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#### Abstract

The purposes of this study were to investigate and to compare the actual state of clothing gift giving behavior according to gerder. A sunvey using questionnaire was conducted on 417 unversity stadents in the Cheongiu area, Korea. The questionnaire was composed of questions concerning demographic factors, clothing gift giving behavior and purchasing behavior, and of multiple choice and 5 -point scales depending on the characteristics of the questions. Frequencl. descriptive anatusis, $x^{2}$-test and $t$-fest were used for a data anatysis. Most of the students had experience of giving the clothing for a gifi more than once during the year. They usually purchased the clothing for their parents and firends. The items of wothing were low purchasing risk items tike sweuter, T-shirts, underwear and shits or blouse. The main reason for purchasing clothing gift for their parents and firends was based on mostly practical motivation.
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## I. Introduction

Gift giving is a common behavior found in almost all countries. It is an expression of gratitude, affection and interest, but more fundamentally, a social activity that serves to establish and maintain the rclationship between giftgiver and gift-recciver. Giving also plays a distinct role in the family context. Gifts exchanged among family members can be treated as grants. which are one-way transfers given without expecting the recipient to reciprocate. Gift giving
in the family can be interpreted as a means for socialization of its members".

Wheller in the East or the West, the reciprocal act of giving and receiving gifts has become a practice people engage in not just on special occasions such as bitthdays, Christmas, and other holidays. but also during ordinary activities such as travelling or on busincss trips ${ }^{23}$. The type of gift varies according to occasion, with the currently most popular items being selected for Christmas, items for personal usage for birtbdays, and practical items for weddings ${ }^{31}$. Also, lifestyle influcuces gift pur-

[^0]chasing-a finding that can be used for gift markel segmentation ${ }^{+1}$.

Clothing gifts include all kinds of gaments worn on the body and given as gifts, and encompass clothes, hats, gloves and socks ${ }^{\text {s.n. }}$. Clothing has been reported to be a frequently given gifi among family members in several countries ${ }^{71}$. Clothing gifts are generally purchased for bithdays and Christmas ${ }^{\text {(1) }}$. In Korea, for example. ummarried women tend to purchase clohing gifts for occasions such as Parents' Day, while martied women gencrally purchase clothing gifts when the need arises, such as when the weather changes ${ }^{112}$. The studies by Belk ${ }^{(1)}$ and Cheal ${ }^{(2)}$ found that half of clothing items selected for gifts were casual wear or sportswear, while one third was sportswear and shirts and $16 \%$ was sweaters ${ }^{13}$. Outerwear was chosen in rebationships with relatively detached roles while underwear or accessories such as handkerchiefs and socks were selected in relationships with relatively non-detached roles ${ }^{1+j}$. In other studies, one-third of the clothing gifts most preferred by housewives in their 30 s were shirts and accessorics for their husbands ${ }^{151}$.

As such. clothing gifts make up a major proportion of gift items because such gifts have a stronger communication ability than others. They are more tangible and closely related to the body of an individual ${ }^{(\sin : 7)}$. However, most of the existing studies on clothing gifts have focused on adult women ${ }^{|k|}$, with very litile study of university students who are generally extremely interested in clothing.

Against this backdrop, this paper presents a study of university students in Cheongiu designed to analyze their clothing gitt behaviors, and atso gender differences in gift giving practices. by studying clothing gift giving behaviors including per annum frequency. time of giving and receiver of clothing gifts, and gift purchasing behavior such as items, places and prices in clothing gilt purchasing.

