

PRODUCT ATTRIBUTES AND INFORMATIONAL SOURCES  
PREFERRED IN THE PURCHASE DECISION  
FOR A PARKA

By

ROXANNE STELL

Bachelor of Science

Northern Arizona University

Flagstaff, Arizona

1980

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE  
May, 1983

Thesis  
1983  
S824p  
cop. 2



PRODUCT ATTRIBUTES AND INFORMATIONAL SOURCES  
PREFERRED IN THE PURCHASE DECISION  
FOR A PARKA

Thesis Approved:

*Groualynn Sikes*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser

*Lana Stufflebean*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Carol Ann Lewis*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Norman N. Durham*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Dr. Grovalynn Sisler, major adviser, for her encouragement, assistance, and support throughout the course of this study. Appreciation is also extended to Carolyn Flowers and Dr. Tana Stufflebean who provided assistance and support during the study preparations of the manuscript.

Special thanks goes to Dr. William Warde for his assistance in the computer analysis of the data. Extended appreciation goes to Dr. Janice Briggs for her assistance and support during the early stages of this undertaking. To Larry, who provided love and understanding, this endeavor is dedicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
Purpose. . . . .	3
Objectives . . . . .	3
Hypotheses . . . . .	4
Assumptions . . . . .	4
Limitations . . . . .	5
Definitions . . . . .	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	6
Functions of Dress . . . . .	6
Protective Clothing . . . . .	7
Information Seeking . . . . .	9
III. RESEARCH PROCEDURES . . . . .	15
Development of the Instrument . . . . .	15
Description of the Respondents . . . . .	16
Method of Data Analysis . . . . .	17
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	18
The Importance of Product Attributes . . . . .	18
The Helpfulness of Informational Sources . . . . .	20
Comparison of Ratings for Product Attributes Among Three Classifications . . . . .	22
Comparison of Ratings for Informational Sources Among Three Classifications. . . . .	24
Discussion of Findings . . . . .	26
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	30
Conclusions . . . . .	32
Recommendations for Further Research . . . . .	33
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	34
APPENDIXES . . . . .	36
APPENDIX A - QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	38
APPENDIX B - CHI-SQUARE TABLES . . . . .	40

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Mean Scores of Respondents' Ratings for Product Attributes . . . . .	19
II. Mean Scores of Respondents' Ratings for Informational Sources. . . . .	21
III. Chi-Square Values for Product Attributes According to Participation in Outdoor Recreational Activities . . . . .	41
IV. Chi-Square Values for Product Attributes According to Ownership of a Parka. . . . .	43
V. Chi-Square Values for Product Attributes According to Gender. . . . .	45
VI. Chi-Square Values for Informational Sources According to Participation in Outdoor Recreational Activities. . . . .	47
VII. Chi-Square Values for Informational Sources According to Ownership of a Parka. . . . .	49
VIII. Chi-Square Values for Informational Sources According to Gender. . . . .	51

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Today more than one-third of the year is classified as leisure time (Packard, 1979). Packard has identified three areas of leisure and their impact on fashion marketing. They include necessative, expansive, and innovative leisure.

**Necessative:** free time as an opportunity to produce income.

The fashion implications are mostly of a functional nature.

**Expansive:** growth of existing life style or activity. The fashion implications are many and varied and depend on one's activities.

**Innovative:** creation of new life styles and activity.

Innovative refers to a newly created approach to life engendered by leisure regardless of the motive. The fashion implications are exceptionally strong since the activity involved will require initial investments in dress and equipment (Packard, 1979, p. 163).

The impact of leisure has created a need for new tools, facilities, and clothing. "The fashion industries will be challenged to produce versatile, functional, and attractive clothing for almost every activity" (Packard, 1979, p. 167). A growing number of firms are now manufacturing outdoor clothing and equipment to meet the increasing demand for such products. Many more stores are now planning "to expand existing playwear/activewear departments to include more functional items" (Why chains are trailing in functional activewear, 1981, p. 26).

Individuals continue to spend their leisure time involved in outdoor recreational activities. These may be classified as non-urban

activities which take individuals away from their homes and away from shelter (Packard, 1979). Non-urban activities may include backpacking, camping, canoeing, cycling, hiking, rock climbing, or skiing.

Today millions of individuals are pursuing leisure activities such as backpacking or hiking. According to Hart (1977, p. 15):

In 1975, by the best estimate, Americans spent some forty-two million days hiking in the nation's wild and semi-wild places, a sixteen-fold increase since 1945. Wilderness hiking has grown five times as fast as the population.

This increase in wilderness travel suggests a market segment which may have unique clothing requirements. As Fourt and Hollies (1970, p. 1) stated: "Clothing may be selected and adjusted by conscious intent to secure comfort or at least as much protection from adverse environment as possible."

If clothing is worn for protection in the outdoors it would appear reasonable that functional (performance) attributes would be of primary importance. "Because its primary function is to shelter, warm, and sustain you in unpredictable, potentially life threatening elements, color and appearance in the outdoor wardrobe should be secondary concerns" (Thomas, 1980, p. 47). As Rohles, McCullough, and Munson (1980, p. 1) stated: "Most consumers want their outdoor products to be lightweight, durable, warm, and easy to pack, clean, and maintain." Attributes such as weight, fabric content, construction techniques, insulative material, and care instructions should be deemed significant in the selection of outdoor clothing.



### Purpose

The purpose of the study was to identify important product attributes and helpful informational sources as perceived by consumers in the decision to purchase a parka. The results may indicate a need to offer additional product information to aid in the decision to purchase a parka. The results may also offer additional insights useful to educational instructors, industry, and businesses which disseminate information regarding the attributes in outdoor clothing design, construction and promotion.

### Objectives

The specific objectives of the study were as follows:

1. To identify the product attributes which are important to the consumer when making a decision to purchase a parka.
2. To identify the informational sources which are helpful to the consumer when making a decision to purchase a parka.
3. To determine whether differences exist (in regard to product attributes and informational sources) between the ratings of
  - a. individuals who actively participate in outdoor recreational activities and those who do not participate
  - b. individuals who own a parka and those who do not own a parka
  - c. male and female respondents.

## Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested:

H<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the ratings of participants and non-participants in outdoor recreational activities in regard to the product attributes and informational sources selected.

H<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the ratings of parka owners and non-owners in regard to the product attributes and informational sources selected.

H<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the ratings of male and female respondents in regard to the product attributes and informational sources selected.

## Assumptions

The assumptions in the study were as follows:

1. The product attributes listed (brand name, care instructions, color, construction techniques, insulative material, lining fabric, price, shell [outer] fabric, special features, and weight) are attributes consumers use in making a decision to purchase a parka.

2. The informational sources listed (clubs/organizations, consumer groups, displays, educational classes, friends/relatives, hangtags/labels, mail order catalogs, magazines, newspapers, and television) are sources consumers use in acquiring product information for a parka.

### Limitations

The limitations of the study were as follows:

1. The participants in the study were limited to students enrolled at Oklahoma State University who volunteered to complete the questionnaire.

2. The results of the study cannot be generalized to garments other than a parka or to consumers as a whole.

### Definitions

The following terms were used in the study:

Information Seeking: Searching out information concerning garment attributes in order to choose among competing alternative products.

Outdoor Clothing: Clothing worn to protect the body and provide comfort from uncontrollable environmental conditions.

Parka: A functional outdoor jacket with a hood and pockets which provides the wearer protection, comfort, and convenience.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Today individuals spend time and money with regard to leisure activities. These various activities have different requirements. To better understand and meet the clothing needs of the individual involved in outdoor recreational activities the following areas were reviewed and discussed: functions of dress, protective clothing, and information seeking.

