CLOTHING ATTRIBUTES THAT INFLUENCE

MAIL-ORDER CHOICES

By

VICTORIA ANN SEITZ

Bachelor of Science in Home Economics

Kansas State University

Manhattan, Kansas

1978

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1984

CLOTHING ATTRIBUTES THAT INFLUENCE

MAIL-ORDER CHOICES

Thesis Approved:

_____
Thesis Adviser

_____

_____

_____
Dean of the Graduate College

1189533

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express sincere appreciation to my major advisor, Dr. Donna Branson, for her outstanding guidance and support toward the completion of this thesis as well as to the members of my thesis committee, Dr. Lynn Sisler and Dr. Josh Wiener, for their assistance during this endeavor.

Special thanks is given to Dr. William Warde for his statistical guidance and the faculty members of the Clothing, Textiles and Merchandising Department for their suggestions and encouragement during the time of study.

In addition I would like to extend a very special thanks to Katye Nelson for her typing expertise and patience during this endeavor. Also acknowledged are my fellow graduate students and employees of the Clothing, Textiles and Merchandising Department for their enthusiastic support and assistance during my master's program.

Finally, sincere appreciation is extended to my family, especially my father, for their encouragement and love while I pursued my master's degree. Also acknowledged are my dear friends whose friendship has made this endeavor all worthwhile. Thanks to all of you.

This thesis is dedicated to my mother, the late Betty Seitz, whom I will always respect and love dearly.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter   Page

LIST OF TABLES

vii

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, marketers have focused their attention on

direct marketing. Direct marketing has increased due to 1) increased

emphasis on consumers' self-identity on developing and maintaining

individuality in goods and services, 2) women in the work force, 3)

increased desire for leisure time for further self-development and

creative expression, 4) heightened demand for specialty products and

services, 5) popularity in paying by phone and special interest mail-

order catalogs, and 6) rapid consumer acceptance of technically com-

plex items such as computers (Rosenberg and Hirschman, 1980).

Increased consumer acceptance of technically complex items has

led to new developments and, consequently, consumer acceptance of

telecommunications as a means of shopping. Retailers and consumers

have realized the potential of two-way cable television as a conven-

ient source for in-home shopping. Consequently, cable retail merchan-

disers are part of a system of creating and distributing a total

product and service to subscribing consumers. Research conducted by a

representative company for cable systems manufacturers found that 47

percent of potential cable subscribers were interested in an in-home

shopping channel (Schultz, 1981). Apparel was the second largest pro-

duct category consumers wanted to order by cable.

While telecommunications is in an early stage of development,

several other direct methods of choosing and buying merchandise have grown rapidly. These methods include catalog showrooms, electronic funds transfer systems, and mail-order catalogs. The focus of this study is on mail-order shopping.

Mail-order businesses are booming. Lydon (1982) stated that:

> The number and variety of items available by mail, plus catalogs that advertise and showcase them, have prolif-erated at such a rate that one of the newest entries to the magazine field is called Direct which caters to the upwardly mobile catalog consumer (p. 87).

In the 1970's, mail-order businesses thrived. Americans spent an estimated $26.2 billion on mail-order items in 1978, a figure doubled that of 1975, during which an estimated $12 billion in mail-order items were sold (Quelch and Takeuchi, 1981). During the same period, mail-order houses averaged, after taxes, a seven percent profit com-pared with less than half the rate obtained by retail stores (Quelch and Takeuchi, 1981).

Success of mail-order businesses has resulted from several socio-economic and competitive factors occuring in the U.S. economy (Quelch and Takeuchi, 1981) such as a rise in discretionary income among con-sumers, more women in the work force, increased number of single households, an older population, and growth of the "me" generation. In addition, rising costs of gasoline, availability of the WATS (800) lines, expanded use of credit cards, and low cost data processing also contributed to mail-order success. Inconvenient store hours, unsatis-factory in-store service, difficulty of parking, and the development of mail-order services by traditional retailers represent competitive factors that influenced the position of mail-order businesses (Quelch and Takeuchi, 1981).

Retailers, as well as consumers, find that they can save time, energy, and money through the use of mail-order catalogs. Retail establishments, such as Bloomingdales and Neiman-Marcus, have expanded their potential market areas without new store expenses.

A survey conducted by Parade found that more than four out of five people purchased items through the mail with a mean number of 3.8 orders per year (Pironti, Vitriol, and Thirm, 1981). More than one-quarter of the respondents paid at least $100 on a single mail-order purchase, and almost half of the participants paid $50 for a single item purchased through the mail. Pironti, Vitriol, and Thirm (1981) noted that most items that respondents ordered by mail were initially seen through magazine ads or mail-order catalogs.

Mail-order houses offer a wide assortment of consumer goods such as magazines, books, gourmet foods, plants, seeds and apparel. A survey conducted by the Direct Marketers' Association (Stone, 1983) indicated that magazine subscriptions were the number one category for purchases made by consumers through the mail in the past 12 months. Apparel was the second largest category of purchases made through the mail.

Despite the growth of mail-order businesses, mail-order purchasing is an area in which relatively little research has been done. Mail-order houses evolved from the inadequacies that existed in conventional retail stores and filled the gap in the marketing hierarchy. In recent years, the tremendous growth of mail-order businesses has challenged conventional retailers, especially clothing stores, concerning prices, product assortments, quality of merchandise, conveniences, and consumer patronage.

Knowledge of important clothing attributes underlying mail-order
choices is of major importance to marketing strategists. First, this
information, from a managerial perspective, will provide an important
base for building successful strategies to attract new mail-order con-
sumers by understanding and fulfilling their information needs.
Second, research of this nature will provide marketers with knowledge
regarding clothing attributes important to mail-order consumers,
thereby reducing perceived risks involved with mail-order purchasing.
Third, this research will provide merchandisers with important inform-
ation for formulating policies and strategies to attract new customers
to telecommunications shopping.

Purpose and Objectives

This study assessed the importance of selected clothing attri-
butes influencing mail-order choices in relation to the level of
fashion consciousness and socio-demographic characteristics of mail-
order consumers.

Specifically, the study:

1. determined socio-demographic characteristics of selected
female mail-order consumers residing in Oklahoma,

2. determined the level of fashion consciousness among selected
female mail-order consumers,

3. assessed important clothing attributes underlying clothing
purchases by selected female mail-order consumers, and

4. investigated the relationship between the importance of
selected clothing attributes, fashion consciousness, and socio-
demographic characteristics of selected female mail-order consumers.

Hypotheses

The following 71 hypotheses were tested.

Group I

H_{1-8}: Fashion consciousness will vary significantly with the age, education, occupation, marital status, family size, income, extent of purchase, and geographic locality of the respondent.

H_{1-5} The level of perceived risk will vary significantly

Group II In the perspective of performance, financial, social, time/convenience, & overall between American & Korean consumers

H_{9-15}: The importance of price, style, color, fabric, brand name, garment care, and catalog name will vary significantly with the respondent's level of fashion consciousness.

H_{6-28}: The degree of expectation for quality, $_{23-24}$ will vary significantly with the respondent's level of perceived risk.

Group III

H_{16-23}: The importance of price will vary significantly with the age, education, occupation, marital status, family size, income, extent of purchase, and geographic locality of the respondent.

Group IV

H_{24-31}: The importance of style will vary significantly with the age, education, occupation, marital status, family size, income, extent of purchase, and geographic locality of the respondent.

Group V

H_{32-39}: The importance of color will vary significantly with the age, education, occupation, marital status, family size, income,

extent of purchase, and geographic locality of the respondent.

Group VI

H_{40-47}: The importance of fabric will vary significantly with the age, education, occupation, marital status, family size, income, extent of purchase, and geographic locality of the respondent.

Group VII

H_{48-55}: The importance of brand name will vary significantly with the age, education, occupation, marital status, family size, income extent of purchase, and geographic locality of the respondent.

Group VIII

H_{56-63}: The importance of garment care will vary significantly with the age, education, occupation, marital status, family size, income, extent of purchase, and geographic locality of the respondent.

Group IX

H_{64-71}: The importance of catalog name will vary significantly with the age, education, occupation, marital status, family size, income, extent of purchase, and geographic locality of the respondent.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions were used in this study.

Clothing Attributes are clothing factors that guide and influence the consumer's purchase decision and include price, style, color, fabric, brand, garment care, and catalog name.

Consumers are those who purchase goods and services for personal and family use (Schwartz, 1981).

Consumer behavior is behavior that involves the purchasing and other consumption related activities of people engaging in the exchange process. Consumer behavior is motivated or purposive, directed toward the goal of obtaining products, services or other resources for use in their own right or as a medium for further exchange (Zaltman and Wallendorf, 1979).

Cosmopoliteness is a state of being where an individual is not bound by local or national habits or prejudices and is at home in all countries or places (Williams, 1980).

Fashion consciousness denotes a level of fashion awareness that involves fashion opinion leadership and clothing interest variables. Fashion consciousness was operationally defined as the construct of fashion opinion leadership and clothing interest scores examined simultaneously as two separate but related variables.

Gregariousness is a state of being where an individual is fond of the company of others or is sociable (Williams, 1980).

In-home shoppers are consumers that place orders by telephone or by mail from the home, or that order in person from a catalog office or a catalog counter of a retail store (Gillett, 1970).

Direct mail-order is a form of non-store retailing in which a retailer does not maintain a store in the conventional sense (Schwartz, 1981).

Mail-order catalog is a printed booklet that shows limited lines of merchandise that may be purchased. The merchandise is distributed to consumers through the mail either by mail-order houses or

retail stores.

   Mail-order consumer is a consumer who purchases clothing and
other items from mail-order catalogs.

   Out-shopper is a consumer who purchases items outside their
are of residence, by telephone or through the mail (Thompson, 1971).

   Shopping behaviors are consumer patterns that indicate what
goods are purchased, where they are purchased, the means of payment,
and the thought processes involved in the purchase decision.

   Specialty goods are products that are so special in the minds
of the consumers that they will go out of their way to purchase them
(Schwartz, 1981).

Limitations

   The study was limited to a pre-selected population, limited in
geographic locality and limited to women mail-order consumers of
clothing. Because of the nature of the population frame, the evi-
dence presented can only be applied to this particular population.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature reviewed focused on three areas: 1) characteristics of fashion leaders, 2) socio-demographic characteristics and market segmentation of consumers, and 3) information acquisition and consumer choice.

Characteristics of Fashion Leaders

Because studies regarding fashion leadership among mail-order consumers are limited, the literature review focused on relevant characteristics of a general population. Distinctive fashion leadership characteristics exist among consumers that influence their consumption of clothing (Schrank and Gilmore, 1973, Katz and Lazerfeld, 1973, and Summers, 1970). Schrank and Gilmore (1973) examined the characteristics of innovators and fashion opinion leaders, and found that innovators were more secure and had relatively negative attitudes toward conformity to friends in dress. In addition, results showed that innovativeness and clothing interest were highly characteristics of fashion opinion leaders.