## II. Method

## 1. Subjects

The study looked at 417 university students cnrolled in universities in Cheongju, and inctuded 253 female students $(60.7 \%)$ and 164 ma-

[^1]
le students（ $39.3 \%$ ）．A preliminary study was conducted in September 2002 and the findings from the analysis of the study results were used to refinc the questionnaires that were subse－ quently used to conduct the main survey in November and December 2002．The characteris－ lics of the respondents are shown in 〈Table 1〉．

## 2．Instrument

An appropriate questionnaire was developed after revicwing those utilized by previous stu－ $\mathrm{dy}^{19.20]}$ ．The questionnaires were composed of questions concerning demographic factors，cloth－ ing gift－giving behaviors and purchasing behav－ iors，and of multiple choice and 5 －point scales（1 being＇not at all important＇and 5 being＇very important＇）depending on the characteristics of the questions．

## 3．Data Analysis

The survey data were used to calculate fre－
quency，percentage，average and standard devia－ tion according to the characteristics of the sur－ vey questions，and $t$－test and cross tabulation were also used to identify gender differences in clothing gift purchasing behaviors．

## III．Results

## 1．Clothing Gift Giving Behavior

This study examined clothing gift giving be－ haviors，including gift giving number，frequency． time and cause in order to discover respondents＇ gift giving behaviors．
As seen in 〈Table 2$\rangle .99 .5 \%$ of respondents gave gifts（very often： $3.4 \%$ ，often： $63.7 \%$ ，so－ metimes： $32.3 \%$ ），and female students gave more gifts than male students did．In terms of the number of times the respondents gave gifts in the past year， $36.3 \%$ indicated 4－6 times，and $29.1 \%$ indicated $1-3$ times，revealing that two－ thirds of respondents gave gifts 1 $\sim 6$ times per year．In addition，female students demonstrated a higher per annum frequency of gift－giving than their malc counterparts．In terms of the number of times respondents gave clothing gifts， $61.3 \%$ indicated 1－3 times．The female students gave clothing gifts more oflen than the male students， with the former comprising $67.6 \%$ of this group and the latter $51.5 \%$ ．
The results of the multiple response study of gift－giving occasions during the past ycar（Table 3）revealed that friends＇birthdays were most common with $22.7 \%$ ．followed by parents＇bitth－ days $(21.8 \%)$ ，Parents＇Day（ $13.4 \%$ ），and Christ－ mas $(8.5 \%)$ ，and the results did not show a meaningful difference by gender．However，a small gender difference was found in occasions for clothing gift－giving．which also allowed for multiple responses，with female students indica－ ling an order of friends＇birthday，parents＇birth－ day，Parents＇Day and anniversaries，while male students responded in the order of parents＇bir－ thday，friends＇birthday，Parents＇Day，Christmas and anniversaries．The receivers of the clothing

[^2]〈Table 2〉 Gift Giving Behavior
Frequency $(\%)$

| Range |  | Female | Male | Total | $x^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Frequency of Gift Giving | Very often | $9(3.6)$ | 5(3.0) | 14(3.4) | $\begin{gathered} 15.1 \\ (p<01) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Often <br> Sometimes | 177(70.2) | $88(53.7)$ | 265(63.7) |  |
|  |  | $66(26.2)$ | 69(42.1) | 135(32.5) |  |
|  | Vever | O(0.0) | 2(0.5) | 2(0.5) |  |
|  | Total | 252(100) | 164(100) | 416(100) |  |
| Gift Giving Number | 1.3 | 52(20.6) | $69(43.7)$ | 121(29.5) | $\begin{gathered} 33.9 \\ (p<.001) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | 4-6 | $95(37.7)$ | 57(36.1) | 152,37.1) |  |
|  | 7-9 | $51(20.2)$ | 22(13.9) | 73(17.8) |  |
|  | 10 or more | 54(21.4) | $10(6.3)$ | $64(15.6)$ |  |
|  | Tolal | $252(100)$ | 158(100) | $410(100)$ |  |
| Number of Clothing Gifts | 0 | 24(9.6) | 49(30.1) | 73(17.7) | $\begin{gathered} 29.9 \\ (p<.001) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | 1-3 | 169(67.6) | $84(51.5)$ | 253(61.3) |  |
|  | 4-6 | 44(17.6) | $26(16.0)$ | 70(16.9) |  |
|  | 7-9 | $7(20.2)$ | $3(3.9)$ | 10( 2.4 ) |  |
|  | 10 or more | 9(21.4) | 1(0.6) | 7( 1.7) |  |
|  | Total | $252(100)$ | 163 (100) | $41.3(100)$ |  |

gifts were, according io both female and male respondents. parents. girlfriendboyfriend, friends. and siblings.

