CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews the related literature and conceptual framework of this study. The literature review cover the shopping behaviour, shopping value, consumer’s decision making styles, perceived shopping mall image, shopping mall brand loyalty and consumer segmentation. The conceptual framework of this study will be explained in the end of this chapter.

2.1 Shopping behaviour

This section is attempts to provide an explanation on consumer shopping behaviour by review the previous study on the previous literature.

Shopping is one of the distinct activities of consumer behaviour (Tauber, 1972) and shopping behaviour is a distinctive form of consumer behaviour (Asseel, 1987). According to Tauber (1972, p 46):

“People's motives for shopping are a function of many variables, some of which are unrelated to the actual buying of products. It is maintained that an understanding of shopping motives require the consideration of satisfactions which shopping activities provide, as well as the utility obtained from the merchandise that may be purchased. If needs other than those associated with particular products motivate people to go to a store, the retailer should incorporate this information into his marketing strategy”. 
Tauber's research hypothesized eleven motives for shopping behaviours. He divided them into personal and social motives:

**Personal motives**

- **Role playing.** Shopping can be an activity that are learn and expected as part of a certain role or position in society such as mother, housewife or husband (Jamal, Davies, Chudry and Al-Marri, 2006).
- **Diversion.** Shopping can be a form of recreation activity and allowed shopper to diversify from the routine of daily life.
- **Learning about new trends.** People can go shopping to update for the latest trends in fashion, styling or product innovations.
- **Physical activity.** Shopping can be a physical exercise for people who are living in urban and congested living space.
- **Self gratification.** Shopping can be an activity for shopper to motivate themselves by buying something nice and interesting.
- **Sensory stimulation.** While shopping, people will expose to many potential sensory benefits provided by the shopping mall. Shopper browse through a store looking at the merchandise, enjoy handling the merchandise, listening to the background music and the scents.

**Social motives**

- **Social experiences outside the home.** During shopping, people can meet and socialite with friends.
• Communication with others having similar interests. When people shop for hobby-related goods they may meet and communicate with other shoppers who have the same interest.

• Peer-group attraction. The peer group attraction initiate consumers’ desires to be with they reference group (Ahmad et al., 2005).

• Status and authority. Many shopping experiences provide the opportunity for an individual to command attention and respect. In few other activities can an individual expect to be waited on" without having to pay for this service” (Buttle and Coates, 1984).

• Pleasure of bargaining. For many shoppers, bargaining is a degrading activity; haggling implies that one is 'cheap'. Others, however, appear to enjoy the process believing that, with bargaining, goods can be reduced to a more reasonable price (Buttle and Coates, 1984).

Westbrook and Black (1985) extended Tauber’s (1972) work on consumer’s shopping behaviour and they have suggested seven dimensions of shopping behaviours. According to Westbrook et al., (1985), the shopping behaviours including anticipated utility, role enactment, negotiation, choice optimization, affiliation, power and authority, and stimulation.

According to Dholakia (1999), shopping behaviour are context specific; shopping has nowadays become a pass-time rather than a pure purchasing activity, such as shopping for groceries, household items, clothing and gifts. Thus, the motives and behaviours evident when a consumer is shopping for gifts are not same as those exhibited when consumer shops for groceries. And, individual consumers’ motive and attitudes
towards shopping often vary significantly. Also according to Zaffar, Ghingold, and Zainurin (2006), two consumers may shop at the same stores for similar reasons, e.g. convenience, courteous help nice décor, etc., but one consumer may find shopping a burden, something to be done quickly within a minimum of effort while another may enjoy shopping, engaging in it as sport by achieving the satisfaction of buying a desired item at a bargain price. This latter consumer does not mind spending time searching for alternatives.

Shopping involves much more than eye-sight and foot. That is what Paco Underhill (1999, p 161) said,

"shopping is... the kind of activity I mean involves experiencing that portion of the world that has been deemed for sale, using our senses – sight, touch, smell, taste, hearing – as the basis for choosing this or rejecting that...virtually all unplanned purchases – and many planned ones, too – come as a result of the shopper seeing, touching, smelling or tasting something that promise pleasure, if not total fulfillment."