#### Functions Of Dress

The function of dress has been categorized in a number of ways. Most often the functions of dress are identified as protection, modesty, and adornment. Bush and London (1960) described the functions of dress as (a) protection of the body against harm, (b) concealment or display of parts of the body and (c) differentiation through decoration and adornment of the individual or group from another. Sproles (1979) has expanded these functions into eight categories which include utility, modesty, adornment, sexual attraction, symbolic differentiation, social affiliation, psychological self-enhancement, and modernism. Roach and Eicher (1976) have identified three uses of dress. These include dress as (1) a physical environment for the body, (2) an interface between the body and environment and (3) a means of communication for the individual within the social environment.

Dress may function to aid in the satisfaction of individual needs. These needs may be identified by the classic hierarchy of needs developed by Maslow (1954). Maslow suggested that individuals are motivated to satisfy five types of needs: (1) physiological needs relate to proper functioning of the human body (food, drink, rest, activity); (2) safety needs include physical security, protection from the environment, and reduction of fear or anxiety; (3) love needs involve receiving affection; (4) esteem needs include feelings of self-esteem, self-worth, recognition, and social approval; (5) self-actualization needs relate to success in personal achievement, expression of personal creativity and self-fulfillment. Dress may function to serve one or more of these needs.

#### Protective Clothing

Although a variety of functions may be suggested, writers generally consider protection the least important factor for the use of clothing. However, it has been given emphasis with regard to specific occasions where clothing may be used as an insulator in severe climates or uncontrollable environmental conditions.

The protective (utility) element of clothing should perform practical functions. These have been categorized by Sproles (1979) as protection, comfort, and convenience. "The protective function occurs when clothing effectively screens out direct contact between the body and the natural environment" (Sproles, 1979, p. 30). The well-being of man depends upon this balance between man's body temperature and environmental conditions. Research concerning protective clothing had its beginnings in the military where it was necessary to assess clothing

requirements for severe regions. Since that time protective clothing has been expanded to include clothing for the handicapped, firefighters, policemen, astronauts, and active sportsmen.

Dress as a physical environment for the body may be bio-physical or bio-aesthetic. The bio-physical element may help maintain heat balance or thermal comfort. In order for dress to protect the individual from extreme heat and cold it is used as an interface between the body and the natural environment (Roach and Eicher, 1976).

"Comfort is enhanced when clothing maintains the consumer's preferred body temperature" (Sproles, 1979, p. 30). Thermal comfort may be enhanced by engaging in more physical activity, consuming more food, or through utilization of clothing as a means of heat insulation (layering or use of fiber types and fabric constructions). Clothing worn for the outdoors acts as a heat insulator by permitting the release of just enough heat so the skin temperature stays well within the comfort range (Meier, 1965). It is critical that damp underlayers (due to perspiration), which may diminish insulating ability, be avoided.

Grise (1980) measured the thermal comfort characteristics of textile apparel fabrics that would be worn by individuals indoors with sedentary to moderate activity levels. Results indicated layering of fabrics, increased air spaces, thickness, and fabric surfaces could contribute to higher insulation values. According to Fourt and Hollies "the concept of quiet or resting comfort is too limited for the general study of desirable clothing conditions for military use or for men at physical work or active sport. The quiet comfort ideal is closely tied to ceremonial rather than functional clothing" (Fourt and Hollies, 1970, p. 4-5).

A study by McCullough (1980) focused on assessing the thermal insulation value of jackets and sleeping bags. A reliable, valid, and objective test method for measuring the thermal insulation of outdoor garments and sleeping bags was discussed. These measurements were used in estimating the amount of thermal protection products should provide the wearer in different climates.

As the demand for variety and quality of outdoor clothing and equipment increases manufactures will continue to promote the thermal properties of these products. Manufacturers, consumer organizations, and magazine publishers have all attempted to evaluate and compare thermal comfort characteristics of outdoor clothing and equipment. However, according to Rohles, McCullough, and Munson (1980) all sources have lacked reliability and validity.

Clothing may be considered a convenience if it allows the wearer freedom of movement, performance of activity, and opportunity to carry things (Sproles, 1979). Today, many designers of outdoor garments "seem intent on creating functional, lightweight clothing which protects us from the elements, and which permits absolute physical freedom" (Thomas, 1980, p. 58).

#### Information Seeking

The consumer seeks information to gather facts necessary to choose from competing alternative products. "Consumer decision making includes an active and often purposeful seeking and use of information on current fashion selections" (Sproles, 1979, p. 193).

It has been suggested that product characteristics and personal characteristics of the consumer may determine the amount of information sought. Troelstrup (1974) has listed several circumstances which can motivate consumers to seek information. He also indicated that consumers with a college education, in the middle-income level, in white-collar occupations, and under age 25 are more likely to engage in extended decision making.

As the consumer gathers the desired information, the number of alternative styles considered is narrowed to a manageable number, and the final decision is made based on critical attributes such as product characteristics, style, detail, color, brand name, etc. (Sproles, 1979). There are limitations to the number of criteria that can enter into the purchase decision. "Most studies show that six or fewer criteria generally are used by most consumers, although the number may go as high as nine" (Engel, Blackwell and Kollat, 1978, p. 369).

Studies concerning fashion preference and buying practices of consumer segments often examine critical product attributes. Smith (1974) studied the fashion preferences and buying practices of professional black women. The majority of respondents selected seven of the nine available responses (price, color, fit, becomingness, fabric, construction, line or style, prestige and brand name).

Eubanks (1978) studied the clothing practices of freshman and senior college women. Participants were asked to select two of the nine factors (price, color, fit, style, care, brand name, construction, prestige, and becomingness) which they felt were important in their clothing selection. Fit was regarded as the most important to both



groups. Freshmen selected becomingness as the second most important factor and seniors chose price.

Pyle (1980) investigated selected clothing variables of large size women in relation to their self-concepts. Respondents were asked to select factors which they perceived as important in their clothing selections. The nine factors considered included price, color, fit, style, care, brand name, construction, prestige, and becomingness. Sixty-eight percent of the participants selected fit as most important. Price was selected as the second most important factor for selecting clothing and the third most important factor was becomingness. Brand name and prestige were not considered important.

Stivers (1974) examined the clothing buying practices of undergraduate men. Eleven factors that might influence clothing purchases were listed. These included price, brand name, "in fashion," care required, family member or friend, quality of merchandise, color, need, promotion and advertising, merchandise return policy, and fit. Subjects were asked to indicate their first, second, and third choices in order of importance. Need was selected as the most important factor influencing clothing purchases. Price was ranked as second and garment fit ranked third in importance. Promotion/advertisement and merchandise return policy received only two responses. They were considered to be unimportant in clothing purchase decisions.

Martin (1971) examined specific types of information the consumer desired in the decision to purchase a fashion garment. The subjects were shown line drawings and asked to make a decision to purchase based on the drawing with the assumption that it fit them correctly. They

were given a list of nine informational factors from which they could choose five factors. The nine factors included price, color, content of material, brand name, store identification, instructions for care, department of store, salesgirl's evaluation of quality, salesgirl's evaluation of style. The results indicated that 62% of the participants desired to know the price as their first piece of information. Physical characteristics (color and material) were requested more often than psychological factors (salesgirl's evaluation of quality and style).

Sources for product information may be examined prior to and away from the point of purchase. Beal and Rogers (1957) examined informational sources used in the adoption process of new fabrics. The sources were classified into five categories (mass media, agencies, informal, commercial, and self) each of which had different levels of use at each stage in the adoption process. The results indicated that mass media (magazines, newspapers, television, and radio) were the most important at the awareness stage. At the information and application stages informal sources (neighbors, friends, and relatives) were rated the most important. Commercial sources (displays, and sales personnel) were important in the trial stage.

Eagle (1974) investigated the clothing selection and buying practices of 30 married male business executives. The subjects were asked to rank their first, second, and third choices regarding product information sources. The nine sources from which to select included wife, personal acquaintance, magazine, store display, sales personnel, radio and television, movies, and newspapers. Personal acquaintances and magazines were ranked as the most important sources of fashion

information. Store displays were ranked second and wives third as important sources of fashion information.

