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ABSTRACT

A recent survey by IBM institute for Business Value reports that fifty four percent retailers are improving upon their store design to facilitate a rich experience for their customers. These changes stress upon improved functionality and efficiency of the store as well as making the shopping task a fun activity. Retailers are recognizing that today’s shopper is not only seeking utilitarian benefits but also desires fulfillment at an emotional level. Thus, the store environment has to be geared towards facilitating both the utilitarian and hedonic desires of a consumer.

Traditionally, researchers have studied the effect of store environment on cognitive evaluations of customers. These cognitive evaluations include perceived merchandise quality, perceived price, perceived service quality etc. This study broadens the scope of store environment research to affective evaluations as well. The main purpose of the study is to examine the role of store environment on customers’ internal evaluations which constitute both utilitarian and hedonic evaluations; and how these evaluations lead to the customers’ judgment of overall value.

Additionally, it is proposed that store environment will not impact all the customers in a similar manner. Customers will value only those consequences which they desire. Therefore for some customers the primary drivers of value will be utilitarian benefits whereas for others hedonic benefits. Customer’s shopping motivation is identified as the moderating factor in the model.

Data were collected using a survey methodology. Shoppers’ perception of store environment was recorded after they had visited a particular store. They were also asked about various cognitive and affective evaluations they made in the store as well as their perceptions of overall value received. Generally the model presented in this study was supported. The three dimensions of store environment –social factors, ambiance and design factors were found to influence evaluations of merchandise quality, interpersonal
quality, price, efficiency, enjoyment, appeal and escapism. Additionally, these evaluations contribute to the customers’ perceptions of overall value. Individual perceptions of value lead the customers to spend more time in the store and create a desire to visit the store again.

The equivalence of the model for recreational and task oriented shoppers was also examined in the study. Findings suggest that the value formation for recreational and task oriented shoppers is different. Whereas, recreational shoppers take both cognitive and affective evaluations into account while forming value perceptions; task oriented shoppers are more inclined towards cognitive evaluations such as perceptions of interpersonal quality, efficiency, merchandise quality and price. In sum, this study emphasizes that store environment impacts consumer perceptions of utilitarian and hedonic benefits offered by the store, and may influence different types of shoppers in unique ways.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Do we as shoppers pick stores at random to shop, or do we have a particular store(s) which we are most likely to visit for a particular shopping task? It’s most likely that we do have our own favorite stores where we like to shop. Perhaps what makes us favor these stores over others is the positive experience that we had when we shopped there the last time. So is it all about shopping experience? That seems to be the buzz word in today’s economy. Researchers and practitioners alike are proposing that the traditional levers of price, selection and location, although still important, are no longer sufficient as bases for competitive differentiation. Retailers need to focus on improving the end to end experience in-order to boost sales and win customer loyalty.

The main question concerns to the type of experience retailers should deliver to their customer base. Is there a solution that can fit all customer types or should retailers profile customers to understand what an individual shopper may be looking for? I think the answer resides in the customer itself, since any type of store offering can not be appreciated if that does not relate to what the customer wants.

Some of the measures taken by retailers to improve and differentiate the shopping experience for their customers are - use of advance technology such as delivering promotions to personal mobile devices and use of digital media displays in the store; enabling cross-channel shopping where shoppers can order on the internet and within hours pick up from the nearby store; providing their employees access to a wide range of data to make quick and effective decisions, and designing stimulating in-store environments that is not only geared towards functional benefit such as maximizing sales per square but to create memorable shopping experiences. The primary goal encompassing all the above mentioned strategies is to deliver greater customer value. Greater customer value can only be achieved if the implemented strategies cater to the
desired result for the customers, which in turn will also make the investment of resource in the implementation of such strategies a profitable venture for the concerned business.

‘Sears Grand’ is a fine example of the changing face of retailing today. The Sears Grand concept was created to deliver a memorable shopping experience to its customers. The one-level store is brightly lit with wide, uncluttered aisles and easy checkout lanes at the exit. A racetrack format combined with colorful, bilingual signage makes it easy for customers to navigate the 165,000 to 210,000 sq. foot stores easily. Additionally, price verifiers throughout the store enable customers to easily identify the price on any product or call for assistance if needed. To make the shopping experience even more convenient and fun, Sears Grand features shopping carts that have a kid-friendly racecar theme and are equipped with cup holders for mom and dad. The stores also feature convenient services and a café where busy families can grab a bite to eat. The theme that emerges out of this description of Sears Grand is an atmosphere created to maximize shopping convenience through store layout and design, faster availability and accessibility of information, and offering multiple benefits by merging merchandising, entertainment and hospitality.

The key for creating outstanding and memorable experiences lies in the understanding of what customer seeks when they shop in a store. Retailers are trying to delve deeper to understand why customers make particular shopping decisions, not just what they bought and where they bought it (IBM Business Consulting Services, 2004). Traditional superficial classifications (based on demographic characteristics) are increasingly inadequate to accurately predict behavior. For example, two 40-year-old working women who both have two children and similar household income may shop very differently, depending on their personal value systems. One customer chooses brands that donate a part of profits to good causes; prefers recycled goods, even if they cost more; and emphasizes convenience and simplicity in the shopping experience. The second customer only buys products from domestic companies and brands; clips coupons and carefully compares prices before choosing what to buy; and emphasizes product quality and value. How must retailers vary the services delivered to these two very
different customers? How will a retailer signal to its customer when he or she enters the store that one has reached the right place? Specifically, how should retailers tailor the in-store experience to specific customer groups to make it noteworthy and memorable?

**The Nature of the Problem**

The importance of in-store shopping environment on consumer behavior is not a new idea in the marketing literature. Kotler (1973 p.50) first introduced the concept of store atmospherics and defined it as “the effort to design buying environments to produce specific emotional effects in the buyer that enhances his or her purchase probability”. In 1974, two environmental psychologists, Mehrabian and Russell, introduced the Stimulus-Organism-Response (S-O-R) framework. Their framework asserts that the physical environment influences individuals’ internal states, and in turn these states determine approach and avoidance behavior. The S-O-R framework initiated a number of marketing studies that have generally supported relationships between store environment and consumer perception, affect and store patronage intentions (e.g. Donovan and Rossiter, 1982; Baker, Levy, and Grewal, 1992; Baker, Parasuraman, Grewal and Voss, 2002).

Despite the plethora of evidence in support of the link between atmospherics and consumer behavioral outcomes already accumulated by the past studies, several areas in store environment research warrant further examination. For example, store environmental research till date has not adequately addressed the importance of environmental cues for varying customer types. Though conventional wisdom and actions of retailers imply that customers differ in their goals and motivations to engage in shopping activities; empirical verification as to how these motivations may influence customers’ perceptions of in-store environment is lacking.

The extant literature also lacks empirical research on the effect of store environment on customer’s perceived value. Though the effect of store environment on merchandise value has been investigated in the literature (e.g. Zeithaml 1988; Baker et al 2002), there is a dearth of research based answers as to how store environment can
deliver hedonic value such as enjoyment, escapism, visual appeal etc. Since, customers’
overall perception of value received from a store will depend upon the ability of the store
to deliver the value sought by the customer, an understanding of customer segmentation
based on shopping goals or motivations, which are both hedonic and utilitarian, is critical
to design environments that are apt to deliver superior value to the target customer. A
shopping visit to a retail facility can be valuable or valueless based on whether the
facility in question was able to deliver the desired consumption experience to the
customer.

In accordance with this line of thought, the goal of this dissertation study is to explore
the following research questions:

1. Does a customer’s shopping motivation affect the impact of in-store
   environmental cues?
2. How does an in-store environment influence the customer’s evaluation of
   utilitarian and hedonic benefits received from the shopping trip?
3. How customer’s evaluation of benefits received lead to the perception of overall
   shopping value?
4. What are the consequences of overall shopping value?
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents a review of literature on in-store environment, shopping value and shopping motivations. Next, a conceptual model is introduced. The theories relevant to the proposed model are explained at each stage. Finally, a summary of this model and its characteristics are outlined.

Physical Store Environment

The Stimulus-Organism-Response model as proposed by Mehrabian and Russell 1974, established the link between physical environment and individual’s behavior. In the following section, I discuss the Stimulus-Organism-Response (S-O-R) model and each of its dimensions from the perspective of retail store environment.

The Stimulus-Organism-Response (S-O-R) Framework

Environmental psychology literature asserts that the physical environment influences the approach-avoidance behavior of individuals within it (Mehrabian and Russell 1974). Mehrabian and Russell’s S-O-R framework describes mechanisms for how environmental elements influence individuals’ internal states and in turn their approach-avoidance behaviors (see Figure 1). They propose that emotional states serve as mediating variables in determining a variety of approach-avoidance behaviors. Following the S-O-R model, a number of marketing studies on atmospherics generally support the relationship between store environment and consumer behavior (e.g., Donovan and Rossiter 1982, Baker et al 1992). In a retailing context, the atmospheric variables are the stimuli (S) that drive consumer evaluations (O), and then influence their behavioral responses (R). Consumer behavior responses are either approach or avoidance within a retail store. This view is consistent with Markin, Lillis and Narayana’s argument (1976) that retail store designers, planners, and merchandisers shape a retailing space, that creates one’s mood, activates intentions, and affects a customer’s reactions.
Environmental Components of Physical Stores

On the basis of S-O-R framework, environmental stimulus cues are the antecedents of consumer evaluations towards a retail store. Schellinck (1982) defined a cue as “a characteristic, event, quality, or object, external to a person that can be encoded and used to categorize a stimulus object.” A store environment contains numerous non-product cues that aim to create a buying environment designed to produce specific emotional effects in the buyer to enhance his or her purchasing probability. These cues are termed as store environmental cues.

Service marketing researchers indicate that the ability of the physical environment to influence behaviors and to create an image is particularly apparent for service businesses such as retail stores (Bitner 1986). To enhance the development of store environment research, several researchers have proposed classification schemes in an attempt to categorize all the elements in a physical store environment (e.g., Baker 1987, Bitner 1992). Bitner (1992) proposed three dimensions of store environment features that constitute the servicescape (1) ambient conditions, (2) spatial layout and functionality, and (3) signs, symbols and artifacts.

Likewise, Baker (1987) classifies environmental components into ambient, design and social factors. Ambient factors refer to the non-visual elements of a space that tend to impact the consumer’s subconscious (e.g. temperature, music, and lighting). Design factors are the stimuli that represent the visual elements of a space that tend to exist more
at the forefront of a consumers’ awareness (e.g. color, layout, architectural elements). Social factors involve the presence of employees and customers in the environment. A comparison of these two classification schemas was undertaken by Brady and Cronin (2001), which found Baker’s typology to be more comprehensive and parsimonious in uncovering the underlying dimensions of service environments. Since retailing involves a large service component this study will use Baker’s typology of environmental cues.

Customer’s Internal Evaluations

Researchers have found that physical environment induces two types of internal states for an individual: affective and cognitive (Zeithaml 1988; Mehrabian and Russell 1974). Each type of evaluation impacts a consumer’s shopping behavior in a different way.

Affective evaluation: Affective evaluation is a judgment of something as pleasant, attractive, valuable, likable or preferable (Russell and Snodgrass 1987). Mehrabian and Russell (1974) first suggested that an individuals’ emotional responses to an environment which summarizes the emotion-eliciting qualities of an environment. Though Mehrabian and Russell suggest three dimensions for affective responses, subsequent research concluded that the emotion-eliciting qualities of environments are captured by two dimensions of pleasure and arousal (Russell and Pratt 1980; Russell and Snodgrass 1987). Baker et al. (1992) define pleasure as “the extent to which a person feels good in the environment,” and refer to arousal as “the extent to which a person feels excited or stimulated.”

In a retailing context Donovan and Rossiter (1982) applied the M-R model and found that affect is a significant factor of consumers’ approach behaviors within a store. Baker et al. (1992) examined the effect of two environmental factors on consumer affective evaluation. They found that ambient cues (music) interact with social cues (store employees) to influence consumers’ pleasure levels and the social cues increase consumers’ arousal levels. Consistent with the S-O-R model, their findings indicate that consumer affective evaluations mediate the relationship between store environments and
shopping behavior. In sum, the research reviewed here suggests that consumers’ affective evaluations can be explained in terms of pleasure and arousal dimensions. Furthermore, pleasure and arousal mediate the relationship between the physical environments and approach-avoidance behavior.

*Cognitive evaluations:* Cognitive evaluations are associated with consumer perception. Perception processes are rooted in information-processing and inference theories (Bettman 1979; Zeithaml 1988; Baker 1998). Perception is a high level of psychological activity concerned with the process whereby sensory stimulation (e.g. cues) is converted into meaningful information (Bettman 1979). When consumers engage in external search during a purchase situation, the stimuli in a physical store provide some important informational cues to consumers. Consumers may use those cues as the basis for forming inference about price, product, or service quality in that store (Baker 1998; Baker et al. 2002). For example, the use of carpeted floor and elegant décor in a store design may make consumers infer that this store might charge higher prices and provide higher quality of merchandise and service. During this process, a consumer selects, organizes and interprets information cues residing in a store to create a meaningful picture of that store. This rational process or “making sense” is cognitive evaluation.

To consumers, the availability of extrinsic environmental cues is particularly important for services or manufactured goods that are high in experience, credence attributes, or unobservable quality (Bitner 1986; Zeithaml et al. 1985; Zeithaml 1988). In the same vein, Kirmani and Rao (2000) argued that marketing signaling rooted in information economic theory should be used to supplement information processing for consumers. Because information asymmetry may exist between transacting parties due to the unobservable quality of products or experience-based services, it is economically wise for companies to offer some signals to its consumers who lack information about those products or services. In essence, marketing signals serve as surrogate indicators for consumers, as they form beliefs about services or product quality. Those signals may include a variety of forms such as brand name, advertising, expenditure, price, or retailer investment in reputation. The physical environment is rich in such cues, and as such may
be very influential in communicating the company’s image and product or service quality to their customers (Rapopart, 1982).

