CARLETON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

What Motivates a Consumer to Make An Online Purchase

MMS Thesis

Submitted by Tracy Somerton Dupuis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
In Partial fulfillment of the requirements for the MMS degree

December 2002

**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-79779-1

Canada

The undersigned recommend
to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
acceptance of the thesis

What Motivates a Consumer to Make An Online Purchase

Submitted by Tracy Somerton Dupuis, B.Comm.(Hon.)
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Management Studies

Thesis Supervisor

Director, Eric Sprott School of Business

Carleton University
December 2002

ABSTRACT

This thesis focuses on the shopping experience, and attempts to uncover what motivates a consumer to make an online purchase. The data for the research was collected using a questionnaire with six sections; each section focused on an area that was expected to impact a consumers' decision to purchase online. There were 105 completed questionnaires gathered thru judgmental sampling.

The findings of the research indicate that the lower the interest in a variety of shopping-related activities the more likely the respondent was to have shopped online, the less interested the respondent was in shopping online the less likely they are to have made an online purchase and that the five senses play an important role in the purchase decision (depending on what is being purchased).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	6
Preliminary Data Collection.....	6
Main Challenge.....	14
Literature Review.....	15
Previous Research.....	15
Background on the Internet.....	17
Articles Regarding Online Shopping.....	18
Recent Articles Regarding Online Shopping.....	23
Articles Referenced in the Scales.....	28
Outline of Proposed Research.....	30
Proposed Research Method.....	30
Questionnaire.....	32
Questionnaire Sources.....	32
Research Hypotheses.....	33
Data Validation.....	38
Data Analysis.....	39
Logistic Regression.....	40
Table 1.....	41
Table 2.....	42
Table 3.....	43
Table 4.....	44
Table 5.....	45
Table 6.....	45
Reliability Analysis.....	46
Factor Analysis.....	47
Results.....	47
Characteristics of Sample.....	47
Demographic Characteristics.....	48
Computer Use.....	48
Internet Use.....	48
Discussion of Hypothesis.....	49
Hypothesis 1.....	49
Table 7.....	50
Hypothesis 2.....	50
Table 8.....	50
Hypothesis 3.....	51

Table 9.....	51
Hypothesis 4.....	52
Table 10.....	52
Hypothesis 5.....	52
Table 11.....	52
Hypothesis 6.....	52
Table 12.....	53
Hypothesis 7.....	53
Table 13.....	54
Results Discussed.....	54
Limitations.....	58
Opportunity for Future Research.....	59
References Cited.....	61
General References, not cited.....	64
Appendix A.....	66
Cluster Descriptions	
Appendix B.....	68
The Questionnaire	
Appendix C.....	78
The Scale Sources	
Appendix D.....	86
Numbering of Variables	
Appendix E.....	88
Coding Legend	
Appendix F.....	90
Scale & Hypothesis Representation	
Appendix G.....	92
Correlations	
Appendix H.....	94
Reported Reliability	
Appendix I.....	96
Frequency Table	

INTRODUCTION

Although 80% of Canadians agree that 'technology is important to me', only 43% of Canadian Internet users have made an online purchase (Wilson, 2000). Why is this? Many previous studies (see Watson (1998) and references therein) have investigated the impact of privacy issues on the decision to buy online. This thesis will assist with the understanding of **what motivates a consumer to make online purchases**. It is hypothesized that there are four areas which may influence this decision to purchase online: the characteristics of the products, the familiarity and confidence in the products, consumer and location attributes, and privacy issues. The expectation is that the main factor influencing the decision to buy will be the attributes of the consumer.

PRELIMINARY DATA COLLECTION

Because there is not a significant amount of research on this topic, preliminary qualitative data were collected through informal interviews. The following section contains excerpts of the inputs that were gathered by face-to-face conversations, e-mails and phone conversations. All of these interactions were very causal and the conversations were allowed to go freely without sticking to a pre-determined set of questions. Regardless of whether or not someone had made an online purchase, everyone had a definite attitude which was based on news stories, word of mouth and/or their personal experiences. Here are some relevant excerpts:

My experience: I have never really found the idea of shopping online very appealing because I like the social aspect of shopping and also the idea of knowing exactly what I am buying. Because I knew that my thesis would somehow deal with online shopping I thought that it would be best if I made at least one online purchase. My opportunity came when I received a coupon for \$25 off a \$50 purchase from indigo.ca. It wasn't a terrible experience but I must say that I didn't like having to make a decision to buy a book based on a 5-line description. By the time I input my credit card number (I don't have any concerns about someone stealing my number) I had purchased 5 books and anxiously awaited their delivery. Two days later I was off to the post office to pick up my parcel. Inside the box I found my books, but was disappointed with the choices that I made – what was I thinking? Because I couldn't be bothered returning them, I am the owner of 5 books which have never been read. As of today I have no expectations of ever making another online purchase. For me, the benefit of the Internet is that it is a convenient way of sharing information with people, regardless of location. When my friend Sue and I were trying to find bridesmaid dresses for my wedding we weren't sure how we were going to show the other bridesmaids who were located in Winnipeg, Edmonton and California what dresses we were thinking of choosing. Thanks to the Alfred Angelo website everyone was able to see the front and back of the dress without leaving the house.

Pam is a married, mother of two who used to purchase everything from the school uniforms for her boys to books online when she was living in Simi Valley, California. In the 15 months since Pam and her family returned to Ottawa, she has yet to make an online purchase. Why? When she was in the US it was very easy to make purchases, but more importantly the return process was very simple. If you wanted to return the goods you could simply leave them on your front step and a courier would come the next day to bring them back to the vendor. The other interesting thing that she mentioned is that in the valley, everyone was making online purchases whereas, in Ottawa none of her close friends purchase online.

Jack is in his late 50's and has been retired for 3 years. When I asked him what he thought about the internet he said that he thought it was a great way to bring people together, but that he had no desire to ever 'surf the web'. Jack likes the idea of sitting at home and making purchases online since he doesn't like shopping. The catch? He doesn't own a computer and doesn't intend on purchasing one. All he wants is to spend his time on a beach!!

Alice is a single woman in her late 50's who uses the internet as a source of information, but has no desire to use it as a purchasing tool. When I ask her why she responds that she would prefer to see what she is buying and that shopping online is just something that she doesn't think of doing. Even when I asked her if she knew the quality and the characteristics of goods would she make a repeat

purchase online the answer is still no. She said that there is no guarantee that what she orders is what she will receive. When I asked her if she had ever ordered from a catalogue, she said yes, but that it was different. When you order from a catalogue you speak to a person so that there is a sense of reassurance. The other factor that she mentioned is that Sears has an excellent reputation and that she didn't have any concerns about the service that she would receive or the return process if the goods were unsatisfactory.

Travis is in his early 30's and is a recent transplant to Santa Clara, California from Brampton. When he lived in Brampton he never made a single purchase online, but since he has moved to California he has bought everything from a book to his sofa online. He said it's just the thing to do. When I asked him what the difference is in California he said that online shopping is everywhere. Most billboards are for advertising ".com's" and because more people make online purchases, there is a sense of security. Travis hasn't had any bad experiences so far, but he believes that unless something drastic happens he is an online shopper for life. Gone are his days of fighting for parking spots and dealing with crowds in stores.

Richard is in his early 20's and spends most of his spare time on the computer. He has only made two purchases online and does not intend of making another purchase in the near future. He is one of the people that I expected would be an e-commerce junkie, but he isn't. When I asked why he doesn't buy more goods

online his opinion is that he doesn't like shopping whether it is online or in a store. Most of his shopping consists of computer books or computer programs, with the odd clothing shopping trip here and there. He would never shop online for clothing since it would be difficult to know how the clothes fit and it would be a bother to return them. As for the computer-related shopping, he prefers to flip through books before he buys them. When I ask why not go to a bookstore to see what books you want and then go home and order them online, his response is that it isn't worth the bother unless there is a significant reduction in price. Richard is the only person that I spoke to who has purchased groceries online. He shared an order with his buddy because neither of them had access to a car and the nearest grocery store was about a 90 minute walk. He purchased produce, cheese and bread and found that everything was received as ordered. Now that he is living closer to a grocery store he does not believe that he will purchase groceries online again.

Eleanor is in her mid-50's, and is married. Within the last 18 months she began using a computer at work and although in the beginning she thought it was the worst invention ever, she now understands how it can simplify her work day. Before I asked the question about online shopping, I basically knew the answer. Eleanor is one of those people that lives for the social aspect of shopping. Her response is a definite 'no' and that she wouldn't even consider online shopping. When I asked her to expand on her position, she indicates that she spends enough time in front of a computer during the day and that she just likes going to

the mall and shopping, then stopping for a coffee break and just enjoys people watching. The other issue is that she doesn't like the idea of entering her credit card number into the computer - she doesn't care what security features the sites have.

Deborah is in her mid-20s and lives in Long Beach, California. She has made many online purchases since moving to California: books, cds, perfume, flowers, airline tickets and concert tickets. Her experiences have been good and she would definitely purchase online again. (In fact, after I received her initial response she e-mailed me to tell me that she had just purchased a wedding gift for a friend who was out of state via the internet. In addition, it was convenient since she didn't want to lug a heavy gift to the wedding in Chicago. She also saved the state sales tax). She mentioned that the Barnes and Noble.com site is very 'user friendly' as you are able to search for gift ideas by topics, authors, holidays... When purchasing tickets, both airline and concert, Deborah receives a discounted rate – she thinks this is due to the decreased labour and capital involvement. The one purchase that she wouldn't make online is for clothing due to the 'trying on' aspect.

Cathy is in her mid-20's and has never made an online purchase. This is due to two main reasons. The first is that most of the sites where she finds things are American and with the impact of the exchange rate the items are more expensive than finding them in a store. Also, she likes going to stores, seeing what is new

without having to know exactly what it is she is looking for. If she does find something she wants to buy, she can take it home with her immediately.

Kerry is in her late 20's is married and a new mom. She has never made a purchase online. She prefers to see the product first because she doesn't like returning things. Also, she isn't comfortable entering her credit card number online. Because she is a new mom, I thought that she may be more willing to try online shopping as she isn't really living on her own schedule at the moment. Quite the opposite is true, she really enjoys getting out for the interaction, and shopping is the perfect way to achieve this especially as the weather gets cooler.

Tim is in his mid-30's and has never made an online purchase although he does use the Internet to do comparison shopping and to see what products are on the market. He has no concern about inputting his credit card number online, but he does not like the idea of having to wait for the goods to be delivered once he places the order. He has not purchased concert tickets online although he has used the Ticketmaster website to determine where he wants to sit so that when he calls to speak to an agent he is prepared. When I asked him why he wouldn't make the purchase online he indicated that he prefers to speak to someone in case he encounters any problems during the transaction. He did indicate that he would be willing to shop online if there were significant savings over buying the goods in a store. Even with significant savings he did mention that he would be concerned that what he received would not be what he had ordered and he couldn't be bothered with the return process. He said that he would consider

online grocery shopping although once again he was concerned about delivery. Even if there was a prearranged delivery time he was concerned that something would prevent him from being home on time and then what would happen to his groceries? It is just more convenient to go to the grocery store on his own time.

Margaret is in her mid-50's. When I ask her if she has even made an online purchase she just laughed and said that she didn't even know how to turn on the computer at home – she leaves that up to her husband! She has never really thought about making a purchase online as she enjoys her trips to the store and doesn't think that there is anything that online shopping can offer her that a traditional store can't. When booking flights, she would prefer to speak to her travel agent than to book the flights online. If she could get a better price booking online she says that she would be tempted but because she finds technology so overwhelming, it's just easier to speak to her travel agent. She likes to speak to her travel agent about recommendations and basically just likes speaking to a human.

Laralyn is in her mid-20's and is a student at the University of Calgary. She enjoys shopping and finds that a trip to the mall is a welcome escape from school work. She estimates that only 20% of the trips that she makes to the mall results in a purchase of any significance. She has never made a purchase online although she is willing to if she had the opportunity and the price was right. The main reason that she hasn't yet is that she hasn't found any products to

purchase; she can't imagine buying clothes or shoes without trying them on first. She once tried to purchase tickets for a Ricky Martin concert through Ticketmaster.ca, but she kept getting disconnected, so she picked up the phone instead. After that experience she likely wouldn't try to purchase tickets online again.

There are many other people that I had conversations with about my thesis and there are only a few people who have tried online shopping. In most cases it was a trial just to see what it would be like and although there weren't any horror stories most people interviewed indicated that they likely wouldn't make another online purchase. They don't like the idea of spending even more time in front of the computer when they have already spent a majority of their day there. Shopping for them is a time to get together with friends and to see what is happening in the world. Shopping is an experience that online retailers just don't seem to be able to compete with.

MAIN CHALLENGE

Two main challenges were encountered during the preparation of this thesis. The first challenge related to the definition of online shopping. Online shopping is the purchase of a good or a service over the Internet. This statement is supported by the definition of electronic commerce as a process of buying and selling products, services, and information over computer networks (Turban, Lee, King and Chung, 2000). Because most people that I spoke to during the

preliminary research thought of shopping as being product-related instead of a transaction involving cash, there were a few people who said that they had not made any online purchases. When asked follow-up questions on whether they had purchased concert or airline tickets they indicated yes. For the purpose of this thesis, online shopping is defined as *the purchase of goods and services via the Internet*. This includes traditional goods such as books, clothing, cds as well as airline tickets, concert tickets and other 'non-tangible' goods.

The second challenge arose during the data collection. Although the drop off/pick up method was to be used it was not successful. The questionnaires were dropped off at 30 homes on 3 streets in sealed envelopes to ensure complete confidentiality as required by the Carleton University Research Ethics Committee. The expectation was that the questionnaires would be completed by some residents of the homes and left in the mailbox for pick-up the following day. When the pick-up was done there were only 3 completed questionnaires to be picked up. Because of this lack of success the decision was made to use judgmental sampling.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Previous Research

In order to determine if any previous research existed on this topic, an extensive search was performed using the following online tools:

- Sociological Abstracts
- CBCA (Canadian Business & Current Affairs)
- ABI

- Digital Dissertations
- SSI (Social Science Index)
- PAIS (Public Affairs Information Service)

The words used to query on were: web* (for anything web related); shop* (to find anything related to shopping); stud* and surv* (to find any studies/surveys related to the topic); and finally onlin* (to locate any information regarding online transactions). The search words were combined in many different ways to ensure that all related research was located.

