

## Gender Differences of Mail-Catalog Shoppers in Shopper Tendencies, Patronage Motive Strength, and Patronage Behaviors

### 카탈로그 구매자들의 구매자 성향, 애고 동기, 애고 행동에 관한 성별 차이 연구

General Manager of Marketing Wems-C&IT Inc.  
Eunah Yoh

General Manager of Marketing Wems-C&IT Inc.  
여 은 아  
(2001. 8. 13 접수)

#### Abstract

본 논문에서는 카탈로그 구매자들이 의복쇼핑과 관련한 변인에 대하여 성별 차이를 보이는지를 연구하였다. 총 207명의 의류카탈로그 소비자들을 남성그룹 (N=97)과 여성그룹 (N=110)으로 나누어 카탈로그 의복쇼핑과 관련하여 구매자 성향, 애고 동기, 애고 행동을 비교하였다. 여성은 남성보다 유희적, 가격 중시, 편리성 중시 구매자 성향을 높게 보였다. 여성 소비자들은 남성에 비해 카탈로그 쇼핑에 대한 전반적인 만족도를 더 높게 나타내었고, 특히 편리성, 용이성, 유희성, 안전성, 경제성 면에서 더 높게 평가하였다. 남성이 여성보다 더 높은 만족도를 나타낸 유일한 항목은 카탈로그의 브랜드 구색이었다. 이처럼 카탈로그 의복쇼핑의 만족도에 관한 성별 차이에도 불구하고 실제로 카탈로그를 통한 의복쇼핑 행동에서는 성별의 차이가 발견되지 않았다. 결론을 바탕으로 의류 카탈로그 업체를 위한 마케팅 전략들이 제안되었다.

**Key words:** Mail-catalog, Gender difference, Patronage motive, Apparel shopping;  
우편카탈로그, 성별차이, 애고동기, 의복쇼핑

### I. Introduction

Catalog shopping has been an essential shopping method since catalogs were first introduced by Montgomery Ward in 1872(Ross, 1984). Through the 80' s and 90' s, catalog sales increased 12 percent while general retail industry indicated an average growth of 5.3 percent in the US(Gorden, 1994). According to 1997 research of Simmons Market Research Bureau, about 57% of

US consumers used catalogs for shopping while only 6% of US consumers used TV home shopping(KOTRA, 1999). In Korea, catalog shopping has also been rapidly growing with an annual growth rate of 50% through the 1990s(Daewoo Economic Research Center, 1996). Catalog shopping is estimated as about 50% of the total home shopping sales in Korea(Beon, 1997).

Among many items sold through catalogs, apparel is one of the products that are most frequently purchased through catalogs, holding

26% of catalog market share(Michals, 1997). Catalog is considered as a more effective medium for apparel sales than cable TV and the Internet(Park, 1997) since it can be repetitively exposed to segmented target markets(Lee, 1991).

As catalog became important in apparel shopping, researchers studied various aspects of catalog apparel shopping. However, there was little research exploring gender differences related to catalog shopping(Lumpkin & Hawes, 1985; McCorkle et al., 1987) although gender differences in shopping tendencies and behaviors have been recognized by previous researchers(Bellante & Foster, 1984; Reilly, 1982; Zeithmal, 1985). One reason for this is that samples of many previous studies(Kim et al., 1996; Lee & Lee, 1996; Lee & Lee, 1998; Shim & Mahoney, 1992; Simpson & Lakner, 1993; Smallwater & Wiener, 1987) were much depended upon females since females were traditionally considered to take a shopper's role for their families.

However, two demographic trends - tendency toward more families headed by a single parent and the increasing number of working women - have transformed consumer and family buying patterns during the last decades of the 20th century(Cooney, 1993). More and more males have been engaged in shopping activities for themselves and for family(Underhill, 1999). Therefore, better understandings of male shoppers on their shopping tendencies and behaviors will be important for future marketing. In addition, studies focusing on in-home shopping media such as mail-catalogs will be meaningful for marketers who want to better serve consumers suffering shopping time poverty.

In this research, gender differences of catalog apparel shoppers are explored focusing on their shopper tendencies, patronage motive strength,

and patronage behaviors for catalog apparel shopping. Shopper tendency indicates shopper classification according to shopping habits or styles(Hawkins et al., 1989). Also, patronage motive strength presents shoppers' expected satisfaction on catalog apparel shopping(Eastlick & Feinberg, 1994) and patronage behavior indicates frequency of and expenditure on catalog apparel shopping.

