

DOES GENDER REALLY AFFECT SHOPPING PATTERNS?

IOANA-NICOLETA ABRUDAN¹

ABSTRACT. Movies, jokes, books and folklore are full of stereotypes on the differences between men and women. Of these, one of the most known and accepted, even in academic literature, is related to differences in shopping behavior of men and women. Women are “renowned” for indulging themselves in shopping as a form of therapy, of relaxation and pastime. Departing from this largely accepted dogma, that women love shopping, and that they spend more time and money on both products and services, a generalization on differences on all aspects of shopping may be inferred. But are they really that different from men with respect to shopping habits? The aim of the present study is to question whether these assumptions about the differences between women and men shopping behavior are indeed true. The results indicate differences in shopping orientations, but no statistically significant differences regarding the amount of money and time spent shopping and similarities on all the other facets of shopping included in the study - formats preferred, days of the week spent shopping, distance traveled to the stores, accompanying parties when shopping, impulse shopping behavior.

Key words: *shopping orientation, shopping behavior, shopping pattern, gender*

JEL Classification: M31

¹ Lecturer, Department of Marketing, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Babes-Bolyai University Cluj-Napoca, ioana.abrudan@econ.ubbcluj.ro

1. Introduction and Review of Literature

Many stores and shopping centers in Romania provide a broad and deep assortment of products for females, while for men there are a lot fewer available choices. The question is whether this strategy is consistent with market demand and the situation among buyers. Do men really spend, as it is believed, less time and money shopping than women? Is their shopping pattern really different from that of women?

Gender is an important variable used in marketing to segment consumers (Meyers-Levy and Sternthal, 1991). The influence of gender upon decision-making and shopping behavior has been a subject of special interest in the field of marketing. (Hernandez et al, 2011, p. 118). Shopping is stereotypically a female activity (Buttle, 1992). Females are more likely than males to shop specific items such as grocery and clothes, while males are in charge of shopping specialized items (e.g. life insurance, cars, and house maintenance). However, some authors indicate that this trend is gradually reducing since men are engaging more in shopping activities, as the importance of women on the labor market is increasing and as their roles tend to overlap gradually (Otnes and McGrath, 2001; Chebat et al, 2005; Carpenter and Brodsahl, 2011). Considering the growing importance of male consumers in the shopping context, understanding gender differences can be useful in helping retailers implement an appropriate marketing strategy (Lee and Trim, 2006; Pan and Zinkhan, 2006; Helgesen and Nettet, 2010; Maurer Herter et al, 2014). Despite the fact that the popular press, particularly book publishing, has focused extensive interest in issues related to gender, comparison between men and women's shopping behavior in malls has only recently emerged as a study topic (Evans et al, 1996). In fact, practitioners seem to have examined this area in more depth than academics (Raajpoot et al, 2008, p. 827).

This study aims to verify, in autochthonous context, whether there are differences between shopping orientations of men and women, and if they are to be found at the level of actual purchase behavior as well.

The research of Jackson et al (2011) indicates that males and females exhibit different attitudes and behaviors related to shopping. Shopping behavior is defined through its facets: store formats chosen, frequency of stores visits and acquisitions and other aspects relevant to purchasing behavior: amount of time and money spent, distance traveled for shopping, shopping days, accompanying persons and impulse purchases.

Gender differences in shopping orientations

Shopping orientation is an important variable of shoppers' behavior (Banyte et al, 2015, p. 697), largely documented in literature. The concept is tightly related to that of motivation, often being considered as equivalent (Bellenger & Korgaonkar, 1980; Stoltman et al, 1991). Shopping orientation describes general consumers' inclination to shopping (Visser & Du Preez, 2001). Orientations can be very diverse: economization, accessibility, experiment, leisure, self-actualization, social interaction, sensory stimulation, etc. Shopping orientation is composed of a personal dimension (activities, interests, opinions, motives, needs and preferences) and of a behavioral one, related to the purchase of goods and services. The assumption is that females have a more pronounced hedonic orientation, while men a more utilitarian one. The hypothesis to be tested in this research with respect to shopping orientations is:

H1: Gender influences shopping orientation.

Orientation towards price comparison and economy is reflected in the present study through the variables „best quality / price ratio” and „discounts”. Some researchers have found out that men are more price sensitive than women (Otnes and McGrath, 2001), and that men often associate the purchase process with a competitive game, they feel winners when they buy the product they want for the lowest price. Noble et al. (2006) however, have not found gender differences in relation to this shopping motive. The assumption in this research is that women are

more motivated by this aspect than men (H_{1A}). As they usually are the primary purchasers for their families, they try to maximize the use of their budget.

Hedonic shopping refers to the emotional aspects of shopping behavior, whereas utilitarian shopping focuses on its rational aspects (Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982; Arnold and Reynolds, 2012). Men are more functional / utilitarian in their shopping orientation, the most frequent motivating factor of their shopping behavior being the need to acquire a product. Meanwhile, women are more strongly influenced by social, experience, identity-related and emotional associations when shopping (Dittmar et al, 2004). According to Shim (1996), boys are more perfectionistic, high-quality-conscious, while girls are more price-conscious, value-for-money, recreational and hedonistic, fashion-conscious and looking for novelty. Other studies have confirmed that men are high on the utilitarian shopping dimension, preferring a better product selection and convenient and fast buying process, while women are more hedonic oriented and enjoy shopping, window shopping, social interaction and browsing more than men (Meyers-Levy and Sternthal, 1991; Polegato and Zaichkowsky, 1994; Alreck and Settle, 2002; Bakewell and Mitchell, 2003; Noble et al, 2006; Raajpoot et al, 2008; Seock and Sauls, 2008; Hansen & Jensen, 2009; Jackson et al, 2011; Maurer Herter et al, 2014; Banyte et al, 2015; Sohail, 2015). Seock and Sauls (2008) agree that the major shopping orientation for men is to acquire the products. Men see shopping as an instrument, while for women it is a means of expression (Noble et al, 2006). Another taxonomy of this dichotomous division of shopping orientations, often met in the literature, is (Hansen & Jensen, 2009, p. 1156): economic (or conventional) shoppers - "problem solvers", who often dislike shopping and approach retail stores from a time - and money - saving point of view, and recreational shoppers - enjoy the act of shopping, see it as an overall experience and emphasize the emotional aspects of shopping activity (Bellenger and Korgaonkar, 1980; Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982; Meyers-Levy and Sternthal, 1991; Polegato and Zaichkowsky, 1994; Seock and Bailey, 2008; Workman and

