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ABSTRACT

In retailing research, personal shopping orientations have received considerable attention, often in combination with motivation-based shopper taxonomies. Although shopping orientations and perceived shopping alternatives are often considered independent inputs into a consumer’s choice model, it is argued in this paper that shopping orientations influence the perception of retail store attributes as well as the attitude towards retail stores. An empirical study indicates that the effect of shopping orientations on attitude towards food retailers is stronger than the effect on the perception of specific food store attributes. The different level of abstraction and emotion is used to explain this difference.

INTRODUCTION

Shopping behaviour is generally guided by consumers’ perceptions, not by objective reality (Schiffman and Kanuk 2004). The objective reality, e.g. a retail store with its characteristics, is internally processed in the consumer’s mind. A series of psychological concepts can be considered as mediating variables on the relationship between the retail store characteristics and the actual behaviour (Hanna and Wozniak 2001).

Motivational forces are commonly accepted to have a key influencing role in the explanation of shopping behaviour (Jarratt 1996). Shopping orientations (or shopping motives), refer to a consumer’s needs and wants related to the choice of outlets (Moschis 1976; Sheth 1983). These orientations vary from consumer to consumer (Luomala 2003) and they represent rather “enduring characteristics of individuals” (Westbrook and Black 1985: 87).

The main objective of this paper is to analyse whether (and how) consumers’ shopping orientations influence central psychological constructs, which in turn are assumed to influence shopping behaviour. Two different relations are analysed: how shopping orientations influence the way the consumer perceives the retail store and how shopping orientations influence a consumer’s attitude towards the retailer.

The paper is structured as follows: After a short literature review, perception of store attributes and attitude towards food retailers are discussed and the potential influence of shopping orientations on these constructs. In an empirical study, consumer clusters, based on their shopping orientations, are derived. Mean differences of central perception dimensions and of attitude between clusters are compared in order to evaluate the influence of the shopping orientations.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In consumer research, it is commonly accepted, that different individuals react differently to the same stimuli. Inter-individual heterogeneity on the basis of specific needs or requirements is implicitly accepted in most marketing studies (Howell and Rogers 1983). The study of shopping orientations represents “a fairly mature area of research” in retailing (Gröppel-Klein et al. 1999: 63). However, up to now there has been no commonly agreed upon catalogue of shopping orientations. Several empirical studies distinguish between functional shopping orientations (utilitarian shopping values) and non-functional needs (hedonic shopping values) (e.g. Luomala 2003; Sheth 1983), but many investigations use more differentiated catalogues of shopping orientations (see e.g. Westbrook and Black 1985).

Influence of Shopping Orientations. Dawson et al. (1990) showed the influence of different shopping orientations on store choice and preferences. Hallsworth (1991) shows that patrons of different food stores differ significantly in their shopping motives. Other studies emphasise the individual character of central perception dimensions, whose importance weightings may be different for different consumers due to their shopping orientations (see Birtwistle et al. 1999; Doyle and Fenwick 1974/75; Rich and Portis 1964).

In his integrative theory of patronage preference and behaviour Sheth (1983) considers this difference in importance people place on certain attributes. In his concept, shopping orientations and shopping options are used as independent influence factors of the preference building for shopping outlets.

On the other hand, some studies imply that shopping orientations also exert an direct influence on the perceived image of a store. This indicates that a relationship between shopping orientations and perception of store attributes as well as the overall judgement of the store might be assumed (Lumpkin 1985; Mason et al. 1983; Osman 1993). It is therefore likely that perception of alternatives is not independent of the orientations or motives of the consumers, but that both psychological constructs are closely interconnected (Hanna and Wozniak 2001).

Consumer Segments. It is common practice in marketing research to cluster or classify consumers. Such shopper taxonomies which are often based on shopping orientations have been developed by several researchers. For instance, Jarratt (1996) identified “have to” shoppers, “moderate” shoppers, “experiential” shoppers, “product-focused” shoppers, “service” shoppers, and “practical” shoppers based on the importance the shoppers put on certain store features. Comprehensive overviews of such investigations and their deduced shopper typologies are given by Osman (1993). Westbrook and Black (1985) summarised several studies by concluding that there seems to exist a more price-oriented shopper type, a more convenience-oriented shopper type, an apathetic shopper type (very low involvement and low motivation towards shopping across all dimensions) as well as a highly involved shopper type (who simultaneously follows several objectives in his shopping activity).