The search performed in 2000, in SSI, PAIS, CBCA, the Sociological Index did not locate any relevant information. There were two thesis' found using Digital Dissertations which had related topics. The first was written in 1997 by a student at the University of Tennessee and its purpose was to systematically analyze the influence of store, consumer, and product attributes on adoption of shopping via the Internet (Knuz, 1997). Although requested, this thesis was not received and it was therefore not possible to perform a more detailed literature review.

The second was written in 1999 by a student at the University of Minnesota. This study was written to examine the individual characteristics of Internet shoppers and the factors that influence Internet purchasing behaviour (Lee, 1999). The data was gathered from a previous Internet survey conducted by a department at the Georgia Institute of Technology. This thesis concluded that Internet users' attitudes about Internet shopping was the best predictor of Internet purchasing frequency, as well as intentions to make Internet purchases

in the future. Because this study was based on data collected by an Internet survey, people who do not use the Internet were excluded as possible respondents.

Background on the Internet

When the Sputnik satellite was launched the US felt threatened and established ARPA (Advanced Research Projects Agency) to focus on creating a set of open standards to allow distributed computing between and among computing facilities spread throughout research and development, university and government locations. As the fear of a cold war diminished the name was changed to the Internet and it became a method of allowing an open networking standard for the sharing of information and computing power.

The Internet is an international network of networks that allows different computers users to share information and communicate interactively. Unlike most forms of communication, the Internet has no fixed physical location, central point or permanent intelligence. Instead, all stored information and network management is widely distributed, allowing each remote entity to be in charge of its own area (Information Highway Advisory Council, 1997).

In Canada the Internet began in the late 1980's when a group of universities and research institutions joined with the federal and several provincial governments to create a national computer communications network.

As a result of this collaboration in June 1990 CA*net, Canada's national Internet backbone, was created. In January 1993 the federal government created CANARIE which was a jointly funded government-industry initiative to stimulate industrial R&D on high-bandwidth network facilities and applications. Within its first two years in existence, CANARIE had linked Canada's North by linking regional networks to the national backbone and upgrading the CA*net backbone for satisfactory performance given the explosive growth in user demand. In December 1996 13.3 percent of Canadian households subscribed to the Internet at home, though many more use it at work (Canadian Internet Survey, 1997). This number had increased to 40% in 2000.

Articles Regarding Online Shopping

In a survey conducted in October 2000, 79% of households in the new city of Ottawa have computers with Internet access which has increased since 1999 when Statistics Canada found that 60.7% of the Ottawa region's residents have computers with Internet access (Campbell, 2000). The survey also found that although Internet use is more likely to occur in the under-30 age group with university education, there is widespread use of the Internet which dismisses the initial concerns that only a certain group of people would have access to the Internet. This is attributed to the lower costs of computers and Internet access, but also to the desire to access the endless information made available on the Internet (Campbell, 2000).

The idea for this topic came from an article in the magazine Business Week, titled "E-Shoppers Take a Breather" (Koretz, 2000). The article focused on the fact that although the amount of Internet retail sales continues to grow, it is not growing nearly as much as expected. The two main drivers for this are that many e-shoppers are not making purchases online any longer and those that do are spending less on each transaction. One interesting finding is that researchers at the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School have been tracking purchases of 1000 Internet shoppers since 1997 and in 1998 15% of those people did not make an e-purchase, but increased their use of mail-order catalogs (Koretz, 2000). It is believed that the Net may become just an alternate shopping channel, not the endlessly growing retail beast some experts project. In the article there was no mention of what motivated these people to stop making their online purchases. This information could assist online retailers in not only retaining their clients, but also in attracting new e-shoppers.

Although Canadians are more likely to purchase the 'latest and greatest' technology products or services than Americans' we are less likely to make online purchases and if we do, we don't purchase as much (Wilson, 2000). In a survey conducted by the Boston Consulting Group in the fall of 1999 they found that in addition to the normal security concerns about online purchases, many times consumers just cannot find what they want on Canadian sites (The BCG, 2000). In most cases American and other foreign sites offer a better variety, but then duty and foreign exchange concerns impact the decision to buy. Retailers must ensure that e-shoppers enjoy their online shopping experience since a

recent study found that 38% of consumers that experienced a failed purchase suggested that they would stop purchasing from the website where the failed purchase occurred (Wilson, 2000).

Canadian retailers are beginning to move online and are showing strong performance on several key economic drivers such as acquisition costs, conversion and loyalty rates but have yet to conquer the fulfillment challenges, which is deemed to be a critical part of the consumer purchase process. Order fulfillment is the process of getting the ordered product into the hands of the consumer (Napier, Judd, Rivers and Wagner, 2001). A poor fulfillment process not only weakens consumer confidence but it leads to consumer defections (The Boston Consulting Group, 2000). Although Canadian retailers are increasingly aware of the opportunities that an online presence represents, they also recognize that their online channel must complement their other sales channels in order to meet and exceed the expectations of customers.

Even though some companies have yet to establish themselves as online retailers, they are likely to have some form of advertisements on the Internet. Although Internet advertising is only 1 to 2 percent of the total \$100 billion a year advertisement bill in the United States, it is growing rapidly (Turban, Lee, King and Chung, 2001). It is expected to be \$8 billion by 2002 (Business Week, 1997). Through the use of cookies, which is information about an individual's browser which is stored on the user's web browser and provides an identity that can be accessed on a return visit, companies can gather relevant information

from consumers for the purpose of targeting product information more effectively in the future. The object of this continuous relationship building is to give consumers information about the manufacturer and its products as well as to receive information from consumers about their likes and dislikes (Wilcox, 1999).

Many consumers who are reluctant to make online purchases do look at the Internet as an excellent source of product information. One study in 1995 found that gathering purchase-related information was the most preferred web activity performed by web users (Gupta, 1995). With the amount of information offered on the web, consumers are more educated shoppers than previously which results in a more powerful position in the process.

A 1999 study which attempted to understand net users' attitudes about online privacy found that although most respondents were generally comfortable about providing preference information to web sites, they were often very uncomfortable providing credit card and social insurance information. To address this concern many companies post privacy policies, but the study found that although these policies are viewed as being important, people are still reluctant to input certain data online. One interesting finding is that when asked about the use of cookies, 78% of respondents said that would definitely or probably agree to web sites using them to provide a customized service (Cranor, Reagle and Ackerman, 1999). The authors of the study indicate that there were

varied levels of concern regarding online privacy to support their conclusion that a one-size-fits-all approach is unlikely to succeed.

In contrast to the Business Week article that discussed the decrease in e-shopping transactions, there are still many people who believe that we are currently just experiencing the tip of the iceberg. IBM has established the Institute for Advanced Commerce (IAC) whose goal is to find practical ways for IBM to sell its products with the aid of the Internet (Bayers, 2000). IBM is currently experimenting with a new product, EasiOrder, that enables a consumer to use a hand-held device which scans the barcode of products and adds them to their grocery list which is then uploaded to the Net.

The emergence of bot.com companies like, mySimon and DealPilot are sure to change the way that consumers conduct business online. Both of these companies operate by finding the best price on goods that a consumer requests. An interesting finding on DealPilot was how infrequently the well-known companies had the lowest price. However, most of the time the consumer chose to purchase at the more expensive price as it was from a vendor that they trusted (Bayers, 2000). Although this finding supports the fact that branding is just as important in the Internet economy, it may be found that over time the brand that consumers begin to trust are no longer the traditional companies, but the bot.coms who are performing the work. Although eBay has experienced many successes there are some people who believe that a cash economy is going to

be replaced by a barter-based economy whereby you will trade goods/services instead of cash to acquire new goods. This idea is the basis for a website called Ubarter.com whereby small business owners can exchange product for product and if both sides do not have similar products you acquire a virtual currency called, Ubarter dollars, which are redeemable in an internal economy sponsored by a participating company.

In an article published in the Ottawa Citizen called Attention, online shoppers found that one of the biggest things holding back rapid growth in Internet shopping is difficulty in learning about businesses that sell online. The article gives examples of six local companies who sell on the web and what their strong and weak points are from the consumers' perspective. Most of the businesses had convenience as a strong point and cost as one of the weak points. In most cases the consumers is paying delivery charges that they would not incur if they went to the store to make the purchase. One Ottawa working mother who frequently purchases groceries online says, "that there is no time wasted in the grocery aisles or at the checkout; no temptation to buy things she doesn't need; and no lugging the stuff home and into the house" (Prentice, 2000).

Recent Articles Regarding Online Shopping

Because of the length of time that has passed since the initial literature review was completed, an additional literature review was performed in 2002. This review was not as extensive as the first, as it focused on articles which

related directly to this thesis and its findings. The search was performed using Google.ca, the Carleton library and suggested resources.

In September 2002, Statistics Canada reported that from January to December 2001 an estimated 4 million households, about one third of all households in Canada, had at least one member that used the Internet to support purchasing decisions, either by window shopping or placing online orders. An interesting finding is that about 1.7 million households, or 14% of the total, window-shopped in 2001 – that is, they used the Internet to narrow their purchasing decisions, but did not commit to ordering or purchasing online (www.statcan.ca, 2002). The new data also confirmed that for every \$10 spent by households on electronic commerce in 2001, \$6.50 was spent on purchases directly from Canadian sites. Even though there had not been reduction in concern regarding security and privacy, there was an increase in households placing orders electronically.

The paper “Shopping Style Segmentation of Consumers” attempts to provide some insight into determining which consumers would be willing to switch to online format and to what extent (Papatla & Bhatnagar, 2002). The main issue that is investigated is whether there are different segments of consumers with varying levels of preference for different shopping formats. The data that was used was from an online survey of the purchasing habits and format preferences of a sample of households, with 1800 completing the survey fully. The respondents were asked to indicate whether they bought any of six product

categories at an online store, catalog and/or retail in the preceding six months. The model used identified four segments which were alike in some ways and different in others. An interesting finding is that for three of the four segments the relative preference for the three formats is retailer preferred to catalog preferred to online.

In his paper, Michael Ward examines consumer substitution behaviour among three distribution channels: online shopping, traditional retail and catalog shopping (Ward, 2001). The data for this study was from four semiannual online surveys of e-commerce, traditional retail and direct-mail usage from 1996 to 1997, with 10,000 respondents included. Each respondent answered questions about the three channels for 17 product categories. Based on his results, consumers consider online shopping and catalog shopping to be closer substitutes than any other pair of channels. This is explained by the fact that a website and a catalog have basically the same information but using a different medium and that both online and catalog shopping require similar product delivery methods.

Women have yet to welcome Web-based shopping as readily as men. A primary factor for this state is how men and women view shopping (Van Slyke, Comunale & Belanger, 2002). The article, "Gender Differences in Perception of Web-based Shopping", explores gender difference with respect to Web-based shopping. Although men and woman are equally likely to use the internet for

personal and business purposes, women are less likely than men to purchase products and/or services from the Web. They discuss many factors that may influence this including, that women truly enjoy the shopping experience compared to men, gender differences in computer-related attitudes and behaviour and that men and women have different perceptions of the usefulness and ease of information technologies. The results of their study indicate that men are more likely to intend to shop on the Web and it establishes significant differences in how men and women perceive Web shopping. The article concludes by making recommendations to organizations which may increase women's perception of Web-based shopping. These recommendations include using technology to increase a sense of community and create a social forum for customers, providing accurate descriptions and photos of products, having liberal return policies and offer special incentives to new customers.

The article "Electronic Shopping" discusses the importance of interface design on online traffic and sales. There are four groups of online retail store attributes highlighted: merchandise, service, promotion and convenience. Regarding merchandise, online retailers should offer a large product selection and because consumers cannot interact with the products internet catalogs should offer hyperlinks to more extensive product information. Consumers want help with product selection, gift services, contact information for sales representatives, a FAQ section for speedy answers, information about the security of their transaction, company return, payment and credit policies,

information about shipping and handling costs, guarantees and statements about product quality. The use of promotions is a way to increase store visits, as long as they are effective. Consumers want sites that are easy to use and that have an uncomplicated checkout process. The article concludes that the user interface is an essential link between the customer and the retail store in Web-based shopping environments and that the growth of the Internet retail sales will depend, at least partially, on these interface design issues (Lohse & Spiller, 1998).

A study performed by Kim, Cho and Rao suggests that online purchasing behaviour depends on consumers' perceptions of risk and benefits, and consumers' characteristics such as lifestyles that are mediated by these perceptions (Kim, Cho & Rao, 2000). The sample included 306 respondents and the data was from an online survey dataset by GVUC and the Georgia Institute of Technology. They indicate that a limitation to using Internet web surveys, is that only people with access to the Internet can participate and that there are issues related to self-selection of participants. Their results suggest that online purchasing behaviour is effected both directly and indirectly by consumer lifestyles and that Internet retailers have to direct their products and provide specific promotions to each targeted segment of customers at the aggregate level as well as to individual customers (Kim, Cho & Rao, 2000).

The purpose of the article "The Internet Shopper" is to understand how Internet shoppers differ from non-Internet shoppers (people who have not made purchases on the Internet). The data for this study was collected thru telephone surveys. During these surveys respondents were asked general questions about their Internet use and demographics, questions about their in-home shopping behavior, they were asked whether they had purchased products from the Internet and they were asked a series of short questions to measure their attitudes (toward shopping, direct marketing, and advertising), brand and price consciousness, risk aversion, variety-seeking propensity, innovativeness, importance of convenience, and impulsiveness (Donthu & Garcia, 1999). The article concludes that Internet shoppers do not differ from non-shoppers on gender and education, however Internet shoppers are older and have a higher income. Also, Internet shoppers are convenience seekers, more innovative, less risk adverse, and less brand and price conscious (Donthu & Garcia, 1999).

