

HYUN HEE PARK *Kyungpook National University*

DONG MO KOO* *Kyungpook National University*

ELIZABETH B. GOLDSMITH** *Florida State University*

The Effect of Shopping Orientation on Cosmetic Attribute Evaluation, Purchase Motivation, and Re-purchase Intention[†]

The Purpose of the current study is to investigate the differences in cosmetics attribute evaluation, purchase motivation, and brand re-purchase intention with respect to shopping orientations of Korean female university students. Questionnaires were distributed to 250 female students at Kyungpook National University and 220 completed questionnaires were analyzed. The results were as follows. First, shopping orientations and cosmetics attribute evaluation each generated four factor solutions, whereas cosmetics purchase motivations produced three factors. Second, three consumer groups - Efficiency Shopper Group, Indifference Shopper Group Ambivalence Shopper Group - with different shopping orientations were identified. Third, the study found significant differences in consumers' attribute evaluation such as function and price among the groups. The study also revealed a significant difference in contingent purchase motivations and brand re-purchase intention among the groups. From these results, we could identify that cosmetics re-purchase intention was

significantly different among three different groups with different shopping orientations. Furthermore, consumer classification according to shopping orientations in cosmetics product purchase can be used by cosmetics marketers and managers to establish product plan and marketing strategy development. Additionally, the current study has originality and value that the relationship between shopping orientation and re-purchase intention has not been studied very much in the cosmetics product domain.

The cosmetics market is currently under severe competition due to the structural changes in the market and the shift in consumer purchase trends. Managers and marketers in the cosmetics industry need a deeper understanding to better serve their customers and grow in the future. Previous research studies on cosmetics have concentrated their focus on:

- i) identifying lifestyle-based purchase and usage behavior (Aaker *et al.*, 1982; Chae, 2001; Hong & Oh, 2001; Lee, 2002; Park & Kim, 2005),
- ii) the effect of psychological variables on purchase behavior (Bak & Kim, 2004; Darden & Reynolds, 1971; Kim & Mun, 2005; Moschin, 1976; Mun & Yoo, 2003),
- iii) distribution channels (Kim & Park, 2005; Sun & Yoo, 2004), and

[†]Bk21 Research Professor, School of Business Administration, Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea

*Professor, School of Business Administration, Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea (unlimited@knu.ac.kr)

**Professor, Department of Textiles and Consumer Sciences, Florida State University, Florida, USA

Key Words: shopping orientation, cosmetic attribute evaluation, cosmetic purchase motivation, re-purchase intention

- iv) purchase tendency and benefits sought (Kim, 2004; Kwon & Kim, 2000; Lee & Lee, 2003; Lee, 2004).

However, there has been little research focused on the influence of shopping orientations on attribute evaluations, specific motivations, and re-purchase intention regarding cosmetics. Shopping orientation is a well-established theoretical construct used to explain consumers' shopping behavior (Goldsmith, 2005; Jeon *et al.*, 2005; Kim, 2002; Lee *et al.*, 1999; Lin & Chen, 2006; Mathwick *et al.*, 2001; Park & Kang, 2005; Ryou & Cho, 2005). Since little research has examined the effects of shopping orientations on attribute evaluations and re-purchase intention with respect to cosmetics, the present study attempts to fill this gap. The purpose is to identify the differences in cosmetics attribute evaluations, purchase motivations, and re-purchase intention with respect to consumer groups with different shopping orientations. That is to say, the specific purpose of this study is to segment the female university students' cosmetic market based on shopping orientation and develop a profile of each segment in terms of attribute evaluations, purchase motivations, and repurchase intention. Identifiable segments provide a tool for better communication of product benefits with the target market as well as a more complete, multi-faceted description of each segment. The present study will help marketers and managers of cosmetics companies devise effective tools in planning new product development and marketing strategies.

Following this introduction, the next section reviews the literature on shopping orientation, attribute evaluation, purchase motivation, and re-purchase intention. Section three suggests a conceptual model and hypotheses. Section four presents the results of empirical tests. Section five discusses the results and compares them with the findings of previous studies. Section six presents conclusions and theoretical and managerial implications.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Shopping Orientation

Shopping benefits derived by consumers have been a popular topic of research within several disciplines

including economics, psychology, and sociology. Babin *et al.* (1994) identified two factors of shopping orientations: hedonic and utilitarian. Hedonic shopping orientation reflects the potential entertainment value of shopping and the enjoyment and/or fun arising from the experience (Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982). In contrast, utilitarian shopping orientation are derived from the consumer's belief that specific goals for a shopping trip were satisfied in terms of finding the item they were looking for. These shopping orientations are the amalgamation of all qualitative, quantitative, subjective, and objective shopping experience of the consumer that evaluates values where relative evaluation standards have been considered (Schechter, 1984). These two different orientations lead customers to engage in shopping both offline (Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982; Sweeny & Soutar, 2001) and online (Childers *et al.*, 2001; Shang *et al.*, 2005). Bloch and Richins (1983) showed that consumers shopping behavior differed across product categories among different shopping orientations. Moye and Kincaide (2002) found that different shopping orientations differently valued the environment dimensions of the stores. Li *et al.* (1999) found that shopping orientation valuing convenience significantly and positively related to the frequency of web users' online purchases. Swaminathan *et al.* (1999) also found that convenience shoppers tended to use the Internet more frequently to purchase goods and spent more money on their Internet purchases.

