

## The Types of Clothing Shopping Value and the Classification of Consumer group by Shopping Values

Kwon, Hae-Sook

Prof., Fashion Design Major, College of Design, Sangmyung University

### Abstract

The main purpose of this research was to examine what were the factors of shopping value that consumers perceived, if there is any difference between male and female, and if male and female consumer group were divided into different groups according to the pursuing shopping value type.'

Data were solicited from convenience sample of 347 adults(156 male and 191 female) who were between 19 to 49 years of age. Sources for the sample were companies and apartment complexes and several colleges in Seoul and Chonan to diversify by such demographics as age and social status.

The statistical methods used for this study are factor analysis and cluster analysis and Scheffe test using a SPSS 10.00 GLM.

The main findings are as follows:

First, four dimensions of clothing shopping values were identified as pleasure, planned, leisure, and convenience value. For male, it appeared in the order of pleasure, leisure, planned, and convenience shopping value and for female, it appeared in the order of pleasure, planned, leisure, and convenience shopping value. The most important subdimension of clothing shopping value was 'pursuing pleasure' and the least important one was 'convenience' regardless of gender.

Second, three types of consumer groups for male & female were identified.

For male consumers, it appeared as planned, leisure/convenience, and pleasure pursuing group. For female consumers, it appeared as pleasure, convenience, and leisure shopping pursuing group. Here, pleasure is a common factors to affect shopping itself free from gender, but male does shopping with plan and female with pleasure.

**Key Words** : clothing shopping value, pleasure shopping value, leisure shopping value, plan shopping value, convenience shopping value

## I. Introduction

The ultimate goal of shopping is not to purchase a product itself, but to purchase the value that is obtained from shopping. In other words, the product which is a showcase of marketing behavior, can be defined as an aggregate of values.<sup>1)</sup> Value is the mental representation of fundamental desire to reflect the real lives of consumers. As the final result of consuming behavior and the standard of evaluating this result are different among consumers, the definition of value is different by scholars.<sup>2)</sup>

Many researchers proved that individual value affected the buying intention and buying behavior. The reason why consumer purchases a particular product is based on one's belief that the purchased product will help to achieve the value-related goals. Therefore, value plays an important role in buying behavior and works as an element to raise consumption activity to a certain extent.<sup>3)</sup>

Shopping value that the consumer has in shopping circumstance belongs to specific value.<sup>4)</sup> Bloch and his colleagues (1986) referred to shopping value as something that consumers obtained through shopping. They claimed that a shopping value measure should account for more than just functional utility and the emotional aspect ought to be included.<sup>5)</sup> To integrate the results of previous studies, shopping value can be defined as "the value which occurs when consumers believe that shopping experience is useful and valuable." This included the possession of merchandise, task performance as well as the subjective and pleasant aspects of price and practical convenience.<sup>6)</sup>

The experiences that consumers undergo during shopping are various. They involve many aspects of shopping activities such as the comparison of products and the research activity to collect information in advance and gain new information and appreciate the mood of a shop. Therefore, various emotions and reasons experiences can be during shopping.

Men and women are different in almost every aspect of consumption, from their preferences for products to their responses to advertising and product positioning. Slama and Tashchian (1985) found that women are more involved in the purchasing sequence and Zeithaml (1985) found that women seek information more actively before purchase and spend more time in store than men do. This tendency is assumed to be stronger in case of clothing shopping because the pressure regarding appearance management is stronger for women than men.<sup>7)</sup>

Recently, a number of researches regarding the shopping value and buying behavior have tried to explain the various emotions that consumers experience while shopping and find out the explanatory and the consequence variables of emotional reaction.<sup>8)9)10)11)12)</sup> However, in spite of the fact that clothing has stronger emotional aspect comparing to other products, research on the clothing shopping value is limited.

In this research, the types of shopping value that consumers have during clothing shopping will be identified and how the consumer groups are classified according to the types of clothing shopping value they pursue. And this paper will find out if there exist any differences according to the gender of the consumer.