Several empirical studies support the argument that environmental cues influence one’s cognitive responses. Baker, Grewal and Parasuraman (1994) found that consumers infer higher merchandise quality and service quality in a prestige-image ambient environment than in a discount-image ambient environment. Further, consumers’ merchandise and service quality inferences mediate the effects of ambient and social environmental factors on their store image perceptions. Another study by Bitner (1990) found that the appearance of the physical environment can influence how customers perceive causes of service failure in a travel agency. Less control is attributed to the firm when the service failure occurs in an organized service environment than when the same event occurs in a disorganized environment. Additionally, Grewal and Baker (1994) found that the price range of a product item is more acceptable in a high-social store environment than in a low-social store environment.

Though past research has well established that environmental cues influence consumers’ affective and cognitive evaluations, it is not yet confirmed if a particular set of environmental cues is successful in creating similar evaluations for all customers. For example is a particular type of music likely to produce a state of pleasure and arousal in all customers? Or more broadly does store environment drives affective and cognitive evaluations of customers uniformly.

Approach-Avoidance Behavior

According to the S-O-R framework, approach avoidance behaviors are the actions resulting from individuals’ internal states. Mehrabian and Russell (1974) suggest that approach behaviors include physical approach, work performance, exploration, and social interaction. In a retail setting, Donovan and Rossiter (1982) found that emotional reactions influenced the time that consumers spent in exploring a store, the tendency to spend more money than originally planned, and the likelihood of returning to the store.
(future patronage intention). Extending their previous work, Donovan, Rossiter, Marcoolyn, and Nesdale (1994) found that pleasure was a significant predictor of extra time spent and unplanned purchasing in a retail store. Milliman (1982) found that the tempo of background music could affect traffic flow in supermarket settings. In terms of experiential evaluation, Baker et al. (2002) found negative effects of shopping experience costs (e.g. time/effort and psychic costs) on consumer patronage intentions. In sum, the approach-avoidance behaviors in a retail store include one’s patronage intentions, future patronage intentions, and the amount of time and money spent.

Using the S-O-R framework, Figure 2 summarizes the components and constructs of each stage in physical store atmospherics research.

Figure 2: The S-O-R Framework of Atmospherics and the Constructs in Physical Stores
Figure 3. A conceptual model of the effect of store environmental cues on experiential value and repurchase intention.
Store Environmental Cues and Customers’ Value Perceptions

Past research on the effects of store environmental cues on customers’ value perceptions is scarce. The few studies that have investigated this relationship suggest that store environmental cues affect a customer’s value perceptions; however the relationship is mediated by perceived merchandise quality and perceived merchandise price (Baker et al. 2002, Sirohi et al. 1998). Additionally, higher quality perceptions will positively affect merchandise value perceptions whereas higher price perceptions will hold a negative relationship with perceived merchandise value. This view of atmospherics-value relationship explains the process by which customers make value judgments about the product on the basis of external cues present in the environment, and how these value judgments affect the consumer responses in a retail outcome. Emphasizing the utilitarian approach towards value, empirical studies have shown that by manipulating the environmental variables of a retail store the retailer can affect the value perceptions of customers by influencing the perceived price and quality on one hand and psychic costs (such as perceived waiting time ) on the other.

Two major questions emerge at this point. Firstly, are customers only looking for a good deal in a shopping context, i.e. economic value? And secondly, if shopping is not limited to a search for economic value than what are the other types of value that a customer may search for in a retail setting, and how can a retailer deliver such value to its customers?

To shed some light on these queries, literature related to customer value and shopping motives is presented below:

Customer Value

“At the source of any successful enterprise enabling its very existence is the value creation process”- Reichheld, Markey and Hopton (2000). Customer value has been identified as an important driver of customer loyalty and is considered central to the performance of the firm (Reichheld 1994; Heskett et al 1997). Consequently, customer
value has been and continues to be the focus of academic research both in the field of marketing and management.

In marketing, the role of customer value on consumer behavior has been revised and reexamined at length (Boyd and Levy 1963; Holbrook 1985, 1986; Zeithaml 1988; Bolton and Drew 1991; Tracey and Wiersema 1993; Lai 1995; Woodruff and Gardial 1996; Woodruff 1997). Despite the extant of research on the topic, researchers acknowledge the difficulties in reconciling on a common definition of customer value because of its subjective and dynamic nature (Piercy and Morgan 1997; Naumann 1995; Woodruff 1997). Conceptualizations of customer value as present in the literature can be grouped into three categories: value component models, benefits-cost ratio models, and means-ends models.

Value component models

Value component models are based on the features or characteristics of products and services. Joiner (1994) and Rust and Oliver (2000) perception of customer value is based on the disconfirmation model prevalent in consumer behavior literature. It includes three components of value: dissatisfiers, satisfiers and delighters. Dissatisfiers are features of a product or service that are expected to be present and are generally taken to be granted. For example- availability of the product on the shelf when a customer goes shopping in a store. Since these features are expected to be there, their presence only brings customer to the neutral point but their absence frustrates the customer (Khalifa 2004). Satisfiers are the features or characteristics of a product or service that are expected and explicitly requested by the customer. For example- customer may expect to exercise choice in the method of payment. If the store only accept cash or debit card, it may disappoint the customer; however allowing the customer to use any mode of payment may not only satisfy the customer but may even prove delightful. Delighters are the innovative features of a product or service that the customers do not expect. When the seller’s offering exceeds the customer’s expectation, the customer is delighted. These features have no negative effect if they are absent but lead to a positive state when present.
Kaufman (1998) classifies value elements as utility value, exchange value and esteem value. Utility value is the primary value element that describes the performance of the product. Exchange value translated into the reason for customer wanting the product. And esteem value invokes the buyer’s desire to own the product. Any of these elements or a combination of them drives the customer to make a buy decision. Value components models of customer value places importance on the benefits perceived by a customer in a product or service. They do not account for the costs incurred by the customer to acquire such benefits. Additionally, it is not explained as to why a set of benefits may invoke different value judgments from different customers.

**Benefit-Cost Ratio Models**

“Value is the consumer’s overall assessment of the utility of a product based on perceptions of what is received and what is given (Zeithaml 1988, p. 14).”

“Buyer’s perception of value represents a tradeoff between the quality or benefits they perceive in the product relative to the sacrifice they perceive by paying the price (Monroe 1990, p.46).”

“Customer value is market perceived quality adjusted for the relative price of your product (Gale 1994, p xiv).”

“By customer value, we mean the emotional bond established between a customer and a producer after the customer has used a salient product or service produced by that supplier and found the product to provide an added value (Butz and Goodstein 1996, p. 63).”

As evident from the presented definitions here value has been defined in terms of the ‘gets versus the gives’ (Day 1990; Dodds, Monroe & Grewal 1991; Jacoby 1971; Ostrum and Iacobucci (1995); Monroe 1990; Zeithaml, 1988). Day (1990) proposes that value can be expressed in terms of a ‘value equation’; “Customer Perceived Benefits – Customer Perceived Costs = Customer Perceived Value” (p.142). This conceptualization of the value construct defines value as a trade-off between total benefits received versus total sacrifices made (Buzzell and Gale, 1997; Monroe, 1979; 1990; Monroe & Krishnan, 1985; Sweeney 1994). This sacrifice can be monetary or non-monetary, but the emphasis is on acquiring practical, utilitarian and instrumental utility in a product from this trade
Thus, the traditional understanding of value can be viewed as a more functional definition of value, which is derived from customer analysis of multiple functional benefits such as specific product attributes and the technical utility a product offers (Jacoby 1971; Lai 1995; Shavitt 1992; Woodruff, Schumann and Gradial 1993; Zeithaml 1988).

Value conceptualization under benefit-cost model is not limited to utilitarian benefits alone. Groth (1994) argues that customers buy products or services not only for utilitarian purposes but also for psychic need fulfillment. These psychic factors are both internal and external. Internal factors are the customer’s own perceptions of value independent of the opinions, suggestions, influences, and approval of others whereas external factors are the customer’s perception because of the opinions, influences, suggestions and approval of others. Both internal and external factors can be real or perceived.

Means End Model

Means-end models are based on the assumption that customers acquire products and services in order to achieve favorable ends. Means are products and services whereas ends are the personal values considered important by the customer. Woodruff (1997) emphasizes that customers perceive products or services as bundles of attributes and attribute performance. They form preferences for certain attributes based on their ability to facilitate desired consequences. Customers also learn to prefer those consequences that help them to achieve the desired end goal.

Various authors have emphasized on the total consumption experience in their conceptualization of value. Consumption of a product or service provides the individual with cognitive and sensory benefits (Hirschman 1984). Cognitive consumption leads to the tangible benefits derived from performing utilitarian functions whereas sensory consumption is the emotional reward that a customer derives from the product (Holbrook and Hirschman 1982).
Operationalization of Customer Value in Present Study

Shopping can provide both task related (product acquisition) or hedonic value through responses evoked during the experience (Babin et al. 1994 p. 645). Value of a good or service is dependent on its role in creating a consumption experience (Holbrook 1982). To create and maintain lasting relationships with one’s customers, marketers need to go beyond the price and quality mix to provide experience-based value (Steigelman 2000). A strictly utilitarian approach, focusing on an object, its price or the functional utility provided by a product is too narrow to account for all value provided by the consumption experience (Hirschman and Holbrook 1982). Therefore value in a shopping context has to be considered from an experiential perspective that includes both the tangible utilitarian outcomes and hedonic responses from a consumption experience. This study adopts the experiential view of value as proposed by Holbrook (1994), where value is defined as

“A relativistic (comparative, personal, situational) preference characterizing a subject’s experience of interacting with some object."

Experiential value perceptions are based upon either direct usage or distant appreciation of goods or services. Experiential value offers both extrinsic and intrinsic benefits (Babin and Darden 1995; Batra and Ahtola 1991). Extrinsic benefits are derived from shopping trips that are utilitarian in nature (Batra and Ahtola 1991). Whereas intrinsic value is derived from the “appreciation of an experience for its own sake, apart from any other consequence that may result (Holbrook 1994 p. 40).” Mathwick et al (2001) build upon Holbrook’s (1994) typology of experiential value and provide additional insights into the four dimensions of experiential value which are as follows:

Consumer return on investment: Consumer return on investment represents the “active investment of financial, temporal, behavioral and psychological resources that potentially yield a return” (Mathwick et al., 2001). The consumer may experience this return in the form of economic utility generating from the efficiency of an exchange encounter (Zeithaml, 1988) as well as from the perception of affordable quality (Grewal, Monroe and Krishnan 1996).
**Service Excellence:** Service excellence is a reactive response whereby the consumer exhibits an admiration for the marketing entity’s capacity to serve as a means to a self-oriented end (Holbrook and Corfman 1985). Service excellence acts as a standard against which quality judgments are ultimately formed (Oliver 1999). Therefore the value derived from perceived service excellence reflects the customer appreciation of a service provider to deliver on its promise through demonstrated expertise and task related performance (Zeithaml 1988).

**Aesthetics:** An aesthetic response is analogous to the appreciation of a work of “art”, it is a reaction to the symmetry, proportion and unity of a physical object (Veryzer 1993). In a retail context, aesthetics is reflected in two key dimensions—the visual elements of a retail environment and the entertaining aspects of the service performance itself (Mathwick et al 2001). Visual appeal is driven by the design and physical attractiveness of the retail setting. Entertainment value reflects the appreciation for the marketing entity’s ability to lift the spirits of shoppers (Babin et al 1994). Consumers who perceive the shopping experience to be more than an errand or purchase opportunity and seek to make it a memorable or entertaining experience respond to the entertainment dimension of aesthetics. In sum, both visual appeal and entertainment dimensions of aesthetic response offer pleasure on their own, irrespective of the retail store’s ability to facilitate the economic goals of shoppers (Driefus 1997).

**Playfulness:** Playful exchange behavior is reflected in the intrinsic enjoyment one finds while engaging in absorbing activities that offer a means of escape from the demands of the day-to-day life (Unger and Kernan 1983). Playfulness operates outside the immediate material interests and has a restorative capability (Day, 1981). In addition to enjoyment, escapism is another aspect of playfulness that allows the customer to temporarily seek a refuge from worldly demands. Window shopping or other forms of vicarious consumption are examples of escapism in the retail shopping context.
This typology emphasizes value as a transient process influenced by personal goals, moods, and consumer self image (Flint, Woodruff and Gardial 1996; Johar & Sirgy 1991; Shavitt 1992; Woodruff, Schumann and Gardial 1993; Woodruff 1997). Different individuals will favor different things and activities (Maynes 1975), and will utilize different criteria in perceiving benefits from a shopping experience, thus leading to different value judgments (Taylor 1961).

According to Zeithaml (1988 p.13) “what constitutes value even in a single product category appears to be highly personal and idiosyncratic”. Thus, value becomes a personal evaluation, based on one’s internal value system tied into innate needs and wants. Subsequently each consumption context evokes a different value perception to be applied to that specific purchase transaction. (Holbrook 1994; Oliver 1996; Woodruff 1997). Each purchase transaction can evoke a different value perception but all forms of value are self-oriented; having intrinsic characteristics that are self-motivating and self-justifying (Holbrook & Hirschman, 1982). In this conceptualization of value the construct is seen as a judgment within a particular context (Lewis 1946), one that is highly dependent on the circumstances under which the decision was made (Taylor 1961). Therefore, it is logical to imply that in order to gain a deeper understanding of what constitutes value for a given consumer, an understanding of customer motivation is essential. In the following section, consumer shopping motivations are reviewed:

**Shopping Motivations**

Shopping motivations reflect the general predisposition of consumers toward the act of shopping (Gehrt et al., 1992). This predisposition may be manifested in buyer’s decision making process that includes patterns of information search, alternative evaluation, and product selection. In order to infer shopping motivations, various taxonomies of retail shoppers were developed by researchers based on orientation to (1) product usage (Darden and Reynolds 1971), (2) actual patronage and shopping behavior (Stephenson and Willett 1969), (3) shopping enjoyment (Bellenger and Korgaonkar 1980), (4) retail attribute preference (Bellenger et al. 1977, Darden and Ashton 1974),
and (5) psychological needs (Taub 1974). It has been suggested in the literature that common segments can be found across the various taxonomies generated by past studies (Lesser and Hughes 1986, Westbrook and Black 1985).