The results of a study by King and Summers (1967) indicated that newspapers, fashion magazines, and displays were the "most helpful" sources of information.

Informational sources may also be sought out at the point of purchase. The consumer cannot make a final decision until the alternatives are made available. Point of purchase information may include packages, tags, and labels which list specific details about product attributes. The results of a study by King and Summers (1967) revealed that point of purchase information on packages (including hangtags) ranked high as being a helpful source of fashion information.

#### Summary

Dress has been viewed as providing various functions for the individual. The protective function of clothing plays an important role for individuals involved in outdoor recreational activities where maintaining heat balance becomes crucial. Protective elements for the consumer are being assessed through use of various fabrics and activity levels.

Product attributes may vary according to consumer segments or the types of products being purchased. These attributes may assist the consumer in their purchase decision. Research has indicated that price, fit, becomingness, color, and material content are factors which are important to the consumer in selecting clothing items.

Sources for product information may differ according to various consumer segments or stages in the product adoption process. These sources of information may help the consumer in the decision making process. Research has indicated that personal acquaintances, magazines, displays, hangtags and labels are important sources of information.

## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH PROCEDURES

The purpose of the study was twofold: to identify the product attributes consumers perceived as being important in the purchase decision for a parka, and to identify the informational sources which the consumer perceived as helpful in the purchase decision for a parka. The ratings of product attributes and informational sources were compared between (1) participants and non-participants in outdoor recreational activities, (2) parka owners and non-owners, and (3) male and female respondents.

#### Development of the Instrument

The instrument developed for the study utilized a Likert scale which consisted of ten product attributes and ten informational sources. The product attributes (brand name, care instructions, color, construction techniques, insulative material, lining fabric, price, shell [outer] fabric, special features, and weight) were based on characteristics associated with a parka. Informational sources (clubs/organizations, consumer groups, displays, educational classes, friends/relatives, hantags/labels, mail order catalogs, magazines, newspapers, and television) were selected to include a wide range of opportunities for obtaining product information. The additional questions were formulated to ascertain the respondents' degree of

participation in outdoor recreational activities, ownership of a parka, and gender.

The instrument was pre-tested with eighteen clothing and textile students enrolled at Oklahoma State University. As a result of the pre-test three aspects of the instrument were altered. First, the term "outer" was added to "shell fabric" for clarification. Secondly, since only one respondent who had purchased a parka did not own a parka, a question regarding purchase was eliminated from the questionnaire. Finally, ten of the eighteen respondents were classified as participants in outdoor recreational activities according to their responses. The researcher questioned this disproportionately high percentage of participants due to the demographic characteristics of the group. The validity of the question was investigated and it was determined to be too broad to distinguish between active participants and non-participants in outdoor recreational activities. Hiking and canoeing categories, which were considered less strenuous, were excluded from the selection of outdoor recreational activities.

#### Description of the Respondents

Students at Oklahoma State University participated in the study. Two hundred thirty-seven individuals from home economics, accounting, and forestry volunteered to complete the questionnaire. The researcher visited two clothing and textiles classes, four accounting classes and a forestry club meeting to achieve a more balanced cross-section of individuals. Questionnaires were hand distributed, completed, and collected by the researcher to avoid a low rate of response.

### Method of Data Analysis

During the analysis the questionnaires were grouped three times: according to whether respondents were (1) participants or non-participants in outdoor recreational activities, (2) owners or non-owners of a parka, and (3) male or female. Chi-square values were calculated to compare the responses of the sub-groups within each classification on each product attribute and on each informational source.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The study was undertaken to examine product attributes and informational sources individuals (consumers) perceived as important and helpful when making a decision to purchase a parka. In addition differences which existed between the sub-groups within selected classifications on the ratings of each product attribute and informational source were determined.

An instrument (Appendix A) was developed to collect the data from students at Oklahoma State University. Two hundred thirty-seven questionnaires were hand distributed, completed by the individuals, and returned to the researcher. Three of the questionnaires were unusable leaving 234 questionnaires available for use in the analysis of the data. Two of the three unusable questionnaires were only partially completed. The student who completed the third did not discriminate in his responses to the items (i.e., all items were rated the same).

The ratings of product attributes and informational sources were compared according to whether respondents were (1) participants or non-participants in outdoor recreational activities, (2) owners or non-owners of a parka, and (3) male or female.

#### The Importance of Product Attributes

Information was collected on how individuals rated the importance of ten product attributes (brand name, care instructions,



color, construction techniques, insulative material, lining fabric, price, shell fabric, special features, and weight) in the purchase decision for a parka. The questionnaire included a Likert scale which was applied to the ten product attributes. The values assigned to the responses were extremely important (5 points) to not important (1 point). A mean score was then generated for each of the product attributes. The mean scores were used to identify the product attributes which were most important in the decision to purchase a parka. Mean scores for product attributes are located in Table I.

TABLE I  
MEAN SCORES OF RESPONDENTS' RATINGS FOR PRODUCT ATTRIBUTES  
(N=234)

Product Attributes	Mean	Standard Deviation
Insulative Material	4.21	0.85
Price	4.00	0.96
Shell Fabric	3.95	0.87
Construction Techniques	3.94	1.00
Lining Fabric	3.79	0.98
Color	3.63	1.00
Care Instructions	3.43	1.11
Weight	3.41	1.05
Special Features	3.14	0.90
Brand Name	2.58	0.95

Mean scores for nine of the ten product attributes indicated ratings above a 3.0. These ratings suggested that respondents found the nine product attributes to be important in the decision to purchase a parka. Insulative material, with a mean of 4.21, was rated highest. Price (4.00) was rated second in importance. The mean score for shell fabric (3.95) and construction techniques (3.94) were virtually the same. Brand name (2.58) had the lowest mean rating.

#### The Helpfulness of Informational Sources

Tabulation of data collected on the respondents' ratings of ten informational sources (friends/relatives, hangtags/labels, displays, educational classes, magazines, mail order catalogs, television, consumer groups, newspapers, and clubs/organizations) is provided in Table II. The Likert scale used for rating the ten informational sources included extremely helpful, very helpful, helpful, slightly helpful, and not helpful. Values were assigned for each rating from extremely helpful (5 points) to not helpful (1 point). A mean score was computed for each of the informational sources. The means were used to indicate those sources the respondents rated as being most helpful in the purchase decision for a parka. Mean scores for informational sources are found in Table II.

TABLE II  
 MEAN SCORES OF RESPONDENTS RATINGS FOR INFORMATIONAL SOURCES  
 (N=234)

Informational Sources	Mean	Standard Deviation
Friends/Relatives	3.62	0.93
Hangtags/Labels	3.34	1.11
Displays	3.22	1.07
Magazines	3.05	1.09
Mail Order Catalogs	2.71	1.11
Television	2.68	1.12
Consumer Groups	2.55	1.14
Newspapers	2.54	1.03
Educational Classes	2.39	1.13
Clubs/Organizations	2.15	1.10

Four of the ten informational sources were rated above a 3.0 and were considered helpful sources of information in the purchase decision for a parka. Friends and relatives had the highest mean rating (3.62) of the ten informational sources. Hangtags and labels (3.34) were rated as the second most helpful informational source. Displays (3.22) had the next highest rating followed by magazines (3.05). The lowest mean score of 2.15 was generated for clubs and organizations.

Comparison of Ratings for Product Attributes  
Among Three Classifications

The questionnaires were analyzed according to the three classifications of participation in outdoor recreational activities, ownership of a parka, and gender. Each classification was divided into sub-groups: (1) participants and non-participants, (2) owners and non-owners and (3) male and female. A chi-square test was utilized to determine whether differences existed with regard to the ratings of product attributes for the sub-groups within each classification. Chi-square data were listed in Tables III through VIII (Appendix B). Due to an unequal number of observations in each cell a row percent was given.