## II. The Review of literature

### 1. The Concept of Shopping Value

Value is an individual's ultimate style or continuous faith for behavior mode. Therefore, shopping value may be described as "continuous faith that individual has for the shopping behavior."<sup>13)</sup>

Zeithaml defined shopping value as "all factors, both qualitative and quantitative, subjective and objective, that make up the complete shopping experience."<sup>14)</sup> Regarding this shopping value, Babin et al. (1994) developed hedonic and utilitarian shopping value scales. They mentioned that the shopping value included both values obtained from consciously pursuing the shopping goal and from the pleasure of shopping itself. This means the fundamental duality of the compensation for human behavior. Therefore, in order to comprehend the difference between consumer behaviors inclusively, one needs the research of consumer behavior which considers the 'utilitarian value' that pursues useful outcomes and the hedonic value' that pursues enjoyable outcomes all together.<sup>15)</sup>

### 2. Previous Studies in Shopping Value

In most researches, shopping values were classified into two dimensions such as hedonic value and utilitarian value and were studied in relation to buying behavior.<sup>16)17)18)</sup> Batra & Ahtola(1991) and Cowley et al.(1992) identified the two dimensions of consumer attitude as hedonic value and utilitarian value and then developed the measuring scale. After that, Babin et al. (1994) studied the psychological types and consuming characteristics of

consumers. They verified that the consumer's shopping values were classified into utilitarian value and hedonic value, and there was a distinctive difference in the searching activities and consumption characteristic of their pursuing shopping value.

Most of domestic studies regarding shopping value were conducted by the above mentioned two dimensions.<sup>19)20)</sup> For example, Kim(2000) mentioned that if the shopping values of consumers were different, the judgment of store attributes was different, and there was also difference in emotions that were felt by these. Also found that consumers with hedonic shopping value enjoyed the hedonic advantage from the interior of clothing store and mood for having fun and pleasure rather than simply having a purpose to purchase the goods. This well reflected the amusement and emotional value which shopping had. In addition, as consumers with utilitarian shopping value put the logical and practical value in priority during shopping, the factors of convenient and effective aspects in shopping had significant influence on the emotion in clothing shops. In the research of Lee & Kim(1998), the group pursuing the hedonic shopping value showed a higher level of impulse buying than the group pursuing utilitarian shopping value.

There have been various studies that identified the multi dimensional shopping value.

As the result of Jin & Kho's research (2000), value was divided into three dimensions of authority sensitive, price specialization, and value.<sup>21)</sup> And, in study of Lim & Pyun(2000), the shopping value was classified into four dimensions such as convenience, utility value prone to price, authority, self regulating hedonic value.<sup>22)</sup> According to Pyun(1999) and Rho(2000), measuring shopping value, which

included direct purchasing and eye shopping only, is not able to capture how shopping value differs according to the situation, they argued for studying shopping value, by dividing hedonic value and utilitarian value and classifying the recognition of shopping by each different situation.<sup>23) 24)</sup>

In the study of Choi(1996), the consumer groups according to the factor scores of clothing shopping value were divided into four shopper types high shopping involved, low shopping involved, hedonic, and utilitarian shopper. Each type of shopper was influenced by clothing attitude, clothing purchase behavior, clothing price-related behavior and demographics.<sup>25)</sup>

### 3. The Dimension of Shopping Value.

#### 1) Utilitarian shopping value

The previous studies of utilitarian value were mainly focused on individual utilitarian value and standardized utilitarian value.

The researchers regarded the utilitarian consumer behavior as rational and liable. Kim (2000) said that consumers feel the happiness when they purchase the good what they want to buy.<sup>26)</sup> Jin & Kho(1999) regarded the utilitarian shopping value as a perceived value when finishing the shopping itself.<sup>27)</sup> As perceived utilitarian value depends on the accomplishment of particular consuming desire that is stimulated while shopping, this means that consumers purchased goods with intentional and effective method.<sup>28)</sup>

Bloch and Richins(1984) mentioned that purchasing goods was not the mandatory condition of utilitarian shopping value. It could be shown as the form of collecting information

for certain necessity rather than leisure. It did not mean that all the people who had utilitarian shopping value purchased all goods.<sup>29)</sup>

Choi(1997) mentioned that utilitarian shopping types generally showed lower interest in clothing and considered the fashionability and label less important and also had less experience in clothing.<sup>30)</sup>

Like thus, utilitarian shopping has to do with heuristics, goal fulfillment, and propensity for risk and plays a role as a means to achieving optimal values and emphasizes shopping efficiency and rationality.<sup>31)</sup>

#### 2) Hedonic shopping value

Many researchers indicated that traditional research that considered shopping to be functional and objective product acquisition didnot reflect the total shopping experience because it failed to measure intangible and emotional aspects of the shopping experience.<sup>32)</sup> For example, Macinnis and Pice (1987) said that shopping experience provided hedonic value because consumer could enjoy the benefit of products regardless of purchase.<sup>33)</sup> Bellenger et.al. (1976) mentioned in his study that joy, pleasure, mind refreshing, fantasy, increased involvement, new information collection, breaking from the reality, and etc. were involved in hedonic value.<sup>34)</sup>