During this review of the literature, six main shopper classes can be identified. A brief explanation of these classes is presented below:

The economic shopper as identified by Stone (1954) is the most frequently identified segment in the literature. These shoppers are price conscious and look forward to buying products at the lowest price. The price-bargain-conscious shopper (Stephenson and Willett 1969), the special shopper (Moschis 1976), the low-price shopper (Williams et al., 1978), the economic-convenience shopper (Bellenger and Korgaonkar 1980), the price shopper (Lesser and Hughes 1986), and the price conscious, “value-for-money” consumer (Shim and Mahoney 1992) are all essentially referring to the same segment.

The recreational shopper was first identified by Stephenson and Willett (1969). A similar type of shopper has also been labeled as ‘active’ (Lesser and Hughes, 1986; Lumpkin, 1985) and ‘shopping process involved’ (Westbrook and Black, 1985). Recreational shoppers enjoy the act of shopping regardless of whether a purchase is made or not. Bellenger and Korgaonkar (1980) contend that this group represents a sizeable proportion of consumers, a view supported by Gehrt and Carter (1992) in specific relation to catalogue shoppers.

The apathetic shopper is also referred to as the inactive shopper by Lesser and Hughes (1986) and has emerged in many shopper typologies as the single largest segment of consumers, yet it has been relatively under-explored by empirical researchers (Brown and Reid, 1997).

Convenience-oriented shoppers have been identified in a number of studies, notably in those investigating the shopping orientations of catalogue users (Gehrt and Carter, 1992). Convenience has often been conceptualized as a time-oriented construct, although there is evidence that it also involves space and effort dimensions (Gehrt et al.,
Individuals can be motivated by only one of these dimensions or all simultaneously. Two other major groups appear in the literature with some consistency. The ethical shopper is distinguished by loyalty, with studies investigating store loyalty, brand loyalty, or both. The dominant stream of research into this group has concentrated on store loyalty, often conceptualized as “loyalty to local merchants” in studies of shopping behavior. The personalizing shopper orientation refers to consumers who demonstrate a propensity to value relationships with store personnel. These six orientations are relatively distinct from one another, reducing the potential for redundancy among consumer shopping characteristics.

Consumers possess different shopping motivations and it is logical that these motives or personal goals play an important role in the evaluation of a retailer’s offering and the formation of value judgments about the shopping experience.

**Consumer Responses (Behavioral Outcomes)**

Mehrabian and Russell (1974) refer to approach intention as willingness or desire to move toward and explore an environment. In a retailing context, Donovan and Rossiter (1982) further specified patronage intention behaviors including (1) time spent in store (2) In-store browsing, (3) impulse buying and (4) repurchase intentions.

*Time Spent in the Store*

Many researchers have manipulated environmental variables and measured the time consumers spent in retail settings. Yalch and Spangenberg (1990) reported that music style influenced the time that shoppers spent in the store. Besides music, studies of other variables associated with time spent in store include color (Bellizzi and Hite 1992) and lighting (Areni and Kim 1994). Lighting was found to have no influence on time spent in store.
**In-Store Browsing**

Bloch, Ridgway, and Sherrell (1989) defined in-store browsing as the behavior in which consumers examine the merchandise for information or for recreational purposes without any intention of buying. The browsing behavior usually reflects a shopper’s view of shopping as a potential recreational activity (Babin and Darden 1995). At the same time, shopping may actually provide pleasurable experience to shoppers (Sherry 1990). These feelings of pleasure a shopper may experience while browsing can be regarded as a positive behavioral outcome for a retailer.

**Impulse Buying**

An impulse purchase, by definition, is an unplanned purchase (Bellenger, Robertson and Hirschman 1978; Cobb and Hoyer 1986). Rook (1987) addressed impulse buying as a shopping experience with a sudden urge to buy something immediately. Beatty and Ferrell (1998) extended this concept of impulse buying to include buying with no pre-shopping intentions to buy. Literature suggests that as consumers get exposed to more in-store environmental stimuli, such as displays or promotional events, they would experience more positive emotions (Gardner and Rook, 1988). When a shopper is in positive response, he/she is more likely to engage in approach behavior than avoidance behavior in a retail environment (Baker et al., 1992). Donovan and Rossiter (1982) also found that pleasure was positively associated with overspending in a shopping environment.
**Summary**

Social factors, design factors, and ambient factors are the store environmental elements chosen to test the model developed in this dissertation study. The basic premise is that environmental cues influence the perceptions of interpersonal service quality, merchandise value, efficiency, visual appeal, entertainment, and escapism. These perceptions in turn determine the overall experiential value received by a customer in a retail setting. Positive value perceptions lead to outcome behaviors such as extra time spent in store, impulse buying and repurchase intentions. It is also contended that the evaluation of environmental cues and determinants of overall experiential value in a shopping environment will differ due to the differing customer motivations.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

This chapter contains four groups of research hypotheses. In accord with the literature review and the underlying relationships in the proposed model, the research hypotheses are developed to address the following research questions:

1. How do the three environmental factors (ambient, design, and social) influence customers’ internal evaluations?
2. How do customer’s internal evaluations lead to an evaluation of overall experiential value?
3. What are the consequences of experiential value evaluations?
4. Is the model generalizable across various customer segments based on their shopping motivations?

The Effects of Social Cues on Customer Value Evaluations

Store employees and co-customers are recognized as ‘social factors’ in retail store setting. Prior research suggests that sales people affect customers’ satisfaction level with the store services by influencing the moods of the customers (Grewal and Sharma 1991). The recognition that service employees are particularly helpful and friendly, or provide faster service may induce greater levels of stimulation and pleasure resulting in positive affect towards the store (Wakefield and Blodgett 1999). In addition to the interaction between store employees and a customer, the service encounter is often characterized by the condition of multiple customers whose presence may influence each other. Therefore, a customer’s service experience may be affected positively or negatively by one’s fellow customers (Grove and Fisk 1997).
Store Employee Perceptions – Perceived Merchandise Quality

Literature presents mixed findings for the relationship between store employee perceptions and perceived merchandise quality. For example, Gardner and Simons (1985) found that customers perceived merchandise quality to be higher when the sales people were well dressed, friendly and cooperative versus sloppily dressed, nasty and uncooperative. In another study by Akhter et al. (1994), merchandise quality was perceived to be higher when customers felt that store employees are friendly and knowledgeable. However, in another study by Baker et al. (2002) no relationship was found between employee cues and perceived merchandise quality. In the light of these mixed findings it will be worthwhile to evaluate the relationship between store employee perceptions and perceived merchandise quality.

RH1a: Favorable perceptions of store employee cues are positively related to higher perceived merchandise value.

Store Employee Perceptions – Perceived Price

Helson (1964) posits that contextual factors shape a person’s frame of reference for focal stimuli. In a retailing context, store atmosphere will influence customers’ price perceptions. Additionally, store atmosphere may generate price beliefs irrespective of the actual prices. For example, consumers perceive the prices of a product to be higher if the product is purchased in an upscale store. Although quite a few studies have established that store atmosphere affects price perceptions (Nagle 1987; Kotler 1973; Grewal and Baker 1994), there is sparse research on the effect of individual store environmental cues on price perceptions. Since the appearance and behavior of store employees contribute to the perceptions of overall store atmosphere, it is desirable to investigate the effect of customers’ store employee perceptions on perceived price. It is theorized here that customers will perceive higher prices if the store employees are formally dressed and appear to be knowledgeable about the product sold.
RH1b: Favorable perceptions of store employee cues are positively related to higher perceived prices.

Store Employee Perceptions - Perceived Interpersonal Service Quality

Past research offers empirical evidence that store employee cues affect interpersonal service quality perceptions. The number of employees present in a store and their appearance are tangible signals of service quality in a retail setting (Parasuraman, Berry and Zeithaml 1988; Hartline and Ferrell 1996). Cues of positive interaction between the employees and customers such as greeting the customers when they enter the store, providing assistance and displaying friendly behavior are likely to influence customers’ interpersonal quality perceptions.

RH1c: Favorable perceptions of store employee cues are positively related to higher perceived interpersonal quality.

Store Employee Perceptions – Perceived Efficiency

Efficiency is the extrinsic value that results from the active manipulation of some means in pursuit of some self-oriented goals (Holbrook 1986 p.30). Efficiency can be characterized in the terms of input-output ratio, as to what resources were spent to achieve a given objective. In marketing, where time is perceived to be a key resource, efficiency can also be viewed as ‘convenience’ (Szymanski and Hise 2000). Baker et al. (2002) state that both time and effort are important elements of consumers’ shopping experience costs. Prior research suggests that social factors can influence customers’ perception of time and effort spent in a store. If the number of sales employees is perceived to be insufficient for the customer density, customers may perceive that they have to wait longer to receive assistance (Eroglu and Machleit 1990). In such a case, customers’ time/effort cost perception is higher and may result in anger and frustration on the part of the customer thus leading to lower efficiency.

RH1d: Favorable perceptions of store employee cues are positively related to perceived efficiency.
The Effect of Store Design Cues on Customer Value Evaluations

The design of a store represents the physical appearance of the store. Store design can be broken down into two main components: spatial layout and functionality (Bitner, 1992). Spatial layout refers to the amount and the size of merchandise, fixtures and furnishings, the way they are arranged and the spatial relationship among them (Berman and Evans 1992, p.42). Store functionality is the ability of these items to facilitate performance of the store and accomplishment of goals.

Retailers try to develop their own individual looks through design of the store that can emphasize products and help the product to stand out. The design of the layout
patterns varies by the retail format. Typically, the type of layout used by the merchandise- oriented stores is different from service- oriented retailers (for example, commercial banks). At merchandise- oriented stores, the layout design elements include fixtures, allocation of floor space, product grouping, traffic flow, department locations, and allocation of space for merchandise within departments. Retailers try to accomplish many goals while designing a store environment, such as providing customers an adequate space to navigate and shop easily (Levy and Weitz, 2001), controlling and directing traffic flow on the selling floor (Hasty and Reardon, 1996), and creating a unique store image.

Store Design Cues – Perceived Merchandise Quality

In the absence of prior knowledge, consumers infer quality of the merchandise sold in a store on the basis of other non-product cues. Prior research shows that the same merchandise bought at an upscale store is perceived to be of superior quality than when bought in a discount store (Gardner et al. 1985). Kotler (1973) notes that a retail environment communicates the quality standards that the retailer abides with, and wishes to deliver to its patrons. Baker et al. (2002) also found significant effect of design cues on merchandise quality perceptions.

RH 2a: As the perceptions of store design cues become more favorable, consumers will perceive merchandise quality to be higher.

Store Design Cues – Perceived Price

It is argued in the literature that consumers respond to prices on the basis of the entire purchase situation. Thaler (1985) states that subjects were willing to pay higher prices for a beer purchased at a resort hotel, whereas the same price was considered outrageous in a grocery store. Baker et al. (2002) found that consumers expected higher prices in an upscale store even before they examined the price tags. These expectations were influenced by the cues present in the store environment.
RH2b: As the perceptions of store design cues become more favorable, consumers will perceive the price of the merchandise to be higher.

Store Design Cues – Perceived Interpersonal Service Quality

The design style refers to the store image that is created by the design elements. For example, the use of marble, carpeted floors and rich décor in the store are instrumental in creating a rich and plush environment. On the other hand, tiled floor, plastic racks, etc creates a low store image (Gardner and Siomkos 1985). In the absence of prior knowledge about the store, customers’ expectations of a store’s offering are influenced by the environmental cues (Grewal and Baker 1994). Although studies related to the effect of design cues on perceived interpersonal service quality are sparse in the retailing literature, Greenland and McGoldrick (1994) found that consumers perceived employees in modern style branch banks more approachable and knowledgeable.

RH2c: As perceptions of store design cues become more favorable, consumers will perceive interpersonal service quality to be higher.

Store Design Cues – Perceived Efficiency

The primary purpose of a facility design is to fulfill the goals of its occupants. In retail settings store design is primarily geared towards customer convenience that is facilitated by easy movement, ease in finding information and product, fast checkout etc. Latest research from Mintel on retail store design questioning 1,058 adults, finds over half of consumers having walked out of a store when they were going to make a purchase because of long queues. A further 35% have left a store where they were going to buy goods because they could not find the product they were looking for or the price of the item. The same percentage of consumers was put off by certain shops due to unattractive store design. Consumers tend to spend more time in shops which have an attractive store environment and good facilities such as cafes, restaurants, clean toilets and baby changing places, on the other hand cramped environment and absence of functional elements may initiate negative feelings in a customer.

RH 2d: As the perceptions of design cues become more favorable, consumers’ perceived efficiency will be higher.
Store Design Cues – Perceived Visual Appeal

Store design is not only geared towards accomplishment of functional goals but also to provide aesthetic qualities to the environment. Retail marketers are paying detailed attention to the aesthetics and to the processes by which consumers make meaning out of their physical experience of the place (Kozinets 2002). Through the use of lavish décor, sleek finishes and attention to the smallest detail, the design of the store not only accomplishes task related goals but also provides a visually stimulating experience to the customers. Retailers utilize interesting window displays to capture consumers’ attention and draw them into the store (Sen et al. 2002). The use of warm colors, carpeted floors and spacious layout of the store create a visually appealing look to engage customers into spending more time in the store.