Cosmetics Attribute Evaluation

Attribute evaluation for cosmetics is a general construct that includes evaluations of both subjective and objective attributes consumers consider when they purchase cosmetics (Kim & Park, 2005). Many studies of product attribute evaluation were conducted with respect to consumers' purchase behavior. Broadly speaking, previous research of micro perspective categorizes attribute evaluations into two or more dimensions. For example, Abraham and Littrell (1995) classified clothing product attributes into four dimensions; physical appearance, physical performance, expressive, and extrinsic. O'Neal *et al.* (1990) extracted five

dimensions for evaluating apparel quality: physical, aesthetics, performance, affective, and connotative. Whereas studies with a macro view classify them into intrinsic and extrinsic cues (Davis & Lennon, 1985; Eckman *et al.*, 1990; Hatch & Roberts, 1985). While intrinsic cues in clothing include aesthetic, appearance, and utility dimensions (Jenkins & Dickey, 1976; Morganosky, 1984), extrinsic cues include attributes such as brand, price, store, and other dimensions (Davis, 1985; Hatch & Roberts, 1985). Many studies related to cosmetics attributes have been approached using items: quality, skin fitness, side effects, color, fragrance, the date of manufacture, service, and premiums etc. (Han, 1988; Hwang, 2004; Kim, 1997; Yoon, 1993). The present study approaches the topic from the perspective of the macro view through cosmetics attribute dimension.

Previous studies show that quality is the most important criterion among many cosmetics attributes (Kim, 1997; Jo, 1997). Price (Yoon, 1993), skin fitness, and color (Han, 1988) are also considered important. Many consumers testify that package and cosmetics containers stimulate purchase interest (Jo, 1997).

Lee and Kim (1999) showed that people in sound self-fulfillment, actual self-pursuit, and social negative inactivity groups consider quality the most important attribute, followed by function and effectiveness. Ku *et al.* (2000) showed that fragrance, quality, and price are considered important by both high involvement and low involvement groups. Chae (2001) showed that while innovative fashion pursuing people consider all attributes important, the group with thrifty values consider brand fame and design less important. Um (2004) showed that skin fitness, quality, and price are considered important in predicting purchase behavior of herbal cosmetics.

Specific Motivations for Cosmetics

Purchase behavior reflects people's life styles shown in their daily lives (Yoon, 1993). Purchase behavior results from purchase motivations derived from consumer needs. Purchase motivations are defined as the various reasons behind a consumer's purchase

and usage of a particular product (Goldsmith, 2005). Motivations are related to the benefits that attributes of a product can provide to the consumer by satisfying one or more needs (Aaker, 1996), and these benefits are influenced by the social environment and the internal needs of a consumer.

Previous studies show that the principal reasons females begin to wear make-up include beauty, personality emphasis, defect coverage, and skin protection. As females become older, they wear make-up for beauty (Yoon, 1993). Office girls wear their makeup to show their healthiness, competence, and reliability (Dellinger & Williams, 1997). A few studies examine the relationships between specific motivations for cosmetics buying behavior. Jeon (1998) classified cosmetics selection motivations into skin fitness, brand image, brand reliability, price, in-fashion, and promotion material, all of which are related with satisfaction. Song *et al.* (2002) showed that skin protection emerged as the most important attribute among adult females. Yoo *et al.* (2006) investigated sought values of cosmetics product, in cosmetics purchase, use, and possession situation. Yoo *et al.* (2006) showed that people have different specific motivations when situations change. For example, when consumers purchase cosmetics, they pursue convenience, enjoyment, prestige maintenance, utility, fulfillment, and cancellation of a sense of uneasiness; when they use cosmetics, they pursue self-expression, change, expectation, stress management, and consideration for other people; when they own cosmetics, they pursue pride, demonstration, and the sense of relief.

Re-purchase Intention

The loyalty construct has been used as an index measuring success of marketing strategy and a result of favorable brand association (Keller, 1993). Dick and Basu (1994) suggest that brand loyalty is more prominent under conditions of more positive emotional mood and affect. Brands that make consumers "happy" or "joyful" or "affectionate" elicit more purchase and attitudinal loyalty (Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001). Moreover, detailed discussion of loyalty is found in Rundle-Thiele's (2005) study. Rundle-Thiele (2005) suggested that there are five

measurement indices of loyalty: situational loyalty, resistance to competing offers, propensity to be loyal, attitudinal loyalty, and complaining behavior. Attitudinal loyalty is defined as a customer's predisposition toward a specific object and emerges as the function of psychological process. This attitudinal loyalty includes constructs such as preference, re-purchase intention, and involvement.

The present study considers re-purchase intention as the study subject because behavioral loyalty indices such as repetition purchase and purchase continuity are too narrow in perspective and can not suggest general insights into the in-depth reason and process of loyalty (Bloemer *et al.*, 1999). What plays an important role in deciding behavioral loyalty is the customer's disposition such as preference or intention (Bloemer & Kasper, 1995).

CONCEPTUAL MODEL AND HYPOTHESES

Classification of Consumer Group

Previous research has conceptualized value orientation as simply a tradeoff between quality and price (Bolton & Drew, 1991). However, a number of recent researchers argue that value orientation is more complex, that other dimensions of value should be considered by scholars and managers, and that consumer choice is the result of multiple dimensions of consumption value orientations (Bolton & Drew, 1991; Grewal *et al.*, 2003). The current study addresses shopping orientations in the context of cosmetics purchasing. In order to investigate the relationship between shopping orientation and consumers' cosmetics behavior such as attribute evaluation and purchase motivations, one must first classify consumers by different shopping orientations. Specifically, the present study clusters Korean female university students with respect to their shopping orientations and identifies the characteristics of each group. It then compares the cosmetics attributes and motivation of these shopping groups.

Shopping Orientations and Attribute Evaluation

Only a few studies examine the relationship between shopping orientation and cosmetics attribute

evaluation. A previous study of purchasing found empirical evidence that product evaluation criteria were correlated with shopper perceptions (Erdem *et al.*, 1999). As consumers purchase a product, value perception results from their on-going cognitive evaluation process. The shopping orientations that result from their purchase experiences are a function of those emotional reactions. Therefore, we hypothesize that the consumers with different value orientations will evaluate cosmetics attributes differently.

- H1. Consumers with different shopping orientations will evaluate cosmetics attributes differently.