## II. Research Background

### 1. Mail-Catalog Apparel Shopping

As catalog shopping became common, researchers studied various aspects of catalog apparel shopping such as demographics and shopper tendencies of catalog apparel shoppers, product categories purchased through catalogs, and benefits and risks related to catalog apparel shopping. In terms of demographic characteristics, catalog apparel shoppers tend to be young and married as well as to have young children and a higher level of income than non-catalog apparel shoppers(Kim et al., 1996; Shim & Drake, 1990).

Related to shopper tendencies, catalog users were more fashion-conscious(Kim et al., 1996; Seitz, 1987; Shim & Mahoney, 1992; Smallwood & Wiener, 1987), price-conscious(Kim et al., 1996; Simpson & Lakner, 1993) and time-conscious shoppers(Kim et al., 1996; Kwon et al., 1991; Shim & Mahoney, 1992). Also, Lee(2000) found that catalog apparel shoppers were recreational shoppers and convenience-conscious shoppers.

For products frequently purchased through catalogs, Kim et al.(1996) found that consumers buy casual clothing such as blouses/shirts and underwear through catalogs. In the Lee & Lee's (1998) study, homewear/nightwear and accessories were frequently purchased items from catalogs.

Regarding benefits of catalog shopping,

researchers(Lee & Lee, 1998; Shim & Drake, 1990) found that catalog apparel shoppers were more satisfied with convenience, quality, value, product assortments, and services that catalogs provided than were non-catalog shoppers. Important risks associated with catalog apparel shopping were inability to physically inspect apparel(Jasper & Ouellette, 1994), uncertainty of product quality (Kwon et al., 1991), and unreliability of brands(Lee & Lee, 1998).

## 2. Patronage Motive Strength

The value-expectancy model(Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980) was used as a theoretical framework to assess patronage motive strength, which is the expected satisfaction about diverse motives through patronage of a mail-catalog. The value-expectancy model was applied since it was recommended as an appropriate frame to assess patronage motive strength in catalog shopping research(Eastlick & Feinberg, 1994).

In this model, strength of patronage motives is assessed by the following equation:

$$S_i = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n V_i E_i}{n}$$

where  $S_i$  is the subject's motive strength rating on motive  $i$ ;  $V_i$  is the subject's importance rating of motive  $i$ ; and  $E_i$  is the subject's expected satisfaction from catalog apparel shopping on motive  $i$ . In this study,  $S_i$  is considered as 'overall patronage motive strength'; and  $V_i E_i$  is 'motive strength for each motive'.

As primary motives affecting catalog shopping patronage, previous researchers emphasized convenience, price and value(Kim et al., 1996; Lee & Lee, 1998; Shim & Drake, 1990). The results were consistent with the economics of information theory(Stigler, 1961) insisting that consumers seek

for ways to reduce monetary as well as non-monetary costs such as time and effort for shopping. Additionally, other studies revealed important motives for catalog shopping as service(Eastlick, 1989; Shim & Drake, 1990), enjoyment(Gehrt & Carter, 1992), brand(Jasper & Ouellette, 1994; Lee & Lee, 1998), easiness(Settle et al., 1994) and physical safety(Settle et al., 1994).

## 3. Gender Difference

Gender differences in shopping tendencies and patronage behaviors have been recognized by previous researchers(Bellante & Foster, 1984; Reilly, 1982; Zeithmal, 1985). In general, females have been considered as people who enjoy apparel shopping more than do males(Park, 2000). Also several studies indicated that women are more interested in clothing and fashion than are men(Lee et al., 1997; Paik & Lee, 2000; Park, 2000). However, no gender difference was found in clothing expenditure(Park & Yoon, 1994).

In studies focusing on catalog shopping, differences between males and females were found in frequency of apparel purchase through catalogs. Statistics indicate that more females engage in catalog shopping than do males in the US(KOTRA, 1999). However, the results related to catalog shopping frequency were inconsistent. Kim(1999) found that females tend to use more catalog and TV home shopping while males more often use Internet shopping. In the same study(Kim, 1999), no gender difference was found in expenditure on catalog shopping although females were more satisfied in catalog shopping than were males.