As looking by the previous scholars in Korea, Jin & Kho(1999) mentioned that hedonic shopping value was the joyful aspects of shopping through the whole shopping experience irrelevant to purchasing.<sup>35)</sup> Kim(2000) mentioned that it was related with shopping to avoid personal problems or compulsive purchasing which included unscheduled buying, and the purchasing motive

of the product advertisement.<sup>36)</sup> In other words, hedonic shopping value can be seen as which is related to the pleasure that is expected and experienced by activity. It is also the emotional advantage that the consumer experiences through shopping excluding the original purchasing purpose. It also means as a shopping experience that increases the emotional aspect by reflecting the potential pleasure and the emotional value, showing high participation rate, feeling freedom, and having fantastic & liberal feelings.<sup>37) 38)</sup>

Choi(1997) mentioned that hedonic type of consumer considered the clothing significant and showed interest in fashion. By lots of experience with the clothing, they have high confidence and somewhat move toward the label in certain level. Along with the above, they have strong 'market aiming aspect' that considers expensive products as high quality.<sup>39)</sup>

Hedonic shopping value is more subjective & personal than utilitarian shopping value, and the value is perceived through joy and pleasure rather than purchasing goods.

### III. Methods

#### 1. Data collection and Respondents

Data were solicited from conveniences ample of 347 adults(156 male and 191 female) who were between 19 to 49 years of age. Sources

for the sample were companies and apartment complexes and several colleges in Seoul and Chonan. As a result, the sample consisted of a broad range of people, diversified by such demographics as age and social status. <Table 1>

365 respondents completed questionnaires yielding 347 useable questionnaires.

#### 2. Measurements and Procedures

1) Demographics. Respondent's demographics of age and occupations were measured as closed-ended items with answer categories.

2) Clothing shopping value. Clothing shopping values were measured by respondents' rating of 12 statements using a 5-point Likert-type scale. These statements adopted from previous studies (Kim,2000; Noh,2000; Pyun,1999; Park,1995; Cho,1996). The selecting procedures and the detailed contents are as following:

Based on the shopping value measuring questions that appeared in previous studies, total 83 of questions that identified as proper for measuring clothing shopping value were collected. Among them, the questions that seem to be duplicated or have similar meanings were considered as one question. In the result of classifying, 53 questions were selected which seem to be proper for clothing shopping value measurement.

<Table 1> The Demographics of Sample

Demographics		Sex		Total(%)
		Male(%)	Female(%)	
Age	19-24	66(19.0)	112(32.3)	178(51.3)
	25-29	45(13.0)	44(12.7)	89(25.6)
	30-34	27(7.8)	26(7.5)	53(15.3)
	35-39	7(4.5)	5(1.2)	12(3.5)
	Over 40	11(2.0)	4(1.2)	15(4.3)
Total		156(45.0)	191(55.0)	347(100)
Job	Professional group	14(4.0)	7(2.0)	21(6.1)
	Business management	10(2.9)	2(0.6)	12(3.5)
	Professional Techniques	15(4.3)	33(9.5)	48(13.8)
	Administration	14(4.0)	15(4.3)	29(8.4)
	Sales & Service	18(5.2)	10(2.9)	28(8.1)
	College student	81(23.3)	113(32.6)	194(55.9)
	Housewife		10(5.2)	10(5.2)
	Etc	4(1.2)	1(0.5)	5(1.2)

The selected 53 questions verified the content validity by 5 graduates from clothing major and 5 social workers. The term definitions of hedonic shopping value and utilitarian shopping value were suggested. They were asked to judge whether the suggested questions were involved in hedonic value or utilitarian value. Finally, 12 questions of 6 hedonic values and 6 utilitarian values were selected that showed high agreement among the participants.

### 3. Statistical Analysis

In this research, SPSS(Statistical Package for Social Science) Version 10.0, was used for factor analysis in order to comprehend the shopping value type and cluster analysis in order to classify the consumer groups according to their shopping value type.

## IV. Results and Discussion

### 1. Consumers' Clothing Shopping Value

To investigate the clothing shopping value dimensions, factor analysis was executed on the 12 questions of clothing shopping value, and the factors loading less than 0.5 were eliminated. With this result, 'I am willing to pay more time to buy a good quality clothing with reasonable price' was removed in male consumer case and 'I immediately back home if there is no goods what I want to buy' was excluded in female consumer case. The minimum eigen-value of 1.0 was used as the final factors to measure a shopping value.