Katz and Lazerfeld (1973) studied fashion leadership among young women and matrons indicating that women's life-cycles were associated with the degree of expressed fashion interest and that the degree of fashion interest was at its peak among young single women. Katz

and Lazerfeld (1973) suggested that fashion was a contributing factor
to young single women who were interested in dating and marriage.
Katz and Lazerfeld (1973) also noted that fashion was more likely to
be of greater importance to young single women than to mothers of
children because young single women had fewer concerns competing for
their time.

Young women who were highly educated and had high incomes and
occupational status were more likely to be fashion leaders (Summers,
1970). Summers (1970) noted that sociological and demographic
characteristics of fashion leaders included cosmopoliteness, gregar-
iousness and physical mobility that allowed the individual greater
opportunity for exposure to new and different fashion ideas and
therefore provided fashion information for social conversations. In
addition, fashion leaders scored high on competitiveness, exhibition-
ism, self-confidence, and independence, and low on non-leadership
personality factors. Summers (1970) suggested that these character-
istics helped constitute a high fashion interest since the concept
of fashion involved personal display and exhibitionism.

Socio-Economic and Demographic Characteristics

Marketers have analyzed potential target markets by examining
various socio-economic and demographic characteristics within
particular consumer market segments. Market segmentation is based
on factors influencing consumers' consumption of goods and services
in a market. Pacharel and Abraham (1979) defined a market as "a
collection of people within geographic boundaries who have a potential
to purchase products" (p. 9). Market segmentation is based on the

notion that all buyers are different and that "different market segments exhibit different patterns of behavior" (Zaltman and Wallendorf, 1979, p. 70).

Market segments are characterized by several social factors including cultural differences, social class, and physical mobility of consumers within the segment. Cultural differences greatly influence the diverse patterns of consumption among market segments marked by the differences associated with consumers' lifestyles within a particular culture (Still and Cundiff, 1972, Zaltman and Wallendorf, 1979, Cosmas, 1982). Cosmas (1982) noted, however, that the relationship between consumers' lifestyles and consumption patterns failed to indicate a particular market segment because taste preferences and individual information processing abilities varied to a greater extent within each lifestyle group than among different lifestyle groups.

Sociologists and marketers suggest that consumers' social class, as well as their lifestyle, influences consumption patterns within market segments. Marketers believe that a high correlation exists between a consumer's social class and what is purchased, where, and how often purchases are made, the means of payment, the reason for the purchase, and the thought processes involved in making the purchase decision.

What goods consumers purchase are influenced by their social class (Still and Cundiff, 1972). Still and Cundiff (1972) noted that consumers concerned themselves with social status and express it through means of status symbols such as dress, ornaments, and other possessions.

Many products, especially signature goods, are recognized as

symbolic attributes of social status. Researchers Jolson, Anderson, and Leber (1981) identified signature goods-buyers and avoiders. Jolson, Anderson, and Leber (1981) defined signature goods as products that carried an external brand mark such as a symbol, logo or name, and had the purpose of "endowing the product with high perceived quality and affiliation with a favored designer in order to create the basis for status and price differentiation" (p. 19). Results indicated that signature goods-buyers were more likely to be female, active, aggressive, and had a higher level of education than avoiders. Jolson, Anderson, and Leber (1981) suggested that consumers' propensity to favor purchasing garments with prestigious external logos was attributed to their sex, race, level of education, and aggressiveness in their personality.

Consumer's social class has been shown to influence the means of payment for products. Slocum and Mathews (1970) identified social class as a major influence for understanding, explaining, and predicting credit usage among consumers and found that higher income groups were more apt to favor credit use over cash than lower income groups. Furthermore, higher social classes considered credit a more acceptable form of payment for furs, luggage, antiques, and other goods than lower social classes. These findings supported results obtained by Thompson (1971), Gillett (1970), and Berkowitz, Walker and Walton (1979) who found that mail-order consumers favored credit as a means of payment for products and had a greater propensity to own several, rather than one credit card.

Economics, as well as social factors, influence consumers' purchasing behavior. Still and Cundiff (1972) described some of the

economic factors that influenced consumers' consumption patterns as credit, disposable personal income, family size, and family income.

Gillett (1970) and Thompson (1971) examined the influence of family size and occupation on consumers' shopping patterns. Gillett (1970) investigated the characteristics of urban in-home shoppers which were defined as consumers that used direct mail, catalog, and telephone for individual purchases. Gillett (1970) theorized that locked-in shoppers, that included working women, women with small children, and elderly women, experienced difficulty getting to stores and used in-home shopping resources greater than those who had greater access to stores. Findings indicated that in-home spending failed to vary with the difficulty of shopping outside the home and that working women and mothers with pre-school children thought that their situations presented no particular shopping barriers. Similarly, Thompson (1971) found that the occurrence of out-of-town shopping or shopping by mail failed to vary with the number of children living at home or the occupation of the head of the household.

Gillett (1970) examined the socio-demographic characteristics of in-home shoppers and found that in-home shoppers ranked significantly higher than other shoppers in family income, education, and occupation of household head. Gillett (1970) suggested that the more affluent, highly educated shopper was likely to seek the shopping flexibility and convenience that mail and telephone shopping could provide. Similarly, Berkowitz, Walker, and Walton (1979) found that in-home food shoppers were more likely to work outside the home, have higher status occupations and were younger than store shoppers. Thompson (1971) suggested similar findings in that out-of-town and mail-order

shoppers were among higher income classifications than low income
groups.

The Direct Marketing Association (Stone, 1983) investigated the
socio-demographic characteristics of mail-order consumers and found
that a high percentage of mail-order consumers held professional
occupations, attended college, were between the ages of 25-44, and
were female. In addition, findings indicated that parents made more
mail-order purchases of clothing than did singles or married couples
without children. Finally, results showed that geographically, the
west central region of the United States was the highest volume
dollar in clothing purchases by mail-order.

Information Acquisition and Consumer Choice

Consumers possess different information-processing abilities that
influence their product choices. Researchers Sproles, Geistfeld,
and Badenhop (1978) examined how much information consumers needed to
make efficient purchase decisions. Sproles, Geistfeld, and Badenhop
(1978) also investigated the level of consumer sophistication as an
influencing factor regarding information needs of consumers. They
(1978) defined sophistication as an acquisition of skills obtained
through consumer oriented courses, experience in 4-H programs, self-
perceived knowledge in evaluating product quality, self-confidence in
choosing quality products, brand name awareness, and level of pur-
chasing experience in the previous year. Results showed that the level
of consumer sophistication affected the use of information for a
specific purchase decision and that as consumers were provided in-
creasing amounts of information relevant to a specific product, they

made more efficient purchase decisions.

Schaninger and Sciglimpaglia (1981) examined consumer sophistication and information cues and found that higher-status working wives examined more information cues and product attributes for durables than for convenience goods. In their research, 120 subjects completed questionnaires followed by an examination of four information-display boards in which the degree of novelty and complexity of the shopping tasks varied with each display board. The four product classes examined were instant coffee, non-dairy coffee creamer, instant lemonade, and electric clothes dryers. Results indicated that the depth of information cues needed by consumers varied significantly with the shopping task as well as with the level of consumer sophistication in efficient purchase decisions. Differences in demographic characteristics and cognitive personality traits also contributed to differences in information cues needed by consumers in efficient purchase decisions.

The extent of information needed by males and females also differed as demonstrated by Crosby and Taylor (1981) who found that although personality traits and values greatly influenced the evaluation of product dimensions, females failed to require as much information as males during purchase decisions. Malhotra (1982) examined the amount of information consumers simultaneously process and hypothesized that consumers had finite limits to absorb and process information during any given unit of time. Malhotra (1982) suggested that consumers, provided with too much information at a given time, such that it would exceed their processing limits, experienced information overload and thus made poorer decisions. The study examined

information overload using four different types of measures: 1) a self-report on information overload, 2) a correct-choice measure based on satisfying criteria, 3) a correct-choice measure based on optimizing criteria, and 4) a measure of subjective psychological states. Malhotra (1982) examined the dysfunctional consequences across the different treatment conditions administered and investigated the occurrence of information overload. Cognitive complexity of the respondents also was investigated in relation to information overload. Results suggested that cognitively complex respondents used significantly more product information and had a lower probability of experiencing information overload than cognitively simple respondents. Results also indicated that respondents experienced greater confusion as the number of product alternatives increased. Malhotra (1982) noted that to completely rank a set of five alternatives consumers had to perform a total of ten paired comparisons according to preference, however, when the number of alternatives increased to ten, the number of paired comparisons needed to rank the alternatives increased to 45. Findings indicated that presented with the ten alternatives, respondents were unable to rank the alternatives by making the paired comparisons.

Dickson (1982), Biehal and Chahravarti (1982), and Snead, Wilcox, and Wilkes (1981) examined the presentation of product information and consumer choice. Dickson (1982) examined the effect of enriching case and statistical information on consumer judgments. Case history information provided anecdotal information that described particular events or objects in detail. Results indicated that case history information, rather than statistical information, generated more

favorable and higher judgments about the product.

Biehal and Chahravarti (1982) examined two aspects of information acquisition: 1) directed learning of product information, and 2) non-directed learning of product information during choice. Results indicated that brand-based processing occurred during memory retrieval of directed learning of product information and that product information learned during choice showed higher levels of attribute-based processing even in a brand-based environment. Findings suggested that information-presentation format and information acquisition affected memory retrieval and choice processes of consumers.

Researchers Snead, Wilcox, and Wilkes (1981) examined the validity of product descriptions and protocols in product choice experiments. Snead, Wilcox and Wilkes (1981) defined protocols as the social act of communicating choice to another person, however, during the experiment, subjects were told that protocols were "simply thinking aloud" (Snead, Wilcox, and Wilkes, 1981). The researchers hypothesized that: 1) fewer attributes would be used in the selection process based on product descriptions, and 2) that choice judgments based on the actual product itself would be more difficult. The sample included 100 homemakers and university students who chose among a selection of drip coffee makers in the price range of $20 to $40. Results indicated that choice-making was more difficult among actual products than among product descriptions and that actual products elicited more information-acquisition probes which produced different sets of choice-determinant attributes than product descriptions. In addition, protocols failed to alter the choice processes of the subjects.

Hirschman and Kirshman (1981) examined product information criteria that influenced consumers' choices. Hirschman and Kirshman (1981) categorized information criteria as subjective and objective. Objective criteria included functional attributes of the product related to the product's design, wear, and performance guarantees, while subjective criteria comprised non-functional attributes including style and appearance of the product. Hirschman and Kirshman (1981) hypothesized that consumers failed to distinguish between objective and subjective information dimensions when evaluating a stimulus. The study examined the criteria used by consumers to evaluate a retail store in which objective criteria included the store's credit and billing, exchange adjustment policies, merchandise pricing and store location and subjective criteria identified the store's merchandise variety, sales clerk service, and atmosphere. Results indicated that consumers used both subjective and objective criteria when evaluating a retail store and that supplying consumers with only objective product information resulted in insufficient information needed to choose among products. In addition, Hirschman and Kirshman (1981) noted that the subjective and symbolic meanings consumers associated with products determined their functionability and thus became dominate traits regarding their use to the consumer. However, findings also suggested that products stripped of their subjective meaning may result in lower levels of consumer satisfaction.