Participation

The hypothesis, there is no significant difference between the ratings of participants and non-participants in regard to the product attributes selected, was tested. Chi-square values for each product attribute were indicated in Table III (Appendix B).

Ratings of two of the ten product attributes were found to be significant with regard to participation. The chi-square value for color indicated a significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) between the ratings of participants and non-participants. More of the non-participants selected color as an important product attribute than did participants.

A significant difference ( $p < .01$ ) was found in the ratings of construction techniques. More of the participants than non-participants rated construction techniques as being important in the purchase decision for a parka.

### Ownership

The hypothesis, there is no significant difference between the ratings of owners and non-owners in regard to the product attributes selected, was tested. Chi-square values for each product attribute according to owner and non-owner sub-groups were identified in Table IV (Appendix B).

Ratings of three of the ten product attributes were found to be significantly different with regard to ownership. The owners rated construction techniques higher on the Likert-scale than did the non-owners. A significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) was indicated by the various ratings of these sub-groups.

Lining fabric was rated important by more of the owners than the non-owners. A significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) between the ratings for lining fabric was shown. A significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) was also found for insulative material. More of the owners than the non-owners indicated that insulative material was important. All of the owners rated insulative material as either "extremely important," "very important," or "important" in the purchase decision for a parka.

### Gender

The hypothesis, there is no significant difference between the ratings of male and female respondents in regard to the product attributes, was tested. Chi-square values for each product attribute according to these sub-groups were listed in Table V (Appendix B).

Ratings of two of the ten product attributes were found to be significantly different with regard to gender. More male respondents

than female respondents indicated lining fabric as highly important in the decision to purchase a parka. The chi-square value indicated a significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) between ratings of male and female respondents.

Shell fabric was also rated highly important by more of the male respondents than of the female respondents. A significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) was found between ratings of these sub-groups.

Based on the data found in Tables III, IV, and V the hypothesis, there is no significant difference between the sub-groups within each classification with regard to the ten product attributes, was rejected. Significant differences were found for ratings in one or more of the classifications for the following product attributes: color, construction techniques, insulative material, lining fabric, and shell fabric.

#### Comparison of Ratings for Informational Sources

##### Among Three Classifications

The respondents' ratings of informational sources were divided among three classifications which were then divided into sub-groups: (1) participants and non-participants, (2) owners and non-owners, and (3) males and females. Chi-square values were calculated to determine whether differences existed between the ratings of the sub-groups within each classification on the helpfulness of each of the ten informational sources.

### Participation

The hypothesis, there is no significant difference between the ratings of participants and non-participants in regard to informational sources selected, was tested. Chi-square values for each informational source were indicated in Table VI (Appendix B).

Ratings of two of the ten informational sources were found to be significantly different with regard to participation. Thirteen percent of the non-participants rated displays as "extremely helpful" in providing product information to aid in the decision to purchase a parka. Only five percent of the participants indicated displays to be "extremely helpful." The chi-square value for displays indicated a significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) between the ratings of participants and non-participants.

The chi-square value for television indicated a significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) between the ratings of participants and non-participants. Fewer of the participants in outdoor recreational activities rated television as helpful in providing product information than did the non-participants.

### Ownership

The hypothesis, there is no significant difference between the ratings of owners and non-owners in regard to the informational sources selected, was tested. Chi-square values for the informational sources were listed in Table VII (Appendix B).

Ratings of only one of the ten informational sources were found to be significantly different with regard to ownership. Fewer of the parka

owners rated television as helpful in offering product information for a parka than did the non-owners. The chi-square value for television indicated a significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) between the ratings of owners and non-owners.

#### Gender

The hypothesis, there is no significant difference between the ratings of male and female respondents in regard to informational sources selected, was tested. Chi-square values for the informational sources were listed in Table VIII (Appendix B).

Ratings of only one of the ten informational sources were found to be significantly different with regard to gender. A significant difference ( $p < .01$ ) was found with regard to hangtags and labels. More of the female respondents indicated hangtags and labels as helpful sources of product information than did the male respondents.

Based on the data found in Tables VI, VII, and VIII the hypothesis, there is no significant difference between the sub-groups within each classification with regard to informational sources, was rejected. Significant differences were found in one or more of the classifications in regard to the ratings for the following informational sources: displays, hangtags and labels, and television.

#### Discussion of Findings

The findings regarding product attributes and informational sources can be related to findings from other studies and to the socio-economic conditions at the time of the study. Insulative material was ranked as the most important product attribute. Due to the nature of the clothing



item (a parka) this would appear to be reasonable. If clothing is worn for protection from the cold, insulative material may function to maintain the thermal balance of the individual. The ratings of respondents indicated price to be the second most important product attribute. Price may be important due to the student status of the respondents or to the economic conditions at the time of the study. Other studies (Martin, 1971; Smith, 1974; Eubanks, 1978 and Stivers, 1974) have also indicated that price was selected as the first or second most important product factor.

Information regarding outdoor wardrobes suggested that color should be of less concern than the functional clothing elements (Thomas, 1980). Findings from this study indicated that color was less important than insulative material, shell fabric, and lining fabric. These attributes could be classified as functional attributes and may help support this concept. Weight is often listed in advertisements for outdoor clothing. Weight was indicated as less important than other product attributes (except special features and brand names. See Table I, p. 19). The type of outdoor recreational activity may determine the importance of weight. The least important product attribute was brand name. The characteristics associated with and/or differentiation between brand names may play a less important role in the purchase decision for a parka than for clothing used in everyday social settings.

The mean scores of respondents did not indicate any of the ten informational sources listed to be "extremely helpful" or "very helpful" in providing product information. Information regarding the functional attributes of a parka may not be easily shown through frequently used types of media such as television and newspapers. Instead, product

information for parkas may be gained at the point of purchase through actual examination of the garment. Friends and relatives were found to be the most important informational source. These findings are similar to those reported by Beal and Rogers (1957). The results of their study indicated that neighbors, friends, and relatives were important sources of information during the information and application stages of the adoption process of new fabrics. Respondents who are unfamiliar with a parka may seek out personal sources in order to share opinions, evaluations, and knowledge. The least important source of information was clubs and organizations. If the respondents were not involved in outdoor recreational clubs or organizations they would have less opportunity for gaining information from this particular source.

The comparison of ratings between the sub-groups indicated significant differences with regard to both product attributes and informational sources. Participants may have a greater interest in functional product attributes than non-participants. This is suggested in the significant differences between participants' and non-participants' ratings for color and construction techniques. Non-participants rated color, an aesthetic attribute, as more important than did participants. However, participants rated construction techniques, a functional attribute, as more important than did non-participants.

Parka owners also indicated functional attributes to be more important than did non-owners. Ratings for construction techniques, insulative material, and lining fabric were rated higher by the owners than the non-owners. If owners have had experience with a similar garment they may have more knowledge of the functional attributes of a parka.

Males also rated functional attributes higher than did female respondents. Ratings for lining fabric and shell fabric were significantly different. Males may have had more experience in outdoor activities (hunting, fishing, sports, etc.) which utilize protective garments, such as parkas.

Ratings for informational sources also indicated significant differences between the sub-groups. Fewer participants rated displays and television as helpful sources of information than did non-participants. Participants in outdoor recreational activities may examine sources which are not typically used for everyday clothing. They may seek sources which portray a more accurate account of conditions encountered in the outdoors and the functional attributes necessary for protection from these conditions. Non-participants may have less concern for functional attributes thereby selecting sources of information with which they are familiar.

Fewer owners also rated television as a helpful source of information. Their personal experience with a parka may suggest that television does not fully exemplify the necessary product information.