1) Clothing shopping value for male consumer

For male consumers, factor analysis yield four factors of clothing shopping values that consumer sought; these were labeled hedonic shopping, leisure shopping, planned/utilitarian shopping, convenience shopping<Table 2>.

The name of each factor was given according to the contents of measurements. Factor 1 was named as an hedonic shopping because it was in chase of fun, pleasure, delights in clothing shopping. Factor 2 named as a leisure shopping because it searched for feeling of freedom and relaxation the clothing shopping. Factor 3 was named as a utilitarian(planned) shopping as it

<Table 2> The result of factor analysis of male clothing shopping value

Factor	Items of subdimension	Factor loading	Cronbach' $\alpha$
Factor 1 Hedonic shopping	3. As I can imagine that all the expensive clothing is mine during the shopping, although I cannot afford that much, I enjoy a clothing shopping.	0.78	0.80
	2. I love to try or touch clothing even when I don't have any plan to buy any clothing and enjoy an eye shopping only.	0.74	
	4. I consider clothing shopping as a part of my life.	0.61	
	1. I love clothing shopping.	0.61	
eigenvalue : 3.75      %of variance explained : 34.12%      cumulative : 34.12%			
Factor 2 Leisure shopping	10. I can feel free from problems in everyday life during clothing shopping.	0.86	0.78
	11. Clothing shopping is a nice breathing time.	0.74	
eigenvalue : 1.40      %of variance explained : 12.76%      cumulative : 46.88%			
Factor 3 Planned/ Utilitarian shopping	5. I carefully think and plan what I am going to buy before I go to store.	0.80	0.48
	7. I immediately back home if there is no goods what I want to buy.	0.65	
	6. Before I purchase clothing, I look around some stores and compare styles and prices.	0.54	
eigenvalue : 1.15      %of variance explained : 10.47%      cumulative : 57.35%			
Factor 4 convenience shopping	8. When I buy clothing, I make a good use of one-stop shopping place as I can easily buy in one spot.	0.84	0.32
	9. I'll appreciate if some one goes to clothing shopping instead of me.	0.58	
eigenvalue : 1.02      %of variance explained : 9.28%      cumulative : 66.63%			

considered an economical efficiency and the feeling of accomplishments through it as an important value. Factor 4 was labeled as a convenience shopping because it was related with willing to have other's help to save one's own energy and time.

For males, the subdimensions of clothing shopping value and the order of importance were hedonic, leisure, intentional/utilitarian, and convenience shopping value.

2) Clothing shopping value for female consumer

For female consumers, factor analysis yielded four factors of clothing shopping values that consumer sought as in male consumers; these were labeled hedonic shopping, planned shopping, leisure shopping, convenience shopping. Although there was difference in a percentage of variance explained, the dimensions of each factor showed the similar phases<Table 3>.

<Table 3> The result of factor analysis of female clothing shopping value

Factor	Dimension of factor	Factor loading	Cron-bach' $\alpha$
Factor 1 Hedonic shopping	3. As I can imagine that all the expensive clothing is mine during the shopping, although I cannot afford that much, I enjoy a clothing shopping.	0.79	0.78
	4. I consider clothing shopping itself as a part of my life.	0.76	
	2. I love to try or touch clothing even when I don't have any plan to buy any clothing and enjoy an eye shopping only.	0.73	
	1. I love clothing shopping.	0.65	
eigenvalue: 4.07 %of variance explained: 33.95% cumulative: 33.95%			
Factor 2 Plan shopping	5. I carefully think and plan what I am going to buy before I go to store.	0.83	0.64
	6. Before I purchase clothing, I look around some stores and compare styles and prices.	0.72	
	12. I am willing to pay more time to buy good quality clothing with reasonable price.	0.54	
eigenvalue : 1.38%of variance explained : 11.49%cumulative: 45.44%			
Factor 3 Leisure shopping	10. I can feel free from problems in everyday life during clothing shopping.	0.66	0.68
	11. Clothing shopping is a nice breathing time.	0.50	
eigenvalue : 1.23%of variance explained : 10.29%cumulative : 55.73%			
Factor 4 convenience shopping	9. I'll appreciate if some one goes to clothing shopping instead of me.	0.79	0.51
	8. When I buy clothing, I make a good use of one-stop shopping place as easily buy it in one spot.	0.78	
eigenvalue : 1.01%of variance explained: 8.39%cumulative : 64.12%			



Factor 1 was named as an hedonic shopping because it was in chase of fun, pleasure, delights in clothing shopping. Factor 2 was named as plan shopping as it was believed that shopping should be reasonable and planned also considered an economical efficiency and the feeling of accomplishments through it as an important value. Factor 3 named as a leisure shopping because it searched for feeling of freedom and relaxation the clothing shopping. Factor 4 was named as a convenience shopping because it was related with willing to have other's help to save one's own energy and time

For females, the factors of clothing shopping value and the order of importance were hedonic, planned/utilitarian, leisure, and convenience shopping value.