Brand name also contributes to consumer product choice by affecting the perceived quality of products (Eccher, 1970, Bellizzi, Hamilton, Kruecheberg, and Martin, 1981). Bellizzi, Hamilton, Kruecheberg, and Martin (1981) found that consumers perceived product

quality differently according to brand name; consumers perceived products with a national brand superior in reliability, prestige, and quality than generic-branded products (Bellizzi, Hamilton, Kruecheberg, and Martin, 1981). Still and Cundiff (1972) suggested that:

> when consumers think that a brand is physically different from competing brands, the brand image centers on the brand as a special version of the product. By contrast, when consumers believe the brand has no differentiating physical attributes, the brand image tends to be associated with the personalities of the people who are thought to buy it (p. 34).

Jenkins and Dickey (1976) investigated product information criteria needed by consumers underlying their clothing purchases. Results indicated that quality, brand approval, performance, appearance, care, and economy were common criteria underlying clothing decisions among all the consumer types examined. Similarly, Martin (1972) found that information regarding garment care was a key factor in consumers' clothing purchases. Of the 243 women sampled, 55 percent reported price, while 25 percent chose style as the primary elements in their clothing decisions at department stores. Wheatley, Chiu, and Goldman (1981) found similar results and suggested that consumers perceived price changes more often than changes in the physical quality of the goods.

Gillett (1970) and Berkowitz, Walker, and Walton (1979) investigated product information criteria needed by in-home shoppers. Berkowitz, Walker, and Walton (1979) compared in-home to store shoppers of food. The researcher used data from 1,000 consumers to compare 1) decision criteria, and 2) shopping attitudes for each group. Findings indicated that in-home shoppers were less price conscious and less concerned with paying the lowest possible prices for goods than

store shoppers, yet both placed equal importance on the available assortments and the quality of the meat and produce. Shopping attitudes also differed between in-home and store shoppers. In-home shoppers placed a higher value on shopping-convenience and possessed negative attitudes toward shopping activities than store shoppers.

In contrast to these results, Gillett (1970) found that in-home shoppers, especially heavier spenders, were active store shoppers and were less inclined to consider store shopping difficult or unpleasant. Gillett (1970) found that in-home shoppers regarded prices, quality, and merchandise assortment advantages among product alternatives more than store shoppers and suggested that in-home shoppers stressed product considerations and low price in their purchase decisions.

Similarly, Korgaonhar (1981) found that catalog showroom patrons placed high importance on prices, buying of well-known brands, and the convenience of in-home shopping. Korgaonhar (1981) described two types of shoppers: 1) recreation, and 2) convenience. The two types differed in extent of information seeking and shopping time involved (Korgaonhar, 1981). Korgaonhar (1981) suggested that convenience shoppers disliked shopping and approached retail store selection from the perspective of time and money saved while recreational shoppers enjoyed shopping as a leisure activity and placed high importance on store decor rather than money-savings and value. Results indicated that catalog showroom patrons were convenience shoppers who were less likely: 1) to purchase goods impulsively, 2) to spend more than an hour per shopping trip, and 3) to continue shopping after the purchase. Korgaonhar (1981) also found that catalog showroom patrons failed to consider shopping as a leisure activity and disliked or were

neutral toward it.

Unlike shopping in retail stores or catalog showrooms, Lydon (1982) noted that consumers were unable to touch or try on clothing featured in mail-order catalogs and, therefore paid attention to other clothing attributes such as fiber content and garment construction when comparing product alternatives. In addition, Winakor (1969) observed that information given in mail-order catalogs provided consumers specific criteria needed to make effective and satisfying purchase decisions.

Summary

Research findings indicated that fashion leaders were more secure, younger, had a higher degree of fashion interest, and had more negative attitudes toward conformity in dress than non-leaders. In addition, fashion leaders were more educated, had higher incomes and occupied a higher occupational status than non-leaders.

The literature reviewed indicated that mail-order consumers possessed similar characteristics to fashion leaders. Specifically, mail-order consumers were between 25-44 years of age, had attended college, were female and were married with children.

Product attributes and prices were important information criteria underlying mail-order choices. Research indicated that mail-order consumers were experienced store shoppers and used mail-order for convenience. In addition, findings indicated that mail-order consumers used credit cards for payment of purchases.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The following research design provided the basis for examining important clothing attributes influencing mail-order choices, the construct fashion consciousness, and socio-demographic characteristics of mail-order consumers. In addition, the research design provided the basis for testing of the proposed hypotheses.

Data Sources

Since it was desirable to maximize the number of women mail-order consumers in the sample, the researcher purchased a pre-selected population frame from an Arizona based direct marketing brokerage firm that compiled mailing lists of specified consumers for a nominal fee. The list consisted of 5,031 names and addresses of women residing in Oklahoma who purchased clothing from various mail-order sources between July and November, 1983. The sample for the mailed questionnaires was systematically drawn to ensure that all cities represented on the list were included. By dividing the population frame by the desired sample size, the researcher decided to select every 25th name. If a name selected was a possible male subject, then the researcher chose the next female name listed.

Variables

Variables of interest included clothing attributes, fashion con-
sciousness, and socio-demographic variables. An instrument designed to
measure the importance of clothing attributes was not located. The
measurement of fashion consciousness was operationally defined using
the Fashion Opinion Leadership and Clothing Interest Inventories devel-
oped by Schrank and Gilmore (1973). Socio-demographic characteristics
to be measured were selected based on the literature reviewed.

Fashion consciousness was a construct that included fashion opin-
ion leadership and clothing interest. Since an instrument to measure
fashion consciousness was not available, the Fashion Opinion Leader-
ship and Clothing Interest Inventories developed by Schrank and Gil-
more (1973) were used in this research. A fashion consciousness score
was not derived from the two inventories, rather, scores were calcu-
lated for each inventory and subsequently analyzed simultaneously.

The Fashion Opinion Leadership Inventory consisted of twenty
statements on behavior regarding clothing; a modified Likert scale
listed five responses ranging from definitely true to definitely false.
The Clothing Interest Inventory consisted of twenty statements regard-
ing clothing interest of the respondents. Respondents rated each
statement to the extent that it applied to them; a modified Likert
scale listed five responses ranging from definitely true to definitely
false.

Previous research (Martin, 1972, Gillett, 1970, Eccher, 1970,
Korgoanhar, 1981, and Lydon, 1982) indicated that consumers based
mail-order choices on price and brand. Martin (1972) found that

consumers considered style, color, fiber content, care instructions,
and store name important to clothing purchases. Therefore, to
assess the importance of selected clothing attributes, the researcher
specified the following clothing attributes for study: price, style,
color, fabric, brand name, garment care, and catalog name. A modified
Likert scale ranged from most important to least important and was
used to assess the importance respondents placed on each attribute.

Pre-test

Members of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Still-
water, Oklahoma pre-tested the questionnaire during a group meeting
held November 26, 1983. Twenty-five members completed the question-
naires. The researcher encouraged respondents to offer suggestions
and criticisms regarding the questionnaire. Graduate students and
professors in the Clothing, Textiles, and Merchandising and the Mar-
keting Departments at Oklahoma State University also reviewed the
questionnaire. Pre-test results and suggestions from respondents
and reviewers provided a basis for revision of the instrument.

As part of the development of the final instrument, the research-
er included the Conformity Inventory, originally developed by Selker
(1962) and refined by Schrank and Gilmore (1973), in the pre-test to
explore respondents' conformity to dress in relation to fashion con-
sciousness. After examination of the pre-test data, it was decided
to eliminate the Conformity Inventory from the questionnaire. This
decision was based on the time it took to complete the questionnaire
and the lack of response for this inventory.

A review of pre-test responses indicated that suits and dresses

were clothing items respondents most frequently thought of when selecting important clothing attributes. Therefore, to ensure that all respondents considered the same clothing items, the researcher reworded the directions in Section II to deliberately call these items to the respondents' attention. In addition, wording of the modified Likert scale was changed to list five responses ranging from very important to least important.

Since respondents in the pre-test failed to provide information on the number of children living at home, the statement was reworded. Also, in order to improve respondents' recall of their extent of mail-order use, the statement was clarified to include a request that respondents check their records of charged purchases.

Data Collection

The cover letter and questionnaire (Appendix A) with a self-addressed stamped envelope was mailed to 209 Oklahoma women on January 6, 1984. Three weeks later, 30 percent of the 209 questionnaires were returned to the researcher. A follow-up letter and questionnaire mailed on January 28 resulted in an additional 16 percent returned during the following two week period. Hence, 109 total questionnaires were returned. Since some questionnaires lacked completion, only 95 were usable. Thus, response rate of 46 percent was achieved after two mailings.

Questionnaire responses were coded numerically for computing purposes. Fashion opinion leadership and clothing interest scores were determined individually by summated ratings with a possible range from 20 to 100 in which higher scores indicated greater fashion

opinion leadership and clothing interest.

Data Analysis

Statistical methods used for data analyses consisted of chi square and analysis of variance. Based on examination of the frequencies data for the variables, age, education, occupation, family size, and marital status were regrouped as follows.

The age categories 18 to 24, 25 to 34, and 35 to 44 were collapsed into one age group thereby achieving similar numbers in each of the remaining age groups. The educational categories, college graduate and attended graduate or professional school category, were combined resulting in four educational categories.

Previous research (Nichols and Abdel-Ghany, 1983) has shown occupation, family size and marital status to be predictors of purchasing behavior. After examination of the data it was decided to regroup the categories of each of these variables in the following manner.

Due to insufficient numbers in each of the six occupational categories, it was decided to collapse the categories into two groups, those employed outside the home and homemakers. The occupational categories: teacher, professional/manager, sales, and clerical/secretarial were combined into one group while the category homemaker formed the second group.

In addition to occupation, family size categories were also collapsed due to insufficient cell sizes. Because a small number of the respondents reported having one child living at home, it was decided to define two family size categories, those respondents reporting children living at home and those who reported no children

living at home.

The marital categories, single, single parent, and divorced, widowed and separated were combined into one group, hereafter labelled single, while married and parent were combined in one group labelled married. Research (Nichols and Abdel-Ghany, 1983) has shown that married subjects had less time for activities, such as for shopping, than singles. Nichols and Abdel-Ghany (1983) suggested that responsibilities to the spouse interferred with married subjects' leisure time resulting in less time for shopping than singles.