Females' ratings for hangtags and labels indicated that they were a more important source of information than did males. Females may be more conditioned or socialized to seek out product information, such as fabric content and care instructions, often given on hangtags and labels.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Research has indicated that consumers making purchase decisions often seek knowledge concerning physical characteristics of garments through a variety of informational sources. However, at the time of the study, research which indicated the product attributes and informational sources deemed important to consumers of outdoor clothing was not available. The study was undertaken to ascertain the important product attributes and helpful informational sources consumers prefer when making the decision to purchase a parka. A questionnaire was distributed to 237 Oklahoma State University students enrolled in home economics, accounting, and forestry.

Data from 234 questionnaires were used for the analysis. Mean scores were used to identify those product attributes and informational sources rated as most important and helpful by the respondents. The questionnaires were then grouped into three classifications, (1) participation in outdoor recreational activities, (2) ownership of a parka and (3) gender, for comparison. Chi-square values were used to compare the responses among the sub-groups within each classification for each product attribute and informational source.

Respondents rated insulative material as the most important product attribute when making a decision to purchase a parka. Price was ranked as the second most important product attribute and brand name was ranked

least important of the ten product attributes. The mean ratings of respondents indicated that friends and relatives were the most helpful sources of information in the purchase decision for a parka. Clubs and organizations generated the lowest mean rating for helpful informational sources.

The comparison of ratings indicated that ratings of five of the ten product attributes were significantly different between the sub-groups in one or more of the classifications. Non-participants rated color as a more important product attribute than did participants. More of the participants rated construction techniques as an extremely important product attribute than did non-participants. More of the parka owners as compared to non-owners, rated construction techniques, lining fabric and insulative material as important product attributes. The rating of male respondents indicated lining and shell fabric to be more important product attributes than did the female respondents.

The five product attributes which were rated significantly different between the sub-groups within one or more of the classifications included color, construction techniques, lining fabric, shell fabric, and insulative material. Brand name, care instructions, price, special features, and weight were not found to be significantly different with regard to participation, ownership, or gender.

The comparison between the sub-groups within one or more of the classifications indicated that the ratings for three of the informational sources were significantly different. Non-participants rated displays as a more helpful informational source than did participants. Fewer of the participants rated television as a helpful source of information than did non-participants. The ratings of parka

owners also indicated television to be a less helpful informational source than did non-owners. Ratings of the female respondents suggested that hangtags and labels were a more important source of information than did ratings of male respondents.

The three informational sources which were rated significantly different included displays, television, and hangtags and labels. Clubs and organizations, consumer groups, educational classes, friends and relatives, mail order catalogs, magazines, and newspapers were not found to be significantly different with regard to participation, ownership, or gender.

#### Conclusions

The following conclusions were made as a result of the findings for this study. Mean scores indicated nine of the ten product attributes to be important in the purchase decision for a parka. The most important product attribute was insulative material and the least important was brand name. Mean scores also indicated four of the ten informational sources to be helpful in the purchase decision for a parka. Friends and relatives were the most helpful informational source and clubs and organizations were the least helpful source.

Significant differences were found between the sub-groups within one or more of the classifications with regard to product attributes. Product attributes found to be significantly different with regard to participation included color and construction techniques. Within the ownership classification, ratings for construction techniques, lining fabric and insulative material, were found to be significantly different.

Ratings for lining and shell fabric were significantly different with regard to gender.

Significant differences in ratings for informational sources were also found between the sub-groups within one or more of the classifications. Within the participation classification, ratings for displays and television were significantly different. Ratings for television were also significantly different with regard to ownership. Ratings for hangtags and labels were significantly different with regard to gender.

#### Recommendations for Further Research

The following recommendations were made as a result of the present study:

1. Examine a wider range of outdoor clothing items and determine the product attributes and informational sources deemed significant in the purchase decision.
2. Develop a method which would more accurately discriminate between participants and non-participants in outdoor recreational activities to determine whether differences exist in regard to the product product attributes selected for outdoor clothing.
3. Repeat the study in different geographic regions to determine whether differences exist between participants' in outdoor recreational activities and non-participants' selections of product attributes and informational sources for outdoor clothing.
4. Use a variety of garments (fashion and functional) with similar product attributes and compare the results between the garments.
5. Examine the sources of information used at each stage in the adoption process for outdoor garments as compared to fashion garments.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baker, M.Y. and Sadler, M. Energy and What You Wear. Oklahoma State Cooperative Extension Service Bulletin No. 300, 1978.
- Bartz, A.E. Basic Statistical Concepts. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1981.
- Beal, G.M. and Rogers, E.M. Informational sources in the adoption process of new fabrics. Journal of Home Economics, 1957, 48, 630-634.
- Bush, G. and London, P. On the disappearance of knickers: hypothesis for the functional analysis of the psychology of clothes. Journal of Social Psychology, 1960, 51, 359-366.
- Compton, N.H. and Hall, O.A. Foundations of Home Economics Research: A Human Ecology Approach. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1972.
- Eagle, C.A. An investigation of the clothing selection and buying practices of thirty married male business executives in Knoxville, Tennessee. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Tennessee, 1974.
- Engel, J.F., Blackwell, R.D., and Kollat, D.T. Consumer Behavior. Chicago: The Dryden Press, 1978.
- Eubanks, G.E. An investigation of the clothing practices of two selected groups of college women at Oklahoma State University. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1978.
- Fourt, L. and Hollies, N. Clothing: Comfort and Function. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1970.
- Grise, K.S. Thermal comfort characteristics of textile apparel fabrics. Proceedings, ACPTC National Meeting, Washington, 1980, 72.
- Gurel, L.M. and Beeson, M.S, eds. Dimensions of Dress and Adornment: A Book of Readings. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt, 1975.
- Hart, J. Walking Softly in the Wilderness. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1977.
- Jenkins, M.C. and Dickey L.E. Consumer types based on evaluative criteria underlying clothing decisions. Home Economics Research Journal, 1976, 4, 150-162.



- Keane, D.D. Thinsulate thermal insulation: An innovation for outerwear. National Outdoor Outfitters News, May 1978, 12-15.
- King, C.W. and Summers, J.O. The New Product Adoption Research Project. Institute for Research in the Behavioral, Economic, and Management Sciences. Purdue University, Paper No. 196, 1967.
- Martin, C.R. What consumers of fashion want to know. Journal of Retailing, 1971-1972 (Winter), 47, 65-71, 94.
- Maslow, A.H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.
- McCullough, E.A. Measuring the thermal insulation of jackets and sleeping bags using a copper manikin. Proceedings, ACPTC National Meeting, Washington, 1980, 73.
- Meier, R. Thermal comfort. In M.E. Roach and J.B. Eicher, eds. Dress, Adornment, and the Social Order. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.
- Packard, S. and Raine, A. Consumer Behavior and Fashion Marketing. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown and Co. Publishers, 1979.
- Pyle, K.A. Clothing variables in relation to self-concept of a selected group of large size women. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1980.
- Roach, M.E. and Eicher, J.B., eds. Dress, Adornment, and the Social Order. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965.
- Roach, M.E. and Eicher, J.B. Uses of Dress by Human Beings. Unpublished working paper, Michigan State University, March 1976.
- Rohles, F.H., McCullough, E.A., and Munson, D.M. How warm is a warm jacket? Proceedings, Symposium on Human Factors and Industrial Design in Consumer Products. Medford, MA, 1980, 24-33.
- Ryan, M.S. Clothing: A Study in Human Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1966.
- Smith, B. Fashion preference and fashion buying practices of professional black women. Unpublished master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1974.
- Sproles, G.B. Fashion: Consumer Behavior Toward Dress. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1979.
- Sproles, G.B. Perspectives of Fashion. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing, Co., 1981.
- Stivers, S.F. Clothing and buying practices of undergraduate men at the University of Kentucky. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Tennessee, 1974.

Thomas, L. The Backpacking Woman. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1980.

Troelstrup, A.W. The Consumer in American Society. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1974.