In summary, the clothing shopping values for male and female consumers were identified as hedonic, planned, leisure and convenience value. The hedonic value subdivided into hedonic and leisure value and utilitarian value subdivided into planned and convenience value. The highest value was a hedonic value and the lowest one was convenience value in both genders. The second was leisure value for male and plan value for female. In other words, for male consumer, hedonic value was the most important factor and followed by leisure, planned and convenience. For female consumers, hedonic value was the most important factor, and followed by plan, leisure, and convenience.

The contents of consisting items per dimensions were all same except 'anned shopping value.'For this dimension, the item of 'if they don'thave the good that I was intended to purchase, then I come back right away'was included in male consumer group, otherwise, it did not get involved to any

dimensions in female group. The item of 'I am willing to pay more time to buy a good quality clothing with reasonable price.' was included in female consumer group, however, it was not included in any dimensions for male group.

Like this, the dimensions of clothing shopping value that male & female consumers pursue are revealed to be the relatively same except for the 'planned value'. But the extent of influence of each dimension and the specific contents of each dimension are different according to gender.

## **2. Classification of consumer group according to clothing shopping values**

With the scores of four factors resulted from factor analysis, cluster analysis was conducted to classify the consumer groups according to their clothing shopping values. As a result,three shopping pursuit groups were identified and each cluster demonstrated the distinct characteristics. To examine the characteristics of each cluster, ANOVA and Scheffe test were done.

### **1) Classification of male consumer group according to clothing shopping values**

As a result of cluster analyses, three shopping pursuit groups were identified. <Table 4>the three groups, the plan shopping pursuit one was the largest, consisting of 67 respondents(67% of total). As compared to the other two segments, this one yielded the highest scores on the plan shopping factor(0.63) and its name was given as a plan shopping pursuit group(group 2).And group 1 was labeled as hedonic shopping pursuit group because it yielded the highest

scores on hedonic shopping factor(1.26), and 3 yield the highest scores on shopping factor(0.38) also the comparatively higher scores on convenience shopping factor(0.12), therefore, it was labeled as leisure/convenience shopping group.

The result of and Scheffe test shown in <table 5> reveals that all three groups differed significantly each other on their shopping values.(p<.05)

In detailed, the hedonic shopping pursuing group(group 1) showed comparatively high level of the three factors of the pleasure(M=3.56) and the planned shopping(M=3.55) andthe leisure (M=3.47), while lower score on the convenience shopping value (M=2.97).

Planned shopping pursuing group(group 2) yielded highest score for the planned(M=3.84), and followed by convenience(M=2.56), leisure (M=2.93) and hedonic shopping factor(2.18).

As compared to the other groups, the leisure/convenience shopping group(group 3) generally yielded lower scores on all four factors. It yielded the highest scores on the leisure(M=2.93), and then followed by the convenience shopping(M=2.91), the planned (M=2.75), and the hedonic(M=2.18).

As looking by each factor, for pleasure shopping value, group 1 showed highest mean for hedonic factor and the other two groups were obtained statistically same scores. For leisure shopping value, three groups differed from

<Table 4> Clothing shopping values in male consumers

Factor	Factor 1 Hedonic shopping	Factor 2 Leisure shopping	Factor 3 Planned shopping	Factor 4 Convenience shopping
Name of Consumer Group				
Group 1 : (N=39, 25%) hedonic shopping pursuit group	<b>1.26</b>	0.42	0.06	0.35
Group 2 : (N=67, 43%) planned shopping pursuit group	-0.28	-0.53	<b>0.63</b>	-0.29
Group 3 : (N=50, 32%) Leisure/convenience shopping group	-0.61	<b>0.38</b>	-0.89	<b>0.12</b>

\* 1) The higher the scores, the higher the importance of factor.

\* 2) The number of parentheses displays a frequency and percentage of each group.