Shopping Orientation and Purchase Motivations

Purchase motivations are the various reasons behind people's product purchase behavior. Accordingly, purchase motivations may influence how people feel in a shopping or purchasing context. Consumers come into consumption situations with different purchase goals that influence their pre-consumption expectations, including their affective expectations (Dube, 1990). Therefore, the present study hypothesizes that shopping value influences their purchase motivations.

- H2. Consumers with different shopping orientations will have different purchase motivations.

Shopping Orientation and Re-purchase Intention

Shopping orientations has been proposed as a multidimensional outcome of shopping process (Babin *et al.*, 1994). In a study of shoppers at mall anchor stores, Babin and Attaway (2000) found that hedonic and utilitarian shopping values positively influence customer share, which is defined as a consumer's recall of previous repeat purchase behavior, in terms of time and money, at a specific retailer relative to competitors, capturing an estimate of actual re-patronage behavior. Past behavior is a predictor of future behavior. Accordingly, the present study hypothesizes that consumers with different shopping orientations will have different levels of re-purchase intention with respect to future cosmetics purchases.

H3. Consumers with different shopping orientations will have different levels of re-purchase intention with respect to future cosmetics purchases.

scales, a conveniently selected sample is appropriate for theory testing purposes. The survey was conducted for two weeks from March to April of 2006. A total of 250 questionnaires were distributed. Thirty questionnaires with incomplete or no answers were excluded for further analysis. Two hundred-twenty responses were put into analysis, resulting in a valid response rate of 88%.

METHOD

Study Subjects

Female university students in their twenties in Daegu, South Korea, were selected as the respondents of the present survey. The sample was made up of students enrolled Kyungpook National University liberal arts classes. Although this convenience sample limits generalizability, the purpose of the study was to test the theoretical relationships proposed. Calder *et al.* (1981) suggested that as long as the study is not intend to provide interval estimates of the mean scores on the

Measures

The survey method was used to collect data. A survey questionnaire consisted of five parts: shopping orientation, cosmetics attribute evaluation, cosmetics purchase motivation, re-purchase intention, and demographics. Seven-point rating scales (1 = strongly disagree, or strongly unimportant, and 7 = strongly agree, or strongly important) were utilized to measure the constructs adopted.

Scales measuring shopping orientations (Babin *et*

Table 1. Sample Demographics

| | Items | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|---------|
| University Ranks | Freshman | 39 | 16.3 |
| | Sophomore | 59 | 24.7 |
| | Junior | 55 | 23.0 |
| | Senior | 86 | 36.0 |
| Monthly Expenses for Cosmetics | Less than \$50 | 180 | 75.3 |
| | \$50-less than \$100 | 46 | 19.2 |
| | \$100 -less than \$150 | 9 | 3.8 |
| | \$150 -less than \$200 | 3 | 1.3 |
| Monthly Household Income | More than \$200 | 1 | 0.4 |
| | Less than \$1,000 | 17 | 7.3 |
| | \$1,000 -less than \$2,000 | 57 | 24.6 |
| | \$2,000-less than \$3,000 | 64 | 27.6 |
| Monthly Personal Expenses | \$3,000-less than \$4,000 | 55 | 23.7 |
| | More than \$4,000 | 39 | 16.8 |
| | Less than \$100 | 9 | 3.8 |
| | \$100-less than \$200 | 43 | 18.0 |
| Monthly Personal Expenses | \$200-less than \$300 | 92 | 38.5 |
| | \$300-less than \$400 | 55 | 23.0 |
| | \$400-less than \$500 | 16 | 6.7 |
| | More than \$500 | 24 | 10.0 |

Notes : Due to missing value, the number of respondents for each variable may not equal to the total number of respondents (n = 220)

al., 1994), cosmetics attributes (Chae, 2001; Jo, 1997; Ku *et al.*, 2000), cosmetics purchase motivations (Song *et al.*, 2002; Yoo *et al.*, 2006; Yoon, 1993), and re-purchase intention (Macintosh & Lockshin, 1997) were adopted from the previous literature and modified appropriately to fit into the study context. Specifically, in order to measure repurchase intention of brand, first, the respondents were asked to write down the brand name and item of the most memorable thing among cosmetics which they purchased in recent 6 months (ex. Lipstick of MISSHA). Next, they were asked to answer repurchase intention of that brand. The pre-test was given to 72 students enrolled in junior level fashion marketing courses. Based on the results of the pre-test, items in the current study were selected. Preliminary investigations were successfully conducted to test the psychometric properties of these scales.

DATA ANALYSIS

Frequency analysis, factor analysis, reliability analysis, cluster analysis, multivariate ANOVA, and the Duncan test were employed for the analysis of data using SPSS 12.1.

Sample Characteristic

Table 1 shows the demographics of the respondents. Thirty-nine (16.3 %) respondents were freshmen, 59 (24.7 %) sophomores, 55 (23.0 %) juniors, and 86 (36.0%) seniors. Of the respondents, 75.3 percent spent less than \$50 U.S. and 19.2% of the respondents spent over \$50 and less than \$100 to purchase cosmetics per month. Of the respondents, 27.6% earned their monthly household income between over \$2,000 and less than \$ 3,000, and 16.8% earned more than \$4,000. Of the respondents, 38.5% spent amount between \$ 200 and \$ 300 for their pocket money each month.

Scale Psychometrics

In preliminary analyses, exploratory factor analysis with Varimax rotation was utilized to check the convergent and discriminant validity of the scales item. After confirming the factor structure, the

individual items representing their respective construct were summed up to form a construct scale. Higher scores of each construct indicate higher levels of the respective constructs. No factor loading score was less than 0.52 as shown in Table 2. Most scores were greater than 0.70, indicating a highly stable loading structure.