In research focusing on apparel shopping through catalogs, several researchers(Jasper & Ouellette, 1994; Lumpkin & Hawes, 1985) found that females more frequently shopped apparel through catalogs. However, Kim and Ku(1997)

found that males preferred home shopping through mail catalogs while females were more interested in cable TV home shopping.

In addition, gender differences in consumers' patronage motives were investigated related to catalog apparel shopping. Females showed more emphasis on time-saving and convenience motives regarding in-home apparel shopping than did males (Eastlick & Feinberg, 1994; Lee & Hong, 1999). However, males highly rated merchandise and service as important patronage motives for catalog apparel shopping (Eastlick & Feinberg, 1994). Little research about gender differences in catalog apparel shopping calls for further studies.

### III. Methods

#### 1. Research Hypotheses

Purpose of the present study is to explore gender differences of mail-catalog apparel shoppers in: 1) shopper tendencies, 2) catalog patronage motive strength for apparel, and 3) catalog patronage behaviors for apparel. Research hypotheses are indicated below.

Null Hypotheses:

There is no difference between male and female catalog apparel shoppers in:

Question 1: Shopper tendencies

- H1-1: Recreational shopper tendency
- H1-2: Social shopper tendency
- H1-3: Price-conscious shopper tendency
- H1-4: Brand-loyal shopper tendency
- H1-5: Convenience-conscious shopper tendency

Question 2: Catalog patronage motive strength for apparel

- H2-1: Overall patronage motive strength
- H2-2: Brand motive

- H2-3: Convenience motive
- H2-4: Easiness motive
- H2-5: Enjoyment motive
- H2-6: Personal safety motive
- H2-7: Price motive
- H2-8: Service motive
- H2-9: Value motive

Question 3: Catalog patronage behaviors for apparel

- H3-1: Number of apparel orders through catalogs
- H3-2: Number of apparel items purchased through catalogs
- H3-3: Amount of money spent for apparel shopping through catalogs

#### 2. Research Methods

Data were collected in the US in January 1999, using a random sample list of 1600 general consumers that was provided by a sampling company. Questionnaire that was developed based on previous research and theoretical frameworks was modified based on results of pilot test done with 44 college students. Although no major changes of questionnaire items were made, wording and order of items were modified based on pilot test results.

The questionnaire was sent twice to the sample; a postcard reminder was also mailed. Among 448 consumers who returned questionnaires (return rate=27.38%), 207 respondents who had experience in apparel item orders through mail-catalogs were selected for the research sample. Responses from 241 non-catalog users that were not used in this study were submitted for other research. Two research groups were made out of these 207 catalog users, including: 1) male catalog shoppers (N=97) and 2) female catalog shoppers (N=110). Data were analyzed by descriptive statistics, factor

analysis, cross tabulation, t-test, and multiple analysis of variance(MANOVA).

### 3. Research Variables

Research variables for this study were: 1) shopper tendencies, 2) patronage motive strength for catalog apparel shopping, and 3) patronage behaviors for catalog apparel shopping. Shopper tendencies and questionnaire items were selected from the previous research(Gehrt & Carter, 1992; Shim & Mahoney, 1992). Three shopper tendencies including tendencies of price-conscious shopper, brand-loyal shopper, and convenience-conscious shopper were adopted from Shim and Mahoney's(1992) study. Also, recreational shopper tendency was adopted from Gehrt and Carter(1992). In addition, social shopper tendency was added. For each shopper tendency, three questionnaire items were used to generate variables. Statements used to access each shopper tendency are presented in table 1.

Patronage motive strength was measured based on the value-expectancy model(Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). Catalog shopping patronage motives used for the research included convenience, easiness, enjoyment, personal safety, and price, following Settle et al.(1994). Also, brand and service motives adopted from other previous research(Jasper & Ouellette, 1994; Shim & Drake, 1990) were added. For each motive, satisfaction level related to catalog apparel shopping was measured with a 7-point Likert scale item, using items such as "Catalog shopping offers me good value for apparel products". In addition, perceived importance of each motive for apparel shopping was measured with a 7-point scale item. The satisfaction and importance scores for each motive were multiplied together to generate patronage motive strength variables. Sum of the multiplied scores was divided

by number of motives to generate the overall patronage motive strength variable.