<Table 5> Difference among male consumer groups regarding clothing shopping values sought

Consumer group	Group 1(n=39) M(SD)	Group 2(n=67) M(SD)	Group 3(n=50) M(SD)	F-ratio
Factor 1; Hedonic shopping	3.56a(0.56)	2.22b(0.55)	2.18b(0.50)	92.88***
Factor 2; Leisure shopping	3.47a(0.86)	2.37c(0.79)	2.93b(0.79)	23.87***
Factor 3; planned shopping	3.55b(0.67)	3.84a(0.47)	2.75c(0.56)	56.79***
Factor 4; Convenience shopping	2.97(0.90)	2.56(0.85)	2.91(0.74)	3.44*
a>b>c> Scheffe test result	* p<0.05	** p<0.01	*** p<0.001	

each other and showed in the order of hedonic, planned, and leisure/convenience shopping pursuing group. There was no significant difference in convenience shopping factor between groups.

2) Classification of female consumer group according to clothing shopping values

As a result of cluster analyses, three shopping pursuit groups were identified (table 6). As compared to the other two groups, this one yielded highest scores on the convenience-shopping factor (0.89). Therefore, it was labeled

as convenience shopping pursuing group (group 1). Of the three groups, hedonic shopping pursuing group (group 2) yielded largest, consisting of 83 female respondents (43% of total) and leisure shopping pursuing group (group 3) yielded the highest scores on shopping factor (0.60). No significant difference across groups for the planned shopping value was found.

As looking by the result of ANOVA and Scheffe test which showed in (table 7), all three groups differed significantly each other on their shopping values. ( $p < .05$ )

<Table 6> Clothing shopping values in female consumers

Factor Name of Consumer Group	Factor 1 Hedonic shopping	Factor 2 Leisure shopping	Factor 3 Planned shopping	Factor 4 Convenience shopping
Group 1 ; (N=59, 31%) Convenience shopping pursuit group	-0.46	-0.63	0.07	0.89
Group 2; group (N=83, 43%) hedonic shopping pursuit	0.82	0.09	0.08	-0.22
Group 3: (N=49, 26%) Leisure shopping pursuit group	-0.84	0.60	-0.22	-0.70

\* 1) The higher the scores, the higher the importance of factor.

\* 2) The number of parentheses displays a frequency and percentage of each group.

<Table 7> Difference among female consumer

Factor Group	Group 1 (n=59)	Group 2 (n=83)	Group 3 (n=49)	F-ratio
Factor 1; Hedonic shopping	2.63b(0.69)	3.81a(0.44)	2.66b(0.48)	110.06***
Factor 2; Leisure shopping	2.99b(0.67)	3.43a(0.65)	2.94b(0.72)	11.13***
Factor 3; planned shopping	3.01a(0.71)	3.82b(0.59)	3.81b(0.54)	34.91***
Factor 4; Convenience shopping	3.36a(0.76)	2.30b(0.67)	2.01b(0.64)	61.63***

\*  $p < 0.05$  \*\*  $p < 0.01$  \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

In detailed, the hedonic shopping pursuing group (group 1) showed the highest score on convenience (M=3.36), followed by planned (M=3.01), leisure (M=2.99) and hedonic shopping factor (M=2.63). The leisure shopping pursuing group (group 2) obtained comparatively high score for the planned (M=3.82) and the hedonic shopping factor (M=3.81), and followed by the leisure (M=3.43), and the convenience (M=2.30).

Leisure/convenience shopping group (group 3) yielded the highest scores on the planned shopping scores (M=3.81), and followed by the leisure (M=2.94), the hedonic (M=2.66) and the convenience shopping factor (M=2.01)

As looking by each factor, for pleasure shopping value, group 2 showed highest mean and other two groups were obtained statistically same scores. For leisure shopping value, group 2 showed highest mean scores and other two groups were obtained statistically same scores. For planned shopping value, group 1 showed lowest mean and other two groups were obtained statistically same scores. For convenience shopping value, group 1 showed highest mean and other two groups were obtained statistically same scores.

In summary, three segments for both male and female consumers were identified as a result of cluster analysis. The three consumer groups appeared to be distinct from one another in terms of clothing shopping values sought. For male consumers, these were labeled and appeared in the order of planned (43%), leisure /convenience (32%), and hedonic shopping pursuing group (25%). And, for female, they were hedonic (43%), convenience (31%), and leisure shopping pursuing group (26%).

These results mean that the female consumers mostly pursued certain pleasure from clothing

shopping. And the second most important value that consumers pursue is convenience, and it means that there is hardly a case for forgetting the daily life during shopping and consider shopping as a good time for relaxing. For, male consumers, they look around several shops and check the style and price before purchasing clothes. In addition, if the shops do not carry the clothes they are wishing to purchase, they mostly return home. The next most case was regarding clothing shopping as leisure or as a concept of relaxing and pursuing convenience. The least case is to accept clothing shopping itself as a pleasure.'