It can been that individual go shopping for some other reasons, beside to acquire a product, they also shop for non-purchase reasons such as looking for social interaction, sensory stimulation, learning for new rends and even exercise. That is, consumer can shop for utilitarian reasons related to achieving specific purchase goals. Alternatively, they can shop for hedonic reasons related to having fun. According to Arnold and Raynolds (2003) there are six hedonic shopping motives, namely, adventure shopping (to shop for stimulation, adventure, and the feeling of being in another world), social shopping (for enjoyment shopping with friends, family, socializing while shopping, and
bonding with others while shopping), gratification shopping (for stress release, to alleviate a negative mood, and shopping as a special treat to oneself, idea shopping (to keep up with trend and new fashion, and to see new products and innovations), role shopping (for enjoyment of shopping for others), and value shopping (refer to shopping for sales, looking for discounts, and hunting for bargains).

According to Zafar et al. (2006) visiting shopping malls has become a major recreational activity among urban Malaysian consumers. They also found that the Malaysian students spending more at least 10% of their monthly expenditure in shopping mall. From the above scholars study and the consistency of the previous research results on consumer shopping behaviour, this study is to profile Malaysian shoppers based on their reason for shopping and demographics.

2.2 Shopping value

Rokeach (1973, p. 5) defines value as “an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence.” Previous researches have found that values affect various aspects of consumption behaviours and attitudes (Becker and Connor, 1981; Donthu, Naveen and Cherian, 1992; Prakash and Munson, 1985; Valencia, 1989). Zeithaml (1988) has suggested that perceived value can be regarded as a “consumer’s overall assessment of the utility of a product (or service) based on perceptions of what is received and what is given.” The assessment here is referred to a comparison of a product or service’s “get” and “give” components. The most common definition of value is the ratio or trade-off between quality and price (Cravens, Holland,
Lamb, and Mancrieff, 1988; Manroe, 1990). According to Schechter (1984) the value in the context of shopping is “all factors, both qualitative and quantitative, subjective and objective, that make up the complete shopping experience.” This definition recognizes explicitly value’s subjective nature. Here, value is provided by the “complete shopping experience,” not simply by product acquisition (Babin, Darden, and Griffin, 1994). Also according to Michon and Chebat (2004), shopping behaviour is dependent on shoppers’ value and attitude toward the mall environment and store atmospherics. These values reside in shoppers’ culture and personal traits.

Among the shopping value research that carry out, utilitarian and hedonic value are the two shopping value often identified (Babin et al. 1994; Chiders et al. 2001). The utilitarian dimension of shopping has been the primary focus of marketing researchers (Bloch and Bruse, 1984). In general, consumers pursuing utilitarian value can be characterized as task-related and rational; focused on decision utility (Batra and Athola, 1990; Engle, Blackwell, and Miniard, 1993). Also, the utilitarian shopping value can be related to the consumer’s need to obtain some utilitarian consequences from visiting a store and incorporates aspects such as shopping convenience and perceived risk (Sand, Oppewal, and Beverland, 2007).

Hedonic shopping value can be related to the consumer’s need to obtain fun and pleasure and relates to the perceived level of shopping enjoyment (Sand et al., 2007). Babin et al., (1994) has developed and validated a scale to measure consumer’s evaluations of a shopping experience along the utilitarian and hedonic value. According to Babin et al., (1994), the utilitarian value with a work mentality whereas hedonic value is more subjective, personal and results more from fun and playfulness associated with a
shopping experience. Arnold et al., (2003) have deepened the study on hedonic shopping motivation and developed a six-factor scale that consists of adventure, gratification, role, value, social, and idea shopping motivation.

In general, shopping value exists among shoppers and this influences their consumption behaviours and attitudes. Therefore, by using certain scales developed in the previous research we can identify shopper perceived shopping values.