Why chains are trailing in functional activewear. Retail Week, July 15, 1981, 24-26.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

## QUESTIONNAIRE

This is an illustration of a parka which could be used in outdoor recreational activities. Assume that this parka fits you correctly. Do not assume any other information about the parka.

## PART A

Directions: Please indicate the importance of each of the following product attributes if you were making a decision to purchase a parka. Indicate your choice by placing a (✓) check under the appropriate heading for each attribute.

Product Attributes	Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
Brand name					
Care instructions					
Color					
Construction techniques					
Insulative material					
Lining fabric					
Price					
Shell (outer) fabric					
Special features					
Weight					



## PART B

Directions: Please indicate how helpful each of the following sources is to you in providing product information for making a decision to purchase a parka. Indicate your choice by placing a (✓) check under the appropriate heading for each source.

Information Sources	Extremely Helpful	Very Helpful	Helpful	Slightly Helpful	Not Helpful
Clubs/organizations					
Consumer groups					
Displays					
Educational classes					
Friends/relatives					
Hangtags/labels					
Mail order catalogs					
Magazines					
Newspapers					
Television					

## PART C

Directions: Please indicate how often you have actively participated in the following outdoor recreational activities. Indicate your choice by placing a (✓) check under the appropriate heading for each activity.

Activity	Never	One or Two Times	Three or More Times
Backpacking			
Kayaking			
Rock climbing			
X-country skiing			

## PART D

Directions: Please answer the following questions by placing a (✓) check beside the correct response.

What is your gender? \_\_\_\_\_ male  
 \_\_\_\_\_ female

Have you ever owned a parka? \_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no

APPENDIX B

CHI-SQUARE TABLES

TABLE III  
 CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR PRODUCT ATTRIBUTES  
 ACCORDING TO PARTICIPATION IN OUTDOOR  
 RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES<sup>a</sup>

Product Attributes	Participants (N=98)		Non-Part. (N=136)		Chi-Sq. Value	Level of Sig.
	N	%	N	%		
<b>BRAND NAME</b>						
Extremely Important	2	2.04	2	1.48		
Very Important	10	10.20	19	14.07		
Important	39	39.80	60	44.44		
Slightly Important	27	27.55	39	28.89		
Not Important	20	20.41	15	11.11	4.379	.3572
<b>CARE INSTRUCTIONS</b>						
Extremely Important	16	16.49	29	21.32		
Very Important	34	35.05	37	27.21		
Important	24	24.74	41	30.15		
Slightly Important	18	18.56	25	18.38		
Not Important	5	5.15	4	2.94	3.139	.5348
<b>COLOR</b>						
Extremely Important	21	21.43	29	21.48		
Very Important	29	29.59	53	39.26		
Important	29	29.59	42	31.11		
Slightly Important	14	14.29	11	8.15		
Not Important	5	5.10	0	0.00	10.432	.0337
<b>CONSTRUCTION TECHNIQUES</b>						
Extremely Important	42	42.86	36	26.47		
Very Important	41	41.84	50	36.76		
Important	11	11.22	34	25.00		
Slightly Important	3	3.06	11	8.09		
Not Important	1	1.02	5	3.68	14.558	.0057
<b>INSULATIVE MATERIAL</b>						
Extremely Important	43	43.88	61	45.19		
Very Important	40	40.82	44	32.59		
Important	14	14.29	24	17.78		
Slightly Important	1	1.02	4	2.96		
Not Important	0	0.00	2	1.48	3.962	.4112
<b>LINING FABRIC</b>						
Extremely Important	27	27.84	36	26.47		
Very Important	38	39.18	47	34.56		
Important	25	25.77	38	27.94		
Slightly Important	7	7.22	11	8.09		
Not Important	0	0.00	4	2.94	3.377	.4969

TABLE III (Continued)

Product Attributes	Participants (N=98)		Non-Part. (N=136)		Chi-Sq. Value	Level of Sig.
	N	%	N	%		
<b>PRICE</b>						
Extremely Important	36	36.73	55	40.44		
Very Important	27	27.55	38	27.94		
Important	27	27.55	38	27.94		
Slightly Important	7	7.14	5	3.68		
Not Important	1	1.02	0	0.00	2.930	.5696
<b>SHELL (OUTER) FABRIC</b>						
Extremely Important	36	37.11	33	25.19		
Very Important	39	40.21	50	38.17		
Important	20	20.62	41	31.30		
Slightly Important	2	2.06	6	4.58		
Not Important	0	0.00	1	0.76	6.801	.1468
<b>SPECIAL FEATURES</b>						
Extremely Important	10	10.31	9	6.72		
Very Important	22	22.68	29	21.64		
Important	46	47.42	62	46.27		
Slightly Important	17	17.53	32	23.88		
Not Important	2	2.06	2	1.49	2.103	.7168
<b>WEIGHT</b>						
Extremely Important	21	21.43	23	16.91		
Very Important	26	26.53	33	24.26		
Important	38	38.78	48	35.29		
Slightly Important	11	11.22	28	20.59		
Not Important	2	2.04	4	2.94	4.098	.3929

<sup>a</sup>All respondents did not respond to all items



TABLE IV  
 CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR PRODUCT ATTRIBUTES  
 ACCORDING TO OWNERSHIP OF A PARKA<sup>a</sup>

Product Attributes	Owners (N=102)		Non-Owners (N=132)		Chi-Sq. Value	Level of Sig.
	N	%	N	%		
BRAND NAME						
Extremely Important	2	1.98	2	1.52		
Very Important	12	11.88	17	12.88		
Important	42	41.58	57	43.18		
Slightly Important	31	30.69	35	26.52		
Not Important	14	13.86	21	15.91	.665	.9556
CARE INSTRUCTIONS						
Extremely Important	21	20.59	24	18.32		
Very Important	37	36.27	34	25.95		
Important	25	24.51	40	30.53		
Slightly Important	16	15.69	27	20.61		
Not Important	3	2.94	6	4.58	4.056	.3985
COLOR						
Extremely Important	22	21.78	28	21.21		
Very Important	34	33.66	48	36.36		
Important	31	30.69	40	30.30		
Slightly Important	11	10.89	14	10.61		
Not Important	3	2.97	2	1.52	.699	.9515
CONSTRUCTION TECHNIQUES						
Extremely Important	42	41.18	36	27.27		
Very Important	41	40.20	50	37.88		
Important	13	12.75	32	24.24		
Slightly Important	5	4.90	9	6.82		
Not Important	1	.98	5	3.79	9.493	.0499
INSULATIVE MATERIAL						
Extremely Important	55	54.46	49	37.12		
Very Important	33	32.67	51	38.64		
Important	13	12.87	25	18.94		
Slightly Important	0	0.00	5	3.79		
Not Important	0	0.00	2	1.52	11.064	.0259
LINING FABRIC						
Extremely Important	32	31.68	31	23.48		
Very Important	42	41.58	43	32.58		
Important	24	23.76	39	29.55		
Slightly Important	3	2.97	15	11.36		
Not Important	0	0.00	4	3.03	11.681	.0199

TABLE IV (Continued)

Product Attributes	Owners (N=102)		Non-Owners (N=132)		Chi-Sq. Value	Level of Sig.
	N	%	N	%		
<b>PRICE</b>						
Extremely Important	42	41.18	49	37.12	2.779	.5955
Very Important	25	24.51	40	30.30		
Important	28	27.45	37	28.03		
Slightly Important	7	6.86	5	3.79		
Not Important	0	0.00	1	0.76		
<b>SHELL (OUTER) FABRIC</b>						
Extremely Important	38	37.25	31	24.60	8.734	.0681
Very Important	42	41.18	47	37.30		
Important	19	18.63	42	33.33		
Slightly Important	3	2.94	5	3.97		
Not Important	0	0.00	1	0.79		
<b>SPECIAL FEATURES</b>						
Extremely Important	12	11.88	7	5.38	4.500	.3425
Very Important	23	22.77	28	21.54		
Important	47	46.53	61	46.92		
Slightly Important	18	17.82	31	23.85		
Not Important	1	0.99	3	2.31		
<b>WEIGHT</b>						
Extremely Important	25	24.51	19	14.39	6.054	.1951
Very Important	24	23.53	35	26.52		
Important	38	37.25	48	36.36		
Slightly Important	14	13.73	25	18.94		
Not Important	1	0.98	5	3.79		