Articles Referenced in Scales

The article Understanding the Outshopper focuses on intermarket patronage by examining the characteristics of 'outshoppers'. Outshoppers are consumers who forego the convenience of hometown shopping and travel to out-of-town markets to purchase products (Hawes & Lumpkin, 1984). The data was collected thru the use of a self-administered questionnaire completed by the household member responsible for most of the family's shopping. The respondents were located in a trade area around Dallas-Fort Worth and were

from a variety of communities and a mix of residential location categories. The study concluded that there were many demographic and psychographic characteristics that differentiate frequent outshoppers. Those that were most relevant to this thesis are: held a negative attitude toward local shopping conditions, were less loyal to local merchants and was a shopping innovator.

The purpose of the study discussed in the article Characteristics of Adopters and Non-Adopters of Home Computers was to investigate the nature of the adopter of the home computer (Dickerson & Gentry, 1983). The author tested three hypothesis related to the character of adopters. To gather the data to test these hypotheses, a four-page questionnaire was sent to pre-selected computer club members (adopters) and Psychology Today subscribers (non-adopters). The study found that the adopter was more likely to be middle-aged, have a higher income, more education and have more experience with a variety of technical products and services than non-adopters.

In the article Patterns of Consumer Learning George Moschis (1981) discusses his study which examined a wide variety of consumer-related learning properties that compromise consumer behaviour. Contrary to the cognitive-development theory to socialization which suggest that only younger adolescents at the formal operations stages ages (11 to 15) are still developing and integrating various cognitive skills, this study expected older adolescents to still be developing and integrating complex skills (Moschis, 1981). The sample was students from different schools located in different areas of Wisconsin. The

findings of this research indicate that consumer socialization continues throughout the late adolescent years and that cognitive resistance to advertising does not develop prior to the high school years.

The article New Insights About the FCB Grid outlines how measures of the basic dimensions of the FCB (Foote, Cone and Belding) grid were developed and has presented considerable evidence that these measures are reliable and valid. In particular, the measures were developed from related theories, they have acceptable internal consistency, they correlate as they should with similar measures developed by other authors, and they capture a good deal of the variation in how consumers perceive purchase decisions (Ratchford, 1987). These conclusions were based on the information collected during five studies that were performed in various parts of the US ending with one 'final study' which determined the involvement/think-feel tendencies of 60 common products.

OUTLINE OF PROPOSED RESEARCH

Proposed Research Method

The questionnaire was pre-tested to ensure that it was an effective tool in measuring the motivators for online shopping. Twenty-five questionnaires were completed as part of the pre-test and as result three changes were made to the questionnaire. One question was added to Section A (Perceptions of the Shopping Experience) of the questionnaire to measure the respondents' interest in shopping and another question relating to their comfort using the Internet was

added to Section D (Shopping Location Preferences). The final change, made to the second part of Section E (Product Characteristics) resulted in having respondents' indicate the importance of their senses on the purchase decision for clothing and groceries, instead of just on a purchase.

It was expected that the information on consumer motivations regarding online purchasing would be collected through a random survey of homes in the Ottawa area. Initially, the drop off/pick up of the questionnaires would occur on the same day however if this was not successful, then the questionnaires would be dropped off one day and be picked up the next. The questionnaires were dropped off at 30 homes on 3 streets in sealed envelopes to ensure complete confidentiality as required by the Carleton University Research Ethics Committee. The expectation was that the questionnaires would be completed by adult residents of the homes and left in the mailbox for pick-up the following day. When the pick-up was done there were only 3 completed questionnaires in the mailboxes to be picked up. Because of this lack of success the decision was made to use judgmental sampling. There are 6 clusters in total: Nortel employees, Algonquin College students, EDC employees, Miscellaneous (no common identifier), Family breakfast and the Pre-test respondents (Appendix A). These clusters were chosen because it was expected that they included respondents of varying ages/gender, education levels and Internet involvement.

A sample size of 150 to 200 was desired for the testing of the questionnaire, however the actual size was 105 respondents.

The Questionnaire

There are six distinct sections in the questionnaire. Each section focuses on an area that is expected to impact a consumers' decision to purchase online. In certain sections respondents will be asked both questions and sub-questions depending on the question being asked. The last section asks 13 demographic questions. The answers for these questions will be used to determine the characteristics of the sample and how they relate to the decision to purchase online. A copy of the questionnaire is found in Appendix B. The original questionnaire has been modified to include the variable coding which will be discussed in the Data Validation section.

Questionnaire Sources

The primary source for the questions in the questionnaire is the Marketing Scales Handbook, however other sources have also been used. A copy of each of the original scales can be found in Appendix C. Unless noted, the scales have not been modified from their original version. The Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) was used to determine if any of the scales had been used in other research papers. Because most of the scales are from the mid-1980's, the SSCI from 1985, 1990, 1995 and 2000 (up to August) were referenced. None of the scales were found to have been referenced in any additional research papers.

The source of the statements in section A is a 1985 study by Lumpkin, referred to as **Involvement (Shopping)**, which measured a person's degree of interest in a variety of shopping-related activities. An alpha of 0.8303 was

reported and factor analysis indicated that the items loaded together. This scale was chosen for the questionnaire as it will assist in determining if people who have lower scores in the questions are more likely to make online purchases because they aren't really interested in the social part of shopping.

The **Attitude Toward Computer Technology** scale was found in the Marketing Scales Handbook. This scale reflects a person's lack of comfort with some aspects of computer technology and was referred to as Computer Attitudes by Dickerson and Gentry (1983). Factor analysis indicated that the items loaded together, and an alpha of 0.50 was calculated for the scale. When speaking to people for the initial research, it became evident that some people will not embrace technology no matter what they have been told the benefits are. This scale was included in the questionnaire as it is expected that if a person has a negative attitude (low score on the scale) toward computer technology they are not going to be receptive to the idea of online shopping regardless of the perceived benefit.

The questions in section C: Personal Information Privacy Concerns were extracted from a MMS thesis by Lisa Watson (Watson, 1998). This section was included in the questionnaire to investigate how concerns regarding privacy may impact the decision to purchase online. It is expected that the respondents who have more positive overall views on privacy will be more likely to make an online purchase.

In order to investigate shopping location preferences, two scales have been used, both of which are from the Marketing Scales Handbook. The first scale, developed by Hawes and Lumpkin (1984), was called **In-Home Shopper** to measure a person's interest in shopping at home through phone or mail order. An alpha of 0.755 was calculated for the scale and factor analysis indicated that all items loaded together. In order to determine a person's interest in online shopping the statements were modified slightly to replace the words mail/phone ordering with Internet shopping. The expectation is that those people who show an interest in shopping online are more likely to make online purchases. An additional question was added to this section to determine if comfort with the Internet has an impact on someone choosing to make an online purchase.

The second scale was also developed by Hawes and Lumpkin (1984), but this time it was developed to measure a consumer's attitude about shopping at local stores. It is called **Shopping Conditions (Local)**. As with the first scale in factor analysis all items loaded together and they calculated an alpha of 0.711. When consumers are unhappy with their current shopping options it is expected that they will be more likely to use the Internet as a method of purchasing goods/services.

It is expected that characteristics of the product will impact a consumers decision to purchase online. Section E Product Characteristics contains two scales that address product characteristics. The first scale is called **Attitude Toward Branded Products** and was developed by George Moschis (1978). This purpose of this scale is to measure a person's opinion of brand name

products. An alpha of 0.50 was reported for the scale; there was no examination of scale validity reported. His initial findings were that lower scores on the scale indicated that respondents had positive opinions about branded products whereas higher scores suggest that they have negative attitudes. It is expected that a respondent who has lower scores will be more likely to make online purchase, specifically associated with a specific brand as they are more familiar with the product and know what to expect. The first question in the scale was removed as it was not deemed necessary since this thesis is not investigating the impact of brand advertising. The second scale **Attitude Toward the Purchase (Feeling Dimension)** was constructed by Ratchford (1987) and was used to measure the degree to which a purchase decision is influenced by one's feelings versus one's cognitive thinking. The alpha value for the scale was 0.66; the scale was not examined specifically for validity. The article referenced did not indicate why validity was not examined. The scale has been included to determine the importance that the five senses have in the decision to make a purchase. What may be concluded from this section is that senses that people use to make a purchase may influence their decision to purchase online.

The demographics section was based on the survey that Cranor, Reagle and Ackerman (1999) used for their investigation of net users' attitudes about online privacy. Question 9 (have you ever purchased tickets for a sporting event, airline?...online) was added because early in the initial research it was discovered that some people did not consider their purchases of tickets from

ticketmaster.ca or airline tickets purchased on the Internet as purchases. Two questions were added to determine what, if any influence the notion of 'being Canadian' impacts the decision to purchase online. The first question asks respondents if they would be more willing to make a purchase if it was a Canadian company, and the second asks if they would be more willing to make a purchase if it was in Canadian funds. In order to determine why some people have not made an online purchase, question 12 was added. The reason that they have not made a purchase may be something other than what has been identified in the body of the survey. Depending on the results, the findings from this question could be used as a basis for additional research on what motivates someone to purchase online.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Normally, hypotheses are not stated in terms of measures but rather conceptually. Then how each concept will be measured is given. Because in this research the focus is on studying the use of existing measures of concepts that may relate to the use of the internet for shopping the hypothesis are stated directly in terms of the conceptual measures.

Hypothesis 1: People who score low in the Perceptions of the Shopping Experience section will be *more* likely to make an online purchase.

Hypothesis 2: People who score low on the Attitudes Towards Computer Technology section are *less* likely to make an online purchase.

Hypothesis 3: People who feel well-informed in the area of computer privacy and are not concerned about threats to their privacy are *more* likely to purchase online.

Hypothesis 4: People who score low on the Shopping Location Preferences (#1) scale are *less* likely to make an online purchases.

Hypothesis 5: People who score low on the Shopping Location Preferences (#2) scale are less likely to make an online purchase.

Hypothesis 6: People who score low on the Product Characteristics (#1) are *more* likely to make an online purchase.

Hypothesis 7: The senses that people use to make a purchase will impact their decision to make an online purchase.

These hypothesis lead to seven statistical hypothesis which will be tested with the data.

Statistical Hypothesis 1: The Perception of the Shopping Experience scale is not related to whether or not consumers have made an on-line purchase.

Statistical Hypothesis 2: The Attitudes Towards Computer Technology scale is not related to whether or not consumers have made an on-line purchase.

Statistical Hypothesis 3: The Personal Information Privacy Concerns scale is not related to whether or not consumers have made an on-line purchase.

Statistical Hypothesis 4: The Shopping Locations Preferences #1 scale is not related to whether or not consumers have made an on-line purchase.

Statistical Hypothesis 5: The Shopping Locations Preferences #2 scale is not related to whether or not consumers have made an on-line purchase.

Statistical Hypothesis 6: The Product Characteristics #1 scale is not related to whether or not consumers have made an on-line purchase.

Statistical Hypothesis 7: The Product Characteristics #2 scale is not related to whether or not consumers have made an on-line purchase.

DATA VALIDATION

Prior to inputting the data into SPSS v11.0, each question in the questionnaire was assigned a variable number (Appendix D) to ensure consistency among the results and a coding legend was established (Appendix E). Once the data was input, the frequency distributions were analyzed to ensure that the data input 'made sense' and that there were no obvious data entry errors. This process confirmed that there were 105 responses for each variable and that all data input was within the expected range. Ten entry errors were picked up as a result of this check. The errors were corrected and the frequency distributions were run again to ensure that the responses were within the expected range. In an attempt to minimize the possibility that data was entered incorrectly, but within the expected range, the data input from every 10th questionnaire was checked manually. Fortunately, this process found only one number that was input incorrectly (a 5 was input instead of a 6).

Because eight questionnaires contained responses for the variables that were left blank (coded as 66) or N/A (coded as 77), the data had to be revised prior to beginning the analysis. The blank or N/A responses were re-coded with the mean value of the included variables. By creating new values for variables which were equal to the mean of the original variables, but with the mean input for the blank and N/A responses there was no impact on the mean across subjects. This was confirmed by re-running the means and ensuring that they had not changed.

Once this was done the scales were developed. Each scale represented the variables in a section of the survey with the exception of Section D Shopping Location Preferences and Section E #2 (Appendix F). These exceptions occurred because of a few changes that were made between the pretest and the final questionnaire. In Section D a new statement was added 'I am comfortable using the Internet' and in Section E the statements were modified to ask the importance that the 5 senses have in the decision to purchase specific goods – clothing and groceries, instead of just for purchasing in general.

Prior to beginning the data analysis correlations were run for the scales to determine if there were any issues related to multicollinearity. The correlations can be found in Appendix G. The correlations were acceptable with the exception of S4 and S5 which will be discussed in the following section.

DATA ANALYSIS

There are three sub-sections on this section. The first section explains the logistic regressions that were performed on the data. The second section investigates the reliability of the scales that were used in the logistic regressions and the third section describes why it was not possible to compare the factor structures between this analysis and the analysis reported in the articles where the scales were developed.

Logistic Regression

For the purpose of this study, logistic regression using SPSS was the primary analytical technique employed. Logistic regression is a type of regression where the dependent variable is limited (coded 0,1) (Whitehead, 2002); in this case the respondents either had or had not made an online purchase. This decision to use logistic regression was based on the following four criteria (Haines, Riding & Thomas, 1989). First, logistic regression is a multivariate technique which permits the identification of sets of variables which, in linear combination, are statistically associated with the probability of membership in one of two mutually exclusive categories: had purchased online or had not purchased online. Second, the use of this approach improves on the type of approach which attempts to relate the decision to purchase online to individual (univariate) attributes of the sample. Third, because the statistical assumptions which underlie logistic regression admits both continuous and categorical variables, the use of this technique is likely to be less subject to concerns over the assumptions behind discriminant analysis. Finally, logistic regression is more easily interpreted than discriminant analysis. The logistic regression function forecasts the probability of an online purchase given independent variables.