In previous research(Kim et al., 1996), catalog usage behaviors for apparel shopping have been assessed by expenditure and number of orders that were made for catalog apparel shopping. In this study, patronage behaviors for catalog apparel shopping were measured by three items asking about number of apparel orders made through catalogs, number of apparel items purchased through catalogs, and money amount spent for catalog apparel shopping in the past 12 months.

## IV. Results

### 1. Sample Demographics

Among a total of 207 respondents who had experience in catalog apparel shopping, there were 97 male catalog shoppers and 110 female catalog shoppers. Ages of respondents were normally distributed with a median of 45-54 categories for both males and females. There were more male respondents who had a high level of education and income. Respondents who had undergraduate and/or graduate degrees were about 60% in male group and 42% in female group. Income earners in a category of \$50,000 and over were about 56% in males and 52% in females. About 83% of males were married while only 66% of females were married. Most of the respondents had White and European ethnicity in male(88%) and female(90%) groups. About 35% of male and 29% of female catalog shoppers were living in non-metropolitan areas.

To address possible non-response biases, the demographics of the respondents were compared to the US population(U.S. Bureau of Census, 1997). The respondents' demographic profile resembled the US population figures on age, marital status,

ethnicity, education and income. However, the study sample had more people who were over 65, who were White, and who had a high level of education and income. The results suggest that the findings may not be fully generalized to the US population although national random sampling was attempted for data collection.

## 2. Factor Analysis of Shopper Tendencies

To determine respondents' shopper tendencies, exploratory factor analysis was run. For each factor, only a single factor was generated, therefore, no rotation was applied. For recreational shopper group, factor loadings were ranged from 0.56 to 0.67 with high reliability( $\alpha=0.72$ ). Factor loadings of social shoppers were between 0.80 and 0.89 with high Cronbach's alpha of 0.91. Items measuring price-conscious shopper tendency indicated factor

loadings between 0.57 and 0.84( $\alpha=0.78$ ). Factor loadings of brand-loyal shoppers ranged from 0.62 to 0.80 with reliability alpha of 0.57. For convenience-conscious shopper group, factor loadings were between 0.56 and 0.89( $\alpha=0.69$ ).

Since all factor loadings were higher than 0.55(Nunnally, 1967) and not lower than 0.30(Kline, 1998), the measures were evaluated to have adequate construct validity. Also, internal consistency among measures for each factor was considered to be acceptable since all reliability figures were over 0.50 which is the minimally sufficient criteria for reliability in social science research(Peter, 1979). Based on reliability and validity analysis results, means of multiple measures for each factor were used as shopper tendency variables. Results of factor analysis for shopper tendencies are presented in table 1.

Table 1. Factor Analysis Results for Shopper Tendencies

Factors	Sample Statement (Number of items)	Factor Loading	Eigen- Value	Percent of Variance	Cronbach's Alpha
Recreational shopper	I enjoy apparel shopping whether or not I purchase an item.	.67	1.86	62.1	.72
	I feel a psychological lift when shopping for apparel.	.56			
	I go shopping for recreation.	.63			
Social shopper	I prefer to shop for apparel with my friends or family.	.89	2.55	84.9	.91
	I like to get suggestions from my friends or family when I shop for apparel.	.80			
	I like my friends or family to help me with apparel shopping.	.86			
Price-conscious shopper	I often shop around until I find an apparel item I want at the lowest price.	.84	2.11	70.5	.78
	I find myself checking prices even on inexpensive apparel items.	.57			
	I read advertisements for apparel sales.	.70			
Brand-loyal shopper	When shopping for apparel, I usually stick to certain brands.	.80	2.13	71.1	.57
	I concern brands when I shop for apparel.	.71			
	Brand is important in apparel shopping.	.62			
Convenience- conscious shopper	I usually shop for apparel at the most convenient store.	.89	2.01	67.1	.69
	I concern convenience when I shop for apparel.	.56			
	Convenience is important in apparel shopping.	.56			

### 3. Gender Differences in Shopper Tendencies, Patronage Motive Strength, and Patronage Behaviors

Gender differences of catalog shoppers were explored in relation to their shopper tendencies, catalog patronage motive strength, and catalog patronage behaviors for apparel shopping. Descriptive statistics, cross-tabulation, t-test and MANOVA were applied to determine differences of the two groups-male and female catalog apparel shoppers.