RH 2e: As the perception of store design cues becomes more favorable, customers’ perception of visual appeal will be higher.

Figure 5 presents the effect of store design cues on customers’ internal evaluations.
The Effect of Store Ambient Cues on Customers’ Internal Evaluations

Ambient conditions, the “background conditions that exist below the level of immediate awareness” (Aubert-Gamet 1997, p.29), have been a focus of research on reactions to sensory cues in physical stores (Bitner 1992). In this vein, studies of ambient conditions consider visual cues (e.g., lighting, color) (Bellizzi, Crowley, and Hasty 1983; Bellizzi and Hite 1992; Summers and Hebert 2001), auditory cues (e.g., music, noise) (Milliman 1982; North and Hargreaves 1999; Tom 1990; Mattila and Wirtz 2001), olfactory cues (e.g., scents) (Hirsch 1995; Mitchell, Kahn, and Knasko 1995; Spangenberg 1996), and tactual cues (e.g., temperature) (Griffith 1970). Several scholars have studied the effect of ambient cues on consumer evaluations. However, the recurring theme in the past studies is the effect of store ambience on consumers’ pleasure or/and arousal level. There is a significant lack of research as to how ambient cues can influence different cognitive and affective evaluations in the mind of the consumer.

Effect of Ambient Cues on Perceived Price

In a study by Areni and Kim (1993) shoppers inferred higher prices for wine when classical music was played in a wine store than when hip-hop music was played. This finding is also supported by Baker et al (2002), who found the effect of music cues on perceived price of merchandise to be significant. Additionally, retailers often manipulate the illumination in a store to create an upscale image. Higher illumination levels tend to create an upscale image whereas lower illumination levels tend to drop the perception of price.

RH 3a: As the perception of store ambience cues becomes more favorable, customers will perceive merchandise prices to be higher.
Effect of Ambient Cues on Perceived Enjoyment

Store ambience cues can affect the customers in both physiological and emotional ways. For example, noise that is too loud, the temperature of the room or the odor may create physical discomfort to the customer (Bitner 1992). On the other hand, by manipulating lighting, music and scents, retailers try to create an emotionally pleasing environment. Consumers avoid unpleasant and approach pleasant environments. Retailers are making a significant effort to purchase background music inclined to please the target clientele and make the shopping task enjoyable. In retail stores where hedonic consumption is higher (e.g. Barnes and Noble, where customers come as much for entertainment as the actual purchase) ambience of the store may prove to be more important.

RH 3b: As the perception of ambient cues becomes more favorable, consumers’ perception of enjoyment will be higher.

Effect of Ambient Cues on Perceived Efficiency

An inviting ambience of the store can influence the shopping time and effort perceptions of consumers. Environments rich in ambience can induce affective reactions in consumers (Donovan and Rossiter, 1982; Dube and Morin, 1999). Hui et al (1997) state that consumers in their study perceived waiting time to be longer when music was played in the background, however this did not result in consumer dissatisfaction with the service provider. Ambient conditions such as soothing music, pleasantly scented environment, can have a calming effect on the consumers, and can alleviate stress, thus leading to perceptions of low psychic costs (Stratton, 1992).

RH 3c: As the perception of ambient cues becomes more favorable, customers’ perceived efficiency would be higher.
Effect of Ambient Cues on Perceived Visual Appeal

Color and lighting in a store are often manipulated to create the desired visual impact on the consumer (Scott 1993). Accent lightings and warm colors are used to convey an image of high quality. Lower levels of illumination also give an upscale feeling whereas bright lights give a warehouse look to a store (Chain Store Age, 1994 p. 34). Because color and illumination are the visual elements of store ambience, the congruity of these elements with customer preferences will dictate the visual appeal of the environment to the customer.

RH 3d: As the perception of ambient cues becomes more favorable, consumers’ perception of visual appeal will be higher.

Effect of Ambient Cues on Perceived Escapism

Women often use shopping as an escape and a way to buoy their moods, hence the phrase ‘retail therapy’. Retailers are responding to this trend by creating a store environment that is conducive for fun and recreation. Soft music, virtually stimulating displays, opportunities to touch, and taste (where appropriate), game sections, comfortable chairs are all part and parcel of this trend. Restoration Hardware tells stories to establish rapport with customers and create nostalgic cachet around its products. Progressive grocery retailers are combining education with entertainment by offering activities such as wine tasting and cooking classes to make Saturday morning marketing fun.

RH3e: As the perception of ambient cues becomes more favorable, consumers’ perception of escapism will be higher.
The Effects of Customers' Internal Evaluations on Overall Experiential Value

Perception

Experiential value perception of a shopper is a summary judgment of the complete shopping experience. Shopping environments can evoke both cognitive and affective responses in consumers, and such reactions, in turn, influence shopping behaviors and outcomes (Machleit and Eroglu 2000). Additionally, these responses evoked during the shopping experience can provide both task related and/or hedonic benefits to the consumer (Bloch and Richins 1983). As stated earlier, in this study,
overall value is considered from the experiential perspective, which is a reflection of the tangible consequences as well as the hedonic benefits received by the customer.

Perceived Merchandise Quality – Perceived Experiential Value

Prior research has consistently suggested a positive and direct link between product quality and value (Grewal et al 1998; Sirohi et al 1998; Baker et al. 2002). The perception of high product quality is related to high utility received by the consumer from the purchase of the given product. If the perceived merchandise quality is high, the customer will perceive a high return for his/her investment and therefore will include this return in forming an overall experiential value perception.

RH4a: As the perception of merchandise quality becomes more favorable, consumers’ perceived experiential value would be higher.

Perceived Price – Perceived Experiential Value

Price perception is what is given up in terms of monetary prices (Zeithaml 1988). Baker et al (2002) found that monetary price and merchandise quality were salient determinants of perceived value. Monetary price perceptions had a negative effect on value perceptions while merchandise quality had a positive effect on value perceptions. Previous studies examining the effect of monetary price on perceived value also suggest a negative relationship, that is, the higher the price perception, the lower the perceived value (Dodds et al 1991; Grewal et al 1998; Sirohi et al 1998).

RH4b: As the perception of monetary price becomes higher, consumers’ perceived experiential value would be lower.

Perceived Interpersonal Service Quality – Perceived Experiential Value

Zeithaml (1988) states that inferior interpersonal service quality of a store will translate into low value perceptions on the part of the consumer. Interpersonal service quality is an element of service quality perceptions, and includes good treatment, personal attention, high quality service and prompt service to the customers (Baker et al
2001). In a retail setting, if consumers’ perception of the quality of service provided by
the sales force is positive, it will translate into high value perceptions.
RH4c: As the perception of interpersonal service quality becomes more favorable,
consumers’ perceived experiential value would be higher.

Perceived Enjoyment – Perceived Experiential Value

Retail stores are moving away from just massive product display to focusing on
providing customers an entertaining environment. Themed flagship brand stores not only
provide a more engaging experience of the brand’s essence but also satisfy customers that
are looking for entertainment alongside their shopping (Kozinets et al 2002). Retail stores
are providing indoor climbing structures, mountain bike test tracks, internet cafes etc. to
create a more memorable and attractive consumer experience. Consumers who perceive a
shopping experience to be more than a purchase opportunity view that experience to be
appreciated for all its nuances (Mathwick et al 2001). Entertainment value reflects an
appreciation for the entire retail setting, irrespective of a retail environment’s ability to
deliver tangible benefits (Driefus 1997).
RH4d: As the customers’ perception of enjoyment becomes more favorable, perceived
experiential value will be higher.

Perceived Efficiency – Perceived Experiential Value

Consumers consider time and effort as key inputs while deciding upon a shopping
destination. The convenience offered by a store to its customers is a key source of
customer value (Holbrook 1982 p. 45). An ample number of salespeople, self checkout
counters, and small checkout lines, lead to an efficient transaction between buyers and
the seller. On the other hand, crowded shopping environments, waiting for salespeople
for assistance, long checkout cues result in high time and effort costs, and thus low
efficiency. Consumers are likely to have a favorable assessment for the store that they
perceive to be efficient. Consumers’ perception of higher efficiency would result in more
positive experiential value because they gain benefits from saving time and effort.
RH4e: As the customers’ perception of efficiency becomes more favorable, the perceived experiential value will be higher.

Perceived Visual Appeal – Perceived Experiential Value

Visually appealing environments are aesthetically pleasing to a person. Aesthetic value arises from an innate appreciation for the target object (Holbrook 1982 p. 50). Beauty provides immediate pleasure and is valuable in it, without being an intermediate means to some end (Hilliard 1950). In a retail setting, visual appeal of a store can prove to be relaxing and pleasurable to a consumer. Many consumers flock to the malls in the holiday season just to appreciate the festive displays. Extending this thesis to a retail store, it is posited that retail stores that are visually appealing will evoke a positive experiential evaluation from the customers.

RH4f: As the customers’ perception of visual appeal becomes more favorable, the perceived experiential value will be higher.

Perceived Escapism – Perceived Experiential Value

Perceived freedom, fantasy fulfillment, and a sense of escapism may indicate a valuable shopping experience (Babin et al. 1994). Escapism is an aspect of playfulness that allows a customer to temporarily find “a respite from it all”, often involving an element of pretend (Mathwick et al. 2001). Bloch et al. (1986) states that window-shopping is an example of the pretend aspect of escapism in a retail setting. Grandiose, spectacular and entertaining aspects of retailing are becoming increasingly important to the retail stores (Kozinets 2002). As brands become more associated with fantasy oriented lifestyle advertising, the stores that sell these brands are also shifting from functional environments to fantasyland. The richness of store environment (such as that of ESPN Zone Chicago) presents a type of theatrical display meant for enticing and attracting a customer to linger for a longer time.

RH 4g: As the customers’ perception of escapism becomes more favorable, perceived experiential value will be higher.
Figure 7: The effect of customers’ internal evaluations on customer perceived experiential value.
The Effect of Perceived Experiential Value on Customer Response

Perceived value is regarded as the primary driver of purchase intentions and behaviors (Zeithaml 1988; Dodds et al 1991; Baker et al. 2002). However, these studies employ the perceived utilitarian value received from a transaction (e.g. product value) as a measure for customer value. Because the basic tenet of this study is that both utilitarian as well as hedonic benefits form the overall value evaluation of a customer, it is posited that experiential value as perceived by the customer will influence his/her behavioral responses. The behavioral responses include time spent in store, impulse buying, in-store browsing and intention to revisit the store in future. Customers’ positive perception of the value received from a store will lead to positive behavioral response such as spending more time in the store etc. If a customer experiences that the visit to a store was a waste of resources, it will result in negative behavioral responses from the customer. RH 5: As the perception of customers’ overall experiential value becomes high, customers will (a) spend more time in store and (b) will exhibit higher intention to revisit the store in future.

Figure 8: Effect of Perceived Value on Customer Response
The broad question asked in atmospheric research is “How does the store environment influence a customer’s decision to patronize a particular store”? In an effort to provide research based answers, past studies suggest that store environmental cues trigger various cognitive and affective reactions in customers which in turn influence the customers’ patronage intentions. Additionally, the effect of individual environmental elements such as music, color, store design, store employees etc. on patronage intentions have also been investigated. However, while these studies attempt to achieve an understanding of how store atmospherics relate to value perceptions of a consumer, they typically give little attention to the dissimilarities among consumer characteristics in terms of their buying behavior and shopping motivations. Several researchers have noted that customer perceptions of value derived from a retail setting may be moderated by market segment characteristics or shopping goals (Bolton and Drew 1991; Woodruff 1997; Mathwick et al. 2001). Since, value is a subjective assessment of an individual and differs from a person to person, an understanding of the role played by customer characteristics in a retail setting may be necessary before making any generalizations about store atmospherics and value relationship.

Marketing literature has identified various segments among consumers. Consumer taxonomies generated thus far have either focused on demographic variables (Stone 1954; Smith 1956), shopping activities (Wells 1975; Bloch et al. 1994) or consumer motivations (Reynolds et al 2002; Ruiz et al. 2004). Despite the approach undertaken to derive customer segments, all studies have been able to derive stable and meaningful profiles.

Equipped with this knowledge that there are distinct segments of consumers with unique profiles, it is theorized that the contribution of individual environmental features in creating overall value to a customer will be moderated by the customer type. For example, perception of design elements of a store and perception of store employees may
weigh more heavily on the value evaluations of a convenience seeking customer than a recreational shopper who may perceive ambience to be more important than functionality. Furthermore, the contribution of hedonic or utilitarian benefits derived from a shopping trip in the total shopping experience (overall experiential value) may differ based on the shopping motivation of an individual. Therefore, this study attempts to investigate the boundary condition for the relationship between store atmospheres and overall value by testing whether the proposed relationships as hypothesized in the model are equivalent across all customer segments. Testing for invariance of the hypothesized model across customer segments will strengthen the interpretations derived from atmospheric research.

In order to clear the ambiguities regarding the universal application of store atmospheric research concepts, it becomes necessary to test for the generalizability of the corresponding measures. Since theories and measures should not be decoupled (Bagozzi and Philips 1982), it is critical to consider the question whether constructs and measures are equivalent across customer segments. Testing for measurement invariance can also address the question whether empirical similarities or differences (if found) reflect a real phenomenon that may advance theory, or are merely artifacts of measurement instruments. Therefore, following the recommendations of Douglas and Craig (1983 p. 132), this study recognizes and tests for equivalence of the measurement model and equivalence of the structural model across customer segments.

RH6a: The measurement model as hypothesized in the study is equivalent across task-oriented and recreational shoppers.

