A., Lust, K., Odlaug, B. L., Schreiber, L. R. N., Derbyshire, K., Christenson, G., & Grant, J. E. (2013). Prevalence and characteristics of compulsive buying in college students. *Psychiatry Research*, 210(3), 1079-1085. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2013.08.048>
11. Otero-López, J. M., Santiago, M. J., & Castro, M. C. (2023). Big Five Personality Traits and Compulsive Buying: The Mediating Role of Self-Esteem. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, 14(1), 103-116. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe14010007>
12. Lo, H.-Y., & Harvey, N. (2014). Compulsive Buying: Obsessive Acquisition, Collecting or Hoarding? *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 12(4), 453-469. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-014-9477-2>
13. Griffiths, M. D. (2023). Applying the components model of addiction to buying-shopping disorder and hoarding disorder: Further issues and controversies. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 30(1), 88-90. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cps0000136>
14. Pickering, D., & Norberg, M. M. (2023). Are hoarding disorder and buying-shopping disorder behavioural addictions? A conceptual review. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 30(1), 70-82. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cps0000120>
15. Eliyahu, S., Rahamim, S., Natan, N., & Weinstein, A. M. (2025). Impulsivity and compulsivity in compulsive buying. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2025.1665182>

16. Shabbir, H., Bibi, N., Tahir, L., Syed, U. E., & Khan, A. (2024). Role of Self-Control in the Relationship Between Online Shopping Addiction and Compulsive Buying Behavior Among Young Adults. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 5(4), 147-157. [https://doi.org/10.55737/qjssh.v-iv\(CP\).24150](https://doi.org/10.55737/qjssh.v-iv(CP).24150)
17. Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An Alternative "Description of Personality": The Big-Five Factor Structure.
18. McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An Introduction to the Five-Factor Model and Its Applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60(2), 175-215. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1992.tb00970.x>
19. Sofi, S. A., & Najar, S. A. (2018). Impact of personality influencers on psychological paradigms: An empirical-discourse of big five framework and impulsive buying behaviour. *European Research on Management and Business Economics*, 24(2), 71-81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iedeen.2017.12.002>
20. Otero-López, J., Villardefrancos Pol, E., & Castro Bolaño, C. (2017). Beyond the Big Five: The role of extrinsic life aspirations in compulsive buying. *Psicothema*, 4(29), 440-445. <https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2016.392>
21. Otero-López, J. M., Santiago, M. J., & Castro, M. C. (2025). Big Five Personality Traits, Personal Projects, and Compulsive Buying: A Causal Approach. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, 15(2), 19. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe15020019>
22. Yalch, M. M., & Sklar, J. T. (2022). Relative effects of Big Five traits and mindset on malignant self-regard. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 39(2), 182-187. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pap0000399>
23. Donnelly, G., Iyer, R., & Howell, R. T. (2012). The Big Five personality traits, material values, and financial well-being of self-described money managers. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 33(6), 1129-1142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2012.08.001>
24. Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36(6), 556-563. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(02\)00505-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6)
25. Timpano, K. R., & Grisham, J. R. (2023). Are hoarding disorder and buying-shopping disorder behavioral addictions? Too soon to tell and a roadmap for future investigations. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 30(1), 91-94. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cps0000129>
26. Hezel, D. M., & Hooley, J. M. (2014). Creativity, personality, and hoarding behavior. *Psychiatry Research*, 220(1-2), 322-327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2014.07.037>
27. Liu, X., Cai, Y., Tao, Y., Hou, W., Niu, H., Liu, X., Xie, T., & Li, Y. (2023). Association between attachment and hoarding behavior: Mediation of anthropomorphism and moderation of hoarding beliefs among Chinese adolescents. *PsyCh Journal*, 12(1), 128-136. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pchj.610>
28. Rosenberg, M. (2006). Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE).
29. Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., & Swann, W. B. (2003). A very brief measure of the Big-Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(6), 504-528. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(03\)00046-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(03)00046-1)
30. Paulhus, D. L., Buckels, E. E., Trapnell, P. D., & Jones, D. N. (2021). Screening for Dark Personalities: The Short Dark Tetrad (SD4). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*,

37(3), 208-222. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000602><https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000602>

31. Eberhardt W, Bruine de Bruin W, Strough JN. Age differences in financial decision making: The benefits of more experience and less negative emotions. *J Behav Dec Making*. 2019;32:79-93. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.209>

APPENDIX

Dragon Syndrome Scale

The following questions ask you to report information about your beliefs and behaviors related to collected items (jewelry, designer clothes, etc).

Please record the appropriate answer for each item, depending on whether you Strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with it, 1 = Strongly agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Disagree, 4 = Strongly disagree.

1. I feel less anxious/stressed when I view my collection. ____
2. I am uncomfortable when I am separated from my prized possessions. ____
3. I find comfort in my collection, especially during challenging times. ____
4. I experience the same good feelings when I view my collection as when I purchase a new luxury item. ____
5. I feel confident when I view my collection. ____
6. I feel a sense of accomplishment when I add to my collection. ____
7. I perceive my collection as a reflection of personal success. ____
8. Having lots of luxury items makes me feel powerful. ____
9. I have emotional connections to my most prized possessions. ____
10. I enjoy organizing my collection in a specific manner. ____
11. I sometimes find myself looking at shiny objects (e.g., jewelry, metal, or trophies) for extended periods of time. ____
12. I am more likely to be friends with people who wear shiny pieces of jewelry. ____
13. I avoid visiting luxury item stores. ____
14. I find it difficult to resist purchasing luxury items that fit my collection. ____
15. I enjoy when others covet my collection. ____