Cho, 2012; Shephard et al, 2014; Maurer Herter et al, 2014). The hypotheses formulated in this research are that men are more utilitarian oriented, being interested in the products displayed and find shopping tiring (H_{1B}), while women enjoy it (H_{1C}) and browsing more than men. Browsing refers to the examination of a store's merchandise for recreational or informational purposes without a current intent to buy (Noble et al, 2006, p. 182). *Utilitarian orientation* is measured here through variables such as „shopping is tiring“, „I only go shopping when I need to buy something“, „I am interested in the products displayed, not stores' décor“. *Hedonic orientation* is expressed through the inclination towards window shopping and the pleasure to watch beautifully decorated stores.

Shim (1996) has found that females are searching for new styles and fashion trends when shopping (oriented towards *fashion leadership*), as opposed to boys, who search quality. Noble et al (2006, p. 181) also assert that females seek uniqueness and assortment more than males, but males have a stronger desire to attain information when shopping than females. Other studies have also shown that women indicate higher fashion leadership than men (Cho and Workman, 2011; Shephard et al, 2014). This orientation has been associated by several researchers with hedonic orientation (Kang and Park-Poaps, 2010; Kim and Hong, 2011; Shephard et al, 2014). The hypothesis in this study has been formulated according to these findings: Women are motivated by search for new trends when going shopping (H_{1D}).

Another facet of hedonic shopping orientation is *socialization*. Females engage in and maintain *interpersonal affiliations* more than men. In a retailing context this suggests that shopping might afford women the opportunity for social interactions with sales clerks and other retail patrons (Noble et al, 2006, p. 182). The hypothesis of this research is that one of the reasons for which women prefer to go shopping is because they can talk to or watch other people. Hence, women are more motivated than men by the opportunity to socialize (H_{1E}).

Gender differences in shopping behavior

Gender often plays a role in shopping behavior. Between men and women there are both similarities and differences (Hu & Jasper, 2004, p. 130). Certain researchers insist only on the differences, stating that women and men differ in their attitudes and behavior toward shopping (Buttle, 1992; Otnes and McGrath, 2001) and that women have a more positive attitude toward shopping as compared to men (Alreck and Settle, 2002). Raajpoot et al (2008) have found few significant differences between genders, which suggest that there are some differences between the shopping center patronage of men and women, but the differences may not be that large. Following on their research, relative to shopping centers, the current study questions the legitimacy of gender differences in shopping behavior in retail units.

The literature includes several studies that confirm gender differences in *store and shopping center format choice*. When choosing retail format, men prefer uncomplicated and fast shopping (Banyte et al, 2015, p. 696). There are certain store formats that are enjoyed more by one gender than the other. For example, men prefer electronics and computer stores (Harmon and Hill, 2003) and online stores (Alreck and Settle, 2002; Wolin and Korgaonkar, 2003), stores that sell music and movies and sports stores (Hu & Jasper, 2004, p. 123). Women prefer catalogs and physical stores (Alreck and Settle, 2002) and stores that sell accessories and health / beauty products (Hu & Jasper, 2004, p. 123). Other researches, however, have concluded that gender does not condition the behavior in online context (Hernandez et al, 2011, p. 118). Clothing and department stores are equally preferred by both genders. The hypotheses formulated are:

H2: Gender influences frequency of acquisitions for groceries in various store formats.

H3: Gender influences frequency of acquisitions for apparel and footwear in various store formats.

H4: Frequency of shopping centers visits is influenced by gender.

H5: Women buy more frequently than men from shopping center stores.

According to a research carried out by Luceri and Latusi (2012), females' *patronage set* of grocery stores size is wider than males'. A similar conclusion has been iterated by Banyte et al (2015) that men usually shop in one store despite more attractive prices elsewhere. Thus, the hypotheses formulated in this research state that:

H6: Women visit more stores per shopping center trip.

H7: Women buy from more stores than men per shopping center trip.

Regarding the amount of *money spent*, the general assumption is that women spend significantly more than men, because they enjoy this activity more and because they usually are the main purchaser of the family. Thus, research hypotheses have been formulated accordingly. However, Hu & Jasper (2004, p. 121) have not found significant differences in frequency of mall visits and average expenditure between genders.

H.8. Women spend more money than men.

H8.1: Women spend more on groceries than men.

H8.2: Women spend more on apparel and footwear than men.

H8.3: Men spend more on restaurants and cafes than women.

H8.4: Overall, women spend more than men.