### 2.3 Consumer decision-making styles

In attempt to learn how and why people shop, scholars categorize the consumers shopping behaviour based on their decision-making style. A consumer decision-making style may be defined as “a mental orientation characterizing a consumer’s approach to making choices” (Sproles and Kendall, 1986, p. 267). They believe that consumers engage in shopping with certain fundamental decision making modes or styles including rational shopping, consciousness regarding brand, price and quality among others.

Sproles (1985) and Sproles and Kendall (1986) use data from samples of young consumers in the United States to measure basic characteristics of consumer decision-making styles. Sproles and Kendall (1986) provide the Consumer Style Inventory (CSI) to measure consumers’ shopping behaviour using decision making orientation. They make an assumption about consumers’ decision-making styles is that consumers have eight different decision-making characteristics that determine the shopping decision they make. Sproles and Kendall (1986) identify and validate eight different characteristics from a sample of 482 United State high school students. Eight potential styles of
consumers’ decision-making are identified from a total of 40 items that pertaining to affective and cognitive orientations in decision-making (see Table 2.1).

Table 2.1 Characteristics of eight consumer decision-making styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision style</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perfectionist / high quality-conscious consumer</td>
<td>decision style of consumers who systematically search for the best quality products possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brand conscious / price equals quality</td>
<td>decision style of consumers concerned with getting the most expensive, well-known brands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Novelty and fashion conscious</td>
<td>decision style of consumers who like new and innovative products and who gain excitement from seeking out new things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Recreational and shopping conscious</td>
<td>decision style of consumers who take pleasure in shopping and who shop just for fun of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Price conscious / value for the money</td>
<td>decision style of consumers who are concerned with getting lower prices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Impulsiveness / careless</td>
<td>decision style of consumers who tend to buy spontaneously and who are unconcerned about how much money they spend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Confused by over choice</td>
<td>decision style of consumers who feel they have too many brands and stores to choose from and who likely experience information overload in the market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Habitual / brand loyal</td>
<td>decision style of consumers who shop at the same stores and tend to buy the same brands each time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adopted from Sproles and Kendall (1986)

A few researchers have used the CSI scale in their studies for consumers across other countries. Example, Hafstrom, Jung, and Young (1992) use the CSI scales in their study on young Korean consumers’ decision-making styles in related to shopping behaviour and found that CSI has elements of construct validity and has potential use across international populations. Also, Lyonski, Durvasula, and Zotos (1996) confirm the generalizability of CSI across other countries in their investigation on students shopping behaviours and consumers’ decision-making styles in four countries; United State, New Zealand, India and Greek.
From the above literature review on consumer decision making style, we can conclude that decision making style is related to the reasons consumers go shopping. Therefore, in this study the shoppers are profile based on their decision making style.

2.4 Perceived shopping mall image

Marketing research on image historically is mainly focused on retail store and its ability to project a distinctive identity or ‘personality’ in comparison with its competitors (Martineau, 1958). According to Martineau (1958), the store image is defined as “the way in which the store is defined in the shopper’s mind.” According to Kunkel and Berry (1968) image “may be defined as discriminative stimuli for an action’s expected reinforcement. Specifically, retail store image is the total conceptualized or expected reinforcement that a person associates with shopping at a particular store.” They go on to say that “… an image is acquired through experience and it thus learned.” (Lindquist, 1974). Previous researches quoted that store image is complex in nature and is consists of a mix of tangible of functional factors and intangible or psychological factors that influence the consumer perception (Lindquist, 1974). In 1974, Lindquist completed an extensive review of store image literature and developed a list of consumers’ perceived store image attributes which contributed by the following nine attributes and 23 components of these nine attributes.
### Table 2.2: Store image dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise</td>
<td>Quality, selection, style, and price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Layaway plan, sales personnel, easy return, credit, and delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clientele</td>
<td>Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical facilities</td>
<td>Cleanliness, store layout, shopping ease, and attractiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>Location and parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store atmosphere</td>
<td>Congeniality, fun, excitement, comfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Store reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttransaction</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Houston and Nevin (1981) suggest that the concept of store image extends to regional shopping malls as well. Also Houston and Nevin (1980) have identified three major factors or dimensions of shopping mall image from the marketing manager’s perspective. The three factors are mall assortment, mall convenience and market posture. Dodge, Stoll and Deiderick (1987) and Houston and Nevin (1981) have reported confirmatory empirical results that the concept of image extends to regional shopping malls.