RH6b: The structural model as hypothesized in the study is equivalent across task-oriented and recreational shoppers.
CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter describes the methodological issues pertinent to empirical testing of the research hypotheses discussed in the previous chapter. First, the research strategy selected to achieve the objective of this empirical study is outlined. Then, measures of the exogenous and endogenous variables are described. Third, the research procedure, including the sample selection method and desired sample size, are delineated.

Research Strategy

McGrath et al. (1982) explore the problems of conducting research in the social sciences. They argue persuasively that each individual method makes trade-offs between the fundamental problems that researchers want to avoid and the problems they are willing to accept. Cook & Campbell (1979) state that, all other things being equal, it is always best to maximize: generalizability with respect to populations, precision in control and measurement of variables related to the behavior of interest and existential realism for the participants and of the context in which behavior is observed. For example, if one uses a controlled laboratory experiment to maximize precision in control and measurement of variables, one risks low generalizability to other populations and lack of realism with respect to the work context.

Researchers have traditionally used lab experiments and simulations for store atmospheric studies. Laboratory experiments are high in internal validity, since this strategy allows the researcher greater control of potential extraneous variables. By reducing the noise of these potential confounding variables, the precision of testing links of interest would increase (Kerlinger 1986). However, experimental research designs are plagued with several problems. A lab setting is an unnatural and foreign environment for the participants. First, their motivation for participating in the experiment is very different
from that of the normal shopper because they are there for the incentive, not a need to shop. This motivational difference has profound effects on the subjects’ behavior, altering the speed at which they move the exercise as well as how they approach the entire exercise. Additionally, the laboratory setting does not effectively replicate the shopping environment, this change is quite disorienting, leading to altered behavior.

Finally, the Hawthorne effect (Adair 1984) runs rampant in these evaluations. The subjects know they are being observed and approach the entire task in a different manner than they normally would. Attention is more focused on the task at hand, changing the entire attitude of the subject from the one that the subject may have displayed during a real purchase situation. Additionally, when subjects interact with experimenters during the evaluation, they often attempt to please the experimenter by conforming to expectations and being overly complimentary. The same problem can impair the experimenter as well, preventing him or her from conducting an objective assessment.

The main goal of this study was to empirically test whether atmospheric factors of a store affect all consumer types in a similar manner, therefore it was vital that the study be conducted in a natural setting and the sample be representative of the population of interest. Since sample surveys offer maximum generalizability and realism, it was chosen as the appropriate method for the purpose of this study.

Sampling Procedure

Prior to conducting the main study, an exploratory study of 250 shoppers was conducted to finalize the hypotheses, refine the questionnaire, and to generally confirm that the proposed theoretical model conforms to the actual shopping experience. A convenience sampling method was undertaken for this task. Senior class students from various departments at a large southern university were recruited to fill out the survey questionnaire in exchange for extra credit.
The survey was divided into four sections. The first section enquired about the purpose of one’s visit to the store. The second section required one’s perception of the atmosphere of the store and the third section asked as to how someone felt being in the store. The fourth section was used for registering additional demographic information of the respondent such as age, gender, educational background, ethnicity, and annual gross income. Completed surveys were collected from the respective class instructors. Surveys were inspected for missing data and respondent error. Data gathered from these surveys were analyzed for scale reliabilities and model fit. The results obtained from the pilot study helped to revise questionnaire and provided confidence in the proposed model.

A sample size of 1000 respondents was targeted for the main study. Snowball sampling method was used to collect the data. Upon obtaining permission from class instructors at the business schools of two universities, students were asked to volunteer their participation in collecting data using a survey instrument. Students were duly assured that non participation in this data collection would not affect their grades in the courses they were enrolled. Each student was given four survey forms to collect data. In order to avoid data from a student sample, students were asked to administer the survey to their parents or relatives or friends and return the surveys to class instructor or the researcher after completion. Surveys were handed out to only those students who consented to participate voluntarily. Each student was briefed about the purpose of the study. In order to guarantee equal representation a quota of 500 was set for male respondents as well as for female respondents.

Measures

The questionnaire was developed in several stages, following the procedure of Fowler (1988), and refined according to methods recommended in the appropriate literature (Bagozzi 1991; Campbell 1960; Churchill 1979). As the first step in questionnaire development, a bank of items suitable for measuring the constructs under study was gathered from the relevant literature. These were framed as five-point Likert-type scales to minimize response time and respondent fatigue. Data from the pilot study were used to refine the instrument. An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to
identify and drop items that did not load significantly on the appropriate factor (<0.40) or cross loaded on more than one factor. Given below is a detailed description of the measures adopted for the constructs under final study:

**Shopping motivation**: Shopping motivation measures the general predisposition of consumers toward the act of shopping. Twenty statements measured six attitudes towards shopping: Adventure shopping (4 items)- referred to shopping for stimulation, adventure, and the feeling of being in another world; Gratification shopping (3 items)- involved shopping for stress relief, shopping to alleviate a negative mood, and shopping as a special treat to oneself; Convenience shopping (4 items)- involved shopping to save time and effort; Idea shopping (4 items)- referred to shopping to keep up with trends and new fashions, as well as to see new products and innovations; and Social shopping (5 items)- referred to the enjoyment of shopping with friends and family, socializing while shopping, and bonding with others while shopping. Among these items, nine items capturing convenience shopping and social shopping were adopted from Westbrook and Black (1985), and the rest of the items were adopted from Arnold and Reynolds (2003). Some of the items were rephrased to increase their face validity. A five point Likert scale was used to rate each item where 1 represented ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 represented ‘strongly agree’.

**Store Atmospherics**: The store atmospherics measures are based on Baker’s (1986) three dimension conceptualization of the service environment. Items for all three dimensions: social, design, and ambient, were adapted from Baker et al (1994), and were changed to a five point Likert scale format where 1 represented “strongly disagree” and 5 represented “strongly agree”. Three separate atmospheric scales were utilized based on the distinct elements captured in each scale. The ambiance scale ($\alpha = .86$) covered in-store lighting and music. Four items were used to measure ambiance of the store. Six itemed design scale ($\alpha = .82$) covered items related to store layout and store functionality cues such as signage, aisle space, and the ease of finding merchandise, as well as merchandise layout and location. The social cues were measured using a four item social environment scale ($\alpha = .88$), which encompassed items pertaining to the knowledge, dress
and friendliness of employees as well as the friendliness of other customers within the shopping environment.

*Interpersonal Service Quality:* Baker et. al (2002) labels interpersonal service quality as the quality of interaction between store employees and customers in a retail setting. Interpersonal service quality is said to be a part of overall service quality offered by a retail store. In accordance with Baker et al (2002), four items were used to capture interpersonal service quality and were rated on a five point Likert scale where 1 represented ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 represents ‘strongly agree’. An example is “It would be realistic to expect prompt service from the employees of this store”. The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale is .84.

*Merchandise Quality:* Merchandise quality was operationalized by adapting perceived product quality indicators as developed by Dodds et al. (1991). The three items measuring perceived merchandise quality were rated on a five point Likert scale where 1 represented ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 represented ‘strongly agree’. An example is “The products purchased at this store are of good quality”. The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale is .92.

*Perceived Merchandise Price:* Merchandise price perceptions were measured by three items as developed by Dodds et al. (1991). All the three items were rated on a five point Likert scale where 1 represented ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 represented ‘strongly agree’. An example is “The prices of the product(s) in this store are right, given the quality of the merchandise”. The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale is 0.92.

*Perceived Efficiency:* In this study, efficiency is akin to convenience. It is associated with the time and effort that one spends while shopping at a particular store. Baker et al. (2002) identified time and effort as shopping experience costs. The time and effort cost construct captures consumers’ perception of the time and effort they are likely to expend shopping at a store. In describing efficiency in an e-tailing context, many researchers have identified several dimensions: less search effort, convenience, and effectiveness (Childers et al. 2001, Mathwick et al. 2001, Szymanski and Hise 2000).
Measures from these studies were adapted for capturing perceived efficiency in a physical retail store. Considering the dimensions mentioned in these studies, four items using five-point Likert scales were developed to measure one’s efficiency perception for a retail store. An example of the items used is “Shopping from this store is an efficient way to manage my time”. The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale is .85.

Perceived Visual Appeal: Perceived visual appeal was measured using a three item scale, adopted from Mathwick et al. (2001). The three items captured the store’s visual appeal on a five-point Likert scale where 1 represented ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 represented ‘strongly agree’. An example is “The way this store displays its product is attractive”. The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale is .91.

Perceived Enjoyment: Respondents’ perceptions of enjoyment in the store were measured using a three-item scale, adapted from Mathwick et al. (2001). The items were rated on a five-point Likert scale where 1 represented ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 represented ‘strongly agree’. An example is “This store doesn’t just sell products, it entertains me”. The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale is .85.

Perceived Escapism: Respondents’ perceived escapism was measured by a three-item scale, adapted from Mathwick et al. (2001). The items were rated on a five-point Likert scale where 1 represented ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 represented ‘strongly agree’. An example is “I get so involved when I shop at this store that I forget everything”. The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale is .86.

Overall Shopping Value: Overall shopping value was measured by using a four item scale, adapted from Babin et al. (1994). The scale captured both utilitarian and hedonic dimensions of value. Each item was rated on a five-point Likert scale where 1 represented ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 represented ‘strongly agree’. An example is “Shopping at this store was truly a joy.” The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale is .90.

Consumer Response: Time spent in store and future purchase intentions were used as consumer response variables in the study. Repurchase intentions of the respondents were measured by two items rated on a five-point Likert-type scale where 1
represented ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 represented ‘strongly agree’. The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale is .78. Time spent in store was measured by three items rated on a five-point Likert scale where 1 represented ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 represented ‘strongly agree’. The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale is .84.

Table 1: Theoretical Foundations for Questionnaire Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Store Atmospherics</td>
<td>Social Design Ambience</td>
<td>Baker et al. (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Service</td>
<td>Prompt service Respectful Personal attention Well dressed employees</td>
<td>Baker et al (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Perceptions</td>
<td>Product quality Durability Dependability</td>
<td>Dodds et al. (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapism Perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathwick et al. (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Shopping Value</td>
<td>Hedonic Utilitarian</td>
<td>Babin et al. (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent</td>
<td>Propensity to stay longer</td>
<td>Baker et al. (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repatronage Intentions</td>
<td>Likelihood to revisit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ethical Issues

Since the study required use of human subjects, the research process needed to be reviewed and approved by the human subjects committee at the Office for Research, in accordance with university policy. The nature of this study is qualified to be exempt from the DHHS regulations. The Office of Research approved the research procedure implemented in this study and issued Assurance # IRB00000446. According to university policy, subjects participated in this study voluntarily. The study didn’t place subjects in any physical harm, discomfort or unpleasant situations. The data collected from the respondents were kept confidential and were only used as aggregate data.
CHAPTER 5

ANALYSES AND RESULTS

Missing Data

Out of 1000 surveys, 815 completed surveys were returned. The returned surveys were checked for missing data and response bias. 718 surveys were found usable for data analysis. Cold deck imputation method as proposed by Hair et al (1998) was used for missing data. Cold deck imputation allows researchers to replace missing data with a value that is deemed more valid than the mean of the sample. In this study the perceptions of the atmospheric variables were measured based on the respondent’s inferences after the visit to the retail store. In some instances respondents may not have been able to form opinions due to their inability to remember the particular environmental cue. For example, a respondent may have left the question blank which enquires about the customer’s fondness for the music played in the store because he/she could not remember what type of music was being played during the visit. Therefore imputation of the mid point (value=3) on a 5-point scale should provide better data than the mean value of the construct. After the data were cleaned, reliabilities of the scales were computed in order to check for the consistency of the measurement instruments.

Measurement Model

The measurement model analysis was conducted using a completely standardized solution produced by LISREL 8.3 maximum likelihood estimation method (Jöreskog and Sörbom 1993). The analysis revealed an acceptable fit to the data, based on fit criterion (>-.9) as outlined by Bentler and Bonnett (1980) for NNFI, CFI, and DELTA2 index and the relative noncentrality index (RNI), as recommended by Gerbing and Anderson (1992) as well as a cutoff criterion (<-.08) as suggested by Steiger and Lind (1980) for RMSEA. All of the estimates were well below the recommended threshold or below the cutoff
criterion. Although the chi-square statistic was significant, this statistic is known for its sensitivity to sample size and as a result greater emphasis was placed on additional fit indices (Marsh, Balla and McDonald 1998, Anderson and Gerbing 1984). Table 2 summarizes the results for the CFA analysis as well as reliabilities for the adopted scales.

**Structural Model**

The structural model presented in Figure 3 was tested using structural equation modeling (SEM). In order to examine model fit, the $\chi^2$, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), goodness of fit index (GFI), normed-goodness-of-fit index (NFI), and comparative fit index (CFI) were used. $\chi^2$ illustrates the degree to which discrepancies between the model and the data are due only to sampling variation not model misspecification. RMSEA approximates the amount of error present in the model. GFI indicates how well the covariance matrix estimated by the hypothesized model reproduces the observed covariance matrix (James, Muliak and Brett 1982). The NFI was used because it provides a measure of the proportion of total covariance accounted for by the model (Bentler and Bonett 1980). Finally, CFI which is an improved version of NFI accounts for population parameters.