Women are usually more involved consumers, *spending* more *time* in stores and shopping centers, comparing and contrasting more options than men (Meyers-Levy and Sternthal, 1991; Fischer and Arnold, 1994; Jackson et al, 2011; Maurer Herter et al, 2014). On the other side, men seem to be more time conscious than women (Noble et al, 2006), they spend significantly less time than women on each mall trip (Hu & Jasper, 2004, p. 114), like fast and facile shopping (Banyte et al, 2015). However, other studies contradict these findings, stating that men are shopping almost as much as women (Otnes and McGrath, 2001; Jackson et al, 2011). The hypothesis articulated in relation with the time spent shopping is:

H9: Women spend more time shopping than men.

The logical assumption would be that they are also willing to *travel* farther to search for products and make purchases and are more flexible than men with respect to the days they go shopping. For men, access to the stores and shopping centers and stores' location are more important than for women, included in top three attributes. This has been proved by several researchers, for example Alreck and Settle (2002) and Raajpoot et al (2008). The hypotheses tested in this research are:

H10: The two genders are similar with regard to the days of the week they patronage shopping centers.

H11: Women travel longer distances from home to the shopping centers they visit.

H12: Women travel longer distances from work/education institution to the shopping centers they visit.

Since women view shopping as a means of relaxation and an opportunity to interact with others, while men tend to focus on acquiring information and products, it is expected that there are differences in the *accompanying persons* at shopping for women and men. However, no significant differences regarding this aspect have been identified by Hu & Jasper (2004). Thus, the hypothesis to be analyzed is:

H13: Both men and women have similar habits when choosing the persons to accompany them at shopping.

According to Mortimer (2012), men tend to buy the same goods on a regular basis, but they also buy unplanned things. In addition, male shoppers often buy things for their children impulsively (Banyte et al, 2015). The two genders seem to buy different products on impulse (Dittmar et al, 1995). Women respond better than men to in-store displays (Shephard et al, 2014, p. 279). We assume that:

H14: Women and men display a similar impulse shopping behavior.

H15: Store factors influence women's and men's impulse behavior similarly.

2. Material and Methods

The aim of this study is to test whether there are significant differences in shopping orientations and behavior between men and women. It is part of a broader exploratory research on the shopping behavior in urban areas. For this purpose, Cluj-Napoca, the second largest city in Romania, has been selected. It is a city whose size and maturity of the commercial network makes it suitable for such a research. The respondents have been selected from permanent or temporary residents, at least 15 years of age. As a sampling method, two solutions have been combined, systematic sampling based on Cluj-Napoca's postal codes with quota sampling method, using gender and age of the respondents as variables. Data collection has been performed at respondents' homes to allow for optimum filling in of the questionnaires. The resulting sample includes 642 valid questionnaires.

The variables that make up the hedonistic orientation are: "I like walking through stores" and "I like to shop in beautifully decorated stores", "I often visit the stores to find out the new trends", "I like to talk to or watch people". Utilitarian orientation is defined by the variables "I usually search for discounted products" and "I often visit several stores to find the best price / quality ratio" and "I am only interested in the products displayed, not in stores' décor", "I find shopping tiring", "I only go shopping when I need something". They have been measured on a six-point scale; from "totally agree" to "totally disagree".

Shopping behavior has been described through the frequency of purchases per shopping trip and for a three months period, of shopping trips, the average number of stores visited and where purchases are made per shopping trip, the amount of time and money spent, distance from home or work/education institution to shopping, the accompanying parties, days of the week when shopping is carried out and impulse shopping behavior. Frequency of purchases in stores has been measured on a six levels scale (from "never for the past three months" to "several times a week").

For hypotheses testing cross tabulations between gender and the variables considered have been performed. Each table presents the gender - based structure of respondents' answers in order to adequately outline the variations in opinions and behavior of men and women. Depending on the type of variables, other tests have been applied as well. Chi square tests have been applied for qualitative, nominal variables, while the t-test for quantitative, continuous ones.

3. Results and Discussions

The first aspect that has been analyzed in order to delineate women's shopping behavior from men's is shopping orientation. The hypotheses have been tested using χ^2 test. The results have been included in the two-way table between shopping orientations and gender. The conclusions that can be drawn from the χ^2 test are in line with the literature (Meyers-Levy and Sternthal, 1991; Polegato and Zaichkowsky, 1994; Alreck and Settle, 2002; Bakewell and Mitchell, 2003; Noble et al, 2006; Raajpoot et al, 2008; Seock and Sauls, 2008; Hansen & Jensen, 2009; Jackson et al, 2011; Maurer Herter et al, 2014; Banyte et al, 2015; Sohail, 2015). There are statistically significant differences between men and women with respect to all orientations (see table 1).

DOES GENDER REALLY AFFECT SHOPPING PATTERNS?