In adopting the store image literature, the image of shopping mall is similarly hypothesis to create a distinct identity (Hart, Farrell, Stachow, Reed, and Cadogan, 2007). With the rapid development of shopping malls, more and more studies have been carried out on image-like variable of shopping areas. (Carter, 1978, 1981; Hauser and Koppelman, 1979; O’Neill and Hawkins, 1980; Berman, 1983; Chow, 1996). Studies by Bellenger, Robertson and Greenberg (1977), and Gentry and Burns (1977) have confirmed that image-like variables are important in shopping centre patronage.

According to Leo and Philippe (2002) the shopping mall image is a holistic entity created from the elements such as retail mix, infrastructure and atmosphere. Thus, the shopping mall image can be managed to create a shopping destination for its potential
shoppers (Warnaby and Medway, 2004). A strong image of a shopping location will influence customers’ purchase intention, longer shopping time and higher sales turnover in effect more positive shopping behaviour (Bitner, 1992; Dennis, Newman, and Marsland, 2005; Oppewal and Timmermans, 1997). Specific image dimensions can influence emotional responses and shopping decision in particular shopping situations (Finn and Louviere, 1996; Tai and Fung, 1997). Nevertheless, according to Finn et al. (1996),

“From the consumer perspective, consumer choices are predicted on first establishing (in their mind) the position of each relevant shopping competitor on the key decision dimensions on which they evaluate the malls. Each position is valued by the consumer relative to “how good” it is for a mall to occupy a certain position on a decision dimension like “low prices” when satisfying a particular shopping need. Consumer will then combine these image values into an overall impression of each mall relative to its competitors. These comparative overall impressions determine which mall consumers will consider and, ultimately, in which malls they will shop for a particular type of product or service.”

Furthermore, Hart et al. (2007) found that if customers are enjoying their shopping trip in a mall, then this will create positive impact on their perceived mall image and eventually influence their repatronage intention.

According to McGoldrick (2002), the shopping mall image is a multidimensional concept consisting features which are summarized into two categories: firstly tangible of functional attributes which related to its physical features; and secondly the intangible
attributes which represent its atmospherics qualities. Also shopping mall image is the set of functional qualities as perceived by shopper (e.g., convenience, parking facilities, and service quality) as well as an aura of psychological attributes (e.g., salesmanship and atmosphere) (Chebat, Hedhli, and Sirgy, 2009).

In this study, we based on the notion that consumer’s overall mall image is the sum of the consumer’s perception on each individual intangible and tangible characteristic of the mall. Shopping mall image represents the way in which a mall is defined in the shopper’s mind and influence their shopping intention. Therefore, we can profile shoppers based on their shopping mall image.

2.5 Shopping mall brand loyalty

In order to understand what shopping mall loyalty is, first we need to know what is brand. The American Marketing Association defines a brand as “a name, term, symbol, or design, or a combination of them, intended to identify the goods or services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitor.” According to Murphy (1990) a brand is a product or service offer by a particular marketer, which is differentiated by its name and presentation. Brand is a complex thing, it is dynamic and malleable, it exist psychologica in the mind of the consumer and serve to engage the very psyche of the individual (Randazzo, 1993).

According to Gambill (2000) the primary function of a brand is to identify and distinguish a firm from other firms or the firm’s products or services from those of competitors. “Engram” is the name gives to a psychology impact that a name left an impression in consumer mind (Charmasson, 1988). According to Dr. Richard Tedlow, a
professor at the Harvard Business School explains branding as “a promise of reliability.” He goes on to say that “a brand is in some sense a promise, and brand equity, brand value, comes from the keeping of that promise.” Keeping this promise builds a relationship of trust between the customer and the product or service that the customer uses (Caylor, 1999). It makes the product or service special to the customer and generates loyalty, specifically brand loyalty.