PERCEPTION AND ATTITUDE

The “objective” reality of the retail environment, i.e. the retail store and its attributes, influences the shopping behaviour of consumers through certain internal, psychological variables. The first of those variables to be discussed here is the “filter” through which consumers see objective reality, that is the perception of those attributes of which the retail store consists from the perspective of the consumers.

Perception is the process by which an individual is exposed to, attends to, selects, organises, and interprets stimuli. Interpretation
is the stage of this process in which people draw upon their experience, memory, and expectations in order to attach meaning to a stimulus (Mowen and Minor 2001; Schiffman and Kanuk 2004).

In the field of retailing research literature, consumers’ perception of a retailer can be seen as being closely related to the construct “store image”. To explain this statement we discuss this construct shortly. Early definitions of store image had a broad understanding of the construct. Definitions included the total knowledge and all beliefs that a consumer holds. For instance, Martineau (1958, 47), in an early and typical definition, characterises it as “the way in which a store is defined in the shopper’s mind, partly by its functional qualities and partly by an aura of psychological attributes.” In his meta-study of store image investigations, Lindquist (1974/75) summarises that all authors see store image as complex and as built on a combination of components perceived by the consumer, which merge into an overall or total impression (see also Keaveney and Hunt 1992; Oxenfeldt 1974/75; Zimmer and Golden 1988).

However, even the studies that emphasise the configurational or composite character of store image operationalise it on an attribute-by-attribute-basis, following the assumption that consumers perceive stores on a number of different dimensions—summed up–make up the store image (Keaveney and Hunt 1992). In this way, the chosen statements in the scales are predominantly measuring the cognitive, rational and isolated evaluation of certain attributes (Morschett 2001). This perception also tends to be short-term, i.e. changing the attribute (e.g., changing the store layout) quickly leads to a change in perception.

Doyle and Fenwick (1974/75) state that what is called store image is very often the shoppers’ perception of store attributes such as variety of goods sold, relative prices and store layout. They continue to explain (p. 40) that, “it is reasonable to view the customer as rationally evaluating the store on a multi-attribute utility function”. This view is also confirmed by the fact that many researchers refer to the work of Fisk (1961/62). He combined 30 items into six store image dimensions. But while he emphasised that those are only the “cognitive dimensions” of store image, most succeeding studies use his dimensions without referring to this restriction. Zimmer and Golden (1988, 265) define: “The image of a store consists of the way it is perceived by consumers.” Therefore, we would conclude that past image research has basically been research of perception (including interpretation and assessment) of store attributes in a modern understanding of this construct (Hanna and Wozniak 2001; Schiffman and Kanuk 2004) and has often neglected the long-enduring factors, which are more holistic and emotional.

As store image research has done a lot of work identifying the major facets of store image, this study will draw on those studies (see for example Birtwistle et al. 1999; Fisk 1961/62; Lindquist 1974/75; Mazursky and Jacoby 1986) to capture the perception of major store attributes.

**Influence of Shopping Orientations on Perception**

The relevance of shopping orientations for understanding consumer behaviour has been shown in many empirical investigations. Shopping orientations are expected to influence the cognitive assessment (among other effects) of merchandise and other store attributes (Gröppel-Klein et al. 1999).

One reason for this assumption is that perception is a selective process. Consumers only receive a small fraction of the stimuli to which they are exposed (Schiffman and Kanuk 2004). This selection is, for instance, influenced by a consumer’s involvement level, which influences the information to which he pays attention (Hanna and Wozniak 2001). The involvement level, in turn, is likely to be influenced by his orientations (Luomala 2003). Different shopping orientations might also result in the process of analysing different features of a store more elaborately. As motives influence how much time and effort a consumer spends on interpreting perceived information, different consumers are likely to have a different assessment of the same features, especially when stimuli in the retail environment are often ambiguous (Mowen and Minor 2001).

Together, selectivity and individual interpretations are the main reasons why the perceptual process is highly subjective (Hanna and Wozniak 2001). This subjective reality, the way consumers perceive a store, is (as has been shown) at least partly based on needs and orientations (Schiffman and Kanuk 2004).