Table 1. Shopping orientations for apparel and footwear by gender

Shopping orientation Indicators	Gen-der	Totally disagree	Disagree	Partially disagree	Partially agree	Agree	Totally agree	Mean	Mode	Std. dev.
Best quality / price ratio $\chi^2 = 14.088$; $p = 0.015$	M	52.90%	51.20%	60.80%	43.20%	41.10%	36.80%	4.13	5	1.435
	F	47.10%	48.80%	39.20%	56.80%	58.90%	63.20%	4.47	5	1.356
Discounts $\chi^2 = 12.692$; $p = 0.026$	M	46.70%	54.50%	55.40%	45.40%	41.30%	34.90%	4.06	4	1.312
	F	53.30%	45.50%	44.60%	54.60%	58.70%	65.10%	4.4	4	1.301
Fashion trends $\chi^2 = 22.882$; $p = 0$	M	51.40%	45.90%	55.80%	41.00%	29.90%	25.50%	2.59	1	1.507
	F	48.60%	54.10%	44.20%	59.00%	70.10%	74.50%	3.11	1	1.716
Shopping is tiring $\chi^2 = 31.611$; $p = 0$	M	26.70%	44.40%	34.30%	38.70%	55.70%	59.60%	4.24	5	1.492
	F	73.30%	55.60%	65.70%	61.30%	44.30%	40.40%	3.64	4	1.528
I need to buy something $\chi^2 = 16.917$; $p = 0.005$	M	16.00%	38.50%	41.10%	38.60%	50.30%	51.70%	4.54	5	1.282
	F	84.00%	61.50%	58.90%	61.40%	49.70%	48.30%	4.14	5	1.442
The products displayed, not stores decor $\chi^2 = 12.686$; $p = 0.027$	M	34.20%	42.70%	34.90%	45.30%	54.50%	47.10%	4.02	5	1.392
	F	65.80%	57.30%	65.10%	54.70%	45.50%	52.90%	3.72	3	1.434
Window shopping $\chi^2 = 70.616$; $p = 0$	M	66.70%	58.20%	52.10%	33.30%	21.20%	23.60%	2.66	1	1.445
	F	33.30%	41.80%	47.90%	66.70%	78.80%	76.40%	3.68	4	1.506
See beautifully decorated stores $\chi^2 = 16.077$; $p = 0.007$	M	54.40%	54.80%	53.60%	42.60%	35.30%	36.10%	3.57	4	1.425
	F	45.60%	45.20%	46.40%	57.40%	64.70%	63.90%	3.98	4	1.369
To talk to or watch people $\chi^2 = 12.493$; $p = 0.029$	M	50.20%	47.50%	41.10%	28.60%	40.50%	30.80%	2.15	1	1.265
	F	49.80%	52.50%	58.90%	71.40%	59.50%	69.20%	2.47	1	1.38

Women are primarily motivated by hedonic facets of shopping (finding out the latest trends, relaxing while window shopping, admiring beautifully decorated stores and socializing). Even though they like to search for what they consider the best quality / price ratio and they love discounts, somehow this search may be considered treasure hunting and thus a hedonic orientation. Men, on the other hand, seem to be more motivated by utilitarian aspects when shopping. They agree to a larger extent than women with sentences that refer to shopping as a duty and as a tiring activity (both mean and mode are larger for men than for women). So the hypothesis 1 that gender affects shopping orientations is fully supported.

Table 2. Frequency of groceries acquisitions per store formats and gender

Store formats Indicators	Gender	Never	Once	Once a month	2-3 times per month	Once a week	Several times a week	Mean	Mode	Standard Deviation
Markets	M	49.00%	50.50%	48.40%	39.80%	35.10%	40.70%	3.06	1	1.745
$\chi^2 = 8.28$; $p = 0.141$	F	51.00%	49.50%	51.60%	60.20%	64.90%	59.30%	3.4	1	1.769
Neigh.	M	47.40%	45.20%	54.30%	39.50%	46.00%	40.70%	3.7	6	1.893
$\chi^2 = 5.142$; $p = 0.399$	F	52.60%	54.80%	45.70%	60.50%	54.00%	59.30%	3.9	6	1.897
Spec. stores	M	57.10%	49.00%	40.50%	35.10%	27.80%	44.80%	2.42	1	1.52
$\chi^2 = 25.778$; $p = 0$	F	42.90%	51.00%	59.50%	64.90%	72.20%	55.20%	2.99	1	1.545
Super	M	44.20%	44.10%	46.40%	46.40%	40.40%	46.80%	3.64	4	1.477
$\chi^2 = 1.533$; $p = 0.909$	F	55.80%	55.90%	53.60%	53.60%	59.60%	53.20%	3.67	5	1.487
Hyper	M	46.80%	50.70%	44.80%	44.10%	39.10%	46.40%	3.66	3	1.482
$\chi^2 = 3.09$; $p = 0.686$	F	53.20%	49.30%	55.20%	55.90%	60.90%	53.60%	3.78	5	1.439
C&C	M	43.50%	49.50%	52.40%	23.50%	36.40%		1.53	1	0.87
$\chi^2 = 7.717$; $p = 0.173$	F	56.50%	50.50%	47.60%	76.50%	63.60%	100.00%	1.56	1	1.011
ShC Galleries	M	51.90%	38.30%	42.00%	43.30%	40.30%	53.10%	2.89	1	1.633
$\chi^2 = 7.664$; $p = 0.176$	F	48.10%	61.70%	58.00%	56.70%	59.70%	46.90%	2.95	3	1.508
Online	M	44.40%	40.00%	57.10%	50.00%	50.00%	55.60%	1.33	1	0.87
$\chi^2 = 2.919$; $p = 0.712$	F	55.60%	60.00%	42.90%	50.00%	50.00%	44.40%	1.27	1	0.741
Catalog	M	55.10%	18.80%	16.50%	28.60%	25.00%	33.30%	1.21	1	0.65
$\chi^2 = 71.738$; $p = 0$	F	44.90%	81.20%	83.50%	71.40%	75.00%	66.70%	1.7	1	0.957
Other	M	43.50%	42.90%	75.00%		50.00%	50.00%	1.19	1	0.802
$\chi^2 = 4.799$; $p = 0.441$	F	56.50%	57.10%	25.00%	100.00%	50.00%	50.00%	1.21	1	0.817

Notes: Neigh. = neighborhood stores; Spec. stores = specialty stores; Super = supermarkets; Hyper = hypermarkets; C&C = Cash & Carry stores; ShC galleries = shopping centers galleries; Online = online stores; Cat. = catalog retailing; Other = other retail formats

In order to test the differences in shopping behavior of men and women, two categories of most frequently purchased products have been analyzed: groceries and apparel and footwear. There are no differences between shopping behavior of males and females in terms of formats from which they purchase groceries. Except for specialized shops, where $\chi^2 = 25.778$ and $p = 0$ and catalogs, for which $\chi^2 = 71.738$ and $p = 0$, the significance level exceeds 0.05, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis that between the frequency of purchases made by women and men in various trade formats there are no statistically significant differences. The catalog format is not relevant because the overwhelming majority of buyers have not used it at all in the three months prior to the survey or only once. So, the hypothesis that gender influences the frequency of acquisitions for groceries in various store formats is partially supported.