In order to determine which scales, if any, correctly predicted the decision to purchase online a logistic regression was performed which loaded all of the scales with the exception of scale 5 and scale 10, against V55 (Have you ever made a purchase online?) Scale 5 was excluded as it was highly correlated with

Scale 4 (Table 1). This is expected as S5 consists of the same questions as S4 with the exception of one question that was added from the pretest questionnaire. For the sake of the analysis S4 will be used as it has all the questions contained in the pre-test questionnaire.

TABLE 1

Correlations		S4	S5
S4	Pearson Correlation	1	.982
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	105	105
S5	Pearson Correlation	.982	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	105	105

Correlation if significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Scale 10 was not used as it is based only on data from the pretest which investigates the importance of the 5 senses in the decision to purchase a product. In the final questionnaire the question was more specific looking at the purchase of clothing and groceries.

Prior to beginning the analysis, the original values for yes (1) and no (2) in V55 were recoded to 0 and 1 respectively. The initial confusion matrix reported indicated that 73.33% of cases are correctly classified (Table 2). A confusion matrix contains information about actual and predicted classifications done by a classification system (Kohavi and Provost, 1998).

The confusion matrix in table 2 is interpreted as follows. The 62 in the first column is the number of cases that were observed and correctly predicted to have made an online purchase. The 8 in the second column represents the number of cases that had made an online purchase and were predicted

incorrectly. 88.57% of the actual online purchasers were correctly predicted ($62/(62+8)$). The 15 in the second column is the number of cases that were observed and correctly predicted to not have made an online purchase. The 20 in the first column represents the number of cases that had not made an online purchase and were predicted incorrectly. 42.86% of the actual purchasers who had not purchased online were correctly predicted ($15/(15+20)$). The 73.33% represents the overall number of cases that were correctly classified, regardless of whether the respondent had or had not made an online purchase ($(62+15)/105$).

TABLE 2

Classification Table for VAR00055

The Cut Value is .50

		Predicted		Percent Correct
		1	2	
Observed	1	62	8	88.57%
	2	20	15	42.86%
Overall				73.33%

----- Variables in the Equation -----							
Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp(B)
S1	.0392	.0266	2.1700	1	.1407	.0357	1.0400
S2	.3012	.1088	7.6603	1	.0056	.2058	1.3515
S3	.0143	.1500	.0091	1	.9241	.0000	1.0144
S4	-.0020	.0505	.0016	1	.9683	.0000	.9980
S6	-.2160	.1233	3.0678	1	.0799	-.0894	.8057
S7	-.3114	.1535	4.1170	1	.0425	-.1258	.7324
S8	-.1971	.1090	3.2720	1	.0705	-.0976	.8211
S9	.0406	.1284	.0999	1	.7520	.0000	1.0414
Constant	5.8343	3.4828	2.8063	1	.0939		

Three iterations were performed with the result being the removal of S1, S3, S4 and S9 due to their non-significance. Non-significance was determined by looking at the Sig. Column of the output in Table 2. The variables with scores

above 0.1 were removed. Thus, S2 (Attitudes Towards Computer Technology), S6 (Shopping Location Preferences #2), S7 (Product Characteristics #1) and S8 (Product Characteristics #2) are the significant predictors and the percentage of cases that are correctly classified has increased to 74.29% (Table 3).

TABLE 3

Classification Table for VAR00055
The Cut Value is .50

		Predicted		Percent Correct
		1	2	
Observed	1	64	6	91.43%
	2	21	14	40.00%
Overall 74.29%				

----- Variables in the Equation -----							
Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp(B)
S2	.3174	.1019	9.6970	1	.0018	.2400	1.3735
S6	-.1960	.1155	2.8797	1	.0897	-.0811	.8220
S7	-.2997	.1464	4.1936	1	.0406	-.1281	.7410
S8	-.1643	.0926	3.1522	1	.0758	-.0928	.8485
Constant	6.9199	3.0034	5.3086	1	.0212		

In order to determine if the decision to purchase online can be predicted based on whether or not a respondent has been a victim of an improper invasion of privacy, V17 was added to the analysis. Based on the output referenced in Table 4 it can be concluded that V17 is not an effective predictor. It is interesting to note that the inclusion of V17, a non-significant variable slightly increases the ability to predict the decision to purchase online. This is illustrated in the attached confusion matrix which reports 75.24%. A test of proportions concluded that there is not a significant difference between the confusion matrices.

TABLE 4

Classification Table for VAR00055

The Cut Value is .50

		Predicted		Percent Correct
		1	2	
Observed	1	65	5	92.85%
	2	21	14	40.00%
Overall 75.24%				

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp(B)
S2	.3072	.1041	8.7018	1	.0032	.2239	1.3596
S6	-.2042	.1175	3.0197	1	.0823	-.0873	.8153
S7	-.3031	.1471	4.2452	1	.0394	-.1296	.7385
S8	-.1594	.0930	2.9405	1	.0864	-.0839	.8526
VAR00017	-.0805	.1804	.1994	1	.6552	.0000	.9226
Constant	7.1608	3.0663	5.4536	1	.0195		

Once the scales that predicted the decision to purchase online were found, a further analysis was performed to determine if there was any difference when the decision to purchase online was specifically for tickets. Recall that the original qualitative analysis indicated that some people did not consider the purchase of tickets online as an online purchase. The scales that were initially included in the first analysis were loaded, but this time V56 (Have you ever purchased tickets for a sporting event, airline... online?) was the dependent variable. The initial confusion matrix reported an overall percentage correct of 60.95% (Table 5).

TABLE 5

Classification Table for VAR00056

The Cut Value is .50

		Predicted		Percent Correct
		1	2	
Observed		1	2	
	1	13	29	30.95%
	2	12	51	80.95%
Overall 60.95%				

----- Variables in the Equation -----							
Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp(B)
S2	.1657	.1057	2.4564	1	.1170	.0568	1.1802
S6	-.2107	.1074	3.8520	1	.0497	-.1145	.8100
S7	.0443	.1314	.1135	1	.7362	.0000	1.0453
S8	.0118	.0946	.0155	1	.9009	.0000	1.0119
S1	-.0364	.0244	2.2281	1	.1355	-.0402	.9643
S3	.0290	.1364	.0452	1	.8317	.0000	1.0294
S4	-.0133	.0474	.0784	1	.7794	.0000	.9868
S9	-.0287	.1148	.0627	1	.8023	.0000	.9717
Constant	4.1002	3.0416	1.8172	1	.1776		

After 3 iterations, the output indicated that only scales 2 and 6 could be used as predictors for determining what motivates the online purchase of tickets. The final confusion matrix was 60.0% which is a slight decrease from the initial matrix (Table 6).

TABLE 6

Classification Table for VAR00056

The Cut Value is .50

		Predicted		Percent Correct
		1	2	
Observed		1	2	
	1	12	30	28.57%
	2	12	51	80.95%
Overall 60.00%				

----- Variables in the Equation -----							
Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp(B)
S2	.1456	.0927	2.4661	1	.1163	.0574	1.1567
S6	-.2277	.1015	5.0318	1	.0249	-.1465	.7964
Constant	3.4773	1.7701	3.8590	1	.0495		

Based on the findings of the reliability analysis that will be discussed in the next section three new scales were developed. Logistic regression was performed using the new scales to determine if they changed the results found in the earlier analysis. When looking at V55 scales 1, 8 and 12 were significant. This is quite different from the original analysis which concluded that S2, S6, S7 and S8 were significant. Based on this output we can conclude that there is a significant relationship between S1 and S2 and that when S12 enters the analysis S6 and S7 can be removed.

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS

A reliability analysis using Cronbach's alpha coefficient was performed on each of the scales to determine their internal consistency, and also compare the findings of this research with the reliability reported in the referenced scales. The comparison can be found in Appendix H. An interesting finding which is highlighted in the appendix is that some of the alpha statistics are noticeably lower than those reported in the initial research.

As a result of the reliability analysis three new scales (S11, S12 & S13) were developed due to low reported alphas for S3, S4 & S6. The new scales were created by removing the variable(s) (listed in Appendix F) which were reported to have the highest 'alpha if item deleted' as reported in the Item-total Statistics on the SPSS output.

One conclusion that is made based on the results of the reliability analysis is that the inclusion of the question in section D which was added to determine if

comfort with the Internet has an impact on someone choosing to make an online purchase does not increase the reliability of the scale. The alpha with the question included (.7531) is essentially the same as the alpha reported without the question (.7538).

FACTOR ANALYSIS

Because the referenced articles did not report the results of factor analysis or the factor scores were not reported, it was not possible to test if the factor structure in their data exists in the current data.

RESULTS

This section consists of two sub-sections. The first looks at the characteristics of the sample and the second is a discussion of each hypothesis.

Characteristics of the Sample

Descriptive statistics in SPSS were used to determine the characteristics of the sample. Three demographic characteristics were measured in the study. They were: age, gender and level of education. Two questions were asked to determine if the respondents used a computer at home and at work and the remaining questions related to Internet use. The frequency table supporting this data can be found in Appendix I.

Demographic Characteristics

Age: The mean age of respondents is between 25 and 44. It is not possible to be more specific due to the method used to gather this data.

Gender: 44.8% of respondents were male and 54.3% were female. One person did not answer the question.

Education Level: 55.3% of respondents have either completed university or post graduate studies.

Computer Use

Computer Use at Home: 85.7% of respondents use the computer at home.

Computer Use at Work: 90.5% of respondents use the computer at work.

Internet Use

Use of the Internet: 95.2% of respondents use the Internet.

Main Use of Internet: 87.6% of respondents use the Internet for communication, knowledge/information gathering or both. Five respondents indicated that e-commerce was their main use for the Internet.

'Canadian' Impact: If the online purchase was from a Canadian company 73.5% would be more willing to buy online. 84.3% of respondents would be more willing to make an online purchase if it was in Canadian dollars.

Online Purchases: 66.7% of respondents have made an online purchase and 40% have purchased tickets. Eight respondents who have made an online purchase indicated that they would not make another. There is no clear indication as to the rationale supporting this decision.

Non Purchasers: The main reason given for not having made an online purchase is that respondents prefer to see products prior to making purchase.

Type of Purchase: The most popular items purchased on the Internet are tickets and books/cds.

Average Amount of Purchase: 48.5% of respondents spend on average \$25-\$149.99 on their Internet purchase.

Frequency of Purchases: 38.1% of respondents have not made an online purchase in the last month.

DISCUSSION OF HYPOTHESES

The output from SPSS was used to determine if there was sufficient evidence to support the hypotheses. In order to simplify the validation of the hypotheses, each statement related to a scale, and therefore a specific section in the questionnaire (Appendix F). Appendix F also provides a brief summary of the findings for each hypothesis.

HYPOTHESIS 1: People who score low in the Perceptions of the Shopping Experience section will be *more* likely to make an online purchase.

This hypothesis is correct when the revised scales were used as per the discussion in the logistic regression section. As noted in Table 7, S1 is significant (a value of .0265) has a positive b-value (.0603). This indicates that

those people who score low in S1 (Perceptions of the Shopping Experience) are more likely to make an online purchase.

TABLE 7

----- Variables in the Equation -----							
Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp(B)
S1	.0603	.0272	4.9220	1	.0265	.1479	1.0622
S8	-.2539	.1000	6.4397	1	.0112	-.1822	.7758
S12	-.2091	.0599	12.1946	1	.0005	-.2762	.8113
Constant	4.5931	1.9495	5.5512	1	.0185		

HYPOTHESIS 2: People who score low on the Attitudes Towards Computer Technology section are less likely to make an online purchase.

Because S1 is related to S2 in the dataset it is not possible to test this hypothesis independently (Table 8). However, when S1 is replaced with S2, S2 is significant with a positive coefficient. This result is consistent with hypothesis 2 being correct (i.e rejection of the null hypothesis stated in statistical hypothesis 2).

TABLE 8

Results with S1 and S2

----- Variables in the Equation -----							
Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp(B)
S1	.0393	.0261	2.2741	1	.1316	.0453	1.0401
S2	.2972	.1022	8.4648	1	.0036	.2199	1.3461
S6	-.2167	.1186	3.3344	1	.0678	-.0999	.8052
S7	-.3024	.1484	4.1543	1	.0415	-.1270	.7390
S8	-.1785	.0939	3.6162	1	.0572	-.1100	.8365
Constant	6.3175	3.0415	4.3142	1	.0378		

Results with only S2

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp (B)
S2	.3174	.1019	9.6970	1	.0018	.2400	1.3735
S6	-.1960	.1155	2.8797	1	.0897	-.0811	.8220
S7	-.2997	.1464	4.1936	1	.0406	-.1281	.7410
S8	-.1643	.0926	3.1522	1	.0758	-.0928	.8485
Constant	6.9199	3.0034	5.3086	1	.0212		

HYPOTHESIS 3: People who feel well-informed in the area of computer privacy and are not concerned about threats to their privacy are *more* likely to purchase online.

The data does not support this hypothesis as neither S3 (see Table 2) nor S11 nor V17 are significant in any of the analyses performed (Table 9).

TABLE 9

Classification Table for VAR00055

The Cut Value is .50

		Predicted			
		1	2		
		1	2	Percent Correct	
Observed	1	65	5	92.85%	
	2	21	14	40.00%	
Overall 75.24%					

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp (B)
S2	.3072	.1041	8.7018	1	.0032	.2239	1.3596
S6	-.2042	.1175	3.0197	1	.0823	-.0873	.8153
S7	-.3031	.1471	4.2452	1	.0394	-.1296	.7385
S8	-.1594	.0930	2.9405	1	.0864	-.0839	.8526
VAR00017	-.0805	.1804	.1994	1	.6552	.0000	.9226
Constant	7.1608	3.0663	5.4536	1	.0195		

HYPOTHESIS 4: People who score low on the Shopping Location Preferences (#1) scale are *less* likely to make an online purchase.

This hypothesis is correct when the revised scales are used as shown in Table 10.