The reasons most often cited for giving gifts were 'to show affection' and 'for no particular reason' with $38.6 \%$, followed by 'to reciprocate the receiver's present' ( $12.20 \%$ ) (Table 4). The most common reasons the respondents gave for clothing gift giving were because they 'felt good when they saw the other person weating the clothing gift,' followed by 'clothing gifis are practical,' and the responses variod by gender. The female students' reasons for giving clothing gifts were more positive than those of the male students (Table 5).

## 2. Cothing Gift I'urehasing Behaviors

The results of the study of which clothing gifts university students choose and where they
buy them, and what criteria they apply in choosing the items are as follows.

For specific clothing gift items, $40.8 \%$ responded that they bought T -shirts. followed by sweaters/cardigans ( $40.2 \%$ ) and underwear (28.3 \%). The gift items varied by gender, with female stedents buying sweaters/cardigans most often, followed by $[$-shirts, underwear, shirts blouses and socksestockings (Table 6).

As for clothing gift purchasing place, $28.0 \%$ responded that they visited department stores, followed by chain stores ( $18.8 \%$ ), speciality stores ( $14.4 \%$ ) and discount stores $(9.4 \%)$. Responses varied by gender, with fermale students tending to make their purchases at department stores, chain stores and specialty stores, and male students visiting department stores, discount stores and designer boutiques. However. there was no gender difference in the price of

〈Table 3〉 Gift Giving Occasions and Receivers of the Clothing Gifts
Frequency（\％）

|  |  | Female | Male | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gift Giving <br> Occasions＊ | Friends＇birthday | 237（23．2） | 122（21．9） | 359（22．7） |
|  | Parents＇birthday | 216（21．1） | 129（23．1） | 345（21．8） |
|  | Parents＇day | $136(13.3)$ | 75 （13．6） | 211（13．4） |
|  | Teacher＇s day | $60(5.9)$ | $38(6.8)$ | $9 \times(6.2)$ |
|  | Christmas | $83(8.1)$ | 52（9．3） | 135（8．5） |
|  | Fintrance ceremeny | $55(5.4)$ | 14（ 2．5） | $69(4.4)$ |
|  | Valentine day | $59(5.8)$ | 41（ 7．4） | 100（ 6．3） |
|  | Celebration | $88(8.6)$ | 40（ 7．2） | 128（8．1） |
|  | Misc． | $88(8.6)$ | 46（ 8．3） | 134（8．4） |
|  | Total | 1，022（100） | 557（100） | 1，579（100） |
| Receivers of the Clothing Gifts＊ | Parents | 148（32．7） | $66(29.8)$ | $214(31.8)$ |
|  | Siblings | $78(17.2)$ | 27（12，2） | 105 （15．6） |
|  | Opposite－gender friends | 90（19．9） | $55(24.9)$ | 145（21．5） |
|  | Friends of the same gender | 86（19．0） | 31（14．1） | $117(17.4)$ |
|  | Misc． | 50（11．0） | $42(19.0)$ | 92（13．7） |
|  | Total | 452（100） | 221（100） | 673（100） |

＊Multiple response．

〈Table 4〉 The Reasons for Giving Gift
Frequency $(\%)$

|  |  | Female | Male | Total | $\chi^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reason for Giving Gift | Show affection | 104（41．1） | $54(32.9)$ | $158(37.9)$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.0 \\ (\mathrm{~N} . \mathrm{S}) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Return present | 35（13．8） | 15（9．1） | $50(12.0)$ |  |
|  | No particular reason | 85 （33．6） | 73 （44．5） | 158（37．9） |  |
|  | Others | $29(11.5)$ | $22(13.4)$ | 51（12．2） |  |
|  | Total | 253（100） | 164（100） | 417（100） |  |

clothing gifts purchased，with $20,000-50.000$ won being the most common cost of gifts purchased at $45.1 \%$ ，followed by $50,000 \cdots$ 70,000 won（ $16.4 \%$ ）（Table 7）．