Due to insufficient cell sizes, income and extent of purchase categories were also regrouped. The original eight income categories were collapsed into four groups. Specifically, the income categories 0 to 4,999 dollars, 5,000 to 7,499 dollars, and 7,500 to 9,999 dollars were combined into one group and categories 10,000 to 14,999 dollars and 15,000 to 19,999 dollars are collapsed into another group. The income category 20,000 to 34,999 dollars remained unchanged while categories 35,000 to 49,999 dollars and 50,000 dollars and more were combined into the fourth group.

Extent of purchase categories were combined in the following manner. Extent of purchase categories under 25 dollars and 25 to 49 dollars were combined into one group while categories 50 to 99 dollars and 100 to 299 dollars remained unchanged. Categories 100 to 499 dollars, 500 to 999 dollars, and 1,000 dollars or more were collapsed into the fourth group.

Geographic locality was assessed by placing respondents' addresses into urban and rural categories according to the U.S. Census of Population (1980) definition of urban and rural cities in Oklahoma.

Rural residences were defined as cities with populations of under 50,000 while urban residences had populations of at least 50,000 (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1980).

Due to small numbers in the response categories, the original five response categories of importance were combined into three groups to examine price, style, color, fabric, and garment care importance. The very important and the least important response categories were combined into one category labelled important, and the not important and the least important response categories were combined into a category labelled not important. Responses reported in the somewhat important category remained unchanged. The original five response categories were used to analyze brand and catalog name importance.

The researcher used multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to examine the degree of relationship between fashion consciousness, socio-demographic characteristics, and the importance of selected clothing attributes. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) techniques focus on the structure of simultaneous relationships among phenomena and test the impact of various levels of one or more experimental factors on such phenomena (Sheth, 1977). MANOVA statistical techniques were used to examine fashion consciousness as a construct of fashion opinion leadership and clothing interest scores that were examined simultaneously as two separate but related dependent variables that were continuous in nature. If overall significance was found, univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to identify the dependent variable contributing to the overall significance. Chi square analysis was used to test significant relationships among categorical data.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study assessed the important clothing attributes influenc-
ing mail-order purchases. The analyses were organized around seventy-
one hypotheses given in Chapter I. The researcher used multivariate
and one-way analysis of variance statistical techniques to test hy-
potheses one through fifteen. Chi square analysis was used to test
hypotheses 16 through 71.

Description of Respondents

Socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents are given
in Table I. Thirty-three percent of the respondents were aged 65 or
older. Thirty-one percent of the respondents were between the ages
of 55 to 64, while 20 percent were between 45 to 54. Seventeen per-
cent of the respondents were aged 18 to 44.

Thirty-two percent of the respondents graduated from high school.
Twenty-five percent of the respondents had a college degree, while 24
percent attended college but did not graduate. Nineteen percent of
the respondents did not graduate from high school.

A majority (63%) of the respondents were employed outside the
home and 37 percent were homemakers. Seventy-one percent of the res-
pondents were married compared with 29 percent who were single. Only
24 percent of the respondents had children living at home.

TABLE I

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Age		
18-44	16	17
45-54	19	20
55-64	29	31
65 or older	31	33
Education		
Did not graduate from high school	18	19
Graduated high school	30	32
Attended college	23	24
Graduated college	24	25
Occupation		
Employed outside the home	60	63
Homemaker	35	37
Marital Status		
Single	27	29
Married	67	71
Family Size		
No children living at home	71	76
Children living at home	23	24
Income		
0 to $9,999	25	26
$10,000 to $19,999	20	21
$20,000 to $34,999	25	26
$35,000 or over	25	26
Extent of Purchase		
0-$49	17	18
$50-$99	21	23
$100-$299	32	34
$300 or over	23	25
Geographic Locality		
Rural	19	20
Urban	76	80

Respondents were approximately evenly distributed among all income levels. Almost 60 percent of the respondents reported spending at least 100 dollars on clothing items by mail in the past 12 months. Twenty-three percent of the respondents reportedly spent between 50 and 99 dollars, while 18 percent spent less than 50 dollars for mail-order clothing in the past year. In addition, according to the U.S. Census of Population (1980) definition of rural and urban residences, 80 percent of the respondents resided in urban areas and 20 percent lived in rural areas.

Importance of Selected Clothing Attributes

Tables II and III present frequency distributions regarding the importance placed on the selected clothing attributes by the respondents. Frequencies regarding brand and catalog name importance were distributed among five response categories ranging from very important to least important. In general, respondents reported that brand name was of limited importance to them. Only 18 percent reported brand to be important and 58 percent believed brand name was either not important or least important. Examination of the frequency distribution for catalog name indicated that respondents were fairly evenly divided in their responses among the five categories.

The original five response categories were combined to form three categories, important, somewhat important, and not important, for the clothing attributes, price, style, color, fabric, and garment care. Frequencies for price, style, color, fabric, and garment care are given in Table III. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents considered price and garment care important clothing attributes

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES OF BRAND
AND CATALOG NAME IMPORTANCE FOR
MAIL-ORDER PURCHASE DECISIONS

	Importance Level											
	Very		Important		Somewhat		Not		Least		Total	
Clothing Attribute	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Brand Name	8	8.51	8	8.51	24	28.53	27	28.72	27	28.72	94	100
Catalog Name	19	20.65	19	20.65	20	21.74	16	17.39	18	19.57	92	100

TABLE III

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES OF PRICE, STYLE,
COLOR, FABRIC, AND GARMENT CARE
IMPORTANCE FOR MAIL-ORDER
PURCHASE DECISIONS

| | Importance Level | | | | | | Total | |
| Clothing Attribute | Important | | Somewhat | | Not | | | |
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Price	61	64.89	21	22.34	12	12.76	94	100
Style	42	45.16	34	36.56	17	18.28	93	100
Color	44	46.81	39	41.49	11	11.70	94	100
Fabric	52	55.32	29	30.85	13	13.83	94	100
Garment Care	61	65.59	28	30.11	4	4.30	93	100

underlying mail-order choices. Fifty-five percent of the respondents considered fabric important while 47 percent considered color in their mail-order purchases. Forty-five percent of the respondents consider-ed style important to their mail-order clothing purchases.

Fashion Opinion Leadership and Clothing

Interest Inventories

Table IV presents the respondents' mean scores for the Fashion Opinion Leadership and Clothing Interest Inventories. Respondents' fashion opinion leadership scores ranged from 21 to 97 with a mean score of 56.50. Respondents' clothing interest scores ranged from 20 to 100 with a mean score of 64.74.

TABLE IV

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR FASHION OPINION
LEADERSHIP AND CLOTHING
INTEREST SCORES

Inventory	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Minimum Value	Maximum Value
Fashion Opinion Leadership	56.50	19.73	21	97
Clothing Interest	64.74	21.10	20	100

The researcher tested the instruments used in the study for reliability. A split-half test revealed a 0.89 reliability coefficient for the Fashion Opinion Leadership Inventory and 0.86 reliability coefficient for the Clothing Interest Inventory. Since fashion consciousness was a construct of fashion opinion leadership and clothing interest, a high reliability in the responses was expected between the two inventories. As expected, a split-half test revealed a 0.77 reliability coefficient between the responses on the two inventories.

Summary

Approximately one-third of the respondents were aged 65 or older, one-third were between the ages 55 through 64, and approximately one-third were between 18 through 54. Nearly one-third of the respondents graduated from high school, one-fourth graduated from college, approximately one-fourth attended college but did not graduate and nearly one-fifth of the respondents did not graduate from high school. A majority of the respondents were married without children living at home and were working outside the home. These socio-demographic characteristics conflict with the results obtained by the Direct Marketers' Association (Stone, 1983) whose mail-order consumers were between the ages of 25 to 44 and had children living at home. A majority of the respondents for this study resided in urban areas throughout Oklahoma and spent at least 100 dollars on mail-order clothing items in the past 12 months.

Approximately two-thirds of the respondents considered price and garment care important to their mail-order purchases. Over half of the respondents regarded fabric important to their clothing purchases

while approximately forty-five percent of the sample considered style and color important. Forty-two percent of the respondents considered catalog name important while 18 percent of the respondents regarded brand name important to mail-order clothing purchases. These results are in agreement with previous research by Martin (1972), Gillett (1970), and Korgaonhar (1981), whose results indicated that subjects were price and quality conscious in their purchases of clothing. Limited importance of brand conflicted with findings by Jenkins and Dickey (1976) who suggested that brand approval was common criterion underlying clothing decisions by lower to middle socio-economic level consumers.

Respondents' fashion opinion leadership scores ranged from 21 to 97 with a mean score of 56.50. Respondents' scores on the Clothing Interest Inventory ranged from 20 to 100 with a mean score of 64.74. Reliability of the instruments was determined to be 0.89 for the Fashion Opinion Leadership Inventory and 0.86 for the Clothing Interest Inventory. Previous research (Schrank and Gilmore, 1973) indicated high internal consistency of the inventories with a split-half reliability coefficient of 0.93 for the Fashion Opinion Leadership Inventory and a 0.92 for the Clothing Interest Inventory.

Testing the Hypotheses

Inferential statistics were used to test the hypotheses of interest (see p. 5). The hypotheses were organized into nine groups. Group I hypotheses were concerned with the relationship between the construct fashion consciousness and the socio-demographic variables. Group II hypotheses were concerned with the relationship between the

construct fashion consciousness and the importance of selected cloth-
ing attributes. Groups III through IX hypotheses dealt with the
relationships between the importance of selected clothing attributes
and the socio-demographic variables.

Group I

H_{1-8}: Fashion consciousness will vary significantly with the
age, education, occupation, marital status, family size, income, ex-
tent of purchase, and geographic locality of the respondent.

The construct fashion consciousness was determined by scores on
the Fashion Opinion Leadership Inventory and Clothing Interest In-
ventory. The researcher anticipated that the two scores were statis-
tically and conceptually related, therefore, the scores were
simultaneously tested using multivariate statistical techniques.
Table V presents the results of multivariate analysis of variance
(MANOVA) statistical procedures. Results indicated that the relation-
ship between fashion consciousness and education was statistically
significant at the 0.05 level. More detailed information on univariate
analysis of variance (ANOVA) given in Table VI, identifies fashion
opinion leadership as the variable contributing to the overall signif-
icance. In general, results showed that respondents with more educa-
tion had higher fashion opinion leadership scores. Respondents with
college degrees had a mean fashion opinion leadership score of 69.3
compared with 46.9 for respondents who did not graduate from high
school (Table VII). Results indicated that as the respondents' level
of education increased, their level of fashion opinion leadership also
increased.