Once the model was established, subgroup analyses were conducted to test the moderating effects of shopping orientation. The test followed the procedure outlined by Bollen (1989), and Jöreskog and Sörbom (1993). First, the sample was separated into groups based on the measures for shopping orientation. Due to the limitations of sample size the goal was to separate shoppers into two groups—recreational shoppers and non-recreational shoppers. A K-mean cluster analysis (MacQueen, 1967) was run with the number of groups fixed at two. Based on the final cluster solution the group membership for an individual shopper was established. Next, a multiple group structural equation modeling technique was used for between-group model comparison to examine model equivalence across the identified groups.
Table 2. Measurement Model Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lambda loading</th>
<th>Construct reliability</th>
<th>Variance extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Cues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteous</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well dressed</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Cues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical location of products</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy navigation of store</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient open space</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful in-store signage</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate display of information</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive interiors</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ambient Cues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting was pleasing</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting accentuated the products</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music fit the image of store</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music was pleasing</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Service Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees were helpful</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promptly respond to requests</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic to expect good service</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees do their job well</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Price Perceptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy with the prices</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right given the quality</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merchandise quality perceptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High workmanship</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependable product quality</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durability</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual appeal perceptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive product display</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetically pleasing</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the way the store looks</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enjoyment Perceptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertaining</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just doesn’t sell but entertains</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the constructs under study are provided in Table 3. As expected, store atmosphere variables were consistently related to the customers’ internal evaluation measures and overall value evaluation.
Table 3. Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>.582**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambience</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.572**</td>
<td>.618**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal SQ</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.701**</td>
<td>.609**</td>
<td>.538**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.304**</td>
<td>.329**</td>
<td>.228**</td>
<td>.361**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise quality</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>.479**</td>
<td>.464**</td>
<td>.481**</td>
<td>.591**</td>
<td>.461**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual appeal</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>.478**</td>
<td>.535**</td>
<td>.715**</td>
<td>.525**</td>
<td>.132**</td>
<td>.460**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>.365**</td>
<td>.327**</td>
<td>.521**</td>
<td>.365**</td>
<td>.211**</td>
<td>.267**</td>
<td>.531**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>.197**</td>
<td>.143**</td>
<td>.349**</td>
<td>.241**</td>
<td>.199**</td>
<td>.182**</td>
<td>.346**</td>
<td>.654**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>.218**</td>
<td>.206**</td>
<td>.292**</td>
<td>.316**</td>
<td>.417**</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>.249**</td>
<td>.364**</td>
<td>.470**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>.476**</td>
<td>.547**</td>
<td>.517**</td>
<td>.599**</td>
<td>.488**</td>
<td>.542**</td>
<td>.511**</td>
<td>.418**</td>
<td>.356**</td>
<td>.544**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repurchase intent</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.328**</td>
<td>.424**</td>
<td>.408**</td>
<td>.420**</td>
<td>.496**</td>
<td>.401**</td>
<td>.285**</td>
<td>.182**</td>
<td>.413**</td>
<td>.707**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.158**</td>
<td>.254**</td>
<td>.363**</td>
<td>.208**</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>.369**</td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td>.465**</td>
<td>.455**</td>
<td>.425**</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

N=718

The Hypothesized Model

The \( \chi^2 \) value and fit statistics produced by LISREL 8.3 estimation of the model suggested the model fit the data well. The \( \chi^2 \) value (\( \chi^2 (909) = 3293, p<.002 \)) was significant; however, this is most likely attributable to the large sample size. The larger the sample size, the more likely the rejection of the model and the more likely Type II error. In very large samples, even tiny differences between the observed model and the perfect-fit model may be found significant.

Examination of the fit indices revealed that they were all above the suggested 0.90 cutoff, providing evidence that the model fit the data well (GFI=0.95; CFI=0.94, NFI=0.92). Furthermore, the model showed an acceptable level of error (RMSEA =.060)
which suggests a good model fit (Hu and Bentler 1999). With respect to the predicted path, 19 out of 23 paths (82%) were significant. The completely standardized loadings are presented in Figure 9.

With respect to the non significant paths, design factors did not relate to the perception of merchandise quality and visual appeal. Social factors did not significantly predict perceived enjoyment and efficiency. With respect to overall value evaluations, perceived escapism was the only non-significant predictor. The model explained an acceptable level of variance. Sixty nine percent of the variance in interpersonal service quality, 22% of the variance in perceived price, 50% variance in perceived merchandise quality, 72% of the variance in visual appeal, 70% of the variance in perceived enjoyment, 28% variance in perceived escapism, 68% of the variance in perceived efficiency, and 86% of the variation in perceived overall value was explained by the variables in the model.
Figure 9 Standardized Loadings for the parameter estimates.
Presented below is a discussion of individual hypotheses:

Research Hypotheses 1a-1d: Effect of Social Cues

The purpose of hypothesis 1a was to evaluate the effect of social cues on customer’s perception of interpersonal service quality in a store. The results show support for the stated relationship ($\beta = 0.57, t=9.09$). The positive effect of social cues on perceived prices ($\beta = 0.23, t=3.99$) lends support to hypothesis 1b. Hypothesis 1c proposed that customers perceive higher merchandise quality if the social cues in a store are perceived to be favorable. This relationship is supported in this study ($\beta = 0.30, t=5.00$). Surprisingly, the effect of favorable perceptions of social cues on perceived efficiency in a store, as posited by hypothesis 1d, does not find any support. It appears that the friendliness and good dressing sense of store employees is not perceived as an indication of efficient service in a store. It is also likely that customers base their judgment about efficient service on many factors including store employees.

Research Hypothesis 2a-2e: Effect of Store Design Cues

This section of hypotheses was related to the role of physical appearance of the store in forming a customer’s perception of interpersonal service quality, perceived price, merchandise quality, efficiency and visual appeal. The results lends support to hypothesis 2a that suggested that if a customer perceive the design of a store to be favorable, he/she will infer high interpersonal quality ($\beta=0.38, t=2.54$). Design cues were also found to affect customer’s perception of prices in a store. For stores that were rated higher on store design, the prices were also perceived to be higher ($\beta=0.41, t=5.91$). Thus hypothesis 2b was supported. The effect of store design on merchandise quality (hypothesis 2c) did not find support. However, it was found that favorable design of a store does facilitate efficiency for the customer. It is logical that store design and store layout should be geared towards customer convenience and ease. Hypothesis 2d positing such relationship was supported ($0.25, t=4.28$). It was theorized that store design should not only furnish functional goals but should also add to the aesthetics of a store. Absence of support for
hypothesis 2e nullified this statement. It is possible that customers expect the store layout and design to exude functionality and not frills.

Research Hypotheses 3a-3e: Effect of Ambient Cues

Ambient cues are the sensory cues in a store. Music and light are the two components of ambiance considered in this study. The hypotheses presented in this section relates to the combined effect of music and light and not individual cues. Hypothesis 3a stated a positive relationship between favorable perceptions of ambient cues and merchandise price. Interestingly, results show a negative relationship (β = -0.24, t=-4.04) which is not in accordance to the results found in earlier studies. Since price perceptions of the shoppers were recorded after the completion of the shopping task, an explanation for the reversal of direction can be that the customer may have formed high price perceptions as they entered the store based on ambient atmosphere, but once they checked the actual prices they found them to be reasonable.

The relationship between ambient cues and perceived efficiency as stated in hypothesis 3b was supported (β=0.41, t= 9.51). A strong support for hypothesis 3c was also present in the study (β=0.80, t=13.25). This signifies that lighting in the store can strongly contribute to the visual appeal of the store. Sensory elements in a store environment are more apt to stimulate customers than non-sensory cues. It was found that as customer’s perception of ambient cues in a store became more favorable, customers’ perceived enjoyment was also higher. Therefore hypothesis 3d was also supported (β=0.32, t=6.56). Hypothesis 3e was related to the effect of ambient cues on customer’s evaluation of degree of escape an environment offers. Results portrayed a significant relationship between the two constructs (β = 0.46, t=7.61).
Hypothesis 4a-4g Effects of Customers’ Internal Evaluations on Overall Experiential Value

Shopping environment can evoke both cognitive and affective responses in consumers. This set of hypotheses relates to how such internal responses contribute towards the summary judgment of value accrued from the shopping trip. Results for hypothesis 4a suggested that customers perceived overall value was higher when the store’s interpersonal quality was superior ($\beta=0.15, t=3.44$). Similar support is found for hypothesis 4b that posited a positive linkage between merchandise quality and overall value perceptions ($\beta=0.17, t=4.49$). Hypothesis 4c stated that customers will perceive low overall value if the prices in a store are perceived to be high. This was also found to be true in this study ($\beta=-0.11, t=-3.36$), customers value evaluations were lower when the price perceptions were unfavorable.

Significant support was found for hypothesis 4d, which measures the effect of perceived efficiency on overall value judgment ($\beta=0.33, t=8.73$). Since efficiency reduces the time and effort costs of a customer, higher efficiency will surely contribute to positive value creation for the customer. A positive relationship was also found between favorable perceptions of visual appeal and high overall value ($\beta=0.20, t=5.19$). Thus lending support to the notion that pleasant visual elements of a store contribute to positive value perceptions for the customers. The main tenet of hypothesis 4f was that customers are not satisfied by price bargains alone and look for enjoyment as well in a shopping trip. The results showed that perceived enjoyment is positively related to overall value judgments of a customer ($\beta=0.19, t=3.41$). The relationship between perceived escapism and overall experiential value was not supported.

Hypotheses 5a and 5b: Customer Responses

Repurchase intentions and time spent in store were the two outcome measures in the study. It was theorized that if a customer evaluates the experience in a store to be valuable, he/she is more likely to spend greater amount of time in store (hypothesis 6a) and is likely to come again to make a purchase (hypothesis 6b). Both these linkages
between overall experiential value and customer outcomes were supported. The
relationship between value and time spent in store (\( \beta = 0.86, t = 9.62 \)) as well as between
value and repurchase intentions (\( \beta = 0.55, t = 7.92 \)) were significant.

Differences in Shopping Orientation

Analysis of Shopping Motivations: The first step in the analysis was to find out
whether the survey instrument captured all the five dimensions of the consumers’
shopping motivations. Principal component analysis with varimax rotation was
performed on the twenty items that were expected to measure the five dimensions. The
analysis was able to capture all five targeted dimensions with eigen value greater than 1,
explaining 67% of cumulative variance. Three items capturing social shopping were
below the .40 cutoff criterion and thus eliminated. Table 4 illustrates the loadings of the
seventeen items and Cronbach’s alphas for the five components.

Table 4: Principal Component Analysis of the Shopping Motivation Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Adventure Shopping</th>
<th>Gratification Shopping</th>
<th>Convenience shopping</th>
<th>Idea shopping</th>
<th>Social shopping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interior design usually attracts my attention</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice colors and texture</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice things that other people pass by</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually pay less attention to architecture of stores</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I’m bored I usually go shopping</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loose track of time when I’m in a store</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time seems to fly by when I’m shopping</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I leave the mall I’m surprised to see its dark</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing new products is a waste of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing interests me to browse in a store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing new stores is a waste of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I only visit a store to buy what I’m looking for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learn a lot by visiting the mall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider visit to the mall to be a learning experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping malls are a good place to find what is new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually feel friendly and talkative to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy going to the mall with my friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually avoid talking to others in the mall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reversed items were recoded before the principle component analysis
The items were summated to represent respective shopping motivations. These factors were used as the clustering variables to separate respondents into two groups using K-mean cluster analysis. The first group (431 respondents) consists of respondents that view shopping as a recreational activity, whereas the second group (283 respondents) constitutes task oriented shoppers. The final cluster centers for the groups on the input variables are presented in Table 5. Once the groups were established, both within-and between-group tests were conducted for measurement and structural equivalence. The findings for within and between group analysis are discussed in the following sections.

Table 5: K-mean results for final cluster centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Recreational shoppers</th>
<th>Task-oriented shoppers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adventure shopping</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratification shopping</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience shopping</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea shopping</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurement Equivalence across Groups

To test whether the factor structure of the scale is consistent across the two groups, diagnostic procedures laid by Jöreskog and Sörbom (1989) were followed. It was assumed that \( x = \Lambda_x \xi + \delta \) holds for both the groups, where \( x \) refers to the input variables, \( \Lambda \) matrix specifies the coefficient of regression of the input variables on their corresponding latent construct \( \xi \), \( \delta \) vector refers to the measurement error term. Bollen (1989) suggests a hierarchy of equivalence that can be assessed along three dimensions: model form, factorial equivalence, and equality of error variances. The first level of equivalence examines whether variable \( x \) loads on the same number of factors in the two groups. The hypothesis that is tested is that there are same numbers of correlated common factors in both groups. Once the equivalence in model form is established,
second level of factorial equivalence can be assessed by testing whether the loadings (λ) linking the latent variables ξ to the observed variables x are the same in both the shopping groups. Finally, if factorial equivalence is achieved one can test for the third and the higher form of equivalence which relates to the equality of measurement error invariance between the two groups.

Thus the hypothesized model for the two groups is defined by the parameter matrices

\[
\Lambda_x^{(g)}, \Phi^{(g)}, \Theta^{(g)}
\]

Where superscript g refers to the g\textsuperscript{th} shopping group, g = 1, 2, …, G. For the two samples under study we have

\[
\Lambda^{\text{recreational shoppers}}, \Lambda^{\text{task oriented shoppers}}
\]

\[
\Phi^{\text{recreational shoppers}}, \Phi^{\text{task oriented shoppers}}
\]

\[
\Theta^{\text{recreational shoppers}}, \Theta^{\text{task oriented shoppers}}
\]

Using LISREL procedures, parameter in the above mentioned matrices can be set as fixed, free or constrained. If no constraints are set than LISREL estimates unique values for the groups. However, by setting constraints one can test any form of invariance across the two groups. Relative fit of the three constrained models can be tested by using Δχ^2. Relative fit is a preferred measure of fit as it captures only the difference based on the added constraint for each subsequent test (Bentler and Bonett, 1980; Anderson and Gerbing, 1988).