TABLE 10

----- Variables in the Equation -----							
Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp(B)
S1	.0603	.0272	4.9220	1	.0265	.1479	1.0622
S8	-.2539	.1000	6.4397	1	.0112	-.1822	.7758
S12	-.2091	.0599	12.1946	1	.0005	-.2762	.8113
Constant	4.5931	1.9495	5.5512	1	.0185		

HYPOTHESIS 5: People who score low on the Shopping Location Preferences (#2) scale are *less* likely to make an online purchase.

There is evidence to support this hypothesis when general online purchases is the dependent variable and also when tickets are being purchased. This is supported by the data shown in Table 11 where var00056, the decision to purchase tickets or not, is the dependent variable.

TABLE 11

----- Variables in the Equation -----							
Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp(B)
S2	.1456	.0927	2.4661	1	.1163	.0574	1.1567
S6	-.2277	.1015	5.0318	1	.0249	-.1465	.7964
Constant	3.4773	1.7701	3.8590	1	.0495		

HYPOTHESIS 6: People who score low on the Product Characteristics (#1) scale are *more* likely to make an online purchase.

There is some evidence to support this hypothesis. When S4 is in the initial analysis (Table 2) S4 is insignificant, S7 is significant. However, once S4 is replaced with S12 (the revised S4 with the unreliable scale elements removed),

S12 becomes significant and S7 is no longer significant. This indicates that it is not possible to test H6 with this data set.

These results also suggest a slight correlation between S7 and S12 which is shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12

Results of Logistic Regression (before revised scales)

----- Variables in the Equation -----							
Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp(B)
S2	.3174	.1019	9.6970	1	.0018	.2400	1.3735
S6	-.1960	.1155	2.8797	1	.0897	-.0811	.8220
S7	-.2997	.1464	4.1936	1	.0406	-.1281	.7410
S8	-.1643	.0926	3.1522	1	.0758	-.0928	.8485
Constant	6.9199	3.0034	5.3086	1	.0212		

Results of Logistic Regression (after revised scales)

----- Variables in the Equation -----							
Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp(B)
S1	.0547	.0279	3.8410	1	.0500	.1174	1.0562
S2	.1550	.1074	2.0819	1	.1491	.0247	1.1676
S8	-.2672	.1015	6.9232	1	.0085	-.1919	.7655
S12	-.1799	.0622	8.3652	1	.0038	-.2182	.8354
Constant	3.6667	2.0261	3.2753	1	.0703		

**S6 is no longer significant

HYPOTHESIS 7: The senses that people use to make a purchase will impact their decision to make an online purchase.

When the scale data is related to clothing there is evidence to support this, but there is no evidence in the purchase of groceries (Table 13).

TABLE 13

Classification Table for VAR00055
 The Cut Value is .50

		Predicted		Percent Correct
		1	2	
Observed	1	64	6	91.43%
	2	21	14	40.00%
Overall 74.29%				

----- Variables in the Equation -----							
Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp(B)
S2	.3174	.1019	9.6970	1	.0018	.2400	1.3735
S6	-.1960	.1155	2.8797	1	.0897	-.0811	.8220
S7	-.2997	.1464	4.1936	1	.0406	-.1281	.7410
S8	-.1643	.0926	3.1522	1	.0758	-.0928	.8485
Constant	6.9199	3.0034	5.3086	1	.0212		

RESULTS DISCUSSED

The findings of this research indicate that the lower the interest in a variety of shopping-related activities the more likely the respondent was to have shopped online, the less interested the respondent was in shopping online the less likely they are to have made an online purchase and that the five senses play an important role in the purchase decision (depending on what is being purchased).

As expected people who scored low on the Perception of the Shopping Experience section of the questionnaire were more likely to make an online purchase. Because online shopping alters the social aspect of shopping, people who view shopping as more than just the purchase of goods are less likely to

purchase online. In the article "Why Do People Shop" Tauber hypothesized that peoples' motives for shopping are a function of many variables, some of which are unrelated to the actual buying of products. Some of the personal and social motives which are mentioned in the article cannot be achieved thru online shopping. These include sensory stimulation, physical activity and social experiences outside the home.

As found in this study, Swaminathan, Lepkowska-White & Rao (1999), found that consumers who value social interactions are less interested in the Internet use for shopping and thus shop less frequently on the Internet and spend less money on e-commerce.

It was not possible to determine if a respondent's attitude towards technology impacted their online shopping activity. Most respondent's scored low in this section which may account for the large percentage (66.7%) who have made an online purchase. It would be expected that those who have a favourable attitude towards technology (S2) would be more likely to embrace it and more willing to try shopping online. The present data tends to confirm this. In their article "Predictors on Online Buying Behavior" Bellman, Lohse and Johnson (1999) found that a typical online buyer has a "wired" lifestyle. Such people have been on the Internet for years, not just a few months. They received a large number of e-mail messages every day, they work on the Internet in their offices every week, and they agree that the Internet and other developments in communication technology have improved their productivity at work.

A surprising finding was that Attitude Towards Technology (S2) would be significantly correlated with Perception of the Shopping Experience (S1). This may be merely a property of this particular data set. Further study may be warranted.

Based on their responses a majority of respondents did not have significant privacy concerns which impacted their decision to make an online purchase. These findings contrast those of the 2000 Stats Canada survey which found 75% of those who make actual online purchases expressed security and privacy concerns (Beauchesne, 2001). This effect may begin to decrease as consumers are educated on the security features available on websites and they establish trustworthy relationships with reputable companies.

In the initial analysis a respondents interest in online shopping was not a motivator in their decision to purchase online. However, after excluding some statements from the scales which made the scales less reliable, those who were interested in online shopping were more likely to have made an online purchase. It is possible that the poor wording for the 2 questions that were excluded may have resulted in respondents unknowingly answering them incorrectly. This would have caused the reliability issues.

Based on the findings of this study attitudes towards shopping at local stores were not motivators in the decision to purchase online except when the items being purchased was tickets. This may be explained by the nature of the purchase. As discovered in the preliminary research for this thesis, most people do not think of the purchase of tickets as a purchase of a product. Although in

most cases you are receiving a piece of paper, you are ultimately paying for a service (ie plane flight, concert ticket). Also because of the delivery method (e-mail, mail) the location of the vendor is usually not a concern.

In the initial analysis if a respondent had a low opinion of brand name products they were more likely to make an online purchase. However, when their interest in online shopping was correctly analyzed this was no longer the case. As expected, if a consumer is not concerned about the brand they are purchasing they would be more likely to purchase online as they are more likely to be shopping on the basis of cost, features... all of which would be easier to compare online.

The decision to purchase a specific product online is impacted by the senses that are used in the case of clothing but not groceries. The results are supported by Ratchford's (1987) findings which indicated that grocery items are low on the 'feel' factor. Although clothing is not mentioned in his study it is expected that the purchase of clothing, in most cases, would be high on the 'think' factor as fashion is always changing therefore people tend to think more about their purchases and would likely use some of their 5 senses during the decision making process. In a recent research report, Greenfield Online found that an overwhelming 69 percent of Internet users said shopping at stores and malls allows them to see, feel, touch, and try on the products before they buy them. These findings suggest that the consumers who prefer experiencing products are less likely to buy online (Li, H., Kuo, C. & Russell, M. 1999).

LIMITATIONS

The main limitation in this study relates to the method that was used for data collection – judgmental sampling. Due to challenges that were encountered during the data gathering, it was decided that judgmental sampling would be used. The judgmental sampling process resulted in six clusters. Cluster sampling usually results in lower statistical efficiency than for simple random samples chiefly because clusters are usually homogeneous (Cooper & Emory 1995). It has also been shown to affect the precise significance values of certain tests not used in this thesis (Thomas, Singh & Roberts, 1966; Thomas, 1988). It is possible that similar effects may exist in the statistical tests used in this thesis. In order to reduce this there was an attempt to have a variety of clusters and within those clusters have as varied a sample as possible.

With respect to the questionnaire, additional “would you” questions could have been added as I think they would have provided more insight into what motivates a consumer to purchase online. By asking questions such as “Would you be more willing to purchase online if you were to achieve significant cost savings?” retailers could gain insight into what actions might increase their online traffic and thus their profits. This would be one area of additional research which will be further addressed in the following section.

Also, it would have been beneficial to have a section related to trust. This is different than privacy concerns which were included in this research. Trust is related to the consumers beliefs about the ability, integrity and benevolence of the online business. One of the main inhibitors of consumer participation in e-

commerce is the lack of online consumer trust in the online vendor with whom they are engaging in business. Research suggests that if an online vendor wishes to succeed financially then establishing its consumers' trust is an imperative (Gefen, 2002). By understanding consumer requirements related to trust an online business cannot only attract, but retain their customers.

OPPORTUNITY FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The findings of this thesis can be used by businesses to attract and retain online consumers. Recent studies indicate that online shopping is not as popular as initially expected. By understanding what motivates a consumer to purchase online, businesses can focus their efforts to ensure that the needs of the consumer are met, with the expected result of increased sales and more satisfied customers. This research, however, seems to have created more questions than it has answered. As mentioned above, specific questions could be asked to determine what actions a retailer could take which would increase their online customers, and thus their profits.

Based on the findings of this research the most popular items purchased on the Internet are tickets and books/cds. It is understandable that tickets are purchased online because there is no 'tangible product' per se, however it would be interesting to investigate the online purchase of books and cds. Would the consumers purchasing these items have gone to an actual store to research their purchase prior to making it or were there some other factors influencing their

decision? The findings of this research could be used in the marketing of these products online and also of other products.

Another conclusion that can be drawn from this research is that the respondents would be more willing to make an online purchase from a Canadian company and/or if it was in Canadian currency. How can Canadian companies who want to establish successful online businesses utilize this information to maximize their profits?

It would also be beneficial to research the impact of cost reduction, coupons... on a consumers willingness to purchase online. As was discovered during the preliminary interviews, some respondents would be more likely to purchase online if there were cost advantages to doing so.

There may never be a definite answer to the question, "what motivates a consumer to make an online purchase", as each consumer is a unique individual, but this research has resulted in preliminary answers while leaving the door open for future research.

REFERENCES

- Bayers, Chip. 2000. "Capitalist Econstruction." Wired March:210-219.
- Beauchesne, Eric. 2001. "Online Shopping hits \$1B in Canada." The Ottawa Citizen, October 24:D3.
- Bellman, S., Lohse, G. & Johnson, E. 1999. "Predictors of Online Buying Behavior". Communications of the ACM. Vol. 42 No12 32-38.
- Bruner, Gordon. 1992. Marketing scales Handbook: a compilation of multi-item measures American Marketing Association: Chicago.
- Campbell, Jennifer, 2000. "Ottawa is Canada's most wired metropolis." The Ottawa Citizen, October 23:A1.
- Canada, Government of. 1997. Preparing Canada for a Digital World. Ottawa: Information Highway Advisory Council.
- Cooper, Donald and Emory, William. 1995. Business Research Methods. Irwin Chicago.
- Cranor, L.; Reagle, J.; and Ackerman, M. 1999. "Beyond Concern: Understanding Net Users' Attitudes About Online Privacy."
<http://www.research.att.com/library/trs/TRs/99.99.4/>
- Dickerson, Mary D. and Gentry, James. 1983. "Characteristics of Adopters and Non-Adopters of Home Computers". Journal of Consumer Research. Vol 10 (Sept). 225-235.
- Donthu, N. & Garcia, A. 1999. "The Internet Shopper". Journal of Advertising Research. Vol 39. Issue 3. May/Jun99. 52-58.
- Gefen, David. 2002. "Reflections on the Dimensions of Trust and Trustworthiness among Online Consumers." ACM SIGMIS Databased. Vol 33. Issue 3. August 2002.
- Haines, G., Riding, A. and Thomas, R. 1989. "Small Business Loan Turndowns by Canadian Chartered Banks: Some Empirical Findings". The Entrepreneur and the Challenge of the 90's: Proceedings of the 34th Global Conference of the International Council for Small Business. 480-498.
- Hawes, Jon. and Lumpkin, James. 1984. "Understanding the Outshopper". Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science. Vol 12. No.4. 200-218.
- Lohse, Gerald & Spiller, Peter. 1998. "Electronic Shopping" Communication of the ACM. Vol 41. No7. 81-88.

Kim, D., Cho, B. & Rao, H.R. 2000. "Effects of Consumer Lifestyles on Purchasing Behaviour on the Internet: A Conceptual Framework and Empirical Validation". Proceedings of the twenty first international conference on Information Systems. December 2000.

Knuz, Michelle. 1997. Online customers: identifying store, product and consumer attributes which influence shopping on the internet. The University of Tennessee. Abstract of PhD thesis.

Koretz, George. 2000. "E-shoppers Take a Breather." Business Week. March 20:32.

Kohavi and Provost. 1998.
http://www.cs.uregina.ca/~hamilton/courses/831/notes/confusion_matrix/confusion_matrix.html

Lee, Mi Young. 1999. Internet shoppers' purchasing behaviour. University of Minnesota. PhD Thesis

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. Vol 5 Issue 5.
(<http://www.ascusc.org/jcmc/vol5/issue2/hairong.html>)

Moschis, George. 1981. "Patterns of Consumer Learning". Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science. Vol. 9. No2. 110-126.

Napier, Judd, Rivers & Wagner. 2001. Creating a Winning E-Business. Canada: Course Technology.

Papatla, Purushottam & Bhatnagar, Amit. 2002. "Shopping Style Segmentation of Consumers". Marketing Letters. Vol.13. No.2 91-106.

Prentice, Michael. 2000. "Attention, online shoppers." The Ottawa Citizen, October 29: D1.

Ratchford, Brian T. 1987. "New Insights About the FCB Grid." Journal of Advertising Research. Vol 27 (Aug/Sept) 24-38.