Such an influence of shopping orientations on the perception of stores is assumed by many retail researchers (Birtwistle et al. 1999; Doyle and Fenwick 1974/75; Lumpkin 1985/62; Luomala 2003; Mason et al. 1983; Osman 1993), and empirically shown in a few studies (see e.g. Gröppel-Klein et al. 1999; Hirschman et al. 1978). Consequently it is proposed:

**H1:** Consumers’ shopping orientations influence their perception of store attributes.

The above mentioned functional store attributes are only a part of the “total picture” which consumers establish about a retail store (Keaveney and Hunt 1992; 167; Zimmer and Golden 1988). “Customers will not only hold factually based opinions about a store but will FEEL certain ways towards it” (Oxenfeldt 1974/75, 9). Martineau (1958) already pointed out that retail outlets also have “psychological attributes”, which represent a somewhat non-functional level of associations. There is a long-term attitude towards the store (that is likely to be influenced by the consumer’s perceptions of store attributes), which can be described as the store’s appeal to shoppers (Doyle and Fenwick 1974/75).

Keller (1993) classifies three different types of brand associations by their increasing levels of abstraction: attributes, benefits, and attitudes. The “store attributes” discussed above concentrate more on product-related information for stores. But other kinds of information are linked to a retail store and represent more abstract aspects of consumer knowledge, which is not directly related to the actual physical object (Keller 2003). Attitudes, i.e. summary judgements and overall evaluations, represent the most abstract and highest-level type of associations (Keller 1993).

According to most researchers, attitude refers to an affect or a general evaluative reaction (Schiffman and Kanuk 2004). It is stable and enduring (Hanna and Wozniak 2001). After an attitude has been formed, it often isolates itself from the underlying attributes, and even if those change (within a certain range), the long-term attitudes might remain stable (Keaveney and Hunt 1992).

**Influence of Shopping Orientations on Attitude towards the Store**

As attitudes are personal judgements, they depend on personal orientations (Hanna and Wozniak 2001). Attitude formation is driven by the shopping orientations since these reflect the needs that a retail store is supposed to satisfy. Since different retail stores provide the means to satisfy different shopping needs, they are likely to be judged differently by people with different orientations (Schiffman and Kanuk 2004). The discussion of potential reasons for the influence of shopping motives on attitude has been included in part in the paragraph on shopping orientations. Briefly, three reasons lead to the proposition that attitudes are influenced by shopping orientations:
1. Attitudes are formed, as has been shown above, based on perceptions. Reasons for the potential influence of shopping orientations on perception have been given in the previous section.

2. Attitudes are higher-order associations which are more abstract. Therefore, it is likely that the individual evaluation process is even more subjective than for associations of less abstraction. Emotions and affect are especially influenced by personal characteristics. For instance, Dawson et al. (1990) investigated and showed a relationship between shopping orientations and the emotions which consumers experience during a visit to a retail store. This in turn would most likely also result in the formation of different attitudes among those consumers.

3. Retail literature agrees on the fact that shoppers place differing degrees of value on certain store attributes (Osman 1993). It is also commonly accepted that shopping orientations influence the weight consumers attach to specific store attributes (Birtwistle et al. 1999; Doyle and Fenwick 1974/75; Howell and Rogers 1983; Rich and Portis 1964).

So consumers build on subjectively interpreted associations they hold of the store and weigh those inter-individually differently. It is therefore postulated:

H2: Consumers’ shopping orientations influence their attitude towards a retailer.

Summarising, it is postulated that the objective and physical properties and features of a store are subjectively perceived and judged by consumers (Martineau 1958; Mazursky and Jacoby 1986) and that consumer characteristics, especially shopping orientations, play an important role in the analysis of the subjective interpretation of objective clues, for perceptions as well as for attitude formation.

**EMPIRICAL STUDY AND RESULTS**

An empirical study was conducted in a German city with oral interviews and 560 respondents, with a quota sampling taking into consideration age and gender distribution of food shoppers in Germany. Each respondent was asked about one specific retail store. Seven different stores were chosen as stimuli, i.e. 80 questionnaires were completed for each retail store. Respondents were asked about the same stores. Therefore, our “objective” stimuli are constant and the perception and attitudes of the consumers are heterogeneous only due to other factors. The selected store formats were superstores/hypermarkets (store A, store B), discounters (store C, store D, store E), a supermarket (store F) and the grocery department of a department store (store G).

**Measures**

After an extensive literature review, nine items were extracted as relevant shopping orientations for food shopping (see table 2). Closed-end statements were given to the respondents and they were asked to what degree they agreed with the statements in order to describe their shopping needs concerning food shopping.