As shown in Table 2, shopping orientation had a four factor solution, altogether explaining 65.426% of total variance. These four factors were named based on the items that loaded the highest for each factor. Factor 1 had eight statements and accounted for 32.208 % of the common variance. Because all the statements loaded in this factor measured a motive to be able to enjoy shopping, this factor was conceptually labeled as the hedonic shopping orientation. Factor 2 had three statements and accounted for 11.970 % of the common variance. This factor was labeled as the rational shopping orientation since this factor described a reasonable and intelligent shopping orientation by necessity. Factor 3 had two statements and accounted for 10.691 % of the common variance. This factor was labeled as price-exploratory orientation since the two statements were characterized by the search for price during shopping. Factor 4 had two statements and accounted for 10.557 % of the common variance. This factor showed high importance of quick and easy shopping within limited time and was therefore labeled as efficient shopping orientation.

Four dimensions of attributes evaluation of cosmetics were extracted, altogether explaining 68.460 % of total variance. Factor 1 included package design, advertising, brand, and fragrance and was therefore labeled as brand image. The common variance of the factor was 17.437%. Factor 2 included product quality and skin fitness and was therefore labeled as function. The common variance of the factor was 17.388%. Factor 3 was composed of price and volume and was therefore labeled as price. The common variance of the factor was 16.834%. Factor 4 was labeled as promotion since service and free gift offer were the elements added to product for differentiation or sales enhancement. The common variance of the factor was 16.801%.

Cosmetics purchase motivations produced a

Table 2. Reliability and Factor Analysis of Measurement Variables

| Factor | | Items | Factor Analysis Result | | | Cronbach's α | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---|--|-------------|---------------------|---------------------|------|-------|--------|------|
| Construct | Factor Name | | Factor Loading | Eigen Value | Acumulated Variance | | | | | |
| Shopping Orientation | Hedonic Shopping | I enjoy looking around new products | .818 | 4.831 | 32.208 | .897 | | | | |
| | | I enjoy shopping along with my friend | .809 | | | | | | | |
| | | I like hacking around when shopping | .804 | | | | | | | |
| | | Shopping itself is an enjoyable activity regardless of a product purchase | .783 | | | | | | | |
| | | I enjoy looking around a shopping center without having a specific plan to buy something | .782 | | | | | | | |
| | | I think shopping is a very pleasant experience | .756 | | | | | | | |
| | | When I am depressed, I feel better, if I go shopping | .692 | | | | | | | |
| | Rational Shopping | If there is an exciting new product, I feel interest when shopping although the product unnecessary to me | .669 | 1.795 | 44.178 | .606 | | | | |
| | | I think I shop in a rational and smart way | .788 | | | | | | | |
| | | I have a tendency only to buy the product that I want when shopping | .719 | | | | | | | |
| | | I never buy a product that is unnecessary to me | .709 | | | | | | | |
| | | Price-exploratory Shopping | I do shop in order to know price | | | | .890 | 1.604 | 54.869 | .718 |
| | | | I shop to know whether it is a good product on a reasonable price | | | | .846 | | | |
| | | Efficient Shopping | I enjoy finding out the product that I really want within a short time period. | | | | .862 | 1.583 | 65.426 | .694 |
| I like to visit a store that I can easily find a satisfiable product. | .841 | | | | | | | | | |
| Cosmetics Attribute Evaluation | Brand Image | Package design | .758 | 1.744 | 17.437 | .609 | | | | |
| | | Advertising | .693 | | | | | | | |
| | | Brand | .600 | | | | | | | |
| | | Fragrance | .521 | | | | | | | |
| | Function | Product quality | .876 | 1.739 | 34.825 | .741 | | | | |
| | | Skin fitness | .857 | | | | | | | |
| | Price | Price | .876 | 1.683 | 51.659 | .715 | | | | |
| | | Volume | .848 | | | | | | | |
| | Promotion | Service | .874 | 1.680 | 68.460 | .739 | | | | |
| | | Free gift offer | .852 | | | | | | | |
| Cosmetics Purchase Motivation | Contingent Purchase | Because of low price when product is on sale | .819 | 2.037 | 22.637 | .677 | | | | |
| | | For gift | .683 | | | | | | | |
| | | Because it is in fashion | .645 | | | | | | | |
| | Self-expressive | By influence from mass media (ie. magazine, catalogue, advertising) | .622 | 1.797 | 42.604 | .721 | | | | |
| | | To refresh myself and to get rid of stress | .849 | | | | | | | |
| | | To present my personality | .846 | | | | | | | |
| | Practical Usage | To protect my skin and to conceal spots | .811 | 1.645 | 60.878 | .602 | | | | |
| | | For my own needs | .683 | | | | | | | |
| | | To make myself look pretty in aesthetic way | .644 | | | | | | | |

three factor solution. The total of variance was 60.878 %. Factor 1 was composed of the items related to the purchase motivation influenced by situation and was therefore labeled as contingent purchase motivation. The common variance of the factor was 22.637%. Factor 2 was labeled as self-expressive purchase motivation since the factor was consisted of the items related to the expression of themselves through cosmetics. The common variance of the factor was 19.967%. Factor 3 was labeled as practical usage purchase motivation because the items showed purchase motivation by need or purpose. The common variance of the factor was 18.274%.

On the other hand, the coefficient alpha scores were computed for each construct to show internal consistency. The results are shown at the right side of Table 2. The Cronbach alpha values ranged from 0.602 to 0.897. The Cronbach alpha values above 0.60 are considered as acceptable (Nunnally, 1978). All values showed that internal consistency reliability of each construct was deemed adequate.

CONSUMER CLASSIFICATION AND TESTING OF HYPOTHESES

Classification of Consumer Groups

A K-means non-hierarchical cluster analysis employing four factors of shopping orientation - hedonic shopping, rational shopping, price-exploratory shopping, and efficient shopping - was conducted using SPSS 12.1. The K-means procedure can be used to cluster large numbers of cases efficiently without requiring substantial computer resources (Norusis, 1994) and has been used in

previous consumer research (Furse *et al.*, 1984). The cluster analysis was conducted to classify the respondents into different groups with different shopping orientations. All constructs were summed up and standardized in the form of a normalized distance function. Standardization helps to eliminate effects resulting from differences in measurement units (Hair *et al.*, 1998; Norusis, 1994).