As for the person who most influenced de－ cisions in clothing gift purchasing，the female students indicated friends $(38.0 \%$ ，themselves．
$(35.4 \%)$ and family members（ $14.8 \%$ ），while the male students responded themselves（ $35.6 \%$ ）， girlfriends（ $24.2 \%$ ）and friends（ $15.2 \%$ ），which reveals a difference by gender（ $\beta<.001$ ）．

In addition，the results of an analysis of what respondents considered most important when purchasing clothing gifts using a s－point scales，
＜Table 5〉 The Reasons for Clothing Giving Gifis
Mean

|  |  | Female$3.97$ | Male | Total | $t$－value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reason for <br> Clothing <br> Gifts | I feel good receiver wearing clothing gili |  | 3.70 | 3.87 | $3.26(p<.001)$ |
|  | Clothing git is practical item | 3.78 | 3.47 | 3.66 | $3.28(p<001)$ |
|  | Everybody need clohing | 3.81 | 3.38 | 3.65 | 4.63 （p＜．001） |
|  | 1 like clothing giving gift | 3.50 | 3.27 | 3.41 | $2.20(\mu<.05)$ |
|  | I feel close friendship | 3.32 | 3.27 | 3.30 | 0．49（N．S） |
|  | The receiver will like clothing gift | 3.23 | 3.01 | 3.15 | $2.09(p<05)$ |
|  | Chothing gift can show off | 2，31 | 2.45 | 2.36 | 1．49（N．S） |

〈Table 6〉 The Specific Clothing Gift Items．
Frequency（\％）

|  |  | Fernale | Male | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Items＊ | Sweatercardigan | 100（15．8） | $35(11.1)$ | 135（14．2） |
|  | T－shiots | 90（14．2） | 47（14．9） | 137（14．5） |
|  | Shirts／Blouse | 71（11．2） | 32（10．2） | 103（11．9） |
|  | MuffleriScarf | 45（7．1） | 17（ 5．4） | $62(6.5)$ |
|  | Pants | 60 （9．5） | 25（7．9） | 8.5 （ 8．9） |
|  | Under wear | $68(10.7)$ | 27（8．0） | $95(10.0)$ |
|  | Socks／Stockings | $51(8.0)$ | 21（6．7） | $72(7.6)$ |
|  | Gloves | 25：3．9） | $26(8.3)$ | 51（ 5．4） |
|  | Handkerchief | 33 （ 5．2） | 16（5．1） | $49(5.2)$ |
|  | Hat | 18（2．8） | 12（3．8） | $30(3.2)$ |
|  | Neek tie | 17（2．7） | $9(2.9)$ | 26，2．7） |
|  | Others | 55 （8．7） | 48（15．2） | $103(10.8)$ |
|  | Total | 6．33（100） | $315(100)$ | $948(100)$ |

＊Multiplo response．
＇fit＇（Mean 4．32）was the most important factor considered．followed by＇size＇（Mcan 4．31）and ＇color and design＇（Mcan 4．15）．The responses showed a meaningful gender diflerence，with female respondents placing more importance on fir．color and design．stylc and size than male respondents（Table R）．

## IV．Conclusion

This study focused on university students in Cheongilu to examine their clothing gift－giving behaviors．Gender differences in their behaviors were analyzed，and based on the findings the following results were reached．