Statistics Canada. 2002. "Electronic Commerce: Household Shopping on the Internet." www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/020919/d020919b.htm

Swaminathan, V., Lepkowska-White, E & Rao, B. 1999. "Browsers or Buyers in Cyberspace? An Investigation of Factors Influencing Electronic Exchange". Journal

of Computer-Mediated Communication. Vol 5 Issue 2.
(<http://www.ascusc.org/jcmc/vol5/issue2/swaminathan.htm>)

Tauber, Edward M. 1972. "Why Do People Shop?" Journal of Marketing Vol. 36 p46-49.

The Boston Consulting Group. 2000 Fast Forward: Accelerating Canada's Leadership in the Internet Economy. Report of the Canadian E-Business Opportunities Roundtable.

Thomas, R., Singh, A. & Roberts, G. 1966. "Tests of Independence on Two-Way Tables Under Cluster Sampling: An Evaluation." International Statistical Review. Vol. 64 p295-311.

Turban, Lee, King, Chung. 2000. Electronic Commerce: A Managerial Perspective. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Van Slyke, C., Comunale, C. & Belanger, F. 2002. "Gender Differences in Perceptions of Web-based Shopping". Communications of the ACM. Vol 45. No8. 82-86.

Ward, Michael. 2001. "Will Online Shopping Compete More with Traditional Retailing or Catalog Shopping?" Netnomics. Vol3. 103-117.

Watson, Lisa. 1998. Consumer Privacy on the Internet: Are these concerns being adequately met by on-line market researchers?

Whitehead, John. 2002. "An Introduction to Logistic Regression".
<http://personal.ecu.edu/whiteheadj/data/logit/>

Wilcox, Gary. 1999. "Internet Marketing: Advertising as Information." Texas Business Review. www.utexas.edu/depts/bbr/tbr/Feb.99.Wilcox.html

Wilson, Peter. 2000. "Canadians hot for Net but slow to buy online." The Ottawa Citizen, July 3.

GENERAL REFERENCES, NOT CITED

Akin, D. 2000. "Online shoppers hate bad service: study finds backlash. One in five repost failed attempt to make purchase.

Akin, D. 2000. "Internet shopping still hasn't clicked: but survey says more Canadians are going online more often". Financial Post, May 4:C9.

Bates, B. 2000. Data Communications Demystified. Tempe:TC International Consulting, Inc.

Bloomberg News, 2000. "Americans use Internet mostly for electronic mail" The Calgary Herald, September 27, 1999: B5.

Coy, Peter. 2000. "Going, going, gone...sucker!" Business Week March 20:124-126.

Duffy, Andrew. "Web serves affluent best." The Calgary Herald, January 16, 2000:A5.

Financial Post. 2000. "While 51% of Older Adults comparison shop on the Net, only 39% buy online." March 31:C5.

Green, H.; France, M.; Stepanek, M; and Borrus, A. 2000. "Online privacy: It's Time for Rules in Wonderland." Business Week March 20:83-96.

Hoffman, Donna & Novak, Thomas. 1996. "Marketing in Hypermedia Computer-Mediated Environments: Conceptual Foundations. Journal of Marketing 60:50-68.

Kahn, Jeremy. 2000. "Presto Chango! Sales are Huge!" Fortune March 20:90-96.

Kare-Silver, M. 1999. e-shock The electronic shopping revolution: Strategies for Retailers and Manufacturers. New York: AMA Publications.

Nortel Networks. 1998. "How Nortel is building the New Internet". Nortel Networks Intranet.

Petrou, M. 2000. "Internet shopping still lags in Canada: new study. Security concerns behind reluctance to buy online." Financial Post, June 10:D8.

Reuters, 2000. "Web advertisers spend \$359 million." The Calgary Herald, October 21, 1999: C58.

Roth, John. 1997. "Quarterly Letter: the "Right Angle Turn".

Social Sciences Citation Index 1985, 1990, 1995, 2000 (Jan-Aug). ISI-Thomson Scientific. Philadelphia, PA.

Useem, Jerry. 2000. "New Ethics...or no Ethics?" Fortune March 20:82-86.

Woolley, Scott. 1998. "Dial tones? No, Web tones." Forbes. Jan 26.

APPENDIX A

CLUSTER DESCRIPTIONS

Cluster	Description	Completed	Not Returned	Request Summaries	Respondents
1	Nortel Employees	25	5	6	1 to 25
2	Algonquin Students	9	3	2	26 to 34
3	EDC Employees	24	1	5	35 to 58
4	Miscellaneous	14	0	1	59 to 72
5	Family breakfast	11	0	1	73 to 83
6	Pretest	22	N/A	N/A	84 to 105

APPENDIX B

To Whom it May Concern,

My name is Tracy Somerton Dupuis and I am a Masters student at the Carleton University School of Business. For my thesis research I am conducting a study about what **motivates a consumer to make an online purchase**. For the purpose of this study, online shopping is defined as *the purchase of goods or services over the Internet*.

In order to gather research for my thesis I am using cluster sampling. The questionnaire should only take about 20 minutes to complete and please note that you do not have to use the Internet in order to complete this survey. All of the results will be kept strictly confidential and only overall findings will be reported.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please feel free to contact my thesis advisor Professor George Haines at 520-2600 ext. 7487 or myself at 768-1494.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. If you would like to receive a summary of my thesis results, please fill in the last page of the questionnaire and a copy will be sent to you once the thesis has been completed.

Thank you,

Tracy Somerton Dupuis
Tracy Somerton Dupuis
Graduate Student
Masters of Management Studies

SECTION A: Perceptions of the Shopping Experience

The following statements deal with your opinion of your shopping experiences.

In your role as consumer, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements (please circle number):

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	VARIABLE CODING
I like to go shopping with a friend.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v3
When I talk to my friends, shopping is a topic of conversation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v4
I enjoy going to regional shopping centers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v5
I often combine shopping with lunch or dinner in a restaurant.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v6
When a new store opens, I am among the first to try it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v7
I like to try new and different places to shop.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v8
I get a psychological lift from shopping.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v9
Shopping gives me a chance to get out and do something.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v10
I am interested in shopping.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v11

Section B: Attitudes Towards Computer Technology

The following statements measure your level of comfort with computer technology.

Please indicate to what extent you agree, or disagree with the following statements:

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	VARIABLE CODING
Computer technology is an invasion of my privacy.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v12
I like to handle my own financial affairs without using any electronic machines.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v13

Section C: Personal Information Privacy Concerns

This section asks about your overall views on privacy.

1. How well informed do you consider yourself to be in the area of computer privacy? (circle number)

NOT AT ALL INFORMED	NOT VERY INFORMED	SOMEWHAT INFORMED	INFORMED	EXTREMELY INFORMED
1	2	3	4	5

VARIABLE
CODING

v14

2. Compared to other subjects on your mind, how important is personal privacy? (circle number)

NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	NOT VERY IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
1	2	3	4	5

v15

3. How concerned are you about threats to your personal privacy today? (circle number)

NOT AT ALL CONCERNED	NOT VERY CONCERNED	SOMEWHAT CONCERNED	CONCERNED	EXTREMELY CONCERNED
1	2	3	4	5

v16

4. How often have you personally been the victim of what you felt was an improper invasion of privacy of any kind? (circle number)

0	NEVER
1	ONCE
2	TWICE
3	THREE TIMES
4	FOUR OR MORE TIMES

please continue to section D

v17

5. To what extent do you believe this or these past privacy invasion(s) affect(s) your current behaviour in conducting online exchange or transactions?

NOT AT ALL	NOT SIGNIFICANTLY	SOMEWHAT	SIGNIFICANTLY	EXTREMELY
1	2	3	4	5

v18

Section D: Shopping Location Preferences

1. The following statements measure your interest in making purchases online.

In your role as consumer, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements (please circle number):

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	VARIABLE CODING
I love to browse through on-line catalogs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v19
I would order products from the Internet in order to save energy.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v20
By shopping at through the Internet, I could save a lot of time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v21
I wouldn't like to shop through the Internet.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v22
I would use the Internet because I can't find what I want in the local stores.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v23
Online shopping is more convenient than going to the store.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v24
In-home shopping via the Internet would cost too much for what you get.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v25
I am comfortable using the Internet	1	2	3	4	5	6	v26

2. The following statements measure your attitude about shopping at local stores.

In your role as consumer, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements (please circle number):

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	VARIABLE CODING
Local stores are never open when you want to shop.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v27
Local prices are out of line with other towns.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v28
Local stores offer you good quality for the price.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v29
Local stores just do not meet my shopping needs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v30
Local merchants offer a good variety of merchandise.	1	2	3	4	5	6	v31

Section E: Product Characteristics

1. The following statements measure your opinion about your familiarity and confidence in the products you purchase.

In your role as consumer, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements (please circle number):

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEITHER	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	VARIABLE CODING
Quality products are made by well-known companies.	1	2	3	4	5	v32
I prefer a certain brand of most products I buy or use.	1	2	3	4	5	v33
I don't care about the brand of most products that I buy.	1	2	3	4	5	v34
Brand-name products work better than off-brands.	1	2	3	4	5	v35

2. The following question measures the importance that your 5 senses have in the decision to make a purchase.

Please rate the process of purchasing clothing on each of the following scales:

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEITHER	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	
Decision is based on looks	1	2	3	4	5	v36
Decision is based on taste	1	2	3	4	5	v37
Decision is based on touch	1	2	3	4	5	v38
Decision is based on smell	1	2	3	4	5	v39
Decision is based on sound	1	2	3	4	5	v40

Please rate the process of purchasing groceries on each of the following scales:

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEITHER	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	
Decision is based on looks	1	2	3	4	5	v41
Decision is based on taste	1	2	3	4	5	v42
Decision is based on touch	1	2	3	4	5	v43
Decision is based on smell	1	2	3	4	5	v44
Decision is based on sound	1	2	3	4	5	v45

SECTION F: Demographic Information

This section will be used to determine the characteristics of the sample, and how they relate to the decision to purchase on-line. Please note that these results will not be analyzed individually and are kept strictly confidential.

1 - What is your age?

- 18-24 ☐
- 25-34 ☐
- 35-44 ☐
- 45-59 ☐
- 60+ ☐

2 - What gender are you?

- Male ☐
- Female ☐

3 - What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

- Less than highschool ☐
- Completed high school ☐
- Some college ☐
- Completed college ☐
- Some university ☐
- Completed university ☐
- Post graduate ☐

4 - Do you use a computer at home?

- Yes ☐
- No ☐

5 - Do you use a computer at work?

- Yes ☐
- No ☐

6 - Do you use the internet?

- Yes ☐
- No ☐

7 - What is your main use for the internet?

- Communication ☐
- Knowledge/Information gathering ☐
- E-Commerce ☐

VARIABLE CODING

v46

v47

v48

v49

v50

v51

v52

Other (please specify) _____

8 - Would you be more willing to make an online purchase from a Canadian company?

v53

Yes

☐

No

☐

9 - Would you be more willing to make an online purchase if it was in Canadian dollars?

v54

Yes

☐

No

☐

10 - Have you ever made a purchase online?

v55

Yes

☐

No

☐

11 - Have you ever purchased tickets for a sporting event, airline... online?

v56

Yes

☐

No

☐

IF YOU ANSWERED **NO** TO QUESTIONS 10 & 11, PLEASE ANSWER NUMBER 12 AND STOP

IF YOU ANSWERED **YES** TO EITHER QUESTION 10 OR 11, PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS 13-17

12 - The reason that I have not made an online purchase is (check all that apply):

v57

Do not want to input personal information

☐

Foreign exchange/duty issues

☐

Prefer to see products prior to making purchase

☐

Do not have access to the Internet

☐

I view shopping as a social activity

☐

Unsure of where to find websites

☐

Other (please specify) _____

13 - Have you ever made an online purchase, and do not intend on making another?

v58

Yes

☐

No

☐

if no, please go to question 15

14 - The reason that I do not intend on making another purchase is: (check all that apply)

v59

Delivery took too long

☐

Did not receive goods that were ordered

☐

Not enough customer service support

☐

Did not enjoy purchasing online

☐

Other _____

15 - What do/did you purchase online? (check all that apply)

Books, cds...

☐

Clothing

☐

Outdoor goods

☐

Electronic Goods

☐

Other (please specify)

v60

16 - What is/was the average dollar amount of your purchase?

Under \$25

☐

\$25 to \$74.99

☐

\$75 to \$149.99

☐

\$150 to \$224.99

☐

Over \$225

☐

v61

17 - How many times have you made an online purchase in the last month?

None

☐

1 to 3

☐

4 to 6

☐

7 to 9

☐

over 10

☐

v62

Thank you for completing this survey!

Section G: Optional Follow-up Information

Thank you for participating in this survey. I believe that the results of this study will provide valuable information to businesses that are either currently selling goods and/or services over the Internet, or those who would like to.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS SECTION IS OPTIONAL:

If you would like to receive a summary of the results of this study, please detach this page and return to:

Mail:

Tracy Somerton
C/o Professor George Haines
Carleton University School of Business
1125 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K1S 5B6

Fax: 763-8339 Attention: Tracy Somerton Dupuis

E-mail: ghaines@ccs.carleton.ca

To : Tracy Somerton Dupuis
School of Business

RE: Consumer Motivations Towards Online Shopping

Please send a summary of the results by (please select one):

Mail : _____

Fax: _____
E-mail: _____

APPENDIX C

Involvement (Shopping) #144

Involvement (Shopping)

CAPTION:

Five-item, six-point, Likert-type summated ratings scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6). The scale measures a person's degree of interest in a variety of shopping-related activities. Referred to as Shopping Enjoyment by Lumpkin (1985). See Hawes and Lumpkin (1984) for a scale that combines two items from this measure with two from a clothing interest scale.

Not clear where the items originated or where the scale was first used as a multi-item summated ratings scale.

Lumpkin (1985) analyzed data collected from a sample drawn from the Market Facts Consumer Mail Panel. A total of 2854 completed questionnaires were received, but Lumpkin focused just on 373 respondents who indicated they were 65 years of age or older.

Alpha of .8303 was reported by Lumpkin (1985).

Our analysis indicated the items loaded together.