#### 1) Gender differences in shopper tendencies

To study gender differences on shopper tendencies, five shopper tendencies(recreational, social, price-conscious, brand-loyal and convenience-conscious shoppers) were used. For recreational shopper tendency, females showed significantly higher scores(M=4.23) than males(M=3.11)(p<.001). Females also indicated significantly higher scores in price-conscious shoppers(M=5.14) than males(M=4.52)(p<.01). In addition, convenience-conscious shopper scores were higher in females(M=5.85) than in males (M=5.44)(p<.05). However, there was no significant gender difference in social shopper and brand-loyal shopper tendencies although mean scores for these variables were slightly higher in males than in females.

In the results, gender differences were found in recreational shopper, price-conscious shopper, and convenience-conscious shopper tendencies. Based on the study results, null hypotheses H1-1, H1-3, and H1-5 were rejected while null hypotheses H1-2 and H1-4 were failed to be rejected at the significant level of .05. In addition, multivariate result indicated there were gender differences in shopper tendencies in general(p<.001). The

MANOVA results for gender differences on shopper tendencies are summarized in table 2.

#### 2) Gender differences in patronage motive strength

Gender differences in strength on eight patronage motives(brand, convenience, easiness, enjoyment, personal safety, price, service, value) and overall patronage motive strength were assessed. The t-test was applied to examine gender differences in overall patronage motive strength. In the result of overall patronage motive strength, females(M=26.39) showed a significantly higher mean than did males(M=23.12), indicating an overall gender difference in patronage motive strength(p<.01).

For each patronage motive, gender differences were investigated through MANOVA test. For brand, convenience, easiness, enjoyment, personal safety, and price, gender differences were found(p<.05). Specifically, females(M=27.94) indicated a higher mean in enjoyment than did males(M=21.42)(p<.001). Also, personal safety is another variable that females(M=26.53) showed a

**Table 2. Gender Differences in Shopper Tendencies**

Variables	Mean(S.D.)		Univariate F(Sig.)	Pillais Multivariate
	Male	Female		
Recreational shopper	3.11 (1.50)	4.23 (1.56)	25.49(.000)***	8.75(.000)***
Social shopper	3.54 (1.59)	3.23 (1.75)	1.75(.188)	
Price-conscious shopper	4.52 (1.44)	5.14 (1.39)	9.82(.002)**	
Brand-loyal shopper	4.80 (1.37)	4.45 (1.41)	3.01(.084)	
Convenience-conscious shopper	5.44 (1.30)	5.85 (1.25)	4.83(.029)*	

Note. \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

higher mean than did males( $M=20.88$ )( $p<.01$ ). Females also indicated a higher mean in easiness, price, and convenience( $M=33.25, 21.14, 35.19$ , respectively) than did males( $M=29.13, 17.91, 31.41$ , respectively)( $p<.05$ ). Brand was the only patronage motive strength variable showing a higher mean in males( $M=22.42$ ) than in females( $M=19.03$ ).

There was no gender difference in service and value. Multivariate result indicated there were gender differences in catalog patronage motive strength in general( $p<.001$ ). In the results, null hypotheses H2-1, H2-2, H2-3, H2-4, H2-5, H2-6, and H2-7 were rejected while hypotheses H2-8 and H2-9 were failed to be rejected. The results are summarized in table 3 and 4.

### 3) Gender differences in patronage behaviors

Patronage behaviors for catalog apparel shopping were examined through cross-tabulation chi-square test. In number of apparel orders from catalogs, about 60% of male and female shoppers made 2-5 apparel orders from catalogs in the past 12 months. In addition, 46% of male shoppers and 32% of female shoppers purchased 2-4 apparel items from catalogs in the past 12 months. In terms of amount of money spent on catalog apparel shopping, frequencies of male shoppers indicated two groupings: 1) a group spending \$26-75(24.8%), and 2) a group spending \$151-300(35.0%), while

**Table 3. Gender Differences in Overall Patronage Motive Strength for Catalog Apparel Shopping**

Variables	Mean(S.D.)		t-value(sig.)
	Male	Female	
Overall patronage motive strength for catalog apparel shopping	23.12 (8.21)	26.39 (7.23)	3.04(.003)**