〈Table 7〉Clothing Gifi Purchasing Place And Price of Clothing Gifts Purchased Frequency（\％）

|  |  | Female | Male | Total | $\%^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Place of Purchase | Department store | 63（29．4） | 38（32．2） | 101（30．4） | $\begin{gathered} 23.1 \\ (\rho<0.001) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Designer boutique | 9 （4．2） | 14（11．9） | 23（6．9） |  |
|  | Chain store | $55(25.7)$ | 13（11．0） | $68(20.5)$ |  |
|  | Speciality store | 40（18．7） | 12（10．2） | 52（15．7） |  |
|  | Discount store | 17.7 .91 | 17（14．4） | 34（10．2） |  |
|  | Outlet store | 16（7．5） | 13（11．0） | 29（8．7） |  |
|  | Misc． | 14（16．5） | 11（ 7.5 ） | 25（7．5） |  |
|  | Total | 214（100） | 118（100） | $332(100)$ |  |
| Price （won） | Less than 10，000 | 12（ 5.2 ） | 7（ 5．5） | 19（5．3） | $\begin{gathered} 7.1 \\ (\text { N.S) } \end{gathered}$ |
|  | 10，000－20，000 | 35（15．2） | 13（10．2） | $48(13.4)$ |  |
|  | 20，000－50，000 | 110（47．6） | 52（40．6） | $162(45.1)$ |  |
|  | 50，000～70，000 | $31(13.4)$ | $28(21.9)$ | 59（16．4） |  |
|  | 70，000－100，000 | $13(5.6)$ | 11（8．6） | 24（6．7） |  |
|  | 100，000 or above | $30(13.0)$ | 17（13．3） | 47（13．1） |  |
|  | Total | $231(100)$ | 128（100） | 359（100） |  |

〈Table 8〉 Purchase Consideration Factor for The Clothing Gift
Mean

|  |  | Female | Male | Total | $t$－value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consideration Factor | Fashion trend | 3.74 | 3.70 | 3.73 | 0.43 （N．S） |
|  | Fit | 4.44 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.16 （ $p<.001$ ） |
|  | Style | 4.13 | 3.82 | 4.01 | $3.92(p<001)$ |
|  | Easy carc | 3.57 | 3.33 | 3.47 | 2.35 （ $p<01$ ） |
|  | Comfort | 3.84 | 3.61 | 3.75 | 2.36 （p＜01） |
|  | Color／Design | 4.22 | 4.04 | 4.15 | 2.70 （p＜000） |
|  | Brand | 3.09 | 2.97 | 3.05 | 1.27 （N．S） |
|  | Price | 4.04 | 3.83 | 3.96 | 2.53 （ $p<01$ ） |
|  | Appearance | 3.82 | 3.41 | 3.66 | 4.67 （ $k<001$ ） |
|  | Size | 4.44 | 4.11 | 4.31 | 4.45 （ $\%<001$ ） |

1．Most respondents gave clothing gifts $1 \cdots 3$ times a year，and femalc students favored
clothing gifts more than male students．
2．The occasions for giving clothing gifts di－

Fered by gender, but the gift receivers were the same for both genders. with parents as the most popular response, followed by girlfriendsiboylriends and friends.
3. The most common reason for giving clothing gifts was 'because the feeling good to look at them used by the receiver,' but the responses showed a gender difference.
4. The clothing gift items most preferred by female students were sweatersicardigans, while the male students favored T-shicts. The most common site for buying clothing gifts were department stores and chain stores among female students and department stores and discount stores among male students, which reveals a slight gender difference in responses.
5. For factors respondents considered when purchasing clothing gifls. fit was the high est-ranked response, followed by color and design, and stylc. The female respondents were found to place greater importance on these factors than did the male respondents.
On the basis of above results the followings were proposed as a conclusion. Most of the university students tend to buy clothing gifts for their parents and friends, and when they purchase the gift clothing the first consideration was the fit of the gift to the recejver as well as the feeling good to look at them used by the receiver. In those reasons the clothing gifts would be regarded as frequently chosen gift items. So ii would be necessary to make the university students know how to choose good and inexpensive clothing products for gifis while the students usually have not cnougl knowledge
and experience to make gifts for others. Also if they can have access to the special collections which display consumer-oriented products according to the age group or gender, it would be vary convenient for them to decide and purchase appropriate clothing gifts without spending extra time and cost for getting additional information.
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