Based on shopping orientations, ease of interpretability and distance level coefficients represented by the final cluster centers, a three-cluster solution appeared appropriate for the current analysis (Hair *et al.*, 1998). Results of the cluster analysis are presented in Table 3.

Group 1 consisted of the respondents with high hedonic and rational shopping orientation. More specifically, efficiency is the value sought by Group 1. They do not pursue price-exploratory shopping. Therefore Group 1 is named as "Efficiency Shopper Group" and contained 32.27% of the respondents. Group 2 was named as "Indifference Shopper Group," because the respondents included in Group 2 show the lowest scores on all four shopping orientation. They accounted for 24.09% of all the respondents. The respondents in Group 3 show the highest scores in the hedonic, rational, and price-exploratory shopping orientations. They scored less in their tendency pursuing efficiency orientation. Accordingly, Group 3 was named as "Ambivalence Shopper Group" and contained 43.63% of the respondents.

Testing of Hypotheses and Discussion

After the cluster solution was derived, a ANOVA was conducted to identify the difference between groups using the following dependent variables;

Table 3. ANOVA Analysis and the Duncan Test Between Shopping Orientation Groups

| Factor | Type | Efficiency Shopper Group (N = 71 : 32.27%) | Indifference Shopper Group (N = 53 : 24.09%) | Ambivalence Shopper Group (N = 96 : 43.63%) | F |
|----------------------------|------|--|--|---|------------|
| Hedonic Shopping | | 5.4208(A) | 4.8726(B) | 5.4661(A) | 6.246** |
| Rational Shopping | | 4.4883(A) | 3.8994(B) | 4.6875(A) | 10.435*** |
| Price-exploratory Shopping | | 3.2465(B) | 3.3679(B) | 5.2344(A) | 160.397*** |
| Efficient Shopping | | 6.1620(A) | 4.2075(C) | 5.8542(B) | 115.949*** |

Alphabets indicate results of the Duncan test (A > B > C)

* p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 4. Difference of Cosmetics Attributes Evaluation between Shopping Orientation Groups

| Factor \ Type | Efficiency Shopper Group | Indifference Shopper Group | Ambivalence Shopper Group | F |
|---------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------|
| Brand Image | 4.5036 | 4.6179 | 4.7656 | 1.810 |
| Function | 6.5571(A) | 6.0755(B) | 6.4740(A) | 6.474** |
| Price | 5.1286(AB) | 4.7736(B) | 5.3802(A) | 5.137** |
| Promotion | 4.5714 | 4.5472 | 4.6667 | .153 |

Alphabets indicate results of the Duncan test (A > B > C) * p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 5. Difference of Cosmetics Purchase Motivations between Shopping Orientation Groups

| Factor \ Type | Efficiency Shopper Group | Indifference Shopper Group | Ambivalence Shopper Group | F |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------|
| Contingent Purchase | 2.8071(B) | 3.2406(A) | 3.4427(A) | 7.513** |
| Self-expressive Purchase | 3.2714 | 3.6415 | 3.7083 | 2.217 |
| Practical Purchase | 5.7429 | 5.5849 | 5.8438 | 1.489 |

Alphabets indicate results of the Duncan test (A > B > C) * p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 6. Difference of Brand Re-purchase Intention between Shopping Orientation Groups

| Variable \ Type | Efficiency Shopper Group | Indifference Shopper Group | Ambivalence Shopper Group | F |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------|
| Brand Re-purchase Intention | 4.9714(B) | 5.2138(AB) | 5.4912(A) | 3.237* |

Alphabets indicate results of the Duncan test (A > B > C) * p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

cosmetic attribute evaluation, cosmetic purchase motivation, and brand re-purchase intention to test the hypotheses proposed.

Hypothesis 1 proposed that the consumers with different shopping orientations will evaluate cosmetics attributes differently. Table 4 shows that to test hypotheses proposed to three different groups structures adopted. Table 4 H1 is supported. Table 4 shows that function and price attributes showed significant differences among the three different shopper groups. Consumers in the Efficiency Shopper Group and people in the Ambivalence Shopper Group considered function more important than people in the Indifference Shopper Group. Consumers in the Ambivalence Shopper Group considered price more important than Indifference Shopper Group. This result is consistent with the results that consumers in the Ambivalence Shopper Group are sensitive to price-exploratory shopping. The results show that function and price are important factors when the

cosmetics markets are segmented with respect to shopping value orientations of the consumers.

Hypothesis 2 proposed that people with different shopping orientations will have different purchase motivations. Table 5 shows that there are significant differences in consumer purchase motivations between the Efficiency Shopper Group and other groups. This result shows that people in the Efficiency Shopper Group are less influenced by purchase situations when purchasing cosmetics.

Hypothesis 3 proposed that the consumers with different shopping orientations will have different levels of re-purchase intention with respect to future cosmetics purchases. Hypothesis 3 is supported. Table 6 shows that people in the Ambivalence Shopper Group have higher brand re-purchase intention than people in Efficiency Group.

Summary and Discussion

The present research demonstrates that consumers'

shopping orientations can be used to predict re-purchase intention of consumers purchasing cosmetics. The results can be summarized as follows;

First, consumer shopping orientations generated four factors: hedonic, rational, price-exploratory, and efficient shopping value orientations. Attributes of cosmetics generated four factors: brand image, function, price, and promotion. Cosmetics purchase motivations produced three factors: contingent purchase motivation, self-expressive purchase motivation, and practical usage purchase motivation. The classification of the respondents produced similar results with respect to shopping orientation. Most previous research classified consumers into two different orientations; hedonic shopper group and utilitarian shopper group (Babin *et al.*, 1994; Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982; Jin & Park, 2004). Female university students in Korea also have hedonic shopping orientation as found in previous research. However, utilitarian shopping orientation produced three different orientations: rational, price-exploratory, and efficient shopping orientations. In addition, the current study uses the factors in cosmetics attributes and purchase motivations. Descriptive studies using items to measure those constructs were executed in most previous cosmetics studies.