DOES GENDER REALLY AFFECT SHOPPING PATTERNS?

Table 3. Frequency of apparel and footwear acquisitions per store formats and gender

Store format Indicators		Never	Once	Once a month	2-3 times per month	Once a week	Several times a week	Mean	Mode	Standard deviation
SH	M	50.70%	39.90%	32.40%	26.50%	22.20%	40.00%	1.53	1	0.917
$\chi^2 = 17.666; p = 0.003$	F	49.30%	60.10%	67.60%	73.50%	77.80%	60.00%	1.86	1	1.113
Neigh.	M	47.70%	38.10%	34.10%	40.00%			1.34	1	0.679
$\chi^2 = 8.449; p = 0.133$	F	52.30%	61.90%	65.90%	60.00%	100.00%	100.00%	1.5	1	0.835
Center	M	50.70%	41.80%	32.00%	29.40%	100.00%	50.00%	1.63	1	0.861
$\chi^2 = 15.851; p = 0.007$	F	49.30%	58.20%	68.00%	70.60%		50.00%	1.85	1	0.895
Super	M	45.20%	45.70%	32.70%	43.80%	75.00%	25.00%	1.47	1	0.922
$\chi^2 = 6.718; p = 0.242$	F	54.80%	54.30%	67.30%	56.20%	25.00%	75.00%	1.5	1	0.919
Hyper	M	44.30%	46.20%	42.00%	39.40%	44.40%	40.00%	1.73	1	1.001
$\chi^2 = 0.768; p = 0.979$	F	55.70%	53.80%	58.00%	60.60%	55.60%	60.00%	1.76	1	1.046
C & C	M	44.90%	34.80%	52.40%	62.50%	66.70%		1.25	1	0.685
$\chi^2 = 4.705; p = 0.319$	F	55.10%	65.20%	47.60%	37.50%	33.30%		1.22	1	0.567
ShC	M	43.90%	45.60%	46.30%	38.40%	46.20%	37.50%	2.39	3	1.149
$\chi^2 = 1.83; p = 0.872$	F	56.10%	54.40%	53.70%	61.60%	53.80%	62.50%	2.43	3	1.197
Online	M	44.00%	50.00%	35.00%	25.00%	100.00%	100.00%	1.23	1	0.657
$\chi^2 = 5.953; p = 0.311$	F	56.00%	50.00%	65.00%	75.00%			1.19	1	0.531
Catalog	M	45.80%	37.50%	8.30%				1.06	1	0.253
$\chi^2 = 9.932; p = 0.019$	F	54.20%	62.50%	91.70%	100.00%			1.16	1	0.497
Other	M	43.80%	36.40%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%		1.16	1	0.592
$\chi^2 = 9.051; p = 0.06$	F	56.20%	63.60%					1.04	1	0.205

Notes: SH= second-hand stores; Neigh. = neighborhood stores; Center = city center stores; Super = supermarkets; Hyper = hypermarkets; C&C = Cash & Carry stores; ShC = shopping centers; Online = online stores; Cat. = catalog retailing; Other = other retail formats (e.g. markets)

Analyzing the formats used for apparel and footwear shopping, there are only certain differences with regard to shopping in second - hand stores, city center stores and catalog - women frequent them more often than men. The number of people that have purchased in other formats is extremely small, so there is no use in examining this category. The results show for all the other types of stores similar behavior of respondents, regardless of gender. So, the hypothesis that gender influences the frequency of acquisitions for apparel and footwear in various store formats is partially supported.