<sup>a</sup>All respondents did not respond to all items

TABLE V  
CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR PRODUCT ATTRIBUTES  
ACCORDING TO GENDER<sup>a</sup>

Product Attributes	Male (N=90)		Female (N=144)		Chi-Sq. Value	Level Of Sig.
	N	%	N	%		
<b>BRAND NAME</b>						
Extremely Important	1	1.12	3	2.08		
Very Important	16	17.98	13	9.03		
Important	34	38.20	65	45.14		
Slightly Important	21	23.60	45	31.25		
Not Important	17	19.10	18	12.50	7.191	.1261
<b>CARE INSTRUCTIONS</b>						
Extremely Important	14	15.73	31	21.53		
Very Important	23	25.84	48	33.33		
Important	28	31.46	37	25.69		
Slightly Important	20	22.47	23	15.97		
Not Important	4	4.49	5	3.47	4.034	.4015
<b>COLOR</b>						
Extremely Important	19	21.35	31	21.53		
Very Important	32	35.96	50	34.72		
Important	25	28.09	46	31.94		
Slightly Important	11	12.36	14	9.72		
Not Important	2	2.25	3	2.08	.656	.9566
<b>CONSTRUCTION TECHNIQUES</b>						
Extremely Important	36	40.00	42	29.17		
Very Important	35	38.89	56	38.89		
Important	14	15.56	31	21.53		
Slightly Important	2	2.22	12	8.33		
Not Important	3	3.33	3	2.08	6.772	.1484
<b>INSULATIVE MATERIAL</b>						
Extremely Important	42	46.67	62	43.36		
Very Important	36	40.00	48	33.57		
Important	11	12.22	27	18.88		
Slightly Important	1	1.11	4	2.80		
Not Important	0	0.00	2	1.40	4.262	.3717
<b>LINING FABRIC</b>						
Extremely Important	29	32.22	34	23.78		
Very Important	40	44.44	45	31.47		
Important	16	17.78	47	32.87		
Slightly Important	3	3.33	15	10.49		
Not Important	2	2.22	2	1.40	12.538	.0138

TABLE V (Continued)

Product Attributes	Male (N=90)		Female (N=144)		Chi-Sq. Value	Level of Sig.
	N	%	N	%		
<b>PRICE</b>						
Extremely Important	34	37.78	57	39.58		
Very Important	24	26.67	41	28.47		
Important	26	28.89	39	27.08		
Slightly Important	5	5.56	7	4.86		
Not Important	1	1.11	0	0.00	1.829	.7673
<b>SHELL (OUTER) FABRIC</b>						
Extremely Important	37	41.57	32	23.02		
Very Important	31	34.83	58	41.73		
Important	18	20.22	43	30.94		
Slightly Important	2	2.25	6	4.32		
Not Important	1	1.12	0	0.00	11.382	.0226
<b>SPECIAL FEATURES</b>						
Extremely Important	11	12.22	8	5.67		
Very Important	22	24.44	29	20.57		
Important	41	45.56	67	47.52		
Slightly Important	14	15.56	35	24.82		
Not Important	2	2.22	2	1.42	5.712	.2217
<b>WEIGHT</b>						
Extremely Important	22	24.44	22	15.28		
Very Important	25	27.78	34	23.61		
Important	24	26.67	62	43.06		
Slightly Important	17	18.89	22	15.28		
Important	2	2.22	4	2.78	7.404	.1160

<sup>a</sup>All respondents did not respond to all items

TABLE VI  
 CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR INFORMATIONAL SOURCES  
 ACCORDING TO PARTICIPATION IN OUTDOOR  
 RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES<sup>a</sup>

Informational Sources	Participants (N=98)		Non-Part. (N=136)		Chi-Sq. Value	Level of Sig.
	N	%	N	%		
CLUBS/ORGANIZATIONS	6	6.12	1	0.74		
Extremely Helpful	7	7.14	13	9.63		
Very Helpful	25	25.51	33	24.44		
Helpful	27	27.55	38	28.15		
Slightly Helpful	33	33.67	50	37.04	6.097	.1921
Not Helpful						
CONSUMER GROUPS						
Extremely Helpful	7	7.14	4	2.99		
Very Helpful	13	13.27	25	18.66		
Helpful	25	25.51	43	32.09		
Slightly Helpful	27	27.55	38	28.36		
Not Helpful	26	26.53	24	17.91	5.869	.2091
DISPLAYS						
Extremely Helpful	5	5.15	18	13.24		
Very Helpful	32	32.99	43	31.62		
Helpful	37	38.14	49	36.03		
Slightly Helpful	9	9.28	20	14.71		
Not Helpful	14	14.43	6	4.41	11.811	.0188
EDUCATIONAL CLASSES						
Extremely Helpful	3	3.09	4	2.99		
Very Helpful	8	8.25	20	14.93		
Helpful	37	38.14	45	33.58		
Slightly Helpful	17	17.53	27	20.15		
Not Helpful	32	32.99	38	28.36	3.004	.5572
FRIENDS/RELATIVES						
Extremely Helpful	13	13.27	23	16.91		
Very Helpful	42	42.86	62	45.59		
Helpful	32	32.65	38	27.94		
Slightly Helpful	7	7.14	10	7.35		
Not Helpful	4	4.08	3	2.21	1.684	.7936
HANGTAGS/LABELS						
Extremely Helpful	15	15.46	23	16.91		
Very Helpful	26	26.80	39	28.68		
Helpful	36	37.11	50	36.76		
Slightly Helpful	12	12.37	14	10.29		
Not Helpful	8	8.25	10	7.35	.423	.9805

TABLE VI (Continued)

Informational Sources	Participants (N=98)		Non-Part. (N=136)		Chi-Sq. Value	Level of Sig.
	N	%	N	%		
<b>MAIL ORDER CATALOGS</b>						
Extremely Helpful	7	7.14	4	2.96		
Very Helpful	20	20.41	28	20.74		
Helpful	27	27.55	46	34.07		
Slightly Helpful	29	29.59	35	25.93		
Not Helpful	15	15.31	22	16.30	3.188	.5268
<b>MAGAZINES</b>						
Extremely Helpful	11	11.22	14	10.45		
Very Helpful	26	26.53	24	17.91		
Helpful	34	34.69	53	39.55		
Slightly Helpful	20	20.41	31	23.13		
Not Helpful	7	7.14	12	8.96	2.758	.5991
<b>NEWSPAPERS</b>						
Extremely Helpful	0	0.00	7	5.19		
Very Helpful	12	12.24	21	15.56		
Helpful	33	33.67	46	34.07		
Slightly Helpful	34	34.69	40	29.63		
Not Helpful	19	19.39	21	15.56	6.468	.1668
<b>TELEVISION</b>						
Extremely Helpful	2	2.04	13	9.56		
Very Helpful	17	17.35	18	13.24		
Helpful	29	29.59	57	41.91		
Slightly Helpful	26	26.53	31	22.79		
Not Helpful	24	24.49	17	12.50	13.018	.0112

<sup>a</sup>All respondents did not respond to all items

TABLE VII  
 CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR INFORMATIONAL SOURCES  
 ACCORDING TO OWNERSHIP OF A PARKA<sup>a</sup>