TABLE V

SUMMARY OF MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
FINDINGS FOR SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC
CHARACTERISTICS AND FASHION
CONSCIOUSNESS

Socio-Demographic Characteristics	df	Multivariate F-Value	Significance Level	N
Age	1	1.17	N.S.	83
Education	3	2.45	0.05	83
Occupation	1	0.19	N.S.	83
Marital Status	1	0.74	N.S.	82
Family Size	1	0.95	N.S.	82
Income	3	2.85	0.01	83
Extent of Purchase	4	1.19	N.S.	83
Geographic Locality	1	1.47	N.S.	83

TABLE VI

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT UNIVARIATE ANOVA
FINDINGS FOR SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC AND
FASHION CONSCIOUSNESS
RELATIONSHIPS

Socio-Demographic Characteristics	Dependent Variable	df	Univariate F-Value	Significance Level	N
Education	Fashion Opinion Leadership	3	4.96	0.01	82
	Clothing Interest	3	2.59	N.S.	82
Income	Fashion Opinion Leadership	3	1.45	N.S.	82
	Clothing Interest	3	3.32	0.05	82

TABLE VII

SUMMARY OF MEAN FASHION OPINION LEADERSHIP
SCORES BY EDUCATION LEVEL

Education Level	Mean Score	N
Did not graduate from high school	46.92	14
Graduated high school	53.46	26
Attended college	55.38	21
Graduated college	69.27	22

Table V also indicates that a significant relationship, at the 0.01 level, existed between fashion consciousness and income. Univariate ANOVA showed that clothing interest contributed to the overall significance at the 0.05 level (Table VI). Examination of mean scores by income categories (Appendix B) did not show a definite pattern.

No statistically significant relationships were found when fashion consciousness was analyzed with age, occupation, marital status, family size, extent of purchase, and geographic locality of the respondent (Table V).

Group II

H_{9-15}: The importance of price, style, color, fabric, brand name, garment care, and catalog name will vary significantly with the respondents' level of fashion consciousness.

Table VIII presents results of multivariate analysis of variance procedures and shows that the importance attributed to price and style

varied significantly with the respondents' level of fashion conscious-ness. A significant relationship was found between price and fashion consciousness at the 0.01 level and between style and fashion con-sciousness at the 0.0001 level.

TABLE VIII

SUMMARY OF MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
FINDINGS FOR IMPORTANCE OF CLOTHING
ATTRIBUTES AND FASHION
CONSCIOUSNESS

Clothing Attributes	df	Multivariate F-Value	Significance Level	N
Price	2	4.00	0.01	82
Style	2	6.57	0.0001	82
Color	2	1.44	N.S.	82
Fabric	2	1.38	N.S.	82
Brand Name	4	1.39	N.S.	82
Garment Care	4	2.11	N.S.	81
Catalog Name	4	0.98	N.S.	80

Table IX shows that fashion opinion leadership contributed to the overall significance of price. Respondents with lower fashion opinion leadership scores tended to consider price more important than those with higher fashion opinion leadership scores. Respondents with a mean fashion opinion leadership score of 52.09 considered price more important to clothing purchases than respondents with a mean score

of 69.83 (Table X).

TABLE IX

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT UNIVARIATE ANOVA
FINDINGS FOR IMPORTANCE OF CLOTHING
ATTRIBUTES AND FASHION
CONSCIOUSNESS

Clothing Attributes	Dependent Variable	df	Univariate F-Value	Significance Level	N
Price	Fashion Opinion Leadership	2	6.93	0.01	81
	Clothing Interest	2	2.31	N.S.	81
Style	Fashion Opinion Leadership	2	14.37	0.0001	81
	Clothing Interest	2	12.68	0.0001	81

TABLE X

SUMMARY OF MEAN FASHION OPINION LEADERSHIP
SCORES BY PRICE AND STYLE IMPORTANCE

Clothing Attributes	Level of Importance	Mean Score	N
Price	Important	52.09	54
	Somewhat Important	69.83	18
	Not Important	63.60	10
Style	Important	65.66	36
	Somewhat Important	57.38	31
	Not Important	37.53	15

Importance of style was shown to vary significantly with the respondents' level of fashion consciousness. Univariate ANOVA results given in Table IX show that both fashion opinion leadership and clothing interest scores contributed to the overall significance of style. Table X shows that respondents who reported style important to their mail-order purchase decisions had a mean fashion opinion leadership score of 65.66 compared with a mean score of 37.53 for those that failed to consider style important. Similar findings resulted with the respondents' clothing interest scores in which respondents that reported style important had a mean clothing interest score of 74.05 compared with 45.26 for those respondents that failed to consider style important (Table XI).

TABLE XI

SUMMARY OF MEAN CLOTHING INTEREST
SCORES BY STYLE IMPORTANCE

Clothing Attributes	Level of Importance	Mean Score	N
Style	Important	74.05	36
	Somewhat Important	63.83	31
	Not Important	45.26	15

Although not statistically significant at the 0.05 level, there was a trend toward fashion consciousness and garment care importance

at the 0.1 level. Significant relationships between color, fabric, brand, catalog name, and fashion consciousness were not found (Table VIII).

Group III

H_{16-23}: The importance of price will vary significantly with the age, education, occupation, marital status, family size, income, extent of purchase, and geographic locality of the respondent.

Table XII presents results from chi square analyses and shows that significant relationships were found with education at the 0.01 level and income at the 0.05 level.

TABLE XII

SUMMARY OF CHI SQUARE ANALYSES FOR IMPORTANCE
OF PRICE FOR MAIL-ORDER PURCHASES BY
SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Socio-Demographic Characteristics	df	x^2	Significance Level	N
Age	6	8.05	N.S.	94
Education	6	18.45	0.01	94
Occupation	2	0.86	N.S.	94
Marital Status	2	5.94	N.S.	93
Family Size	2	3.98	N.S.	93
Income	6	13.46	0.05	94
Extent of Purchase	8	10.91	N.S.	94
Geographic Locality	2	1.79	N.S.	94

Results showed that price importance varied significantly with the respondents' education. Table XIII shows that price was considered important to respondents at all educational levels tested, however, respondents who had attended college and those who had graduated from college considered price somewhat less important than other respondents. Sixty-three percent of the respondents who had attended and graduated from college considered price somewhat important compared with 28 percent who did not graduate from college and graduated from high school.

TABLE XIII

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR IMPORTANCE OF PRICE
FOR MAIL-ORDER PURCHASES BY
EDUCATION LEVEL

Clothing Attribute	Importance Level		Education Level			
			Did Not Graduate High School	Graduated High School	Attended College	Graduated College
Price	Important	ROW PCT	19.67	42.62	18.03	19.67
		COL PCT	70.59	86.67	47.83	50.00
		N	12	26	11	12
	Somewhat Important	ROW PCT	14.29	14.29	23.81	47.62
		COL PCT	17.65	10.00	21.74	41.67
		N	3	3	5	10
	Not Important	ROW PCT	16.67	8.33	58.33	16.67
		COL PCT	11.76	3.33	30.43	8.33
		N	2	1	7	2

The results also indicated a significant relationship between the importance of price and income at the 0.01 level. Examination of Table XIV shows that price was considered important by all income levels, however, as respondents' income increased the importance of price decreased. Of the respondents who considered price unimportant, 58 percent reported an annual income of 35,000 dollars compared with eight percent who earned between 0 to 9,999 dollars yearly.

TABLE XIV

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR IMPORTANCE OF PRICE
FOR MAIL-ORDER PURCHASES BY
INCOME LEVEL

Clothing Attribute	Importance Level		Income Level			
			0 to 9,999	10,000 to 19,999	20,000 to 34,999	35,000 Plus
Price	Important	ROW PCT	34.43%	22.95%	22.95%	19.67%
		COL PCT	84.00%	70.00%	58.33%	48.00%
		N	21	14	14	12
	Somewhat Important	ROW PCT	14.29%	28.57%	28.57%	28.57%
		COL PCT	12.00%	30.00%	25.00%	24.00%
		N	3	6	6	6
	Not Important	ROW PCT	8.33%	0.00%	33.33%	58.33%
		COL PCT	4.00%	0.00%	16.67%	28.00%
		N	1	0	4	7

Although not statistically significant, the findings suggested a trend toward a relationship between the importance of price and marital status. Unmarried respondents reported that price was more important to their purchase decision than married respondents. The importance of price was not significantly related to age, occupation, family size, extent of purchase, or geographic locality (Table XII).

Group IV

H_{24-31}: The importance of style will vary significantly with the age, education, occupation, marital status, family size, income, extent of purchase, and geographic locality of the respondent.

To test hypotheses 24 through 31, the researcher used chi square analyses. Table XV provides results of the analyses and shows that a significant relationship existed between the importance of style and education, and style and geographic locality at the 0.05 level. In general, as the respondents' level of education increased, the importance attributed to style also increased (Table XVI). Of the respondents who indicated style not important, 47 percent did not graduate from high school compared with approximately 12 percent who graduated from college.

The importance of style also varied significantly with the respondents' geographic locality. Of those reporting that style was important, 93 percent resided in urban areas (Table XVII).

Style was not found to be significantly related to respondents' age, occupation, marital status, family size, income, or extent of purchase (Table XV).

TABLE XV

SUMMARY OF CHI SQUARE ANALYSES FOR IMPORTANCE
OF STYLE FOR MAIL-ORDER PURCHASES BY
SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Socio-Demographic Characteristics	df	x^2	Significance Level	N
Age	6	1.64	N.S.	93
Education	6	15.30	0.05	93
Occupation	2	1.90	N.S.	93
Marital Status	2	0.59	N.S.	92
Family Size	2	1.94	N.S.	92
Income	6	5.43	N.S.	93
Extent of Purchase	8	5.32	N.S.	93
Geographic Locality	2	7.88	0.05	93

TABLE XVI

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR IMPORTANCE OF STYLE
FOR MAIL-ORDER PURCHASES BY
EDUCATION LEVEL

Clothing Attribute	Importance Level		Education Level			
			Did Not Graduate High School	Graduated High School	Attended College	Graduated College
Style	Important	ROW PCT	7.14	30.95	28.57	33.33
		COL PCT	18.75	43.33	52.17	58.33
		N	3	13	12	14
	Somewhat Important	ROW PCT	14.71	35.29	26.47	23.53
		COL PCT	31.25	40.00	39.13	33.33
		N	5	12	9	8
	Not Important	ROW PCT	47.06	29.41	11.76	11.76
		COL PCT	50.00	16.67	8.70	8.33
		N	8	5	2	2

TABLE XVII

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR IMPORTANCE OF STYLE
FOR MAIL-ORDER PURCHASES BY
GEOGRAPHIC LOCALITY

Clothing Attribute	Importance Level		Geographic Locality	
			Rural	Urban
Style	Important	ROW PCT	7.14	82.86
		COL PCT	16.67	52.00
		N	3	39
	Somewhat	ROW PCT	26.47	73.53
	Important	COL PCT	50.00	3.33
		N	9	25
	Not	ROW PCT	35.29	64.71
	Important	COL PCT	33.33	14.67
		N	6	11

—

Group V

H_{32-39}: The importance of color will vary significantly with the age, education, occupation, marital status, family size, income, extent of purchase, and geographic locality of the respondent.