Store attributes were operationalised in line with prior store image research and specific categorisations of retail marketing mix instruments. The focus was on the more cognitive elements of retail stores, as is usual in this type of research: selection, quality of products, freshness, price, one-stop shopping possibility, advertising, checkout lines, service, convenience, store design, customer relationship programmes, tidiness, and cleanliness.

To get a comprehensive view, the scale that was employed to measure consumers’ attitude towards the store in the study includes different facets of attitude. Following an extensive review of attitude literature and retailing research (see e.g. Dick and Basu 1994; Hanna and Wozniak 2001; Keller 1993; Keller 2003; Lassar et al. 1995; Mowen and Minor 2001; Schiffman and Kanuk 2004), a number of long-term and stable attitude components have been selected. The indicators employed in our study are sympathy, differentiation, trustworthiness, commitment and willingness to recommend. Since these items are considered to measure one latent construct, a reliability analysis was performed.

Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was used for assessing reliability. Its value of .8213 exceeds the threshold of .7 and the adjusted item-to-total correlation is high for all items. The scale seems to have high internal consistency, the factor value of an exploratory factor analysis (KMO = .823; Chi² of Bartlett’s test of sphericity = 942.5 (p = .000)) is used as the measure for attitude.

**Central Dimensions of Shopping Orientations and Consumer Segments**

To find the central dimensions of shopping orientations, an exploratory factor analysis was performed after the adequacy of the sample for this procedure was examined (KMO = .670, Chi²=.980.4 (p=.000)). This procedure, that is commonly used in this type of research (Hirschman et al. 1978; Gröppel-Klein et al. 1999), was applied to a randomly selected half of the sample.

Four dimensions of shopping orientations were extracted, together explaining 69.1 % of total variance:

- Factor 1 corresponds to the motive to be able to buy from a large selection of goods and services at one shopping trip. It is labelled “scope orientation”.
- Factor 2 represents a quality orientation, i.e. demanding a high quality of the assortment in general, freshness and a pleasant store atmosphere.
- Factor 3 is characterised by the search for low prices during promotions and general price-value (“price orientation”).
- Factor 4 shows high importance given to quick shopping and is therefore labelled “time orientation”.

The reliability and validity of the scale and its dimensions were additionally evaluated based on the basis of a confirmatory factor analysis that was applied to the four latent constructs identified in the exploratory factor analysis on the other half of the sample. Parameter estimation was done with the maximum likelihood method (Kline 1998). A GFI of .956, a AGFI of .912 and a RMR-value of .052 indicate a good fit of the measurement model to the empirical data. The fit of the local structures of the model was also examined. Indicator reliability, factor reliability and explained variance of the latent variables all imply a good model fit.

To identify homogeneous groups of consumers, a cluster analysis was applied with the four central dimensions of shopping motives as cluster criteria (before this step, the factors were extracted for the full sample). From table 3, the different clusters can be described as follows:

- Consumers in cluster 1 seek a comprehensive offer of goods and services, while their quality orientation is rather low. Price orientation is medium and time orientation low. It seems appropriate to label this cluster as “one-stop shoppers”.
- For consumers in cluster 2, scope and quality are not relevant motives. For them, however, it is important to do their food shopping quickly and—most importantly—to re-
TABLE 1
Reliability of the Attitude Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items (n=528)</th>
<th>Adjusted item-to-total-correlation</th>
<th>α when item deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sympathy</td>
<td>.7433</td>
<td>.7450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>.6114</td>
<td>.7917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to recommend</td>
<td>.6068</td>
<td>.7883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>.6659</td>
<td>.7702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>.4728</td>
<td>.8275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s α</td>
<td></td>
<td>.8213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2
Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Shopping Orientation Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotated Component Matrix</th>
<th>Factor 1: scope orientation</th>
<th>Factor 2: quality orientation</th>
<th>Factor 3: price orientation</th>
<th>Factor 4: time orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items (orientations) (n=280)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-stop shopping</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>-.272</td>
<td>-.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General quality of assortment</td>
<td></td>
<td>.831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshness</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store atmosphere</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>-.211</td>
<td>-.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price promotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General price-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation towards quick shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>1.981</td>
<td>1.789</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>1.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulated % of expl. variance</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor loadings below .1 not shown.