Informational Sources	Owners (N=102)		Non-Owners (N=132)		Chi-Sq. Value	Level of Sig.
	N	%	N	%		
<b>CLUBS/ORGANIZATIONS</b>						
Extremely Helpful	4	3.96	3	2.27	2.521	.6409
Very Helpful	8	7.92	12	9.09		
Helpful	25	24.75	33	25.00		
Slightly Helpful	24	23.76	41	31.06		
Not Helpful	40	39.60	43	32.58		
<b>CONSUMER GROUPS</b>						
Extremely Helpful	6	5.94	5	3.82	4.203	.3793
Very Helpful	15	14.85	23	17.56		
Helpful	29	28.71	39	29.77		
Slightly Helpful	24	23.76	41	31.30		
Not Helpful	27	26.73	23	17.56		
<b>DISPLAYS</b>						
Extremely Helpful	12	11.88	11	8.33	5.001	.2872
Very Helpful	27	26.73	48	36.36		
Helpful	36	35.64	50	37.88		
Slightly Helpful	14	13.86	15	11.36		
Not Helpful	12	11.88	8	6.06		
<b>EDUCATIONAL CLASSES</b>						
Extremely Helpful	3	2.94	4	3.10	1.818	.7692
Very Helpful	13	12.75	15	11.63		
Helpful	34	33.33	48	37.21		
Slightly Helpful	17	16.67	27	20.93		
Not Helpful	35	34.31	35	27.13		
<b>FRIENDS/RELATIVES</b>						
Extremely Helpful	21	20.59	15	11.36	5.977	.2009
Very Helpful	38	37.25	66	50.00		
Helpful	32	31.37	38	28.79		
Slightly Helpful	7	6.86	10	7.58		
Not Helpful	4	3.92	3	2.27		
<b>HANGTAGS/LABELS</b>						
Extremely Helpful	23	22.77	15	11.36	6.797	.1470
Very Helpful	26	25.74	39	29.55		
Helpful	32	31.68	54	40.91		
Slightly Helpful	13	12.87	13	9.85		
Not Helpful	7	6.93	11	8.33		

TABLE VII (Continued)

Informational Sources	Owners (N=102)		Non-Owners (N=132)		Chi-Sq. Value	Level of Sig.
	N	%	N	%		
<b>MAIL ORDER CATALOGS</b>						
Extremely Helpful	7	6.86	4	3.05	5.588	.2321
Very Helpful	24	23.53	24	18.32		
Helpful	26	25.49	47	35.88		
Slightly Helpful	31	30.39	33	25.19		
Not Helpful	14	13.73	23	17.56		
<b>MAGAZINES</b>						
Extremely Helpful	14	13.73	11	8.46	4.479	.3451
Very Helpful	21	20.59	29	22.31		
Helpful	32	31.37	55	42.31		
Slightly Helpful	26	25.49	25	19.23		
Not Helpful	9	8.82	10	7.69		
<b>NEWSPAPERS</b>						
Extremely Helpful	2	1.96	5	3.82	4.875	.3004
Very Helpful	15	14.71	18	13.74		
Helpful	28	27.45	51	38.93		
Slightly Helpful	36	35.29	38	29.01		
Not Helpful	21	20.59	19	14.50		
<b>TELEVISION</b>						
Extremely Helpful	3	2.94	12	9.09	12.277	.0154
Very Helpful	15	14.71	20	15.15		
Helpful	31	30.39	55	41.67		
Slightly Helpful	27	26.47	30	22.73		
Not Helpful	26	25.49	15	11.36		

<sup>a</sup>All respondents did not respond to all items



TABLE VIII  
 CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR INFORMATIONAL SOURCES  
 ACCORDING TO GENDER<sup>a</sup>

Informational Source	Male (N=90)		Female (N=144)		Chi-Sq. Value	Level of Sig.
	N	%	N	%		
<b>CLUBS/ORGANIZATIONS</b>						
Extremely Helpful	3	3.37	4	2.78		
Very Helpful	9	10.11	11	7.64		
Helpful	22	24.72	36	25.00		
Slightly Helpful	25	28.09	40	27.78		
Not Helpful	30	33.71	53	36.81	.608	.9621
<b>CONSUMER GROUPS</b>						
Extremely Helpful	4	4.49	7	4.90		
Very Helpful	8	8.99	30	20.98		
Helpful	27	30.34	41	28.67		
Slightly Helpful	30	33.71	35	24.48		
Not Helpful	20	22.47	30	20.98	6.611	.1579
<b>DISPLAYS</b>						
Extremely Helpful	8	8.89	15	10.49		
Very Helpful	27	30.00	48	33.57		
Helpful	35	38.89	51	35.66		
Slightly Helpful	12	13.33	17	11.89		
Not Helpful	8	8.89	12	8.39	.626	.9601
<b>EDUCATIONAL CLASSES</b>						
Extremely Helpful	2	2.25	5	3.52		
Very Helpful	10	11.24	18	12.68		
Helpful	27	30.34	55	38.73		
Slightly Helpful	17	19.10	27	19.01		
Not Helpful	33	37.08	37	26.06	3.667	.4530
<b>FRIENDS/RELATIVES</b>						
Extremely Helpful	14	15.56	22	15.28		
Very Helpful	43	47.78	61	42.36		
Helpful	23	25.56	47	32.64		
Slightly Helpful	8	8.89	9	6.25		
Not Helpful	2	2.22	5	3.47	2.117	.7142
<b>HANGTAGS/LABELS</b>						
Extremely Helpful	8	8.99	30	20.83		
Very Helpful	18	20.22	47	32.64		
Helpful	42	47.19	44	30.56		
Slightly Helpful	13	14.61	13	9.03		
Not Helpful	8	8.99	10	6.94	13.726	.0082

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Informational Sources	Male (N=90)		Female (N=144)		Chi-Sq. Value	Level of Sig.
	N	%	N	%		
<b>MAIL ORDER CATALOGS</b>						
Extremely Helpful	5	5.62	6	4.17		
Very Helpful	15	16.85	33	22.92		
Helpful	23	25.84	50	34.72		
Slightly Helpful	27	30.34	37	25.69		
Not Helpful	19	21.35	18	12.50	5.755	.2182
<b>MAGAZINES</b>						
Extremely Helpful	8	8.89	17	11.97		
Very Helpful	24	26.67	26	18.31		
Helpful	29	32.22	58	40.85		
Slightly Helpful	23	25.56	28	19.72		
Not Helpful	6	6.67	13	9.15	4.633	.3270
<b>NEWSPAPERS</b>						
Extremely Helpful	3	3.33	4	2.80		
Very Helpful	9	10.00	24	16.78		
Helpful	26	28.89	53	37.06		
Slightly Helpful	34	37.78	40	27.97		
Not Helpful	18	20.00	22	15.38	5.293	.2585
<b>TELEVISION</b>						
Extremely Helpful	3	3.33	12	8.33		
Very Helpful	14	15.56	21	14.58		
Helpful	28	31.11	58	40.28		
Slightly Helpful	26	28.89	31	21.53		
Not Helpful	19	21.11	22	15.28	5.769	.2171

<sup>a</sup>All respondents did not respond to all items

VITA <sup>2</sup>

Roxanne Stell

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

**Thesis:** Product Attributes and Informational Sources Preferred in the Purchase Decision for a Parka

**Major Field:** Clothing, Textiles and Merchandising

**Biographical:**

**Personal Data:** Born in Newark, New York, April 28, 1958, the daughter of Phyllis and Eugene Stell.

**Education:** Graduated from Saguardo High School, Scottsdale, Arizona, 1976; received a Bachelor of Science degree in Home Economics from Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona, May, 1980; completed the requirements for the Master of Science degree from Oklahoma State University in May, 1983.

**Professional Experience:** Management Trainee for Levy's Department Store, Tucson, Arizona, 1980. Graduate Assistant at Oklahoma State University, 1982.

**Professional Organizations:** Member of Phi Kappa Phi; member of the American Home Economics Association; member of the Oklahoma Home Economics Association.