Note. \*\* $p<.01$

**Table 4. Gender Differences in Patronage Motive Strength for Catalog Apparel Shopping**

Variables	Mean(S.D.)		Univariate F(Sig.)	Pillais Multivariate
	Male	Female		
Brand	22.42 (11.52)	19.03 (11.42)	3.94(.049)*	4.41(.000)***
Convenience	31.41 (11.74)	35.19 (11.75)	4.64(.033)*	
Easiness	29.13 (10.52)	33.25 (11.92)	6.02(.015)*	
Enjoyment	21.42 (11.54)	27.94 (11.45)	14.18(.000)***	
Personal safety	20.88 (13.68)	26.53 (13.21)	7.97(.005)**	
Price	17.91 (8.84)	21.14 (9.72)	5.39(.021)*	
Service	28.68 (8.71)	29.12 (10.42)	1.00(.752)	
Value	26.39 (9.77)	27.16 (9.07)	4.64(.593)	

Note. \* $p<.05$ , \*\* $p<.01$ , \*\*\* $p<.001$

females showed an almost normal distribution with a median category of \$101-150.

For all three variables(number of orders, number of items purchased, and amount of money spent) measuring catalog shopping behaviors, no significant difference was found between the two groups in the chi-square result. Therefore, research hypotheses H3-1, H3-2, and H3-3 were not rejected. Gender differences in catalog patronage behaviors are presented in table 5.

## V. Conclusions

In this research, gender differences of catalog shoppers were explored focusing on their shopper tendencies, patronage motive strength and patronage behaviors related to catalog apparel



**Table 5. Gender Differences in Patronage Behaviors for Catalog Apparel Shopping**

Variable	Description	Male(N=97)		Female(N=110)		$\chi^2$ value(sig.)
		Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>	
Number of apparel orders from catalogs <sup>b</sup>	Once	25	25.8	22	20.0	1.73(.630)
	2-5	58	59.8	66	60.0	
	6-10	9	9.3	15	13.6	
	More than 10	5	5.2	7	6.4	
Number of apparel items purchased from catalogs <sup>b</sup>	One item	17	17.5	16	14.5	7.88(.163)
	2-4 items	45	46.4	35	31.8	
	5-7 items	18	18.6	29	26.4	
	8-10 items	5	5.2	10	9.1	
Money amount spent on catalog apparel shopping <sup>b</sup>	More than 10 items	11	11.3	14	12.7	11.07(.438)
	\$1 to \$25	5	5.2	5	4.5	
	\$26 to \$50	12	12.4	9	8.2	
	\$51 to \$75	12	12.4	10	9.1	
	\$76 to \$100	9	9.3	17	15.5	
	\$101 to \$150	8	8.2	15	13.6	
	\$151 to \$200	20	20.6	11	10.0	
	\$201 to \$300	14	14.4	15	13.6	
	\$301 to \$400	6	6.2	10	9.1	
	\$401 to \$500	3	3.1	3	2.7	
\$501 to \$1000	6	6.2	7	6.4		
More than \$1000	1	1.0	3	2.7		

Note.

<sup>a</sup> Sum of percents may not be equal to 100 due to missing data.

<sup>b</sup> These questions asked catalog patronage behaviors in the past 12 months.

shopping. Among 17 research hypotheses, 10 null hypotheses were rejected ( $p < .05$ ).

In relation to shopper tendencies, females were more recreational shoppers who enjoyed apparel shopping activities than were males. These results support the notion that females like shopping more than do males (Underhill, 1999). Also, females were more price-conscious and convenience-conscious shoppers, compared to males. The results are consistent with the previous research (Eastlick & Feinberg, 1994; Lee & Hong, 1999). However, males were not different from females in their social shopper and brand-loyal tendencies.

Related to patronage motive strength, females showed a higher score in overall patronage motive strength than did males, indicating that females

were more satisfied with apparel shopping through catalogs than were males. Females were more satisfied with convenience, easiness, enjoyment, personal safety and price aspects of catalog apparel shopping than were males. Males showed more satisfaction with brand in catalog apparel shopping than did females. However, males and females were not different in satisfaction levels for service and value of catalog apparel shopping.

Although men indicated a relatively lower level of satisfaction in catalog shopping compared to women, males did not shop less apparel through catalogs. Males and females were not different in the number of orders made, the number of items purchased and the amount of money spent for catalog apparel shopping. These results conflict

with previous findings(Jasper & Ouellette, 1994; Lumpkin & Hawes, 1985).