Discriminant analysis with the cluster classification as the dependent, the factor values as the independent variables, was applied to assess validity. The three calculated discriminant functions show high explanatory power, all have eigenvalues above 1 and all significant to p=.000. Cumulated Wilk’s Lambda is .057 (p=.000).

Central Dimensions of Perception of Store Attributes

As described above, perception was initially measured with a comprehensive item battery. This was first extensively examined and adjusted. The items “tidiness” and “cleanliness” were highly correlated and measure similar facets of the perception of store orderliness, and were therefore combined. The items “quality products” and “freshness” are different facets of the quality of the assortment and they were also combined into one measure. Since Cronbach’s alpha was high or satisfactory for both pairs of items (.79 for orderliness, .64 for quality of assortment), an unweighted averaging was used for aggregation. The number of missing values for the item “advertising” was too high; 12.9 % of the consumers could give no answer to a respective statement. The limit for a useful interpretation of a variable is usually considered to be 10 % (Kline 1998: 72-3). The variable “customer relationship programmes” was negatively correlated to “price”. This was, however, as discussion with several consumers showed, a spurious correlation, since the most price-aggressive stores in the sample (discounters) did not...
have any relationship programmes, so we did not consider this variable any further. The variable “checkout lines” was eliminated due to very low indicator reliability in the first calculation of a confirmatory factor analysis. The variable “convenience” did load highly, but not unambiguously, on two separate factors and was therefore not considered.

To establish meaningful groups of items, the reduced item battery was first analysed by exploratory factor analysis (for half of the sample). Theoretical considerations (drawn from store image literature) lead to the assumption that the underlying factors are probably not independent of each other. Instead of the usual orthogonal factor rotation, we therefore employed an oblique rotation, which allows for a correlation of the factors (KMO=.572; Orthogonal factor rotation, we therefore employed an oblique rotation, which allows for a correlation of the factors. A Chi2=244.6 (sign.=.000). The results of the factor analysis are shown in table 4.

Three factors were extracted, which can be interpreted as follows:

• The first factor can be interpreted as a comprehensively understood quality of performance.
• The second factor is basically made up of two items describing the scope of offers of a store.
• Only one item loads highly on the third factor, the price. This factor will be labelled “price level”.

This result confirms the results a study by Doyle and Fenwick (1974/75), who used multidimensional scaling to extract quality, selection and price as the central dimensions of food store perception, three variables which are very close to our findings.

To test this result further (and due to the rather heterogeneous results in prior store image research), again the other half of the sample was used for a confirmatory factor analysis. A GFI of .962, a AGFI of .912, a RMR-value of .053, indicator reliabilities, factor reliabilities and explained variance of the three latent variables all imply a good model fit. All in all, the three-dimensional structure of store attribute perception finds strong support in the data. For the further analysis, the factor values of an exploratory factor analysis on the full sample were used as perception variables (KMO=.787; Chi2=1.066.8 (sign.=.000), the three factors explain 73.3% of the total variance).

Test of Hypotheses

After assessment of the attitude scale reliability, clustering of respondents by their shopping orientations and extracting the central dimensions of perception, the hypotheses are examined. The level of analysis chosen were the differences between the different shopper segments. Since certain differences in perceptions and attitudes among groups might be dependent on the evaluated retail stores (the seven retail stores were evaluated differently among the different dimensions), consideration of whether there is an even distribution of the seven retail stores in the four shopper clusters must be made. A cross-tabulation showed that this was not the case. As a consequence, a test of differences must be performed on the level of each of the seven retail stores examined.

Shopping Orientations and Perception. As a first step to exemplify the analysis – the cluster means for the perception factors for a single store (store C) are compared (see table 5).

The factor values for factor 1 are all below average (which equals null for all respondents and all stores in the sample) and there are only slight differences among the clusters. The scope of offers is also evaluated negatively by all four segments, with almost no difference between the consumer groups. The price level, as third factor, is evaluated uniformly and very positively (i.e. as “low prices”) by all consumer groups. Again, shopping orientations seem to have had no influence on this evaluation as no significant differences in the assessment are seen.