Table XVIII presents results of chi square analyses and shows that the importance respondents attributed to color was not significantly related to any of the socio-demographic characteristics tested.

TABLE XVIII

SUMMARY OF CHI SQUARE ANALYSES FOR IMPORTANCE
OF COLOR FOR MAIL-ORDER PURCHASES BY
SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Socio-Demographic Characteristics	df	x^2	Significance Level	N
Age	6	0.76	N.S.	94
Education	6	4.00	N.S.	94
Occupation	2	0.17	N.S.	94
Marital Status	2	4.06	N.S.	93
Family Size	2	2.72	N.S.	93
Income	6	10.17	N.S.	94
Extent of Purchase	8	7.90	N.S.	94
Geographic Locality	2	4.21	N.S.	94

Group VI

H_{40-47}: The importance of fabric will vary significantly with the age, education, occupation, marital status, family size, income, extent of purchase, and geographic locality of the respondent.

Table XIX presents results from the chi square analyses and shows that a significant relationship was found at the 0.05 level between the importance of fabric and geographic locality of the respondent. Table XX shows that of the respondents who indicated that fabric was important to their purchase decision, 87 percent resided in urban areas while only 13 percent lived in rural residences.

TABLE XIX

SUMMARY OF CHI SQUARE ANALYSES FOR IMPORTANCE
OF FABRIC FOR MAIL-ORDER PURCHASES BY
SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Socio-Demographic Characteristics	df	x^2	Significance Level	N
Age	6	9.71	N.S.	94
Education	6	6.84	N.S.	94
Occupation	2	3.07	N.S.	94
Marital Status	2	2.17	N.S.	93
Family Size	2	4.66	N.S.	94
Income	6	5.23	N.S.	94
Extent of Purchase	8	8.01	N.S.	94
Geographic Locality	2	7.27	0.05	94

TABLE XX

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR IMPORTANCE OF FABRIC
FOR MAIL-ORDER PURCHASES BY
GEOGRAPHIC LOCALITY

Clothing Attributes	Importance Level		Geographic Locality	
			Rural	Urban
Fabric	Important	ROW PCT	13.46	86.54
		COL PCT	38.89	59.21
		N	7	45
	Somewhat	ROW PCT	17.24	82.76
	Important	COL PCT	27.78	31.58
		N	5	24
	Not	ROW PCT	46.15	53.85
	Important	COL PCT	33.33	9.21
		N	6	7

Although not statistically significant at the 0.05 level, there was a trend toward a relationship between importance of fabric and the respondents' family size. Respondents without children living at home tended to consider fabric more important than respondents with children living at home. Significant relationships were not found between importance attached to fabric and the respondents' age, education, occupation, marital status, income, and extent of purchase (Table XIX).

Group VII

H_{48-55}: The importance of brand name will vary significantly with the age, education, occupation, marital status, family size, income, extent of purchase, and geographic locality of the respondent.

Table XXI presents results of chi square analyses and shows that the importance of brand name was found to vary significantly with the respondents' occupation, marital status, and income at the 0.05 level.

Brand name importance varied significantly with the respondents' occupation, however, a trend was not readily apparent (Appendix B). A significant relationship was found between importance attributed to brand name and the respondents' marital status. Table XXII shows that a majority (62%) of the married respondents reported brand name as not or least important compared with 44 percent of the single respondents.

Brand name importance varied significantly with the respondents' income. Table XXIII shows that brand name was very important to respondents who reported an annual income of 0 to 9,999 dollars and 35,000 dollars and more. Eighty-eight percent of the respondents earned from 0 to 9,999 and 35,000 and more whereas only 13 percent of those earning between 10,000 to 34,999 dollars reported that brand name was very

important to their mail-order purchase decision.

TABLE XXI

SUMMARY OF CHI SQUARE ANALYSES FOR IMPORTANCE
OF BRAND NAME FOR MAIL-ORDER PURCHASES BY
SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Socio-Demographic Characteristics	df	x^2	Significance Level	N
Age	12	20.54	N.S.	94
Education	12	77.54	N.S.	94
Occupation	4	10.42	0.05	94
Marital Status	4	10.62	0.05	93
Family Size	4	5.06	N.S.	93
Income	12	23.17	0.05	94
Extent of Purchase	16	17.04	N.S.	94
Geographic Locality	4	5.96	N.S.	94

Although not statistically significant at the 0.05 level, there was a trend toward a possible relationship between brand name import-ance and respondents' age. Findings suggested that older aged respondents tended to consider brand name more important to their mail-order purchases than younger respondents. No significant relationships were found between brand name importance and education, family size, extent of purchase, and geographic locality of the respondent (Table XXI).

TABLE XXII

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR IMPORTANCE OF BRAND NAME
FOR MAIL-ORDER PURCHASES BY
MARITAL STATUS

Clothing Attribute	Importance Level		Marital Status	
			Single	Married
Brand Name	Very Important	ROW PCT	50.00	50.00
		COL PCT	14.81	6.06
		N	4	4
	Important	ROW PCT	0.00	100.00
		COL PCT	0.00	12.12
		N	0	8
	Somewhat Important	ROW PCT	45.83	54.17
		COL PCT	40.74	19.70
		N	11	13
	Not Important	ROW PCT	29.63	70.37
		COL PCT	29.63	28.79
		N	8	19
	Least Important	ROW PCT	15.38	84.62
		COL PCT	14.81	33.33
		N	4	22

Group VIII

H_{56-63}: The importance of garment care will vary significantly with the age, education, occupation, marital status, family size, income, extent of purchase, and geographic locality of the respondent.

Table XXIV presents results of chi square analyses and shows a significant relationship between the importance of garment care and respondents' geographic locality. Table XXV shows that of the

respondents reporting garment care as important to their mail-order purchase decision, 92 percent resided in urban areas.

Significant relationships were not found between the importance of garment care and age, education, occupation, marital status, family size, income, or extent of purchase of the respondent (Table XXIV).

TABLE XXIII

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR IMPORTANCE OF BRAND NAME
FOR MAIL-ORDER PURCHASES BY
INCOME LEVEL

Clothing Attribute	Importance Level	—	Income Level			
			0 to 9,999	10,000 to 19,999	20,000 to 34,999	35,000 and over
Brand Name	Very Important	ROW PCT	50.00	12.50	0.00	37.50
		COL PCT	16.00	5.00	0.00	12.00
		N	4	1	0	3
	Important	ROW PCT	12.50	12.50	12.50	62.50
		COL PCT	4.00	5.00	4.17	20.00
		N	1	1	1	5
	Somewhat Important	ROW PCT	25.00	45.83	16.67	12.50
		COL PCT	24.00	55.00	16.67	12.00
		N	6	11	4	3
	Not Important	ROW PCT	29.63	11.11	33.33	25.93
		COL PCT	32.00	15.00	37.50	28.00
		N	8	3	9	7
	Least Important	ROW PCT	22.22	14.81	37.04	25.93
		COL PCT	24.00	20.00	41.67	28.00
		N	6	4	10	7

TABLE XXIV

SUMMARY OF CHI SQUARE ANALYSES FOR IMPORTANCE
OF GARMENT CARE FOR MAIL-ORDER PURCHASES BY
SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Socio-Demographic Characteristics	df	x^2	Significance Level	N
Age	6	8.14	N.S.	93
Education	6	3.11	N.S.	93
Occupation	2	0.67	N.S.	93
Marital Status	2	0.05	N.S.	92
Family Size	2	0.50	N.S.	92
Income	6	2.24	N.S.	93
Extent of Purchase	8	6.26	N.S.	93
Geographic Locality	2	14.39	0.001	93

TABLE XXV

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR IMPORTANCE OF GARMENT CARE
FOR MAIL-ORDER PURCHASES BY
GEOGRAPHIC LOCALITY

Clothing Attribute	Importance Level		Geographic Locality	
			Rural	Urban
Garment Care	Important	ROW PCT	8.20	91.80
		COL PCT	27.78	74.67
		N	5	56
	Somewhat	ROW PCT	39.29	60.71
	Important	COL PCT	61.11	22.67
		N	11	17
	Not	ROW PCT	50.00	50.00
		COL PCT	11.11	2.67
		N	2	2

Group IX

H_{64-71}: The importance of catalog name will vary significantly with the age, education, occupation, marital status, family size, income, extent of purchase, and geographic locality.

To test hypotheses 64 through 71, chi square analysis was used. Results shown in Table XXVI indicated that catalog name was not significantly related to any of the socio-demographic characteristics tested.

TABLE XXVI

SUMMARY OF CHI SQUARE ANALYSES FOR IMPORTANCE
OF CATALOG NAME FOR MAIL-ORDER PURCHASES BY
SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Socio-Demographic Characteristics	df	x^2	Significance Level	N
Age	12	0.21	N.S.	92
Education	12	0.43	N.S.	92
Occupation	4	0.14	N.S.	92
Marital Status	4	0.89	N.S.	91
Family Size	4	0.71	N.S.	91
Income	12	0.36	N.S.	92
Extent of Purchase	16	0.72	N.S.	92
Geographic Locality	4	0.41	N.S.	92

Discussion

Tables XXVII and XXVIII present a summary of the significant

relationships found during statistical analyses of the data. A significant relationship was found between respondents' education level and the construct fashion consciousness. Univariate ANOVA indicated that respondents' fashion opinion leadership scores contributed to the overall significance. In addition, there was a direct relationship between the two variables.

A significant relationship also existed between the construct fashion consciousness and respondents' income. Univariate ANOVA showed that respondents' clothing interest scores contributed to the overall significance. A direct relationship was found between income and clothing interest. These findings are in agreement with Summers (1970) who found that fashion opinion leaders had more formal education than non-leaders and that subjects with high clothing interest had significantly higher incomes than those with low clothing interest. Summers (1970) suggested that education exposed subjects to new fashion ideas and influences and that higher incomes allowed for greater discretionary spending for clothing.

Significant relationships were also found with the construct fashion consciousness and the importance of price and style. Respondents' fashion opinion leadership scores contributed to the overall significance of price while clothing interest scores and fashion opinion leadership scores contributed to the overall significance of style. An inverse relationship existed between the importance of price and fashion opinion leadership while a direct relationship existed with clothing interest, fashion opinion leadership and the importance of style.

Significant relationships were found between the importance of

price and income and education. An inverse relationship existed
between the importance of price and education and an inverse relation-
ship also existed between the importance of price and income. A
significant relationship was found between the importance of style
and education. A direct relationship existed between the two
variables. These findings are consistent with the significant rela-
tionships found during multivariate analysis of variance findings in
which fashion consciousness was found to be significantly related to
education and income and to the importance of price and style. These
findings suggest that respondents with higher level of education
tended to be more fashion conscious and thus expressed greater con-
cern for style in their mail-order clothing purchases than respondents
with less formal education.