Second, consumers with respect to shopping orientations were classified into three different groups; the Efficiency Shopper Group, the Indifference Shopper Group, and the Ambivalence Shopper Group. Consumer classification with respect to lifestyle (Chae, 2001; Hong & Oh, 2001; Lee, 2002; Park & Kim, 2005), clothing orientation (Song, 2002), and benefits sought (Kim, 2004; Kwon & Kim, 2000; Lee & Lee, 2003; Lee, 2004) have been frequently conducted in previous cosmetics studies. However, consumer classification with respect to shopping orientation has not been conducted in cosmetics studies. So, it suggests new theoretical and managerial implications.

Third, function and price exhibited statistically significant differences among the groups. People in the Efficiency Shopper Group and in the Ambivalence Shopper Group considered function more important than those people in the

Indifference Shopper Group. People in the Ambivalence Shopper Group considered price the most important construct. In previous research, Lee and Kim (1999) showed that people in all groups with respect to lifestyle consider quality the most important attribute. Hwang (2004) indicated that consumers as a whole consider function or effectiveness, suitability for skin type, side effects, and date of manufacture most important when they purchase cosmetics. The Price-Oriented Group regarded all the criteria as less important than price, quality, and the date of manufacture. The information-oriented group considered price, fragrance, quantity, premiums, and services as more important than the brand-oriented group. The brand-oriented group considers suitability for skin type more important than the information-oriented group. Almost all studies related to cosmetics purchase behaviors showed that function such as quality, and skin fitness were the most important factors to evaluate cosmetics, and price was an important factor to distinguish between groups.

Fourth, there was significant difference in cosmetics purchase motivations among people in three different groups. People in the Ambivalence Shopper Group and in the Indifference Shopper Group considered contingent purchase motivation more important than people in the Efficiency Group. This result means that the Ambivalence Shopper Group and the Indifference Shopper Group have a tendency to be influenced by external environments, while Efficiency Shopper Group has a tendency to be influenced by internal needs.

Fifth, the present study also found significant differences in the brand re-purchase intention among people in different groups. People in the Ambivalence Shopper Group rated highest in their re-purchase intention. This result means that the Ambivalence Shopper Group can be more stable customers than the Efficiency Group.

IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Implications

The results imply that it is necessary for cosmetics

retailers to determine the core benefit sought by cosmetics consumers and provide those core benefits in their products and services. More detailed suggestions can be summarized as follows;

- People in the Efficiency Shopper Group rated high in function, but low in contingent purchase motivation. Functional prominence of product such as product quality and skin fitness for people in the Efficiency Shopper Group is advised.
- People in the Indifference Shopper Group considered function and price less important and contingent purchase motivation important. This result suggests people in the Indifference Shopper Group are more impulsive. Promotional activities such as sales event, measurement of skin state, offers of free massages, cosmetics samples, and free gift offers are more effective for people in this group.
- People in the Ambivalence Shopper Group considered function and price more important and have higher contingent purchase motivation and re-purchase intention. People in the Ambivalence Shopper Group are more sensitive to product differentiation and promotional activities. Emphasis on special functions, advertising through celebrity, product differentiations in vessel design, comfortable store atmosphere, and persuasion of sales person appeals to this group.

Future research could explore the consistency of the groupings (efficiency, indifference, and ambivalence) across different age groups and in other countries. The findings from extended studies would contribute to the ongoing debate and research related to purchase motivation especially as it applies to cosmetics. It would be interesting to see how other cultural groups respond to cosmetics in terms of quality, function, price, and promotions. What are their needs? What promotional activities work best? Lin and Chen (2006) in the summation of their study on insurance and catering services in Taiwan advised companies to adopt appropriate strategies when marketing their products. We concur that appropriate strategies are needed in order to reach

different consumer groups in this case in the area of the retail of cosmetics. It is additionally recommended that companies and stores would benefit by making more effort to inform consumers of their particular emphases when it comes to cosmetics. The informing process can come through a variety of media channels which could be a subject for a future study.

Limitations and Future Research

The present study was limited to the topic of purchase behavior and cosmetics rather than to other areas of purchase behavior such as apparel or food. It was also limited by location of sample although it should be noted that cosmetics as a category of purchase is a rising field in Korea and of keen interest to retailers. The practical implications of our study are significant. Like many other studies adopting survey methodology, the present study has weaknesses pertaining to its field study design. Due to the single-study nature of the investigation adopted, replication and extensions to other ages and areas are needed before any generalization is made. In addition, future research could explore the differences in cosmetic repurchase intention according to cosmetic types such as basic skin care or make up cosmetic. A replication of the present study several years from now in Korea with university students is a suggestion for future research.

Constructs measuring consumers' shopping orientations, cosmetics attribute evaluation, purchase motivation, re-purchase intention variables were adopted to test hypotheses proposed. In the future, diverse studies including other psychological constructs should be conducted to bolster the reasons of consumers purchasing cosmetics as proposed in the current study.

The intent of this paper is to make a contribution to both the cosmetics and the purchase behavior literature. The difference in purchase motivation of three groups of consumers is a highlight of this research. The most important take-away from this study is there are significant differences in motivation between consumers when it comes to cosmetics. To reach them different appeals need to be made. This study is a step forward toward

building theory and understanding the role of purchase motivation within the general study of retailing and consumer behavior.