Table 4. Frequency of shopping centers visits by gender

	Gender	Never	Once	Once a month	2-3 times per month	Once a week	Several times a week	Mean	Mode	Standard deviation
Mall (Polus)	M	44.80%	36.60%	41.70%	49.40%	52.90%	41.40%	3.11	4	1.46
$\chi^2 = 6.630$; $p = 0.25$	F	55.20%	63.40%	58.30%	50.60%	47.10%	58.60%	2.96	3	1.433
Mall (Iulius)	M	46.70%	39.50%	42.50%	46.90%	46.00%	45.10%	3.43	4	1.669
$\chi^2 = 1.688$; $p = 0.89$	F	53.30%	60.50%	57.50%	53.10%	54.00%	54.90%	3.39	4	1.648
Comm. (Auchan)	M	46.80%	41.60%	44.60%	47.30%	36.70%	36.40%	2.04	1	1.249
$\chi^2 = 2.399$; $p = 0.792$	F	53.20%	58.40%	55.40%	52.70%	63.30%	63.60%	2.12	1	1.3
Comm. (Cora)	M	46.60%	44.50%	42.40%	37.50%	50.00%	54.50%	2.07	1	1.328
$\chi^2 = 2.72$; 0.743	F	53.40%	55.50%	57.60%	62.50%	50.00%	45.50%	2.12	1	1.288
Comm. (Central)	M	47.60%	47.00%	32.90%	34.50%	11.10%		1.56	1	0.82
$\chi^2 = 11.856$; $p = 0.037$	F	52.40%	53.00%	67.10%	65.50%	88.90%	100.00%	1.79	1	1.048
Neigh. (Sora)	M	47.00%	41.20%	35.20%	40.00%	100.00%	42.90%	1.52	1	0.969
$\chi^2 = 5.034$; $p = 0.412$	F	53.00%	58.80%	64.80%	60.00%		57.10%	1.63	1	1.012
Neigh. (Sigma)	M	45.10%	45.70%	43.50%	45.80%	27.30%	28.60%	1.38	1	0.899
$\chi^2 = 2.178$; $p = 0.824$	F	54.90%	54.30%	56.50%	54.20%	72.70%	71.40%	1.45	1	1.05
Neigh. (Winmarkt)	M	44.80%	45.20%	26.70%	60.00%	33.30%	75.00%	1.22	1	0.764
$\chi^2 = 4.567$; $p = 0.471$	F	55.20%	54.80%	73.30%	40.00%	66.70%	25.00%	1.2	1	0.646
Neigh. (Leul)	M	44.40%	50.60%	48.90%	30.40%	50.00%	38.50%	1.55	1	1.077
$\chi^2 = 3.737$; $p = 0.588$	F	55.60%	49.40%	51.10%	69.60%	50.00%	61.50%	1.58	1	1.151
Neigh. (Mărăști)	M	46.90%	48.80%	39.40%	35.90%	45.50%	38.10%	2.01	1	1.318
$\chi^2 = 4.908$; $p = 0.427$	F	53.10%	51.20%	60.60%	64.10%	54.50%	61.90%	2.19	1	1.403
Neigh. (Kaufland)	M	53.80%	40.00%	50.00%	40.00%	20.00%	50.00%	2.09	1	1.743
$\chi^2 = 2.171$; $p = 0.825$	F	46.20%	60.00%	50.00%	60.00%	80.00%	50.00%	2.6	1	1.871
Others	M	43.90%	71.40%	44.40%	40.00%	16.70%	60.00%	1.34	1	1.019
$\chi^2 = 4.535$; $p = 0.475$	F	56.10%	28.60%	55.60%	60.00%	83.30%	40.00%	1.37	1	1.065

Notes: Neigh. = neighborhood shopping centers; Comm. = community shopping centers.

According to the data in table 4, the hypothesis that gender influences the frequency of shopping centers visits is not supported, except for one type of community center. In this case the analysis is not relevant, as 60.4% of men and 53.4% of women have not visited this shopping center for the three months prior to the survey or only once (27.2% of men and 24.7% of women). The remaining number of 35 men and 77 women that have visited more frequent Central shopping center is not enough to draw a decisive conclusion. So, we can say that hypothesis 4 is rejected. Men and women show similar shopping behavior with respect to shopping centers.

DOES GENDER REALLY AFFECT SHOPPING PATTERNS?

Table 5. Frequency of acquisitions from shopping centers stores by gender

	Gender	Never	Once	Once a month	2-3 times per month	Once a week	Several times a week	Mean	Mode	Standard deviation
Super/ hypermarket - groceries	M	64.70%	46.20%	46.10%	44.90%	40.10%	45.00%	4.15	4	1.325
$\chi^2 = 4.065$; $p = 0.54$	F	35.30%	53.80%	53.90%	55.10%	59.90%	55.00%	4.27	4	1.225
Super/ hypermarket - others	M	50.00%	40.80%	44.60%	52.30%	34.60%	38.10%	3.11	3	1.287
$\chi^2 = 8.125$; $p = 0.15$	F	50.00%	59.20%	55.40%	47.70%	65.40%	61.90%	3.2	3	1.335
Clothing & footwear	M	51.60%	45.50%	45.80%	35.80%	23.50%	22.20%	2.43	3	1.066
$\chi^2 = 10.067$; $p = 0.073$	F	48.40%	54.50%	54.20%	64.20%	76.50%	77.80%	2.7	3	1.18
Jewelry & accessories	M	53.00%	41.40%	27.00%	6.70%	40.00%	33.30%	1.45	1	0.783
$\chi^2 = 37.108$; $p = 0$	F	47.00%	58.60%	73.00%	93.30%	60.00%	66.70%	1.9	1	1.074
Sports and sportswear	M	40.50%	46.70%	54.70%	35.10%	40.00%	75.00%	1.93	1	1.016
$\chi^2 = 8.546$; $p = 0.129$	F	59.50%	53.30%	45.30%	64.90%	60.00%	25.00%	1.82	1	0.996
Electronics & appliances	M	42.40%	44.30%	57.70%	46.20%	75.00%	50.00%	1.7	1	0.887
$\chi^2 = 5.788$; $p = 0.327$	F	57.60%	55.70%	42.30%	53.80%	25.00%	50.00%	1.57	1	0.778
Home decorations	M	49.30%	39.80%	37.70%	46.70%	12.50%		1.53	1	0.792
$\chi^2 = 10.744$; $p = 0.057$	F	50.70%	60.20%	62.30%	53.30%	87.50%	100.00%	1.74	1	0.973
Cosmetics	M	60.30%	43.70%	34.70%	26.20%	46.20%	37.50%	2.03	1	1.116
$\chi^2 = 32.968$; $p = 0$	F	39.70%	56.30%	65.30%	73.80%	53.80%	62.50%	2.49	2	1.133
Bookstores and toys	M	44.80%	43.10%	50.70%	30.60%	58.30%	66.70%	1.82	1	1.134
$\chi^2 = 6.175$; $p = 0.29$	F	55.20%	56.90%	49.30%	69.40%	41.70%	33.30%	1.8	1	1.067
Restaurants, cafes, bars	M	43.50%	37.50%	44.40%	52.10%	60.00%	35.00%	2.57	1	1.62
$\chi^2 = 9.411$; $p = 0.094$	F	56.50%	62.50%	55.60%	47.90%	40.00%	65.00%	2.44	1	1.622
Entertainment (cinema)	M	41.70%	45.30%	44.80%	55.80%	46.70%	40.00%	2.18	1	1.365
$\chi^2 = 5.134$; $p = 0.4$	F	58.30%	54.70%	55.20%	44.20%	53.30%	60.00%	2	1	1.31
Dry cleaners, bank, beauty salon	M	47.50%	41.50%	42.20%	37.00%	46.70%	25.00%	1.68	1	1.084
$\chi^2 = 3.653$; $p = 0.6$	F	52.50%	58.50%	57.80%	63.00%	53.30%	75.00%	1.83	1	1.188
Other services	M	43.10%	39.00%	46.40%	55.60%	25.00%	42.90%	1.37	1	0.775
$\chi^2 = 1.63$; $p = 0.803$	F	56.90%	61.00%	53.60%	44.40%	75.00%	57.10%	1.36	1	0.772