Lumpkin (1985) gathered data through self-administered mail questionnaires. Scale scores calculated by averaging numerical responses to individual items. A score of 6 means a person enjoys shopping whereas a 1 suggests the consumer does not want to be any involved in shopping than necessary.

Only consumers were cluster analyzed by Lumpkin (1985) and shopping involvement measured somewhat between the three groups, though the level of statistical significance not reported. The group with the highest mean on the scale was the most socially and the most likely to be fashion opinion leaders and innovators. The group with the lowest mean score appeared to be much less active and involved all around.

The reported internal consistency is acceptable, low factor scores of several of the findings in others studies suggest that the nine items may not always load together construct. For example, items 5 and 6 could easily be constructed as shopping

Marketing Scales Handbook 329

#144 Involvement (Shopping)

Innovativeness measures. If a shorter or "pure" measure of shopping is desired, items 7 through 9 are the best subset.

REFERENCES:

- Hawes, Jon M. and James R. Lumpkin (1984), "Understanding the Outlets of Shopping," *Journal of Retailing*, 60 (Fall), 200-218.
Lumpkin, James R. (1985), "Shopping Orientation Segmentation of the Consumer," *JAMS*, 13 (Spring), 271-289.

SCALE ITEMS: INVOLVEMENT (SHOPPING)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree
1	2	3	4	5

1. I like to go shopping with a friend.
2. When I talk to my friends, shopping is a topic of conversation.
3. I enjoy going to regional shopping centers.
4. I often combine shopping with lunch or dinner at a restaurant.
5. When a new store opens, I am among the first to try it.
6. I like to try new and different places to shop.
7. I get a psychological lift from shopping.
8. Shopping gives me a chance to get out and do something.
9. I am interested in shopping.

#17 Attitude Toward Computer Technology

SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward Computer Technology

SCALE DESCRIPTION:

A two-item, six-point, Likert-type summated ratings scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6). The scale reflects a person's lack of comfort with some aspects of computer technology and was referred to as Computer Attitudes by Dickerson and Gentry (1983).

SCALE ORIGIN:

The items were generated and used first as a summated ratings scale by Dickerson and Gentry (1983).

SAMPLES:

Two mailing lists were used to collect data in the Dickerson and Gentry study (1983). One was a list of *Psychology Today* subscribers and the other was a list of members of computer clubs. The former was used to reach non-adopters of computers and the latter was used to reach PC adopters. Analysis was based on a total of 639 questionnaires. Results from a second mailing to non-respondents indicated that their demographic makeup was not significantly different from that of respondents. On the basis of 1980 Census data, the sample was younger and more upscale than the general population.

RELIABILITY:

An alpha of .50 was calculated for the scale in the Dickerson and Gentry (1983) study.

VALIDITY:

Factor analysis indicated the items loaded together.

ADMINISTRATION:

Data were gathered through self-administered mail questionnaires. Scale scores are calculated by averaging numerical responses to individual items. A score of 6 indicates that a person is concerned about computer technology whereas a 1 suggests that a person worries little about it.

MAJOR FINDINGS:

Dickerson and Gentry (1983) found that the scale was one of several lifestyle variables that was a significant discriminator between adopters and nonadopters of home computers. In fact, this variable was the best predictor of all the AIOs. This finding indicates that expressing little fear of computer technology predicted adoption of a home computer well.

Attitude Toward Computer Technology #17

COMMENTS:

The internal validity is extremely low and could be improved through additional items that focus on the construct of interest. The two items could relate to different issues, which might lower reliability.

REFERENCE:

Dickerson, Mary D. and James W. Gentry (1983). "Characteristics of Adopters and Non-Adopters of Home Computers," *JCR*, 10 (Sept.), 225-235.

SCALE ITEMS: ATTITUDE TOWARD COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

1. Computer technology is an invasion of my privacy.

2. I like to handle my own financial affairs without using any electronic machines.

In-Home Shopper #124

ITEMS: IN HOME SHOPPER

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

1. I love to browse through catalogs.
2. I am ordering more things from my home in order to save energy.
3. By shopping at home through mail/phone order, I save a lot of time.
4. I don't like to shop at home through mail or phone order. (r)
5. I use mail/phone order from home because I can't find what I want in the local stores.
6. Mail or phone ordering at home is more convenient than going to the store.
7. In-home shopping via mail/phone costs too much for what you get. (r)

#124 In-Home Shopper

SCALE NAME: In-Home Shopper

SCALE DESCRIPTION:

A seven-item, six-point, Likert-type summated ratings scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6). The scale measures a person's interest in shopping at home via phone or mail order.

SCALE ORIGIN:

The scale appears to be original to Hawes and Lumpkin (1984).

SAMPLES:

Hawes and Lumpkin (1984) collected data from 581 residents of 14 communities in Ft. Worth, Dallas metropolitan area. Each of the communities was randomly sampled from its population by means of their respective telephone directories. The questionnaires to be filled out by the household member responsible for most of the shopping. The distribution of respondents by community was similar to the actual population distribution.

RELIABILITY:

An alpha of .755 was calculated for the scale.

VALIDITY:

Factor analysis indicated that items loaded together and that their loadings were greater than .5. Content validity was deemed adequate given that the construct measured was similar to those used in other (unspecified) studies.

ADMINISTRATION:

Data were gathered through self-administered mail questionnaires. Scale scores were calculated by averaging numerical responses to individual items. A score of 6 indicated a person is actively involved in shopping out of the home whereas a 1 implied little interest in in-home shopping and probably prefers conventional shopping.

MAJOR FINDINGS:

The purpose of the study by Hawes and Lumpkin (1984) was to examine demographic and psychographic characteristics of outshoppers. In-home shopping significantly differed between inshoppers and outshoppers. Persons who engaged in outshopping expressed the least interest in in-home shopping.

REFERENCE:

Hawes, Jon M. and James R. Lumpkin (1984), "Understanding the Outshopping Behavior," *Journal of Retailing*, 60 (Fall), 200-218.

#252 Shopping Conditions (Local)

SCALE NAME: Shopping Conditions (Local)

SCALE DESCRIPTION:

A five-item, six point, Likert-type summated ratings scale going from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6). The scale measures a consumer's attitude about shopping at local stores. It was referred to as Negative Attitude Toward Local Shopping by Hawes and Lumpkin (1984).

SCALE ORIGIN:

These items were apparently first used and reported as a multi-item scale by Hawes and Lumpkin (1984).

SAMPLES:

Hawes and Lumpkin (1984) collected data from 381 residents of 14 communities near R. Worth, Dallas metropolitan area. Each of the communities was randomly sampled in proportion to its population by means of the respective telephone directories. The questionnaire to be filled out by the household member responsible for most of the shopping distribution of respondents by community was similar to the actual population distribution.

RELIABILITY:

An alpha of .711 was calculated for the scale.

VALIDITY:

Factor analysis indicated that the items loaded together and that their loadings were higher than .5. Content validity was deemed adequate given that the construct items similar to those used in other (unspecified) studies.

ADMINISTRATION:

Data were gathered through self-administered mail questionnaires. Scale scores are calculated by averaging numerical responses to individual items. A score of 6 indicates a person has a strong negative attitude about shopping at local stores whereas a score of 1 indicates a person thinks local merchants offer good quality and variety for the price.

MAJOR FINDINGS:

The purpose of the study by Hawes and Lumpkin (1984) was to examine demographic and psychographic characteristics of shoppers. Attitude about local shopping was the most salient psychographic variable in differentiating between shoppers and non-shoppers. Specifically, persons who engaged in outshopping the most expressed the most negative attitudes about local shopping conditions.

556 Marketing Scales Handbook

Shopping Conditions (Local) #252

REFERENCE:

Hawes, Jon M. and James R. Lumpkin (1984), "Understanding the Outshopper," *JAMS*, 17 (Fall), 200-218.

SCALE ITEMS: SHOPPING CONDITIONS (LOCAL)

Strongly Dislike	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

1. Local stores are never open when you want to shop.
2. Local prices are out of line with other towns.
3. Local stores offer you good quality for the price. (r)
4. Local stores just do not meet my shopping needs.
5. Local merchants offer a good variety of merchandise. (r)

#13 Attitude Toward Branded Products

SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward Branded Products

SCALE DESCRIPTION:

A five-item, five-point Likert-type summated ratings scale measuring a person's opinion of brand name products in general.

SCALE ORIGIN:

The measure originates from a dissertation published by Moschis in 1978. His 1981 study, reported below, is from that same dissertation research.

SAMPLES:

Moschis' (1981) data came from 806 middle school or senior school students: 365 "older" adolescents (15 years and older) and 441 "younger" adolescents (younger than 15 years). The students came from 13 schools and seven towns in Wisconsin representing a wide variety of urban to rural situations. The author indicated that the sample was well balanced in terms of most demographic characteristics except sex, because nearly two-thirds of the respondents were female.

RELIABILITY:

An alpha of .50 was reported for the scale.

VALIDITY:

No examination of scale validity was reported.

ADMINISTRATION:

The scale was self-administered by students along with several other measures in a 10-page instrument during a regular class session. Lower scores on the scale indicate that respondents have positive opinions about branded products whereas higher scores suggest that they have negative attitudes.

MAJOR FINDINGS:

The study investigated the validity of the cognitive development approach to socialization (e.g., Piaget) to predict a wide variety of consumer-related cognitions learned during adolescence. In general, the findings indicated that the cognitive developmental model did not explain consumer socialization during adolescence very well. Older adolescents had significantly less favorable attitudes towards advertising, brands, and prices than did younger children.

COMMENTS:

The low internal consistency indicates that the scale is not reliable. This could be due to several different factors being represented in the scale. Redevelopment and testing are needed before the scale is used further.

Attitude Toward Branded Products #13

REFERENCES:

- Moschis, George P. (1978). *Acquisition of the Consumer Role by Adolescents*. Research Monograph No. 82. Atlanta, Ga.: Publishing Services Division, College of Business Administration, Georgia State University.
- _____. (1981). "Patterns of Consumer Learning." *JAMS*, 9 (2), 110-126.

SCALE ITEMS: ATTITUDE TOWARD BRANDED PRODUCTS

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

1. Advertised brands are better than those that are not advertised.
2. Quality products are made by well-known companies.
3. I prefer a certain brand of most products I buy or use.
4. I don't care about the brand of most products I buy (or).
5. Brand-name products work better than "off-brands."

Attitude Toward the Purchase (Feeling Dimension) #34

iminability than the other

SCALE NAME: Attitude Toward the Purchase (Feeling Dimension)

uggest this scale should not
ntially. Further, note that
. Other subscales measure
nt. The 60-item set was
ducts examined.

SCALE DESCRIPTION:

A three-item, seven-point summated semantic differential rating scale measuring the degree to which a purchase decision is influenced by one's feelings versus one's cognitive thinking.

SCALE ORIGIN:

The scale was constructed for the study reported by Ratchford (1987).

SAMPLES:

The version of the scale described here was used in a preliminary study and one final study reported by Ratchford (1987). The preliminary study was based on 50 mall-intercept interviews. The sample for the final study was composed of the 1792 adult members of the Market Facts mail panel who provided responses to the questionnaire.

RELIABILITY:

Alpha values of .66 and .64 were calculated for the scale in the preliminary and final studies by Ratchford (1987), respectively.

VALIDITY:

Ratchford (1987) did not specifically examine the validity of the scale, but did assess its validity when used as part of the think/feel matrix, as discussed below with the findings. In a factor analysis of involvement, think, and feel items, there was definitely a feeling factor but two of the items had positive loadings on the involvement factor also.

ADMINISTRATION:

The scale was self-administered along with other measures in the final study by Ratchford (1987). Higher scores on the scale indicate that consumers' feelings are highly involved with their decisions to purchase some specified product whereas lower scores suggest that their feelings have little to do with their purchase decisions.

MAJOR FINDINGS:

The purpose of the study by Ratchford (1987) was to publicize research done by the Foote Cone and Belding agency in its development and testing of a thinking/feeling grid. Scores on the involvement scale and a composite think/feel scale were calculated for 254 products in the main study. The results for 60 products were plotted in a four-cell matrix, presented in the article, that had degree of involvement as one axis and think/feel as the other axis. The plot was described by the author as being "generally intuitive" (p. 30) because most products were in a cell of the grid one would expect.

#34 Attitude Toward the Purchase (Feeling Dimension)**REFERENCE:**

- ✓ Ratchford, Brian T. (1987), "New Insights About the FCB Grid," *JAR*, 27 (August/September), 24-38.

SCALE ITEMS: ATTITUDE TOWARD THE PURCHASE (FEELING DIMENSION)

Please rate the process of choosing a brand of _____ on each of the following scales.
Please base your rating on your most recent choice of a brand of _____.