A multi-group confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to test for the same form equivalence. There was no equality constraints imposed for this problem. The model only stated that the number of factors is the same across both the shopping groups. \( \chi^2 \)
and other fit indices were used as the measure of the overall fit of the model in both groups. The overall value of the $\chi^2$ is the sum of $\chi^2$ that would be obtained if both the groups were analyzed separately. An analysis of the path loadings signified that all items loaded significantly on the same latent constructs for both the groups. Though the chi-square was significant, all the fit statistics and RMSEA were within the acceptable range. Thereupon a constrained model was run to test if the coefficients linking the latent variables to the observed indicators are the same in both the groups. The model specifications were the same, except for the constraint of $\Lambda$ as invariant. The program estimates path coefficients for the first group and then forces these values on the other group. A chi-square difference test between the unconstrained and constrained model was conducted. The chi-square difference test was found to be significant, suggesting that the item loadings on each factor are not equivalent across both groups. The procedure was stopped at this stage since it was deemed redundant to test for error invariance across the two samples. The results of the analyses are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Results of testing for metric equivalence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Equivalence</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same Form</td>
<td>3115</td>
<td>1411</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factorial</td>
<td>3199</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$ difference (constrained-unconstrained)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Structural Equivalence across Groups

An examination of the within-group fit indices revealed that the structural model fit well for both groups. However, the significant between group \(\chi^2_{\text{diff}}(117) = 338, p < 0.01\) and the lower fit statistics for the constrained model compared to the unconstrained model suggested that individual parameter estimates varied across the two groups. Group comparisons are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Group Comparisons and Parameter Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Comparisons</th>
<th>(\chi^2)</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Goodness of Fit index</th>
<th>Comparative Fit Index</th>
<th>Root Mean Square Error of Approximation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Shoppers (within-group n=431)</td>
<td>2942</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Oriented Shoppers (within group n= 283)</td>
<td>2418</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconstrained between group</td>
<td>4943</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained between group</td>
<td>5281</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\chi^2) difference (constrained-unconstrained)</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine which parameter estimates differed across the two groups, the modification indices for each of the twenty seven between group constraints were examined. The standardized parameter estimates for both groups are presented in Table 8. The between-group analysis indicated that whereas social cues affect the perceptions of interpersonal service quality, price, and merchandise quality in both the groups, they affect perceptions of efficiency only for task oriented shoppers. The ambience of the store that included music and lighting contributed positively to price perceptions, visual appeal, enjoyment and escapism for both the groups; however had no effect on the shoppers’ perception of interpersonal service quality and merchandise quality.
Table 8: Standardized Parameter Estimates for Recreational and Task Oriented Shoppers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Recreational Shoppers</th>
<th>Task-Oriented Shoppers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social ➔ Perceived Interpersonal service quality</td>
<td>.62 (7.97)</td>
<td>.42 (5.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design ➔ Perceived Interpersonal service quality</td>
<td>.23 (3.29)</td>
<td>-.37 (-2.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social ➔ Perceived Price</td>
<td>.15 (2.08)</td>
<td>.23 (5.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambience ➔ Perceived Price</td>
<td>.43 (4.83)</td>
<td>.44 (3.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design ➔ Perceived Price</td>
<td>.69 (6.50)</td>
<td>-.49 (-3.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social ➔ Perceived Merchandise quality</td>
<td>.36 (5.52)</td>
<td>.28 (5.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design ➔ Perceived Merchandise quality</td>
<td>.41 (5.12)</td>
<td>-.74 (-4.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambience ➔ Perceived Visual appeal</td>
<td>.78 (9.82)</td>
<td>.70 (8.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design ➔ Perceived Visual appeal</td>
<td>.64 (2.29)</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambience ➔ Perceived enjoyment</td>
<td>.61 (7.77)</td>
<td>.55 (5.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambience ➔ Perceived escapism</td>
<td>.40 (4.91)</td>
<td>.53 (6.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social ➔ Perceived efficiency</td>
<td>.45 (5.55)</td>
<td>-.44 (-3.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design ➔ Perceived efficiency</td>
<td>.32 (2.30)</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Interpersonal service quality ➔ Value</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.23 (2.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived price ➔ Value</td>
<td>.14 (3.50)</td>
<td>.13 (2.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Merchandise quality ➔ Value</td>
<td>.21 (4.24)</td>
<td>.13 (1.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived visual appeal ➔ Value</td>
<td>.36 (6.10)</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived enjoyment ➔ Value</td>
<td>.28 (2.60)</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived escapism ➔ Value</td>
<td>.11 (2.57)</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived efficiency ➔ Value</td>
<td>.34 (7.25)</td>
<td>.39 (6.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value ➔ Repurchase intent</td>
<td>.78 (8.56)</td>
<td>.81 (7.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value ➔ Time spent in store</td>
<td>.85 (7.72)</td>
<td>.76 (5.79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: t-values for respective paths are presented in the parentheses

Interestingly, the path loadings for design cues on all customer evaluation variables (namely perceived interpersonal quality, perceived price, perceived merchandise quality, perceived enjoyment, perceived visual appeal and perceived escapism) were negative for task oriented shoppers and positive for recreational shoppers. Therefore, it appears that task oriented shoppers found store layout and store functionality features dissatisfactory.
to their standards since they are not motivated by the aesthetics but the functionality component of design.

The results also indicate that overall value perceptions are based on different factors for recreational shoppers and task oriented shoppers. For recreational shoppers, the overall value perception was based on price, merchandise quality, visual appeal, enjoyment, escapism, and efficiency. This signifies that recreational shoppers base their value judgments on both utilitarian and hedonic outcomes of a shopping episode. On the contrary, task oriented shoppers rely heavily on utilitarian outcomes such as interpersonal service quality, price, merchandise quality and efficiency to form a perception of overall value from a shopping trip.
CHAPTER 6
Discussion, Limitations, and Directions for Future Research

Discussion

During the course of this study, two theoretical models have been continuously mentioned- the S-O-R model and Value model. The results of this study helps in aligning these two distinct concepts. In brief, the S-O-R model suggests that the environment of a store leads to certain cognitive and affective evaluations in the mind of the consumer, and these evaluations predict the consumer’s response to approach or avoid the particular store in future. The main question that was put forth in this study was as to which particular evaluations a customer is likely to make while being in a store? Which particular evaluations weigh heavily on customer’s response? And what is the effect of the store environment on such evaluations?

One possible way to gain understanding of consumer shopping behavior is to look through the lenses of customer value as stated by the means-ends theory of value. The theory postulates that customers are driven by their personal goals, they seek consequences that further these goals and in turn choose attributes that result in these consequences (Huber et al 2001). Additionally, although the consumption experience may result in both desired and undesired consequences, it is only the resultant desired consequences that will direct the customer to select a particular behavior in future, for example should the customer visit the same store again or not?

In this study, shopping motivation was chosen as a proxy for personal goals. The impact of store environmental attributes was measured on seven different evaluations customers may make in a retail store. Additionally, the customers’ responses on the amount of time they spent in store and their future purchase intentions were measured. The results suggest that store environmental attributes do not impact all customer types in a similar manner. Additionally, the importance of shopping outcomes in the formation of
overall value judgment differs across recreational and task oriented shoppers. It makes intuitive sense because if an individual’s goal is to find recreational fulfillment through shopping, than stores that can contribute to such consequences that fulfill the recreational goals will be deemed as providing value. On the other hand if an individual is motivated by utilitarian goals, then the stores that provide positive consequences related to utilitarian benefits will be seen as providing value.

Though shoppers may evaluate a store for various outcomes, the importance of each outcome in the value equation may vary for individual shoppers. This point is well supported by the results of this study. Whereas, overall experiential value for recreational shoppers consisted of both hedonic and utilitarian outcomes, for the task-oriented shoppers only utilitarian outcomes lead to the perceptions of experiential value. This means that even if the store has a great ambience and is visually appealing, these attributes are of no consequence to a task-oriented shopper if they do not lead to the desired consequences.

Interestingly, perceptions of recreational shoppers for interpersonal service quality, price fairness, merchandise quality and efficiency of the store were favorable if they liked the design of the store. However, the same was not true for the task-oriented shoppers. Task –oriented shoppers did not display a positive evaluation for interpersonal service quality, price, merchandise quality and efficiency for a store if they perceived the design in a store to be good.. Since researchers have not previously examined the effect of store atmospheric variables in diverse customer segments, it is rather interesting to see evidence that store atmospheric may not affect all customer types in a similar manner. A possible explanation for design elements to show an opposite effect on outcome variables among these two shopper segments may be that in spite of the retailers’ efforts to make store layout and functional design components to be aesthetically pleasing to the eye, the design elements of the store are not meeting the expectations of the consumers who seek efficiency, are solution driven or looking for speedy replenishment. Perhaps the interpretation of design for task-oriented shoppers is different than that of recreational shoppers. In other words this poses a question for construct equivalence of store design as
measured in atmospheric research. Construct equivalence exists when individuals interpret concepts or behaviors similarly across groups. According to the results of the studies, it is possible that recreational shoppers and task-oriented shoppers have different interpretations or definitions of store design.

The implication of these results is quite significant for decisions related to shopping environment in a retail store. If a retailer wishes to create a store environment that can deliver a valuable shopping experience, then an understanding of customers’ motivations is important. This is in tune with the main paradigm of marketing that states that the offering of the marketer should be tailored towards the segment it wishes to target.

The store environment research should also focus on creating environments that are tailored towards the targeted customer segment. For example, if the customer is looking for completing the shopping task in an efficient and timely manner, then the environment of the store should be conducive towards accomplishing such goals. On the other hand, if the customer is seeking recreational benefits from shopping, the store environment should amply contribute towards such outcomes. However, it is becoming difficult for retailers to align their offerings with customer needs due to the complexity in buying patterns emerging among shoppers. Each consumer is exhibiting differing characteristics depending upon particular purchase occasion or shopping motivation. Moreover, each consumer makes distinct value judgments with each new purchase occasion. Responding to the multi-dimensional consumer mindset requires a different approach to retail mix decisions in-order to create multiple formats with distinct kinds of appeals. Academicians and practitioners alike need to find ways to carefully engineer a particular shopping experience and communicate this experience in the market by explicitly presenting consumers with a coherent series of visual and experiential clues emitted by the physical environment. By clueing in customers, retailers will help customers in determining whether or not a particular shopping experience is consistent with their needs and expectations. An understanding of the distinct experiences sought by
the customers on particular shopping experiences is paramount in creating valuable store atmospherics.

Limitations of the Study and Future Research Directions

This study represents an exploratory attempt to gauge if store environmental cues assist in value creation across two different customer segments in a uniform manner. As with any exploratory research, the findings of this study are to be accepted with several limitations. Since limitations of a study can be viewed as directions for future research in the field, it is pertinent to list limitations and future research opportunities simultaneously.

The first limitation is that shopping motivation in this study captures the general predisposition of respondents towards the act of shopping. It is likely that individuals display different shopping orientations on varying occasions.

The second limitation of the study is that the store environmental factors were grouped under ambiance, social and design cues prior to testing the model. This technique captures the aggregate effect of the three store environmental dimensions on the endogenous variables and thereby fails to identify the effect of an individual element of store environment such as music. Future research can attempt to break down the effect of each element on customers’ value perceptions.

The seven factors representing customers’ internal evaluations are not exhaustive. This points to the third limitation of the study. For example, enjoyment and entertainment are listed as two separate hedonic benefits that customers seek during shopping. Due to low discriminant validity found in this study between these two separate constructs; entertainment was dropped from the model. A representation of additional dimensions, which form customer evaluations, may be sought in the model for future research.
The fourth limitation of this study is the non-probability sampling technique used to collect data from the respondents. Usage of a non-probability sample compromises the external validity of a study to a large extent. Therefore it is advisable to repeat this study with a probability sampling technique.

The fifth limitation of the study is that only seven different types of customers’ internal evaluations are studied. There are many more judgments customers may form while in the store. Future research should broaden the scope in order to encompass a wider range of customers’ internal evaluations.

The sixth limitation of the study is that respondents were not told about the type of store they should visit. Since respondents picked the shopping stores themselves, it is likely that some stores were rich in atmospheric variables, whereas others were not. This may lead to some unexplained variance in the model.

Despite the fact that research on store environment has been conducted for approximately a decade and a half, this area of research still holds ample opportunities for eager researchers. The availability of cutting edge technology to retailers is changing both the operations and the environment of a store. Centralized checkout stations, availability of wireless network infrastructure, self-checkout terminals, kiosks, and radio frequency identification tags or other biometric devices are being increasingly used, giving a whole new meaning to store layout and functionality, design and social environment of a store. This requires a close inspection of the available scale to determine content validity in the light of developments occurring in the retail world. It also appears to be vital that researchers develop a deeper understanding of experiential retailing. One way to achieve this objective is to determine the types of experiences which customers wish to achieve while shopping. If we can define and identify types of experiences, we’ll be able to segment customers based on such typology. This can provide retailers with a unique tool to better target and position their offering in the market.
APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTIONS
AND
PAPER AND PENCIL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PILOT STUDY
Store Atmospherics Survey

Informed Consent Form

I HAVE BEEN INFORMED THAT:

1. Ms. Renu Singh, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Marketing, College of Business, Florida State University, has requested my participation in a research study at this institution.

2. The purpose of the research is to investigate consumer behavior phenomenon regarding in-store purchases. The goal of this survey is to gain new insight into how customers evaluate the in-store atmosphere of retail facilities. Approximately 800 subjects are being recruited to participate in this study. I have been asked to participate in this study purely by chance.

3. My participation will involve completing a survey that consists of four sections. The first section enquires about the purpose of my visit to a retail store. The second section requires my perception of the atmosphere of the store and the third section asks as to how I felt being in the store. The fourth section asks additional information about me to help the researcher understand how different people respond to the survey items. It will take approximately 20 minutes to complete this survey.

4. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts if I agree to participate in the study.

5. Although there may be no direct benefits to me, the possible benefits of my participation in this research study are that I will become more aware of my shopping behavior and I will be able to contribute to understanding more about consumer behavior phenomenon.