## V. Conclusion & Suggestions

This research was to examine what were the subdimensions of shopping value that consumers perceived, if there is any difference between male and female, and if male and female consumer group are divided into different groups according to the types of pursued shopping value.

As a result of study, four dimensions of clothing shopping values were identified as pleasure, pain, leisure, and convenience value. The reason why the result of this study shows some differences from other pre-researches (Choi, 1996; Jin & Koh, 2000; Lim & Pyun, 2000) may be because that as the shopping value was specifically mentioned as 'clothing shopping value' in this study, the respondents could answer more detailed and concretely.

Although the dimensions of clothing shopping value pursued by male & female consumers were the same, there were differences of gender in the degree of influence in each dimension. The specific contents of each

dimension were almost same except the 'planned shopping value.' In relation to the planned shopping value, such item that 'I intend to purchase but they do not carry, and I will come back later to buy-' was included in male consumer group behavior; however, it was not involved in any dimensions in female group behavior.

Regarding the level of influence of each dimension according to gender, the male consumer group showed the preference in the descending order of pleasure shopping, leisure shopping, scheduled shopping, and convenience shopping. As for the female consumer group, the preference appeared in the descending order of pleasure shopping, planned shopping, leisure shopping, and convenience shopping.

These results showed that the most important dimension of clothing shopping value was 'pursuing pleasure' and the least important one was 'convenience' regardless of gender. It means that joy, happiness, and pleasure, which are earned during male & female consumers' clothing shopping, are the most important elements and convenience is not the most important element. During clothing shopping, in addition, female consumers invest much more time and efforts comparing to males and give more value on scheduled shopping. Meantime, male consumer groups pursue for value by considering clothing shopping as leisure or relaxing.

Secondly, there were three types of male and female consumer groups according to the shopping value types. For male consumers, it appeared in the order of planned, leisure/convenience, and pleasure shopping pursuing group. For female consumers, it appeared in the order of pleasure, convenience,

and leisure shopping pursuing group.

This result means that the female consumers who participated in this research enjoyed the clothing shopping itself and they mostly pursued certain pleasure from it. During clothing shopping, the second most important value that consumers pursue is convenience, and it means that there is hardly a case for forgetting the daily life during shopping and consider shopping as a good time for relaxing.

Meanwhile, male consumers usually consider and plan in serious amount what clothes they will be purchasing. Before purchasing clothes, they look around several shops and check the style and price. In addition, if the shops do not carry the clothes they are wishing to purchase, they mostly return home. The next most case was regarding clothing shopping as leisure or as a concept of relaxing and pursuing convenience. The least case is to accept clothing shopping itself as a pleasure.

As was shown, consumer groups who participated in the research had different clothing shopping value types and elements according to their gender. Therefore, the detailed service contents and environments that are provided to males and females should be somewhat distinctive to fit their requirements. In other words, clothing companies should provide services and environments that male and female consumers can feel pleasure, joy or happiness when shopping clothes. However, their needs to be an environment provided for male consumers to have effective shopping in prompt time as compared to female consumers. Meanwhile, as female consumers tend to enjoy clothing shopping more and invest more time, the environment and service by considering these characteristics of females should also be provided.