The results presented in table 5, especially χ^2 values and their significance levels, demonstrate no relationship between gender and acquisitions from shopping centers units. The only two exceptions are for two categories of products which are, by their nature, purchased more frequently by women – jewelry and accessories and cosmetics. So, we find evidence that hypothesis 5 is partially supported, in line with the findings of Hu & Jasper (2004).

Table 6. Average number of stores visited and where purchases are made per shopping trip to the shopping center

		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Diff.	Std. Er. Diff.	95% Conf. Int. of the Diff		Gender	Mean	Std. dev.	Std. Er. Mean
									Lower	Upper				
No. visited	EVA	3.75	0.053	-1.904	590	0.057	-0.657	0.345	-1.334	0.021	M	5.18	3.871	0.238
	EVNA			-1.93	585.261	0.054	-0.657	0.34	-1.325	0.012	F	5.84	4.398	0.243
No. acquisitions	EVA	0.049	0.825	-0.723	590	0.47	-0.09	0.125	-0.335	0.155	M	2.05	1.788	0.11
	EVNA			-0.696	451.971	0.487	-0.09	0.13	-0.345	0.165	F	2.18	1.242	0.069

Notes: No. visited = Number of stores visited during a visit at the shopping center; No. acquisitions = Number of stores where acquisitions are made during a visit at the shopping center; F - Levene's Test for Equality of Variances; t - t-test for Equality of Means; EVA = Equal variances assumed; EVNA = Equal variances not assumed; Mean diff. = mean difference; Std. Error Diff. = Standard error difference; Conf. Int. of the Difference = Confidence Interval of the Difference; Std. dev. = standard deviation; Std. Er. Mean = Standard error mean.

In table 6, the t-test results are reported twice. The first line ("**equal variances assumed**") undertakes that the assumption of equal variances has been met. This is the case when significance values for Levene's Test for Equality of Variances (F) are more than 0.05. Both for the number of stores visited and where purchases are made, the sig. value for F (0.053 and 0.825) indicates, therefore, equality of variances. The corresponding value of the t test is on the first line. The independent samples t-test compares the difference in the means from the two groups to a given value (usually 0). In other words, it tests whether the difference in the means is 0. The significance level (2-tailed) in both cases for the t test is above 0.05 (0.057 and 0.47), which signifies that, on average, women have not visited or have not made purchases at a statistically significant different number of stores than men; $t = -1.904$, $p = 0.057$ and $t = -0.723$, $p = 0.47$. This conclusion is reinforced by the mean values for both men and women in the case of number of stores visited and used for purchases, which are very close to one another (5.18 and 5.84 for stores visited and 2.05 and 2.18 for those where purchases are made). Therefore, hypotheses 6 and 7 are rejected.

DOES GENDER REALLY AFFECT SHOPPING PATTERNS?

Table 7. Amount of money and time spent per visit at shopping centers

		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	Mean Diff.	Std. Er. Diff.	95% Conf. Int. of the Diff		Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation
									Lower	Upper			
Groceries	EVA	4.908	0.027	1.55	335	0.122	35.313	22.78	-9.497	80.122	M	202.95	278.326
	EVNA			1.446	198.457	0.15	35.313	24.421	-12.845	83.47	F	167.63	124.517
Apparel & footwear	EVA	0.003	0.955	0.459	335	0.646	9.492	20.66	-31.148	50.132	M	173.01	192.611
	EVNA			0.458	315.62	0.648	9.492	20.743	-31.321	50.305	F	163.52	185.301
Rest. & cafes	EVA	0.019	0.891	0.488	335	0.626	1.881	3.856	-5.704	9.466	M	25.25	33.913
	EVNA			0.491	328.211	0.624	1.881	3.83	-5.653	9.415	F	23.37	36.214
Total amount spent	EVA	1.429	0.233	1.239	335	0.216	47.419	38.282	-27.885	122.723	M	350.48	417.799
	EVNA			1.191	253.497	0.235	47.419	39.802	-30.965	125.803	F	303.06	282.204
Time spent	EVA	0.065	0.798	-1.903	335	0.058	-0.213	0.112	-0.434	0.007	M	3.15	1.044
	EVNA			-1.896	315.818	0.059	-0.213	0.113	-0.435	0.008	F	3.37	1.006

In case of groceries, the sig. value for the F test is less than 0.05, which means that the null hypothesis of equal variances is rejected and thus the second line of t-test results, for equal variances not assumed, must be used. The chance of finding a difference of 35.313 lei or a larger absolute difference between the two means is about 15%. Since this is a fair chance, we do not reject the hypothesis that men and women spend equal amounts of money on groceries. Since the p-value is two-tailed, this means that the 15% chance consists of a 7.5% chance of finding a mean difference smaller than 35 lei, and another 7.5% chance for a difference larger than 35 lei. Therefore, it seems that men and women tend to spent equal amounts of money on groceries. Thus, hypothesis 8.1 is rejected.