Significant relationships were found with the importance of style,
fabric, garment care, and geographic locality. Respondents residing
in urban areas reported style, fabric, and garment care more important
to mail-order purchases than rural respondents. A possible explana-
tion for these findings might be that urban respondents participate in
a wider variety of social activities, such as charity balls, concerts,
and tennis tournaments, and therefore require different clothing for
each activity.

In addition, a significant relationship existed between the im-
portance of brand name and income. Respondents who considered brand
name very important reported an annual income of 0 to 9,999 dollars
and 35,000 dollars and more. These findings might suggest that res-
pondents in these income groups associate a product's brand name
with a particular status level and thus may attribute the importance

of brand name in their mail-order purchase decisions to a greater

degree than other income groups tested.

TABLE XXVII

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF
VARIANCE FINDINGS FOR EDUCATION, INCOME,
PRICE, STYLE AND FASHION CONSCIOUSNESS

Variable of Interest	Multivariate F-Value	Significance Level	Contributing Dependent Variable	Univariate F-Value	Significance Level	Relationship
Education	2.45	0.05	Fashion Opinion Leadership	4.96	0.01	Direct
Income	2.85	0.01	Clothing Interest	3.32	0.05	Direct
Price	4.00	0.01	Fashion Opinion Leadership	6.93	0.01	Inverse
Style	6.57	0.0001	Fashion Opinion Leadership	14.37	0.0001	Direct
			Clothing Interest	12.68	0.0001	Direct

TABLE XXVIII

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE ANALYSES FOR
IMPORTANCE OF PRICE, STYLE, FABRIC, BRAND
NAME, GARMENT CARE AND SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC
CHARACTERISTICS

Variables of Interest	X^2	Significance Level
Price/Education	18.45	0.05
Price/Income	13.46	0.05
Style/Education	15.30	0.05
Style/Geographic Locality	7.88	0.05
Fabric/Geographic Locality	7.27	0.05
Brand Name/Occupation	10.42	0.05
Brand Name/Marital Status	10.62	0.05
Brand Name/Income	23.17	0.05
Garment Care/Geographic Locality	14.39	0.001

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND

RECOMMENDATIONS

The researcher examined selected clothing attributes influencing

mail-order choices; fashion consciousness, operationally defined as

the construct of fashion opinion leadership and clothing interest

scores; and socio-demographic characteristics in relation to their

influence in selecting mail-order clothing. The sample consisted of

209 Oklahoma women mail-order consumers of clothing systematically

drawn from a pre-selected purchased population frame. The researcher

collected data through mailed questionnaires whereby 46 percent of

the questionnaires were completed and returned. Data were analyzed

using analysis of variance statistical techniques and chi square

analysis.

Approximately one-third of the respondents were aged 65 or older,

one-third were between the ages 55 through 64, and approximately one-

third were between 18 through 54. Nearly one-third of the respondents

graduated from high school, one-fourth graduated from college, approx-

imately one-fourth attended college but did not graduate, and nearly

one-fifth of the respondents did not graduate from high school. Sixty-

three percent of the respondents were employed outside the home and

approximately three-fourths of the respondents were married without

children living at home. Eighty percent of the respondents resided

in urban areas. Over half of the respondents reported purchasing at least 100 dollars in mail-order items in the past 12 months.

Approximately two-thirds of the respondents considered price and garment care important to mail-order purchases while 55 percent of the sample reported fabric important. In addition, nearly half of the respondents regarded style and color important to their clothing purchases. Forty-two percent of the respondents considered catalog name important while only 18 percent of the respondents considered brand name in their mail-order purchase decisions.

Scores on the Fashion Opinion Leadership Inventory ranged from 21 to 97 with a mean of 56.50 while scores ranged from 20 to 100 on the Clothing Inventory with a mean of 64.74.

Results of the analyses showed that the construct fashion consciousness varied significantly with education and income. The importance of price and style were also significantly related to the construct fashion consciousness. Chi square analyses resulted significant relationships with the importance of price, style, fabric, brand name, and garment care and selected socio-demographic characteristics tested. The study found that the importance of price was significantly related to education and income, and the importance of style was significantly related to education and geographic locality. In addition, the importance of fabric was significantly related to geographic locality, while brand name was significantly related to occupation, marital status and income. Furthermore, the importance of garment care was significantly related to geographic locality. Significant relationships were not found with color and catalog name importance and the selected socio-demographic variables tested.

Implications

Although the research results are applicable only to the pre-selected population frame, this research offers several implications for marketing practioners. First, the results concur with the literature reviewed illustrating that mail-order consumers are price conscious in their purchase decisions. Based on these results, marketers can formulate marketing strategies aimed at possible financial advantages offered by mail-order shopping.

Second, the study found that urban respondents considered style, fabric, and garment care more important than rural respondents to mail-order purchase decisions. Implications for marketers may suggest that merchandise assortments directed toward the urban resident feature stylish clothing in easy-care fabrics.

Third, since nearly half of the respondents considered garment color important to mail-order purchases, catalogs might show garments in their actual color rather than describing the color, so as to reduce the consumer's perceived risks with mail-order shopping.

Fourth, since brand name was found important among low and high income respondents, marketers can introduce brand names to their merchandise assortments that are particular to each income group to attract these brand conscious consumers. In addition to introducing brand names to the inventory, marketers can implement private-label programs to further attract the brand conscious consumer so as to establish the catalog's identity, much like a retail store, as a source for quality fashionable clothing.

Recommendations

The results of this work suggest several directions for further research. First, because the sample consisted primarily of older age groups, further researchers need to examine mail-order characteristics of other age groups including groups from different geographical regions to examine different mail-order purchasing patterns.

Second, results showed a significant relationship between brand name importance and occupation, however, a trend was not readily apparent. Further study in this area might be to determine a pattern between brand name importance and occupation among mail-order consumers.

In addition, results indicated that older respondents tended to place greater importance on brand name than younger respondents. A third recommendation for further research might be to explore different age groups with brand name importance which may result in significant relationships not found in the study.

Fourth, the literature reviewed suggested that mail-order consumers used credit more for purchases than store shoppers and owned several rather than one credit card. Further investigation of credit usage among mail-order consumers would aid marketers to accurately define their purchasing behavior and attitudes toward credit use.

Fifth, a lifestyle investigation with users and non-users of mail-order catalogs would provide marketers information regarding differences between the two types of shoppers, thus providing the essential tools for formulating marketing strategies and policies regarding increased mail-order use.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bellizzi, J.A., Hamilton, J.R., Kruecheberg, H.F., and Martin, W.S. Consumer perception of national, private, and generic brands. Journal of Retailing, 1981, 51 (4) 56-70.

Berkowitz, E.M., Walker, O.C., and Walton, J.R. In-home shoppers: The market for innovative distribution systems. Journal of Retailing, 1979, 55 (2) 15-33.

Biehal, G. and Chahravarti, D. Information-Presentation format and learning goals as determinants of consumers' memory retrieval and choice processes. Journal of Consumer Research, 1982, 8, 431-441.

Cosmas, S.C. Lifestyles and consumption patterns. Journal of Consumer Research, 1982, 8, 453-455.

Creekmore, A. Methods of Measuring Clothing Variables. East Lansing: Michigan State University Bulletin Office, 1977.

Crosby, L.A. and Taylor, J.R. Effects of consumer information and education on cognition and choice. Journal of Consumer Research, 1981, 8, 43-56.

Dickson, P.R. The impact of enriching case and statistical information on consumer judgments. Journal of Consumer Research, 1982, 8, 398-406.

Eccher, J.J. "The influence of brand name on the perception of product value." Unpub. M.S. thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1970.

Gillett, P.L. A profile of urban in-home shoppers. Journal of Marketing, 1970, 4 (July) 40-45.

Hirschman, E.C. and Krishman, S. Subjective and objective criteria in consumer choice: an examination of retail patronage criteria. The Journal of Consumer Affairs, 1981, 15 (1) 115-127.

Jenkins, M.C. and Dickey, L.E. Consumer types based on evaluation criteria underlying clothing decisions. Home Economics Research Journal, 1976, 4 (3) 150-162.

Jolson, M.A., Anderson, R.E., and Leber, N.J. Profiles of signature goods consumers and avoiders. Journal of Retailing, 1981, 57 (4) 19-38.

Katz, E. and Lazerfeld, P. (1973). Fashion Leaders. In G. Wilis and D. Midgley (Eds.), Fashion Marketing (p. 241-258). London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.

Korgaonhar, P.K. Shopping orientation of catalog showroom patrons. Journal of Retailing, 1981, 57 (1) 78-90.

Lydon, S. The joys of shopping by mail. Ms., 1982, 10 (May) 87-92.

Malhotra, N.K. Information load and consumer decision making. Journal of Consumer Research, 1982, 8, 419-429.

Martin, C.R., Jr. What consumers of fashion want to know. Journal of Retailing, 1972, 47, 64-71, 94.

Nichols, S.Y. and Abdel-Ghany, M. Leisure time of husbands and wives. Home Economics Research Journal, 1983, 12 (2) 189-198.

Pacharel, S. and Abraham, R. Consumer Behavior and Fashion Marketing. 2nd Ed. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Co., 1979.

Pirorti, A.R., Vitriol, M.M., and Thirm, A. Consumer interest in mail-order purchasing. Journal of Advertising Research, 1981, 21 (June) 35-38.

Quelch, J.A. and Takeuchi, H. Non-store marketing: fast track or slow? Harvard Business Review, 1981, 59, 75-84.

Rosenberg, L.J. and Hirschman, E.C. Retailing without stores. Harvard Business Review, 1980, July-Aug., 103-112.

Schaninger, C.M. and Sciglimpaglia, D. The influence of cognitive personality traits and demographics on consumer information acquisition. Journal of Consumer Research, 1981, 8, 208-216.

Schrank, H.L. and Gilmore, D.L. Correlates of fashion leadership: implications for fashion process theory. The Sociological Quarterly, 1973, 14 (Autumn) 534-543.

Schultz, D.E. Consumer poll plugs into cable. Advertising Age, 1981, 52 (40) 30-31.

Schwartz, D.L. Marketing Today, A Basic Approach. 3rd Ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1981.

Selker, M.L. Conformity in dress--an exploration in the development of a measure (1962). In Creekmore's Methods of Measuring Clothing Variables. East Lansing: Michigan State University Bulletin Office, 1977.

Sheth, J. Multivariate Methods for Market and Survey Research. Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Slocum, J.W. and Mathews, H.L. Social class and income as indicators of consumer behavior. Journal of Marketing, 1970, 34 (2) 69-74.

Snead, R.J., Wilcox, J.B., and Wilkes, R.E. How valid are product descriptions and protocols in choice experiments. Journal of Consumer Research, 1981, 8, 37-42.

Sproles, G.B., Geistfeld, L.V., and Badenhop, S.B. Informational inputs as influences on efficient consumer decision-making. The Journal of Consumer Affairs, 1978, 12 (1) 88-103.