## References

- 1) Kim Yongman, Kim Donghyeon (2002), "A study on the effects of the characteristics of internet shopping mall on shopping Values and customer retention". *Marketing science research*, 8, p.68.
- 2) Kim Hakyoon, Lee Hobae(1998). "Consumer behavior", Seoul: Trademanagement- Sa. p.309
- 3) Nam Seungkyu (1999). "Consumer Psychology", Seoul: Doseochulpan-sa. p.10
- 4) Kim Jiyoung, Park Jaeok(2002). "A Study on the Post-Purchase Satisfaction of Clothing Related to Shopping Value". *Journal of the Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles*, Vol.26(3/4), p.549.
- 5) Jin Byoungcho, Koh Aeran (1999). "The Effects of Consumer's Clothing Price Perceptions on Hedonic Shopping Values". *Korean Society of Consumer Studies*, 10(3), p.74.
- 6) Kim, Hwadong (2003). "A study on preference factor and purchase behavior of internet shopping mall among groups of consumer in sopping value". *Journal of Commodity Science & Technology*. 29(8), p.262.
- 7) Chang Eunyoung, Burns, Leslie Davis, Francis, Sally K.(2004), "Gender differences in the dimensional structure of apparel shopping satisfaction among Korean consumers: the role of hedonic shopping value". *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 22(4), p.186.
- 8) Song Kyonghee (1999). "Store Choice Behavior According to Apparel Shopping Orientations in Relation with Life Cycle". Hanyang University, Mater's thesis.
- 9) Hirschman, Elizabeth. c & Holbrook, Morris B. (1982). "Hedonic Consumption: Emerging Concepts", Methods and Propositions. *Journal of Marketing*, 46(3), pp.92-101.
- 10) Kim, Jongkum(1998), "A Study of Shopping Value and Impulse Buying of Juveniles Consumers". Dankook University, Mater's thesis.
- 11) Lim Chaeun, PyunHaesoo(2000), "Effects of Retailer Service types on Consumer's Perceived Shopping Value and Shopping Satisfaction". *Korean Society of Consumer Studies*, Vol.11(3), pp.169-192.
- 12) Kim, Jinwon(2000), "Influences of Shopping Value, Store Attributes, and Task Situation on Clothing Purchasing Behavior". Dept, Ewha Women's University, Ph.D Dissertation
- 13) Kim Jiyoung& Park Jaeok(2002). *ibid.*, p.549.
- 14) Zeithaml,V.A. (1988). "Consumer perceptions of price, quality and, value: A means-end model and synthesis of evidence". *Journal of Marketing*, 52, p.13.
- 15) Chung Sukjin(1999). "The effect of density level and perceived crowding on shopping time". Chung-Ang University. Master's Thesis, p.31.
- 16) Batra, R. & Ahtola,O.T.(1990), "Measuring the hedonic and utilitarian sources of consumer attitudes". *Marketing Letters*, 2(2), pp.157-170
- 17) Babin, Barry J., William R. Darden, & Mitch Griffin (1994). "Work and/or Fun: Measuring hedonic and utilitarian shopping value". *Journal of Consumer Researac*, 20(4), pp.644-656.

- 18) Crowley, A.E., Spangenberg, E.R.& Hughes, K.R. (1992). "Measuring the hedonic and utilitarian dimensions of attitudes toward product categories". *Marketing Letters*, 3(3), pp.239-249.
- 19) Kim Jinwon(2000), *ibid.*
- 20) Lee Seungwook, Kim Jongkum(1998). "A Study on Shopping Values and Impulse Buying of Juvenile Consumers". *The Study of industry Dankook University*, 21, pp.193-215.
- 21) Jin Byoungcho, Koh Aeran (1999). *ibid.*p.83.
- 22) Lim Chaeun, Pyun Haesoo(2000), *ibid.*, p.171.
- 23) Pyun Haesoo (1999), "*Effects of Retailing Store's Service Typology on Consumer Perception of Shopping Value and Shopping Satisfaction*", Seogang University, Master's thesis. p.78
- 24) Noh, Hyungchang(2000). "*A structural study of consumer experience and shopping value in internet shopping mall*", Dongkyk university, Mater's thesis. p.82.
- 25) Choi Sunhyung(1996), "A study on the measuring the apparel shopping value", *The Catholic University Clothing & Textiles Reserch*, 16(1), pp.15-16.
- 26) Kim, Jinwon(2000), *ibid.*, p.81.
- 27) Jin Byoungcho, Koh Aeran (1999), *ibid.*, p.
- 28) Park Taeyoung(1995). "*The Study of Seeking Behavior, Consumption Properties and Psychological Types on Shopping Value*". Hanyang University, Master's thesis, p.32
- 29) *ibid.*p.33.
- 30) Choi, Sunhyung(1997), *ibid.*,p.16
- 31) Chang,Eunyoung, Burns, Leslie Davis, Francis, Sally K.(2004),*ibid.*, p.186.
- 32) *ibid.*,p.187.
- 33) Kim Jiyoung& Park Jaeok(2002). *ibid.*, p.550.
- 34) Pyun Haesoo (1999). *ibid.*, p.23.
- 35) Jin Byoungcho, Koh Aeran (1999), *ibid.*,p.85.
- 36) Kim, Jinwon(2000), *ibid.*, p.32.
- 37) Bloch, Peter H., Ridgway, Nancy M., & Dawson, Scott A., (1990). "The Shopping Mall as Consumer habitat", *Journal of Retailing*, 70(1), pp.23-42.
- 38) Yoo Changjo, Kim Sanghee(1994). "A Study of Shopping Behavior based of Ethnographic Approach Extended Concept, Variety of Feeling and Variety of Shopping Motives". *Korean Society of Consumer Studies*, 5(2).pp.45-62.
- 39) Choi Sunhyung(1997), *ibid.*,p.16

---

Received 1 Sep. 2005, Accepted 2 Nov. 2005.