REFERENCES

- Aaker, D. A. (1996). *Building strong brands*. New York: Free Press.
- Aaker, D. A., Furse, Y., & Reynolds, F. D. (1982). Is life-style research limited in its usefulness to Japanese advertising?. *Journal of Advertising*, 11(1), 31-48.
- Abraham, M. L., & Littrell, M. A. (1995). Consumers' conceptualization of apparel attributes. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 13(2), 65-74.
- Babin, B. J., & Attaway, J. S. (2000). Atmospheric affect as a tool for creating value and gaining share of customer. *Journal of Business Research*, 49, 91-99.
- Babin, B., Darden, W. R., & Griffin, M. (1994). Work and/or fun: Measuring hedonic and utilitarian shopping value. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20(4), 644-656.
- Bak, K. J., & Kim, M. Y. (2004). Make-up purchase behavior and influential factors-focusing on clothing involvement, age, and face satisfaction. *Journal of the Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles*, 28(11), 1372-1383.
- Bloch, P. H., & Richins, M. L. (1983). A theoretical model for the study of product importance perceptions. *Journal of Marketing*, 47, 69-81.
- Bloemer, J., de Ruyter, K., & Wetzels, M. (1999). Linking perceived service quality and service loyalty: A multi-dimensional perspective. *European Journal of Marketing*, 33(11/12), 1082-1106.
- Bloemer, J., & Kasper, H. (1995). The complex relationship between consumer satisfaction and brand loyalty. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 16(2), 311-329.
- Bolton, R. N., & Drew, J. H. (1991). A multistage model of customers' assessments of service quality and value. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17(4), 375-384.
- Calder, B. J., Phillips, L. W., & Tybout, A. M. (1981). Designing research for application. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 8(9), 197-207.
- Chae, J. S. (2001). An analysis on the college women's buying and using behavior of cosmetics according to their life-style. *Journal of the Korean Home Economics Association*, 39(11), 107-126.
- Chaudhuri, A., & Holbrook, M. B. (2001). The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: The role of brand loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, 65(2), 81-93.
- Childers, T. L., Carr, C. L., Pecj, J., & Carson, S. (2001). Hedonic and utilitarian motivations for online retail shopping behavior. *Journal of Retailing*, 77, 511-535.
- Darden, W. R., & Reynolds, F. D. (1971). Shopping orientations and product usage rates. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 8, 505-508.
- Davis, L. L., & Lennon, S. J. (1985). Self-monitoring, fashion opinion leadership, and attitudes toward clothing. In M. R. Solomon (Eds.), *The Psychology of Fashion* (pp.177-182). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Dellinger, K., & Williams, C. L. (1997). Makeup at work. *Gender and Society*, 11(2), 151-177.
- Dick, A. S., & Basu, K. (1994). Customer loyalty: Toward an integrated conceptual framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22(2), 99-113.
- Dube, L. (1990). The power of affective reports in predicting satisfaction judgments. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 17, 571-576.
- Eckman, M., Damhorst, M. L., & Kadolph, S. J. (1990). Toward a model of the in-store purchase decision process: Consumer use of criteria for evaluation women's apparel. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 8(2), 13-22.
- Erdem, O., Ben, O. A., & Tuncalp, S. (1999). Consumer values and the importance of store attributes. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 27(4), 137-144.
- Furse D. H., Punj G. H., & Stewart D. H. (1984). A typology of individual search strategies among purchasers of new automobiles. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 10(4), 417-431.
- Goldsmith, E. B. (2005). *Consumer economics: Issues and behaviors*. Prentice Hall, Inc., New Jersey.

- Grewal, D., Gopalkrishnan, R. I., Krishnan, R., & Sharma, A. (2003). The internet and the price-value-loyalty chain. *Journal of Business Research*, 56(5), 391-398.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5th ed.). Prentice Hall: Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
- Han, D. Y. (1988). *A study consumer behavior with respect to purchasing by Korean female college students*. Master's thesis, Seoul Woman's University, Seoul, Korea.
- Hatch, K., & Roberts, J. A. (1985). Use of intrinsic and extrinsic cues to assess textile product quality. *Journal of Consumer Studies and Home Economics*, 9(4), 341-357.
- Hirschman, E. C., & Holbrook, M. B. (1982). Hedonic consumption: Emerging concepts, methods and propositions. *Journal of Marketing*, 46(3), 92-101.
- Hong, S. S., & Oh, E. J. (2001). A study on the make-up expression and purchasing behavior of make-up cosmetics based on the lifestyle. *Journal of the Korean Home Economics Association*, 39(7), 85-99.
- Hwang, C. S. (2004). Segmentation of the cosmetics market according to shopping orientation. *Journal of the Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles*, 28(12), 1632-1643.
- Jeon, J. H. (1998). *A study on the consumers satisfaction with distribution channels of Korean cosmetic industry*. Master's thesis, Sogang University, Seoul, Korea.
- Jeon, M. C., Marguerite, M., & Ann, D. F. (2005). Consumer shopping value of retail brands. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 9(1), 43-53.
- Jenkins, M. C., & Dickey, L. E. (1976). Consumer types based on evaluative criteria underlying clothing decision. *Home Economics Research Journal*, 4(3), 150-162.
- Jin, H. S., & Park, J. O. (2004). A study on service quality of clothing store according to shopping value type. *2004 Spring Proceedings of the Costume Culture Conference*.
- Jo, Y. U. (1997). *A study on lifestyle and purchase behavior of cosmetic consumer*. Master's thesis, Chonnam National University, Gwangju, Korea.
- Kim, C. S., & Mun, J. H. (2005). Analysis on cosmetics behavior and cosmetic preference of women aged in their 20's. *Journal of the Korean Home Economics Association*, 43(11), 59-71.
- Kim, Y. H. (1997). *A positive study on purchase decision making of make-up cosmetic consumer: Focused on Seoul area resident*. Master's thesis, Dongguk University, Seoul, Korea.
- Kim, Y. K. (2002). Consumer value: An application to mall and internet shopping. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 30(12), 595-602.
- Kim, Y. K., & Park, E. J. (2005). A difference in cosmetics evaluation criteria and consumer satisfaction according to life style-Focused on women university consumers of cosmetics specialty store. *Journal of the Korean Society of Cosmetology*, 11(1), 26-33.
- Kim, Y. S. (2004). A study on the benefits sought and use of cosmetics. *Journal of the Korean Society of Costume*, 54(3), 95-104.
- Ku, Y. S., Kwon, H. J., & Lee, S. M. (2000). A study on the cosmetics purchasing behavior of male college students by clothing involvement. *Journal of Korean Society of Costume Culture*, 8(2), 183-196.
- Kwon, T. S., & Kim, Y. S. (2000). A study on the university student's benefits sought and the use of information source on the hair care cosmetics. *Journal of the Korean Society of Costume*, 50(7), 97-111.
- Lee, H. S., Kim, Y., & Jeong, J. H. (1999). Utilitarian/hedonic shopping value and shopping satisfaction: Development and testing of a structural model. *Journal of Korean Academic Society of Business*, 28(2), 505-538.
- Lee, J. Y., & Kim, Y. S. (1999). The cosmetics consumption behavior according to the life styles of university women. *Journal of the Korean Society of Costume*, 45, 147-159.
- Lee, M. H. (2004). The influence of women's self-concept on cosmetic benefits sought. *The Research Journal of Costume Culture*, 12(4), 614-627.
- Lee, M. H., & Lee, E. S. (2003). A study on shopping orientation and post-purchase of cosmetics. *Journal of Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles*, 27(2), 250-