6. The results of this research study may be published but my name or identity will be revealed only to the extent allowable by law. The researcher will do the following to maintain confidentiality of my records; Renu Singh will not collect names or any personal identifying information from these survey instruments. The instrument will only collect general information about age, gender, and race and income status. This information cannot directly link me to my responses. The survey instruments themselves will be destroyed after the data is entered for analysis.

7. I will not be paid for this participation.

8. Any questions I have concerning the research study or my participation in it, before or after my consent, will be answered by Renu Singh, Department of Marketing, College of Business, Florida State University, (850) 766-3353, rrs8627@garnet.acns.fsu.edu or Prof. Michael Brusco, College of Business, (850) 644-6512, email mbrusco@cob.fsu.edu

9. If I have questions about my rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if I feel I have been placed at risk, I can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board, through the Office of the Vice President for Research, at (850) 644-8633.

I have read the above informed consent form. I understand that I may withdraw my consent and discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I may otherwise be entitled. In signing this consent form, I am not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies. A copy of this consent form will be offered to me.

Subject’s Signature _________________________ (Date) ____________________
To complete this survey please reflect on your recent experience at the store you just visited. Please be sure to complete the entire survey. Thank you.

INSTRUCTIONS: PLEASE COMPLETELY FILL IN EACH BUBBLE WITH BLUE OR BLACK PEN.

PROPER MARKS:  

IMPROPER MARKS  


Section I

Please state your level of agreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The interior design of stores usually attracts my attention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I notice colors and textures in the store’s interior.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I notice things in the store’s interiors and architecture that other people usually pass by</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Compared to other people, I usually pay less attention to the architecture of retail stores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. When I’m bored, I usually go shopping.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. When I’m alone and need something to do, usually go to the mall.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. I need to be looking for a specific item for me to want to visit a specific retail store.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Investigating new products at retail stores is generally a waste of time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. No products interest me enough to make me want to browse in a store.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Investigating new stores at a mall is generally a waste of time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. I loose track of time when I’m in a store.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Time seems to fly by when I’m shopping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. When I leave the mall, I’m sometimes surprised to see that its dark outside.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Going to the mall is particularly enjoyable when I’m with friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
o. I learn a lot by visiting the mall and just looking around.

p. I consider the visit to the mall to be a learning experience

q. Shopping malls are a good place to find out what’s new

r. In the mall certain shops are fun to visit because they sell products that interests me.

s. I usually feel friendly and talkative to others when I’m at a mall

t. The mall is a place where I usually avoid talking to others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section II

What did you think about the store atmosphere?

1. The lighting in the store was pleasing to me

2. The lighting in the store accentuated the products that were displayed in the store

3. I enjoyed the wall color

4. The colors used in the store were pleasing to the eye

5. It was easy to find what I wanted in this store.

6. The store employees were friendly

7. The store employees were knowledgeable

8. The store employees greeted me courteously when I entered the store.

9. The store employees were dressed well

10. The store layout was cluttered and confusing

11. The in-store shelving suited the design scheme of the store

12. The traffic flow in this store was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The store felt congested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The departments/product sections were logically located in this store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Navigating the store was easy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Merchandise were easy to locate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The product grouping in this store made sense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The background music in this store was pleasing to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The music in the store was played at the right volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The music fits the image of the store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The carpeting and flooring in the store were adequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. There was sufficient aisle space in the store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. There was sufficient open space in the store to prevent congestion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The in-store signage was very helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The in-store signage was easily seen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The store layout was well thought out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. In-store displays were impressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. In-store displays were imaginative and fun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. There was adequate display of in-store information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The décor of the store is pleasing to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I like the way the interiors of this store look</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Pricing and sale information was adequately displayed in the store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The in-store furniture was complementary to the store design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section III
What are your impression of the interpersonal service quality, merchandise quality and merchandise price of this store?

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Employees of this store would not know what my needs are.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Employees of this store are willing to help its customers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Employees of this store are very polite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Employees of this store are never too busy to respond to customers’ requests promptly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It is realistic to expect prompt service from the employees of this company</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Employees of this company do not provide personal attention to its customers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I can trust the employees of this store</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Employees of this store do their job well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>If I have any problems with the products of this store, the employees of this store will be sympathetic and reassuring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The price shown for the product is acceptable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I’m happy with the prices of the merchandise in this store</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The prices of the product(s) in this store are right, given the quality of the merchandise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The merchandise of this store is of good quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>There is a high likelihood that the products purchased at this store are durable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The workmanship of the products available at this store is very high</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I find the products very dependable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>There is a high likelihood that the product bought at this store is durable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following statements capture your experience of the store. Please state your level of agreement about the following statements. (1 is ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 is ‘strongly agree’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The way this store displays its product is attractive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The interiors of the store is aesthetically pleasing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I like the way this store looks</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel entertained in this store</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The enthusiasm of this store is catching, it picks me up</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This store just doesn’t sell products-it entertains me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Shopping at this store ‘gets me away from it all’</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Shopping at this store makes me feel like I am in a different world</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I get so involved when I shop at this store that I forget everything else</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Shopping at this store is an efficient way to manage my time</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Shopping at this store is very convenient to me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Shopping at this store fits my schedule</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Shopping at this store makes my life easier</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Shopping Value
(Directions: Think about your overall shopping experience at this store. Please circle the number that represents your best response to the following statements. 1 stands for ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 stands for ‘strongly agree’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This shopping trip at this store was truly a joy.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I continued to shop at this store not because I</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
had to but because I wanted to

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Compared to other things that I could have done, the time spent at this store was truly enjoyable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I enjoyed the shopping at this store for its own sake, not just for the items I have purchased.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I had a good time shopping at this store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Shopping at this store was a complete waste of time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I accomplished just what I wanted to while shopping at this store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I couldn’t buy what I really needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. While shopping at this store, I found just the item(s) I was looking for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I was disappointed because I have to go to another store to complete my shopping.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Given a choice, I would probably come back to visit this store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I spent more time in this store than I originally planned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. This is my choice of store in which I regularly come to shop.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The amount of time that I spent on looking around was fairly high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I would definitely recommend this store to other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I bought more things than I expected at this store.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I paid most of my attention on items I plan to buy on this trip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It is very likely that I will purchase a product from this store in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section IV**
This information is only for research use, please make a check on the category that best describes you.

1. Gender:   ---------Male   -------------------Female.

2. Age   -------------------years.

3. Education:   ------Middle School   -------------------High School
Undergraduate                       Graduate.

4. Occupation: Student               Housewife/husband
               Employed.               Self-employed

5. How often do you shop at this store?

Never   About once a week or more.
Once a month About once every 2-5 months
About once every 6 months to a year.

6. Your ethnicity is:

Caucasian African American
Native Indian Asian
Hispanic Other

Thank you very much!
Please return this survey to the administrator.
APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS
AND
PAPER AND PENCIL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MAIN STUDY
Store Atmospherics Survey

Informed Consent Form

I HAVE BEEN INFORMED THAT:

1. Ms. Renu Singh, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Marketing, College of Business, Florida State University, has requested my participation in a research study at this institution.

2. The purpose of the research is to investigate consumer behavior phenomenon regarding in-store purchases. The goal of this survey is to gain new insight into how customers evaluate the in-store atmosphere of retail facilities. Approximately 1000 subjects are being recruited to participate in this study. I have been asked to participate in this study purely by chance.

3. My participation will involve completing a survey that consists of four sections. The first section enquires about the purpose of my visit to a retail store. The second section requires my perception of the atmosphere of the store and the third section asks as to how I felt being in the store. The fourth section asks additional information about me to help the researcher understand how different people respond to the survey items. It will take approximately 20 minutes to complete this survey.

4. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts if I agree to participate in the study.

5. Although there may be no direct benefits to me, the possible benefits of my participation in this research study are that I will become more aware of my shopping behavior and I will be able to contribute to understanding more about consumer behavior phenomenon.

6. The results of this research study may be published but my name or identity will be revealed only to the extent allowable by law. The researcher will do the following to maintain confidentiality of my records; Renu Singh will not collect names or any personal identifying information from these survey instruments. The instrument will only collect general information about age, gender, and race and income status. This information cannot directly link me to my responses. The survey instruments themselves will be destroyed after the data is entered for analysis.

7. I will not be paid for this participation.

8. Any questions I have concerning the research study or my participation in it, before or after my consent, will be answered by Renu Singh, Department of Marketing, College of Business, Florida State University, (850) 766-3353, rrs8627@garnet.acns.fsu.edu or Prof. Michael Brusco, College of Business, (850) 644-6512, email mbrusco@cob.fsu.edu

9. If I have questions about my rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if I feel I have been placed at risk, I can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board, through the Office of the Vice President for Research, at (850) 644-8633.

I have read the above informed consent form. I understand that I may withdraw my consent and discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I may otherwise be entitled. In signing this consent form, I am not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies. A copy of this consent form will be offered to me.

Subject’s Signature ___________________________ (Date) ____________________
To complete this survey please reflect on your recent experience at the store you just visited. Please be sure to complete the entire survey. Thank you.

INSTRUCTIONS: PLEASE COMPLETELY FILL IN EACH BUBBLE WITH BLUE OR BLACK PEN.

PROPER MARKS:  

IMPROPER MARKS  

**Section I**

**Please state your level of agreement with the following statements.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The interior design of stores usually attracts my attention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I notice colors and textures in the store’s interior.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I notice things in the store’s interiors and architecture that other people usually pass by.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Compared to other people, I usually pay less attention to the architecture of retail stores.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. When I’m bored, I usually go shopping.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. When I’m alone and need something to do, usually go to the mall.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. I need to be looking for a specific item for me to want to visit a specific retail store.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Investigating new products at retail stores is generally a waste of time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. No products interest me enough to make me want to browse in a store.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Investigating new stores at a mall is generally a waste of time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. I loose track of time when I’m in a store.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Time seems to fly by when I’m shopping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. When I leave the mall, I’m sometimes surprised to see that it’s dark outside.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Going to the mall is particularly enjoyable when I’m with friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. I learn a lot by visiting the mall and just looking around.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
p. I consider the visit to the mall to be a learning experience

q. Shopping malls are a good place to find out what’s new

r. In the mall certain shops are fun to visit because they sell products that interests me.

s. I usually feel friendly and talkative to others when I’m at a mall

t. The mall is a place where I usually avoid talking to others.

Section II

What did you think about the store atmosphere?

1. The lighting in the store was pleasing to me

2. The lighting in the store accentuated the products that were displayed in the store

3. It was easy to find what I wanted in this store.

4. The store employees were friendly

5. The store employees were knowledgeable

6. The store employees greeted me courteously when I entered the store.

7. The store employees were dressed well

8. The store layout was cluttered and confusing

9. The in-store shelving suited the design scheme of the store

10. The store felt congested

11. The departments/product sections were logically located in this store

12. Navigating the store was easy
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Merchandise were easy to locate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The background music in this store was pleasing to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The music in the store was played at the right volume</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. There was sufficient aisle space in the store</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The store layout was well thought out</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. In-store displays were impressive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. There was adequate display of in-store information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The décor of the store is pleasing to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section III

**What are your impression of the interpersonal service quality, merchandise quality and merchandise price of this store?**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Employees of this store would not know what my needs are.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Employees of this store are willing to help its customers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Employees of this store are very polite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Employees of this store are never too busy to respond to customers’ requests promptly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is realistic to expect prompt service from the employees of this company</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If I have any problems with the products of this store, the employees of this store will be sympathetic and reassuring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The price shown for the product is acceptable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I’m happy with the prices of the merchandise in this store</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The prices of the product(s) in this store are right, given the quality of the merchandise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following statements capture your experience of the store. Please state your level of agreement about the following statements. (1 is ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 is ‘strongly agree’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. The merchandise of this store is of good quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. There is a high likelihood that the products purchased at this store are durable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. There is a high likelihood that the product bought at this store is durable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The way this store displays its product is attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The interiors of the store is aesthetically pleasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I like the way this store looks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel entertained in this store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The enthusiasm of this store is catching, it picks me up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This store just doesn’t sell products—it entertains me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Shopping at this store ‘gets me away from it all’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Shopping at this store makes me feel like I am in a different world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I get so involved when I shop at this store that I forget everything else</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Shopping at this store is an efficient way to manage my time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Shopping at this store is very convenient to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Shopping at this store fits my schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Shopping at this store makes my life easier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Shopping Value

(Directions: Think about your overall shopping experience at this store. Please circle the number that represents your best response to the following statements. 1 stands for ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 stands for ‘strongly agree’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. This shopping trip at this store was truly a joy.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Compared to other things that I could have done, the time spent at this store was truly enjoyable.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I enjoyed the shopping at this store for its own sake, not just for the items I have purchased.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Shopping at this store was a complete waste of time.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I accomplished just what I wanted to while shopping at this store.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. While shopping at this store, I found just the item(s) I was looking for.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I spent more time in this store than I originally planned</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. This is my choice of store in which I regularly come to shop.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The amount of time that I spent on looking around was fairly high</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I bought more things than I expected at this store.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I paid most of my attention on items I plan to buy on this trip</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It is very likely that I will purchase a product from this store in the future.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section IV
This information is only for research use, please make a check on the category that best describes you.

1. Gender:  ---------Male  ----------------Female.

4. Age  ---------------years.

3. Education:  ------Middle School  --------------High School

--------Under graduate  --------Graduate.
4. Occupation: ---------Student  -----------Housewife/husband
                     ---------Employed.               ------------------Self-employed
5. How often do you shop at this store?

                   ------------Never       -----------------About once a week or more.
                   ------------Once a month   ------------------About once every 2-5 months
                   ---------------About once every 6 months to a year.

6. Your ethnicity is:

                   ---------------Caucasian       --------------------------African American
                   --------------Native Indian    ------------------------Asian.
                   -------------Hispanic         ------------------------Other.

   Thank you very much!
Please return this survey to the administrator.
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