In general, loyalty is defined as the way that consumer express his/her satisfaction with the performance of the product or service received (Bloemer, Josee and Kasper, 1995). According to Jahangir, Parvez, Bhattacharjee, and Ahamed (2009) the concept of loyalty has not been uniquely defined. In previous marketing literature the term loyalty has often been used interchangeably with its operational (measurement) definition to refer to: repeat purchase (Ehrenberg, 1988); preference (Guest, 1994); commitment (Hawkes, 1994). Jahangir et al. (2009) further explain that “loyalty has been referred to in a variety of market-specific contexts, for example, service, store and vendor loyalty and contexts that reflect the measure used: customer and brand loyalty. In fact, the terms, brand loyalty and service loyalty have been used to refer to the same concept.”

Oliver (1999, p. 34) defines brand loyalty as,

“A deeply held commitment to rebuy or repatronize a preferred product/service consistently in the future, thereby causing repetitive same-brand or same brand-set purchasing, despite situational influences and marketing efforts having the potential to cause switching behaviour.”

Also according to Aaker (1991) brand loyalty refers to the attachment that a customer has to a brand. Generally, consumers who are loyal towards a brand have a
positive attitude towards the brand, repeatedly purchase the brand and recommend the brand to other consumers. The best measurement of loyalty has been an issue for debate. Early conceptual definition of brand loyalty was based solely on repeat purchase information (LeHew, 2002). Another group of researcher has suggested loyalty is an attitude toward the evaluation of product or service based on the expectations of its attributes (Selnes, 1993). Others claim that brand loyalty can be categorized as either attitudinal or behavioural (Day, 1969; Jacoby, Jacob and Chesnut, 1978; Aaker, 1991; Wernerfelt 1991; Dick and Bisu, 1994; Oliver, 1999). However, empirical research conducted in recent years supports the fact that attitudinal loyalty and purchase loyalty are related but conceptually distinct constructs (Chaudhuri and Holbrook, 2001; Chiou and Droge, 2006, Rauyruen and Miller, 2007).

John Konnarski, senior president of the International Council of Shopping Centers, says, ”Consumers are more brand-oriented than ever. You have to differentiate yourself. And consumers use the mall as a point of reference as to where they shop. They used to say, I’m going to Bloomingdale’s or Macy’s. Now they reference the mall. Branding has a strong potential to become a real success for mall developers.” Shopping malls want to establish themselves as the brand in the mind of the consumer. They are attempting to tap into the psychological core of the consumer with the criteria that the consumer value in the shopping mall or experience.

Lingdquist quoted Newman’s definition that “Broadly speaking, the brand image consists of everything people associate with the brand.” He says that the word “store” could easily substituted for the word “brand.” Gambill (2000) further extends the context of this manuscript to shopping mall and argues that “shopping mall” could also be
substituted for the word “brand” to capsulate the efforts of shopping mall companies to brand themselves and develop brand loyalty among its customers.

Shopping mall with a famous brand name will attract consumers to shop. Therefore, in this study, the context of brand is adopted and applied to the shopping mall and consumers are profiled based on their shopping mall loyalty. Also, this study adopts the brand loyalty variables scale developed by Chaudhuri et al. (2001) to measure shopper shopping mall loyalty.

2.6 Consumer segmentation

Understanding the consumer and their shopping behaviour are importance for marketer to develop their marketing strategy. Therefore, market segmentation is an important tool for marketers to understand their consumers and plan their marketing strategy. Also, according to Dibb (1998, p. 394), for better understanding of customer shopping behaviour, marketer grouping consumers with similar requirements and buying behaviour into segments.

Most of the researchers segment the consumers based on their shopping motivations. Example, Arnold and Reynolds (2002) segment the consumers to five shopper segments, called here the Minimalists, the Gatherers, the Providers, the Enthusiasts, and the Traditionalists based on the consumers’ hedonic shopping motivations that consists of six factor scales, adventure, gratification, role, value, social and idea shopping motivations. Also, Ruiz et al., (2003) segment a shopping mall’s customers based on the activities they performed during their visit. In the study, they reveal four distinct segments of shoppers; the recreational shopper, full experience
shopper, browser and mission shopper. Some of the important psychographic variable scales such as customer perceptions, shopping mall atmospheric are adopted in this study and will be further explain in the following chapter.