Still, R.R. and Cundiff, E.W. Essentials of Marketing. 2nd Ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Stone, B. Direct marketing: now a bigger bargain. Advertising Age, 1983, 54 (2) 42.

Summers, J.O. The identity of women's clothing fashion opinion leaders. Journal of Marketing Research, 1970, 7 (May) 178-185.

Thompson, J.R. Characteristics and behavior of out-shopping consumers. Journal of Retailing, 1971, 47 (1) 70-80.

U.S. Department of Commerce. Oklahoma: number of inhabitants. 1980 Census of Population, 1980, 18-23.

Wheatley, J.J., Chiu, J.S.Y., and Goldman, A. Physical quality, price and perceptions of product quality: implications for retailers. Journal of Retailing, 1981, 57 (2) 101-116.

Williams, E.B., Ed. The Scribner-Bantam English Dictionary. New York: Bantam, 1980.

Wilis, G. and Midgley, D., Eds. Fashion Marketing. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1973.

Winakor, G. The process of clothing consumption. Journal of Home Economics, 1969, 61 (8) 629-634.

Zaltman, G. and Wallendorf, M. Consumer Behavior Basic Findings and Management Implications. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1979.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTERS AND QUESTIONNAIRE

Oklahoma State University /
DEPARTMENT OF CLOTHING, TEXTILES & MERCHANDISING

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
HOME ECONOMICS WEST 312
(405) 624-5034

January 3, 1984

Today's consumer has a busy mobile lifestyle that requires much time working and little time for shopping. Shopping by mail, for many of us, has provided the solution to our shopping needs. I am a graduate student at Oklahoma State University and under the guidance of my professor, I am studying mail-order consumers.

Because you are a buyer of clothing items by mail we value your judgment highly . . . and because we value your judgment we would like your help in learning more about you and some of the factors that influence your decision to purchase clothing items through the mail. Your reply to this survey will help us aid companies that sell by mail to satisfy your particular needs.

This survey is being mailed to a small select group of mail-order consumers from Oklahoma. To ensure that replies truly reflect the opinions of all, it is important we hear from you.

It will only take a few minutes to complete the survey on the following pages. A pre-addressed postpaid envelope has been provided for your reply. Your name and address has been used merely for addressing purposes and your reply will be kept absolutely confidential.

Many thanks for your help in this research project.

Donna H. Branson, Ph.D.
Associate Professor

Victoria Seitz
Graduate Assistant

Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF CLOTHING, TEXTILES & MERCHANDISING

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
HOME ECONOMICS WEST 312
(405) 624-5034

January 25, 1984

Recently, a survey regarding clothing purchases through the mail was sent to you. As of yet, we still have not heard from you.

Because you are a buyer of clothing items by mail we value your judgment highly and we would like your help in learning more about some of the factors that influence your decision to purchase clothing items through the mail. Your reply to this survey will help us to help you satisfy your mail-order needs.

This survey was mailed to a small select group of mail-order consumers from Oklahoma. To ensure that replies truly reflect the opinions of all Oklahomans, it is important we hear from you.

It will only take a few minutes to complete the survey on the following pages. A pre-addressed postpaid envelope has been provided for your reply. Your name and address has been used merely for addressing purposes and your reply will be kept absolutely confidential.

We urge you to complete the survey on the following pages. Your help is vital to our study and we would very much appreciate your speedy reply. Should the survey be on it's way to us, thank you.

Many thanks for your help in this research project.

Donna H. Branson, Ph.D.
Associate Professor

Victoria Seitz
Graduate Assistant

SECTION I

Please read the following statements about clothing. Rate each according to the extent to which you believe the statement is true or false. Use the following guide and check (✓) the appropriate response.

DT--Definitely true.
PT--Partially true, more true than false.
U --Undecided, uncertain.
PF--Partially false, more false than true.
DF--Definitely false.

DT	PT	U	PF	DF

1. I generally don't pass along fashion information to others. ___(5)

2. Fashion holds a low priority as a topic of conversation among my friends. ___(6)

3. Others consult me for information about the latest fashion trends. ___(7)

4. I believe I am a very good source of advice about fashion. ___(8)

5. People talk too much about fashion. ___(9)

6. I never borrow or lend fashion magazines. ___(10)

7. My friends ask for my opinions about new styles. ___(11)

8. I am more likely than most of my friends to be asked for advice about fashion. ___(12)

9. I do more listening than talking during conversations about fashion. ___(13)

10. When it comes to fashion, I am among the least likely of my friends to be thought of as an advice-giver. ___(14)

11. It is important to share one's opinion about the new styles with others. ___(15)

12. My friends don't think of me as a knowledgeable source of information about fashion trends. ___(16)

13. I recently convinced someone to change an aspect of her appearance to something more fashionable. ___(17)

14. I believe in sharing with others what I know about trends in fashion. ___(18)

15. I enjoy discussing fashion. ___(19)

	DT	PT	U	PF	DF

16. People bypass me as a source of advice about fashion. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(20)

17. I dislike discussing clothes and fashion. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(21)

18. I like to help others make decisions about fashions. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(22)

19. I am never first to be asked for an opinion about a current style. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(23)

20. I enjoy being asked about fashion trends. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(24)

21. I enjoy clothes like some people do such things as books, records and movies. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(25)

22. Clothing is so attractive to me that I am tempted to spend more money on it than I should. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(26)

23. I skip the clothing ads in newspapers and magazines. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(27)

24. I like to read and study fashion trends. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(28)

25. I have no interest in keeping up with the latest fashion trends. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(29)

26. I would rather spend my money on clothes than on anything else. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(30)

27. Mass media accounts of what women in the public eye are wearing are boring. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(31)

28. I enjoy reading about current fashion trends. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(32)

29. I don't attend fashion shows even when I have the opportunity. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(33)

30. Planning and selecting my wardrobe can be included among my favorite activities. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(34)

31. I enjoy window-shopping to see the clothes. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(35)

32. I am not clothes-conscious. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(36)

33. I would like to be considered one of the best-dressed women. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(37)

34. The subject of clothing is uninteresting to me. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(38)

35. It is tiresome to keep up with fashion. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(39)

36. I do not enjoy shopping for clothing or fabrics. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___(40)

	DT	PT	U	PF	DF

37. I think clothes are important in expressing one's creativity.   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ | ___(41)

38. I am not too concerned with clothes.   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ | ___(42)

39. I keep my wardrobe in top condition at all times.   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ | ___(43)

40. I don't stop to look at clothes when I don't plan to buy.   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ | ___(44)

SECTION II

We are interested in knowing the most important factors (such as price and style) that motivate your decision to buy a dress or suit from a mail-order catalog. Please indicate the level of importance of each of these factors stated below in your decision in regards to purchasing a clothing item by checking (✓) the appropriate response.

    VI--Very important.
     I--Important.
    SI--Somewhat important.
    NI--Not important.
    LI--Least important.

	VI	I	SI	NI	LI

1. Price   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ | ___(46)

2. Style   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ | ___(47)

3. Color   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ | ___(48)

4. Fabric   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ | ___(49)

5. Brand name of clothing   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ | ___(50)

6. Care of the garment   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ | ___(51)

7. The catalog the item is purchased from.   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ | ___(52)

SECTION III

The following personal questions are for classification purposes only. Under no circumstances will a particular answer be attributed to a specific individual. PLEASE DO NOT OMIT ANY ANSWERS.

1. AGE

18-24	___	45-54	___
25-34	___	55-64	___
35-44	___	65 or older	___

___(54)

2. EDUCATION

Did not graduate high school ___
Graduated high school ___
Attended college ___
Graduated college ___
Attended graduate or professional school ___

___(55)

3. OCCUPATION

Teacher ___
Professional/Manager ___
Sales ___
Clerical/Secretarial ___
Homemaker ___
Other (Please specify) _____

___(56)

4. MARITAL STATUS

Single	___	Divorced/Separated or Widowed	___
Married	___	Single Parent	___
Parent	___	Other	___

___(57)

5. CHILDREN

How many children are living at home?_____

___(58)

6. ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME

Less than $ 5,000	___	$15,000------$19,999	___
$ 5,000--------- 7,499	___	$20,000------ 34,999	___
$ 7,500--------- 9,999	___	$35,000------ 49,999	___
$10,000--------- 14,999	___	$50,000 or more	___

___(59)

7. Mail-order catalog purchases during the past 12 months: Approximately how much have you spent to buy clothing from a mail-order catalog? (If you charge your purchases you may want to look back to your records.)

Under $25	___	$ 300-----$499	___
$ 25----$ 49	___	$ 500----- 999	___
$ 50---- 99	___	$1,000 or more	___
$100---- 299	___		

___(60)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

APPENDIX B

TABLES

TABLE XXIX

MEAN CLOTHING INTEREST SCORES BY INCOME LEVEL

Socio-Demographic Characteristic	Level	Mean Score	N
Income	0 to 9,000	58.25	20
	10,000 to 19,999	75.82	17
	20,000 to 34,999	58.58	24
	35,000 and over	68.40	22

TABLE XXX

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR IMPORTANCE OF BRAND NAME
FOR MAIL-ORDER PURCHASES BY OCCUPATION

Clothing Attribute	Importance Level		Occupation	
			Employed Outside the Home	Homemaker
Brand Name	Very Important	ROW PCT	25.00	75.00
		COL PCT	3.33	17.65
		N	2	6
	Important	ROW PCT	87.50	12.50
		COL PCT	11.67	2.94
		N	7	1
	Somewhat Important	ROW PCT	54.17	45.83
		COL PCT	21.67	32.35
		N	13	11
	Not Important	ROW PCT	62.96	37.04
		COL PCT	28.33	29.41
		N	17	10
	Least Important	ROW PCT	77.78	22.22
		COL PCT	35.00	17.65
		N	21	6

VITA ^{2}

Victoria Ann Seitz

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: CLOTHING ATTRIBUTES THAT INFLUENCE MAIL-ORDER CHOICES

Major Field: Clothing, Textiles and Merchandising

Biographical:

    Personal Data: Born in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, August 7, 1956, the daughter of Lt. Gen. (Ret.) and the late Mrs. Richard J. Seitz.

    Education: Graduated from E.E. Smith Senior High School, Fayetteville, North Carolina, in May, 1974; received Bachelor of Science degree in Home Economics from Kansas State University in 1978; completed requirements for Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1984.

    Professional Experience: Fashion Coordinator, Burdines Department Stores, 1978-79; Department Manager, Saks Fifth Avenue, 1980-82; Free lance designer and illustrator for Frec Baggs, Incorporated, 1978-84; Graduate teaching assistant, Clothing, Textiles, and Merchandising Department, Oklahoma State University, 1983-84.

    Professional Organizations: Omicron Nu, Phi Upsilon Omicron, American Home Economics Association, Business and Professional Women's Club.