1. decision
expresses one's
personality

7 : 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1

decision does not
express one's
personality

2. decision is
based on a lot of
feeling

7 : 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1

decision is based
on little feeling

3. decision is not
based on looks,
taste, touch,
smell, or sounds

7 : 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1

decision is not
based on looks,
taste, touch,
smell or sounds

SCALE NAME: Att

SCALE DESCRIPT

A two-
a purcl

SCALE ORIGIN:

The sc

SAMPLES:

The ve
reporte
intervi
the Mi

RELIABILITY:

Alpha
studies

VALIDITY:

Ratchf
validit
In a f.
involv
to som

ADMINISTRATION

The sc
(1987
involv
sugge

MAJOR FINDINGS

The p
Cone
on the
in the
in the
The p
produ

APPENDIX D

NUMBERING FOR VARIABLES

SPSS Variable	Meaning
resp	respondent #
cluster	cluster #
v3	Section A #1
v4	Section A #2
v5	Section A #3
v6	Section A #4
v7	Section A #5
v8	Section A #6
v9	Section A #7
v10	Section A #8
v11	Section A #9
v12	Section B #1
v13	Section B #2
v14	Section C #1
v15	Section C #2
v16	Section C #3
v17	Section C #4
v18	Section C #5
v19	Section D #1
v20	Section D #2
v21	Section D #3
v22	Section D #4
v23	Section D #5
v24	Section D #6
v25	Section D #7
v26	Section D #8
v27	Section D #9
v28	Section D #10
v29	Section D #11
v30	Section D #12
v31	Section D #13
v32	Section E 1 #1
v33	Section E 1 #2
v34	Section E 1 #3

SPSS Variable	Meaning
v35	Section E 1 #4
v36	Section E 2 #1
v37	Section E 2 #2
v38	Section E 2 #3
v39	Section E 2 #4
v40	Section E 2 #5
v41	Section E 2 #6
v42	Section E 2 #7
v43	Section E 2 #8
v44	Section E 2 #9
v45	Section E 2 #10
v46	Section F #1
v47	Section F #2
v48	Section F #3
v49	Section F #4
v50	Section F #5
v51	Section F #6
v52	Section F #7
v53	Section F #8
v54	Section F #9
v55	Section F #10
v56	Section F #11
v57	Section F #12
v58	Section F #13
v59	Section F #14
v60	Section F #15
v61	Section F #16
v62	Section F #17
v63	Pretest Section E 2 #1
v64	Pretest Section E 2 #2
v65	Pretest Section E 2 #3
v66	Pretest Section E 2 #4
v67	Pretest Section E 2 #5

APPENDIX E

CODING LEGEND

Variables	Coding	Meaning
v3 to v62	55	Question not in final survey
v3 to v62	66	Blank
v3 to v62	77	Response input is N/A
v3 to v62	88	Response not required
v3 to v62	99	Question not in pretest
v46	1	18-24
v46	2	25-34
v46	3	35-44
v46	4	45-59
v46	5	60+
v47	1	male
v47	2	female
v48	1	Less than highschool
v48	2	Completed highschool
v48	3	Some college
v48	4	Completed college
v48	5	Some university
v48	6	Completed university
v48	7	Post Graduate
v49	1	Yes
v49	2	No
v50	1	Yes
v50	2	No
v51	1	Yes
v51	2	No
v52	1	Communication
v52	2	Knowledge/Information Gathering
v52	3	E-Commerce
v52	4	#1 and #2
v52	5	Downloads
v52	6	#1 and #2 and #3
v52	7	Banking
v53	1	Yes
v53	2	No
v54	1	Yes
v54	2	No
v55	1	Yes
v55	2	No
v56	1	Yes
v56	2	No
v57	1	Do not want to input personal information
v57	2	Foreign Exchange/duty issues
v57	3	Prefer to see products prior to making purchase
v57	4	Do not have access to the Internet
v57	5	I view shopping as a social activity
v57	6	Unsure of where to find websites
v57	7	#1 and #2 and #3 and #5 and #6
v57	8	#1 and #3
v57	9	#1 and #2 and #3
v57	10	#2 and shipping charges
v57	11	#3 and #4 and don't have credit cards
v57	12	#1 and #2
v57	13	#1 and #3 (8) and no trust
v57	14	#5 and #6 and need same day service
v57	15	#1 and #4 and #5

Variables	Coding	Meaning
v58	1	Yes
v58	2	No
v59	1	Delivery took too long
v59	2	Did not receive goods that were ordered
v59	3	Not enough customer service support
v59	4	Did not enjoy purchasing online
v59	5	security concerns
v59	6	currency issues
v60	1	Books, cds...
v60	2	Clothing
v60	3	Outdoor goods
v60	4	Electronic goods
v60	6	#1 and food product
v60	7	#1 and #4 and concert tickets
v60	8	#1 and #2 (5) and #4
v60	9	#1 and concert tickets
v60	10	#1 and #3 and #4 and tickets
v60	11	tickets
v60	12	#1 and #4
v60	13	#1 and #3 and #4
v60	14	#1 and #2 (5) and #4 and tickets
v60	15	#1 and airline tickets
v60	16	#2 and #4
v60	17	#1 and #4 and software
v60	18	#1 and #2 and toys
v60	19	#1 and #2 and tickets
v60	20	#1 and vitamins
v60	21	software
v60	22	#2 and #4 and drugstore products and flower:
v60	23	#1 and #2 and #3
v60	24	furniture
v60	25	domain
v60	26	#1 and #2 and #4 and everyday consumables
v60	27	#1 and #4 and airline tickets and flowers
v60	28	magazine subscription
v60	29	#1 and #3
v60	30	#1 and internet services
v60	31	#1 and #4 and toys
v60	32	online course
v60	33	#2 and tickets
v60	34	work related purchases
v60	35	travel
v61	1	Under \$25
v61	2	\$25 to \$74.99
v61	3	\$75 to \$149.99
v61	4	\$150 to \$224.99
v61	5	Over \$225
v62	1	None
v62	2	1 to 3
v62	3	4 to 6
v62	4	7 to 9
v62	5	Over 10

APPENDIX F

SCALE and HYPOTHESIS REPRESENTATION

Survey Section	Scale	Hypothesis	Results for Hypotheses
Section A - Perceptions of the Shopping Experience	1	1	Correct when revised scales are used
Section B - Attitudes Towards Computer Technology	2	2	Not possible to test this hypothesis independently
Section C - Personal Information Privacy Concerns	3(11)	3	Data does not support this hypothesis
Section D - Shopping Location Preferences #1	4(12)/5	4	Correct when revised scales are used
Section D - Shopping Location Preferences #2	6(13)	5	Evidence for online purchase and the purchase of tickets
Section E - Product Characteristics #1	7	6	Some evidence to support this hypothesis
Section E - Product Characteristics #2	8/9/10	7	Evidence to support related to the purchase of clothing, but not groceries

APPENDIX G

Correlations

	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	
S1	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	1 0.051 105	0.191 0.051 105	0.150 0.126 105	0.066 0.502 105	0.071 0.472 105	0.089 0.368 105	-0.007 0.943 105	0.117 0.233 105	0.036 0.719 105	0.010 0.918 105	0.194 0.047 105	0.040 0.683 105	
S2	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N		1 0.191 105	0.050 0.615 105	-0.293 0.002 105	-0.341 0.000 105	-0.096 0.332 105	0.204 0.037 105	0.119 0.227 105	-0.025 0.801 105	0.133 0.176 105	0.261 0.007 105	-0.058 0.000 105	
S3	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N			1 0.150 105	0.15 0.12 105	0.15 0.14 105	0.02 0.86 105	0.12 0.24 105	0.19 0.05 105	0.26 0.01 105	-0.08 0.40 105	0.85 0.00 105	-0.03 0.39 105	
S4	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N				1 0.066 105	0.982 0.000 105	0.255 0.009 105	0.011 0.912 105	-0.198 0.043 105	-0.107 0.275 105	0.022 0.822 105	0.004 0.964 105	0.863 0.000 105	
S5	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N					1 0.071 105	0.277 0.004 105	0.005 0.959 105	-0.140 0.155 105	-0.063 0.522 105	0.021 0.834 105	-0.024 0.805 105	0.873 0.000 105	
S6	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N						1 0.004 105	-0.140 0.959 105	0.045 0.156 105	0.074 0.452 105	-0.096 0.331 105	-0.180 0.066 105	0.353 0.000 105	
S7	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N							1 0.156 105	0.081 0.412 105	0.134 0.172 105	-0.019 0.849 105	0.197 0.044 105	-0.030 0.765 105	
S8	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N								1 0.081 105	0.438 0.438 105	0.000 1.000 105	0.156 0.112 105	0.069 0.485 105	
S9	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N									1 0.000 105	0.000 1.000 105	0.140 0.156 105	0.076 0.442 105	
S10	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N										1 0.082 105	-0.012 0.903 105	0.004 0.985 105	
S11	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N											1 0.225 105	-0.184 0.060 105	
S12	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N												1 0.418 105	
S13	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N													1 0.000 105

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

APPENDIX H

Reported Reliability

Scale	Reliability Computed from data for this study	Reliability Quoted by Source	Source
S1	0.8872	0.8303	Involvement (Shopping)
S2	0.6820	0.5	Attitude Towards Computer Technology
S3	0.2337	N/A	
S4	0.5271	0.755	In-Home Shopper
S5	0.4793	N/A	S4 with V26 added
S6	-0.1342	0.711	Shopping Conditions (Local)
S7	-0.1328	0.5	Attitude Toward Branded Products
S8	0.8702	.66 and .64	Attitude Toward the Purchase (Feeling Dimension)*
S9	0.5921	.66 and .64	Attitude Toward the Purchase (Feeling Dimension)*
S10		.66 and .64	Attitude Toward the Purchase (Feeling Dimension)*
S11	0.7225	N/A	S3 with V14 removed
S12	0.7538	N/A	S4 with V22 and V25 removed
S13	0.6304	N/A	S6 with V29 and V31 removed

*The original scale grouped the 5 senses together and did not indicate a specific product.

APPENDIX I

v46

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	13	12.4	12.4	12.4
	2	43	41.0	41.0	53.3
	3	26	24.8	24.8	78.1
	4	15	14.3	14.3	92.4
	5	6	5.7	5.7	98.1
	6	2	1.9	1.9	100.0
	Total	105	100.0	100.0	

v47

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	47	44.8	44.8	44.8
	2	57	54.3	54.3	99.0
	66	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	105	100.0	100.0	

v48

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	2.9	2.9	2.9
	2	10	9.5	9.5	12.4
	3	19	18.1	18.1	30.5
	4	8	7.6	7.6	38.1
	5	7	6.7	6.7	44.8
	6	32	30.5	30.5	75.2
	7	26	24.8	24.8	100.0
	Total	105	100.0	100.0	

v49

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	90	85.7	85.7	85.7
	2	15	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	105	100.0	100.0	

v50

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	95	90.5	90.5	90.5
2	10	9.5	9.5	100.0
Total	105	100.0	100.0	

v51

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	100	95.2	95.2	95.2
2	5	4.8	4.8	100.0
Total	105	100.0	100.0	

v52

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	38	36.2	36.2	36.2
2	39	37.1	37.1	73.3
3	1	1.0	1.0	74.3
4	15	14.3	14.3	88.6
5	1	1.0	1.0	89.5
6	4	3.8	3.8	93.3
7	1	1.0	1.0	94.3
66	5	4.8	4.8	99.0
77	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
Total	105	100.0	100.0	

v53

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	61	58.1	58.1	58.1
2	20	19.0	19.0	77.1
66	1	1.0	1.0	78.1
77	1	1.0	1.0	79.0
99	22	21.0	21.0	100.0
Total	105	100.0	100.0	

v54

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	70	66.7	66.7	66.7
2	13	12.4	12.4	79.0
99	22	21.0	21.0	100.0
Total	105	100.0	100.0	

v55

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	70	66.7	66.7	66.7
2	35	33.3	33.3	100.0
Total	105	100.0	100.0	

v56

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	42	40.0	40.0	40.0
2	63	60.0	60.0	100.0
Total	105	100.0	100.0	

v57

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	4	3.8	3.8	3.8
3	13	12.4	12.4	16.2
4	2	1.9	1.9	18.1
5	2	1.9	1.9	20.0
6	1	1.0	1.0	21.0
7	1	1.0	1.0	21.9
8	4	3.8	3.8	25.7
9	2	1.9	1.9	27.6
10	1	1.0	1.0	28.6
11	1	1.0	1.0	29.5
12	2	1.9	1.9	31.4
13	1	1.0	1.0	32.4
14	1	1.0	1.0	33.3
15	1	1.0	1.0	34.3
66	1	1.0	1.0	35.2
88	68	64.8	64.8	100.0
Total	105	100.0	100.0	

v58

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	8	7.6	7.6	7.6
2	48	45.7	45.7	53.3
66	3	2.9	2.9	56.2
88	24	22.9	22.9	79.0
99	22	21.0	21.0	100.0
Total	105	100.0	100.0	

v59

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	1	1.0	1.0	1.0
5	1	1.0	1.0	1.9
6	1	1.0	1.0	2.9
66	4	3.8	3.8	6.7
88	76	72.4	72.4	79.0
99	22	21.0	21.0	100.0
Total	105	100.0	100.0	

v60

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	11	10.5	10.5	10.5
2	3	2.9	2.9	13.3
3	1	1.0	1.0	14.3
4	4	3.8	3.8	18.1
5	5	4.8	4.8	22.9
6	1	1.0	1.0	23.8
7	1	1.0	1.0	24.8
8	1	1.0	1.0	25.7
9	4	3.8	3.8	29.5
10	1	1.0	1.0	30.5
11	5	4.8	4.8	35.2
12	3	2.9	2.9	38.1
13	2	1.9	1.9	40.0
14	2	1.9	1.9	41.9
15	2	1.9	1.9	43.8
16	1	1.0	1.0	44.8
17	1	1.0	1.0	45.7
18	1	1.0	1.0	46.7
19	1	1.0	1.0	47.6
20	1	1.0	1.0	48.6
21	1	1.0	1.0	49.5
22	1	1.0	1.0	50.5
23	4	3.8	3.8	54.3
24	1	1.0	1.0	55.2
25	1	1.0	1.0	56.2
26	1	1.0	1.0	57.1
27	1	1.0	1.0	58.1
28	1	1.0	1.0	59.0
29	1	1.0	1.0	60.0
30	1	1.0	1.0	61.0
31	1	1.0	1.0	61.9
32	1	1.0	1.0	62.9
33	1	1.0	1.0	63.8
34	1	1.0	1.0	64.8
35	1	1.0	1.0	65.7
66	2	1.9	1.9	67.6
88	34	32.4	32.4	100.0
Total	105	100.0	100.0	

v61

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	2.9	2.9	2.9
	2	33	31.4	31.4	34.3
	3	18	17.1	17.1	51.4
	4	9	8.6	8.6	60.0
	5	5	4.8	4.8	64.8
	66	3	2.9	2.9	67.6
	88	34	32.4	32.4	100.0
	Total	105	100.0	100.0	

v62

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	40	38.1	38.1	38.1
	2	28	26.7	26.7	64.8
	3	1	1.0	1.0	65.7
	66	2	1.9	1.9	67.6
	88	34	32.4	32.4	100.0
	Total	105	100.0	100.0	