Jamal et al., (2005) investigate the reasons consumers go shopping in Doha, Qatar. Four hundred supermarket shoppers completed self-administered surveys regarding their attitudes toward 57 individual shopping motivation items adopted from previous research. Their study first uses factor analysis to examine the factor structure and psychometric properties of these items. Using cluster analysis method which adopted from Reynolds et al., (2002), they identify six homogeneous groups with different emphasis on specific reason for shopping. The six groups of shopper are socializing shoppers, disloyal shoppers, independent perfectionist shoppers, escapist shoppers, apathetic shoppers and budget conscious shoppers. However, their study does not support the other three factors that generally attributed to reasons why consumers shop: adventure shopping, impulsiveness and novelty seeking.

After considered the research objectives, this study adopts the methodology and some of the psychological variables scales used in Jamal et al., (2003) study. However, a few changes have being made including social shopping variable scales are dropped, whereas scales for mall loyalty, purchase loyalty and attitudinal loyalty variables are enhanced by adopting the variable scales from Chaudhuri et al., (2001).

Below are the findings of Jamal et al., (2003) that will be used as cross reference in the later chapter of this study. In their investigation (Jamal et al., 2003), they have identify six homogeneous groups with different emphasis on specific reason for shopping.

• Group 1: Socializing shoppers:
Members in this cluster shop for social reason, second highest on utilitarian, third highest on brand loyalty, above average on quality and role but scoring the lowest on gratification and below average on value and brand consciousness.

- **Group 2: Disloyal shoppers:**
  Respondents of this group are scoring lowest on brand loyalty, below average on confusion, gratification, social and utility but scoring above average on value, quality and hedonic.

- **Group 3: Independent perfectionist shoppers:**
  Members of this cluster scoring the lowest on social, the second lowest both on gratification and value, third lowest on role shopping but scoring above average on quality, brand loyalty, confusion and utilitarian shopping.

- **Group 4: Escapist shoppers:**
  Members of this cluster scoring the highest on gratification, the second highest on hedonic shopping, above average on confusion and slightly above average on brand loyalty, role playing, brand consciousness and quality.

- **Group 5: Apathetic shopper:**
  The respondents scoring the lowest on quality, second lowest on utilitarian, the third lowest on gratification and below average on brand consciousness and role but slightly above average on hedonic and confusion.

- **Group 6: Budget conscious shopper:**
  The respondents of this group scoring the least on hedonic, second lower on confusion but highest on value, second highest on gratification, third highest on
brand loyalty, above average on brand conscious but slightly below average on quality.

As mentioned earlier, however their study does not support the adventure shopping, impulsiveness and novelty seeking attributes.

2.7 Theoretical framework of this study

The above literature review reveal that the reasons consumer go shopping is depended on their shopping value, decision-making style, perceived mall image and mall loyalty. Therefore, the study reported here will represent in attempt to segment the shoppers based on their shopping values, decision making styles, perceived shopping mall image and shopping mall loyalty and socio-demographic. A theoretical framework (figure 2.1) has been devised to achieve the objectives. The findings of this study are aimed to compare as well as to delineate any similar or dissimilarities in term of consumer shopping values, perceived shopping mall image, decision making styles, mall loyalty and demographic profiles among the segments identify in later sections with the findings of a research by Jamal et al. (2005).

The various segments of shoppers were found to exhibit some differences in their decision making style, shopping value, shopping motivation and demographic profiles. Therefore, it is the interest of this study to explore, compare and discuss the similarity and dissimilarity of those variables with our finding in later section.
Figure 2.1 Theoretical Framework

- Decision making styles
- Shopping values
- Shopping mall loyalty
- Perceived shopping mall image

→

Psychographic segmentation through cluster analysis