It would be too complex to perform this comparison for every store (three variables for four clusters for the perception, another six variables for four clusters for the attitude, both for seven retailers), so we continue the analysis on the level of the F-ratios of the ANOVA which indicate the heterogeneity of the results for each cluster and combine them in a single value. Table 6 shows the F-ratios for the perception variables for all seven stores (note: the last column in table 6 is equal to the F-Ratio column in table 5; the other figures in table 6 are the equivalent values for the other stores). Significant differences can be seen only in a number of cases:

• For quality of performance, there are significant differences in customer rating for stores A, B and E, which indicates an influence of shopping motives for them. The other four stores receive homogeneous ratings from each group.
• For scope of offers, the perception for stores C and E is heterogeneous among respondent groups; shopping orientations seem to influence the perception of this variable for those stores.
• For price level, perception is homogeneous for every store except store D.

### TABLE 3
Cluster Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
<th>Cluster 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope orientation</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality orientation</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price orientation</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time orientation</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of respondents 203 46 169 142

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
<th>Cluster 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clusters 2 and 4</td>
<td>331.9</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters 1 and 2</td>
<td>201.7</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters 2 and 4</td>
<td>101.2</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences in means not sign. following Scheffé (p=.05)
Summarising, it can be observed, that the majority of perception variables (15 out of 21) do not show any significant differences among the customer clusters. Perception is, all in all, differing from the expectation formulated in hypothesis 1, rather homogeneous and does not seem to be strongly influenced by the different shopping orientations of consumers. While this finding might partly be attributed to the small cluster size in some cases, it clearly shows, that inter-cluster differences are rather small.

Shopping Orientations and Attitude. Again, the potential influence of shopping orientations on the attitude is analysed for each store separately on the level of the F-ratios of the ANOVA. Concerning attitude and its indicators, table 7 shows that significant and highly significant differences between the consumer clusters are frequently found in the data (26 of 42 variables display heterogeneity among consumer groups): Sympathy is judged heterogeneously (for the same store) for four out of seven stores, trust for three, intention to recommend the store to friends for four, commitment for six and differentiation for four stores. Finally the attitude factor itself receives heterogeneous results for five stores. Overall, heterogeneous results dominate this table, showing that the attitude factor itself receives heterogeneous results for five stores. It is, however, interesting to see that again some stores (e.g. G, E and B) are judged very heterogeneously by different groups while others (C and D, two of the discounters) seem to appeal equally to all consumer groups. Differing results for the heterogeneity can be interpreted as a higher or lower degree of polarisation of a retail store. It might describe how closely a certain store’s features are customised to a certain customer group or appeal to the mass market.

CONCLUSION

There are three main contributions of this study. Central dimensions of shoppers’ perceptions concerning food shopping were extracted (quality of performance, scope of offers, price level), confirming the results of an earlier study (Doyle and Fenwick 1974/75).

Also, on the basis of four central dimensions of shopping orientations (scope orientation, quality orientation, price orientation and time orientation), four segments of shoppers differing significantly in the configuration of needs looked for to be satisfied by the shopping activity were identified: one-stop shoppers, time-pressed price shoppers, dedicated quality shoppers, demanding shoppers. This only partly mirrors previous taxonomies, which might imply that shopping orientations (and with them food shopper segments) have been changing over the last decades.

Finally, the investigation supports the hypothesis, that consumers differ in their attitude towards a food store according to their shopping orientations, i.e. their assessment of certain higher-order,
long-term store characteristics are strongly influenced by their shopping orientations. However, the hypothesis, that this is also the case for the perception of store attributes was not supported by the data. Future studies could use larger sample sizes to analyse this finding and also analyse more complex relations between the constructs orientations, perception, and attitude.

However, our results imply that the differences between the consumers segments for the perception factors are lower than those for the attitude. The lower differences among consumer segments in the perception of retail stores can be attributed to the fact that for perception, consumers can use rational, cognitively evaluable cues, which are less influenced by subjective interpretations. So, evaluation of these items is rather objective and shopping orientations do not exert a strong influence. Since subjectivity of attitude is much higher and the assessment more emotional, shopping orientations seem to have considerably stronger influence on attitude towards a store.

REFERENCES

Birtwistle, Grete, Ian Clarke, and Paul Freathy (1999), „Store image in the UK fashion sector: consumer versus retailer perceptions,” The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research, 9 (1), 1-16.


Luomala, Harri (2003), „Understanding how retail environments are perceived,” International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research, 13 (3), 279-300.
Moschis, George (1976), „Shopping orientations and consumer uses of information,” Journal of Retailing, 52 (2), 61-70.