- 260.
- Lee, M. J. (2002). *A study on life style and cosmetic purchase behavior of Korean females*. Master's thesis, Chonnam National University, Gwangju, Korea.
- Li, H., Kuo, C., & Russell, M. (1999). The impact of perceived channel utilities, shopping orientations, and demographics on the consumer's online buying behavior. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 5. Retrived November 13, 2009, from <http://www.ascusc.org/jcmc/vol5/issue2/hairong.html>
- Lin, L. Y., & Chen, C. S. (2006). The influence of the country-of-origin image, product knowledge and product involvement on consumer purchase decisions: An empirical study of insurance and catering services in Taiwan. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 23(5), 248-265.
- Macintosh, G., & Lockshin, L. S. (1997). Retail relationships and store loyalty: A multi-level perspective. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 14(5), 487-497.
- Mathwick, C., Malhotra, N., & Rigdon, E. (2001). Experiential value: Conceptualization, measurement and application in the catalog and internet shopping environment. *Journal of Retailing*, 77, 39-56.
- Morganosky, M. (1984). Aesthetic and utilitarian qualities of clothing: Use of multidimensional clothing value model. *Home Economics Research Journal*, 13, 12-20.
- Moschis, G. P. (1976). Shopping orientations and consumer uses of information. *Journal of Retailing*, 58(2), 61-70.
- Moye, L. N., & Kincade, D. H. (2002). Influence of usage situations and consumer shopping orientations on the importance of the retail store environment. *International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 12(1), 59-79.
- Mun, H. K., & Yoo, T. S. (2003). A study of the self-esteem, degree of appearance concern, clothing attitude and make-up. *Journal of the Korean Society of Costume*, 53(4), 101-112.
- Norusis, M. (1994). *SPSS user guide*. SPSS Inc., Chicago.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- O'Neal, G. S., Hines, J. D., & Jackson, H. O. (1990). Interpreting the meaning of consumer perceptions of clothing quality. In P. Horridge (Eds.), *ACPTC Proceedings* (pp.88). Monument, CO: The Association of College Professors of Textiles and Clothing.
- Park, E. J., & Kang, E. M. (2005). Impacts of service quality and shopping value on consumers' satisfaction for women in their 50's and 60's. *Journal of Korean Home Economics Association*, 43(10), 115-124.
- Park, H. W., & Kim, Y. S. (2005). A study on the naturalistic cosmetics purchasing behavior according to well-being lifestyle of 20-30 aged woman. *Journal of the Korean Society of Costume*, 55(6), 93-106.
- Ryou, E. J., & Cho, O. S. (2005). The effects of the internet shopping values on internet shopping behavior of apparel products-Focused on the shopping mall attributes and perceived risks. *The Research Journal of the Costume Culture*, 13(2), 209-220.
- Rundle-Thiele, S. (2005). Elaborating customer loyalty: Exploring loyalty to wine retailers. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 12, 333-344.
- Schechter, L. (1984). A normative conception of value. *Progressive Grocer Executive Report* 2, 12-14.
- Shang, R. A., Chen, Y. C., & Shen, L. (2005). Extrinsic versus intrinsic motivations for consumers to shop on-line. *Information and Management*, 42, 401-413.
- Song, H. I. (2002). *A study on cosmetic purchasing behavior according to clothing shopping orientation of 20's females*. Master's thesis, Sunchon National University, Sunchon, Korea.
- Song, H. I., Lee, O. H., & Kang, Y. E. (2002). A study on cosmetics purchasing behavior according to clothing shopping orientation of 20's female. *Journal of the Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles*, 26(11), 1593-1604.
- Sun, J. H., & Yoo, T. S. (2004). A study on shopping orientation, information source, store image of consumers according to the distribution channels of cosmetics. *Journal of the Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles*, 28(5), 559-569.

- Swaminathan, V., Lepkowska-White, E., & Rao, B. (1999). Browser or buyers in cyberspace? An investigation of factors influencing electronic exchange. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 5. Retrived November 13, 2009, from <http://www.ascusc.org/jcmc>
- Sweeney, J., & Soutar, G. (2001). Consumer perceived value: The development of a multiple item scale. *Journal of Retailing*, 77, 203-220.
- Um, J. N. (2004). *A positive study on purchase behavior of Chinese medicine cosmetic*. Master's thesis, Sookmyung Woman's University, Seoul, Korea.
- Yoo, C. J., Hong, S. T., & Jung, H. E. (2006). In-depth study on women's needs for makeup and consumption behavior of cosmetics products. *Journal of Korean Academic Society of Business*, 35(1), 21-49.
- Yoon, S. H. (1993). *A study on purchase behavior of Korean cosmetic consumer*. Master's thesis, Kookmin University, Seoul. Korea.
-
- Received September 14, 2009
Revised December 7, 2009
Accepted December 7, 2009