In conclusion, females tended to be more recreational shoppers, price-conscious shoppers, and convenience-conscious shoppers than did males. Females were also more satisfied with catalog apparel shopping overall than were males. Females evaluated catalog apparel shopping better in terms of convenience, easiness, enjoyment, personal safety and price, however, females did not make more apparel orders from catalogs nor spend more money on catalog apparel shopping than did males.

Marketing implications are generated based on study results. First, males felt that apparel shopping itself was less entertaining and enjoyable than did females. In addition, males felt that apparel shopping through catalogs was less easy, less safe, and less convenient than did females. Similarly to other shopping media, mail-catalogs have also tended to target more female consumers than males in terms of product assortments and service contents. As family lifestyles have been changed(e.g., an increasing number of women in the workforce and single-parent families), male consumers became more often involved with shopping activities. More diverse types of catalogs including male-oriented contents and services will be effective in attracting more male consumers to catalog shopping. Marketers can consider diverse ways of better serving male consumers by providing: 1) product assortments for males(e.g., male suit, male shoes), 2) detailed and appropriate size specs for males, and 3) male assistants on the telephone order process for better understanding male consumers' specific needs.

Second, females are more price-conscious and convenience-conscious shoppers for apparel. To increase the level of satisfaction of female

consumers, savvy pricing strategies emphasizing price-merit and/or relative benefits will be necessary. Also, for females who want more convenient shopping environments, an easy and quick process of product ordering and size measurements should be provided in apparel catalogs. Also, comprehensive catalog contents that make one-stop shopping possible will be appreciated by female shoppers.

Third, males showed much less overall satisfaction with catalog apparel shopping than did females. In spite of the lower satisfaction level of males, males are using catalogs for apparel shopping as much as females. It can be inferred that males use catalogs for apparel shopping since catalogs may fit to their lifestyles and shopping needs. In this condition, if marketers make more effort on enhancing males' satisfaction in catalog apparel shopping, frequency and expenditures of males for catalog apparel shopping will be definitely increasing.

The results should be evaluated in the light of some limitations of the study. First, low return rate(27.4%) of the questionnaire may limit generalization of the results to the US population although general sampling was applied. Second, only one questionnaire item was used to assess strength of each patronage motive. The constraint of questionnaire items may limit the applicability of findings. In future research, gender differences in diverse aspects of cable TV and Internet home shopping should be further studied. Also, research investigating male home shoppers' dissatisfaction in detail may provide valuable implications for home shopping marketers.

## References

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M.(1980). Understanding

- attitudes and predicting social behavior. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Bellante, D., & Foster, A. C.(1984). Working wives and expenditure on services. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 11(September), 700–707.
- Beon, J. S.(November 1997). Recent condition and future direction of home shopping. *Marketing*, 68–69.
- Cooney, T. M.(1993). Recent demographic change: Implications for families planning for the future. *Marriage and Family Review*, 18(3/4), 37–55.
- Daewoo Economic Research Center(June 23, 1998). Effects of and responses to opening of retail market in 1996. *Mail Business Newspaper*.
- Eastlick, M. A., & Feinberg, R. A.(1994). Gender differences in mail–catalog patronage motive strength. *Journal of Direct Marketing*, 8(2), 37–44.
- Gehrt, K. C., & Carter, K.(1992). An exploratory assessment of catalog shopping orientations. *Journal of Direct Marketing*, 6(1), 29–39.
- Gorden, H.(1994). Retailers are ready for relationship marketing. *Direct Marketing*, 58(1), 38–44.
- Hawkins, D. I., Best, R. J., & Coney, K. A.(1989). Consumer behavior(4th ed.), Homewood: I.L.Irwin.
- Jasper, C. R., & Ouellette, S. J.(1994). Consumers' perception of risk and the purchase of apparel from catalogs. *Journal of Direct Marketing*, 8(2), 23–36.
- Kim, J. Y., & Ku, Y. S.(1997). Consumers' reaction, perceived benefits and risk when purchasing apparel through Cable TV home shopping. *Journal of the Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles*, 21(6), 1082–1093.
- Kim, Y. J.(1999). A study on the reality of mail–order selling user's purchase, post–purchase satisfaction level and complaining behavior. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Konkuk University, Seoul.
- Kim, Y–K, Feather, B. L., & McEnally, M. R.(1996). Professional women's catalogue usage: Its relationships with involvement, lifestyle and demographic characteristics. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 1(1), 38–49.
- Kline, R. B.(1998). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling. New York: The Guilford Press.
- KOTRA(1999). The world home shopping market. Seoul: KOTRA.
- Kwon, Y., Paek, S., & Arzeni, M.(1991). Catalog vs Non–catalog shoppers of apparel: Perceived risks, shopping orientations, demographics, and motivations. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 10(1), 13–19.
- Lee, E. J., & Hong, B. S.(1999). The apparel product purchasing tendency of PC communication and Internet users in home shopping. *Journal of the Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles*, 23(7), 1007–1018.
- Lee, E. J., & Lee, E. Y.(1996). Effects of consumers' perception of shopping cost and recreational shopping orientation on catalog shopping of apparel. *Journal of the Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles*, 20(5), 826–840.
- Lee, J. Y., & Lee, S. J.(1998). A study on brand of mail–order clothing. *Journal of the Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles*, 22(4), 442–451.
- Lee, S. A.(2000). Research on shopping orientations and impulsive buying of apparel shoppers using home shopping. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Sookmyung Women's University, Seoul.
- Lee, S. H., Kim, H. S., & Son, W. K.(1997). School uniform satisfaction, clothing interests and self–concepts of male and female high school students. *Journal of the Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles*, 21(2), 383–395.
- Lee, S. J.(1991). Home shopping revolution: Subsidiary business to enterprise. Seoul: B&R Press.
- Lumpkin, J. R., & Hawes, J. M.(1985). Retailing without stores: An examination of catalog

- shoppers. *Journal of Business Research*, 13, 139–151.
- McCorkle, D. E., Planchon, J. M., & James, W. L.(1987). In-home shopping: A critical review and research agenda. *Journal of Direct Marketing*, 1(Spring), 5–21.
- Michals, D.(1997, February). WWW.catalog.com. *Working Woman*, 22(2), 8–10.
- Nunnally, J. C.(1967). Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw–Hill.
- Paik, S. Y. & Lee, S. J.(2000). A study on sex role identity, clothing involvement, and clothing satisfaction of high school students. *Journal of the Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles*, 24(1), 55–66.
- Park, K. A.(2000). Novelty seeking, fashion innovative behavior and personal influence: What gender tells. *Journal of the Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles*, 24(2), 257–265.
- Park, K. H., & Yoon, S. J.(1994). Gender differences in fashion awareness and clothing expenditures. *Journal of the Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles*, 18(5), 682–691.
- Park, S. H.(1997). Effects of clothing involvement on purchase intention and evaluation criteria of catalog apparel shopping. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Han Yang University, Seoul.
- Peter, J. P.(1979). Reliability: A review of psychometric basics and recent marketing practices. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16, 6–17.
- Reilly, M. D.(1982). Working wives and convenience consumption. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 8(March), 407–418.
- Ross, N.(1984). A history of direct marketing. In Fact Book on Direct(p.3), New York: Direct Marketing Association.
- Salant, P., & Dillman, D. A.(1994). How to conduct your own survey. New York: Wiley.
- Seckler, V.(2001, January 10). Online retail gains momentum. *Women's Wear Daily*, 2, 12
- Seitz, V.(1987). Clothing interest as an indicator of catalog use. *Home Economics Research Journal*, 16, 120–126.
- Settle, R. B., Alreck, P. L., & McCorkle, D. E.(1994). Consumer perceptions of mail/phone order shopping media. *Journal of Direct Marketing*, 8(3), 30–45.
- Shim, S., & Drake, M. F.(1990). Consumer intention to purchase apparel by mail order: Beliefs, attitude, and decision process variables. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 9(1), 18–26.
- Shim, S., & Mahoney, M. Y.(1992). The elderly mail-order catalog user of fashion products. *Journal of Direct Marketing*, 6(1), 49–58.
- Simpson, L., & Lakner, H. B.(1993). Perceived risk and mail-order shopping for apparel. *Journal of Consumer Studies and Home Economics*, 17, 377–389.
- Smallwood, V., & Wiener, J.(1987). Light and heavy catalog shoppers of clothing. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 5, 25–30.
- Stigler, G. P.(1954). The economics of information. *Journal of Political Economy*, 69, 213–225.
- Underhill, P.(1999). Why we buy: The science of shopping. New York: Obat, Inc.
- U.S. Bureau of Census.(1997). Statistical abstracts of the United States 1997(117th ed.), Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Zeithmal, V.(1985). The new demographics and market fragmentation. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(Summer), 64–75.