For the total amount of money spent, and that on apparel and footwear, restaurants and cafes, the assumption of equality of variances is not met (sig. = 0.233, 0.955 and 0.891, respectively). The significance values (2-tailed) for the t test (0.216, 0.646 and 0.626), on the lines of equal variances not assumed, indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the sums of money spent by men and women on these categories of goods and services and overall. Therefore, hypotheses 8.2, 8.3 and 8.4 are also rejected, even though, for all categories of products and services, men tend to spend more than women. The conclusions are in line with those of Hu & Jasper (2004). For groceries, the mean value in case of men is around 203 lei, while for

women 168 lei; for apparel and footwear, 173 and 163, respectively, while for all products around 350 and 303. The difference may be caused by women's availability to find the best prices or price/quality ratio, while men do not exhibit this orientation.

The variable average time spent per visit at the shopping center has the following categories: under 30 minutes (coded „1”), between 30 minutes and 1 hour (labeled „2”), 1.5 - 2 hours („3”), 2.5 - 3 hours („4”), 3.5 - 4 hours („5”), over 4 hours („6”). The mean time spent at the shopping center calculated for both men and women is around 3 (3.15 and 3.37). This indicates that the average time spent is around 2 hours. Even though women tend to spend, on average (mean = 3.37), a little bit more time shopping than men (mean = 3.15), this difference is not statistically significant ($t = -1.903$, $p = 0.058$). Thus, men and women spend equal amounts of time shopping, which means hypothesis 9 is also rejected. The results confirm those obtained by Otnes and McGrath (2001) and Jackson et al (2011).

Table 8. Usual days of the week for shopping in shopping centers

Shopping center days / Indicators	Gender	Monday -Wednesday	Thursday - Friday	Saturday - Sunday	Any day	
$\chi^2 = 5.002$; $p = 0.287$	M	32.00%	37.10%	44.40%	47.70%	
	F	68.00%	62.90%	55.60%	52.30%	
Distance from home to shopping center (minutes by car)	Gender	Under 5 minutes	5-10 minutes	10-20 minutes	20-40 min.	40+
	M	51.20%	43.60%	43.10%	44.90%	50.00%
$\chi^2 = 1.814$; $p = 0.77$	F	48.80%	56.40%	56.90%	55.10%	50.00%
	Gender	Under 5 minutes	5-10 minutes	10-20 minutes	20-40 min.	40+
Distance from work / school to shopping center (minutes by car)	M	46.90%	40.90%	48.70%	45.60%	45.80%
	F	53.10%	59.10%	51.30%	54.40%	54.20%

Pearson's chi square (χ^2) coefficient (5.002) and its significance level (0.287) indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between men and women in the days they visit shopping centers. Therefore, hypothesis 10 is accepted. And so are hypotheses 11 and 12, as the significance levels for chi square in both cases exceed the 0.05 threshold. This suggests that women, on average, are not willing to travel more than men to shopping centers. A possible explanation may be the fact that women are just as busy as men are, and, even though they would like to spend more time shopping, they cannot afford it.

DOES GENDER REALLY AFFECT SHOPPING PATTERNS?

Table 9. Shopping as a social activity

Variables / Indicators	Gender	Nobody	Husband (wife)/ partner	Children	Other relatives	Friends
Accompanying persons at shopping	M	39.50%	50.90%	15.00%	38.10%	44.10%
	F	60.50%	49.10%	85.00%	61.90%	55.90%

$\chi^2 = 20.16$; $p = 0.001$

From the answers regarding the accompanying parties at shopping it is obvious that women tend to do shopping with their children much more than men (85% and 15% of people shopping with children). Other than that, no statistically significant differences may be noted between the two genders. Overall, there is also no statistically significant difference, so hypothesis 13 is accepted.

Table 10. Impulse shopping behavior

Follow the shopping list	Gender	Never or very rarely	Rarely	Fairly rarely	Pretty often	Often	Very often or all the time	I do not have lists
Groceries	M	35,60%	54,50%	39,10%	42,40%	40,00%	46,40%	49,00%
	F	64,40%	45,50%	60,90%	57,60%	60,00%	53,60%	51,00%
Apparel & footwear	M	44,70%	40,00%	39,70%	36,80%	46,40%	45,60%	48,30%
	F	55,30%	60,00%	60,30%	63,20%	53,60%	54,40%	51,70%

$\chi^2 = 6.798$; $p = 0.340$
 $\chi^2 = 4.207$; $p = 0.649$

Again, contrary to the hypothesis formulated, both men and women do not follow the shopping list they have prepared prior to going to the stores. This takes place regardless of the category of products purchased, groceries or apparel and footwear. Thus, hypothesis 14 is accepted.

Table 11. Influence factors on impulse shopping behavior

Gender	Price	Special offers	Products found	Products merchandising	Store atmosphere	Store personnel
M	39.1%	42%	39.2%	46.2%	33.3%	40%
F	60.9%	58%	60.8%	53.8%	66.7%	60%
	$\chi^2 = 1.354$ $p = 0.245$	$\chi^2 = 0.217$ $p = 0.641$	$\chi^2 = 1.703$ $p = 0.192$	$\chi^2 = 0.056$ $p = 0.813$	$\chi^2 = 0.466$ $p = 0.495$	$\chi^2 = 0.055$ $p = 0.814$

Apparently, women respond better to store stimuli designed to influence impulse shopping behavior. For each of the factors the percentage of women that have been stimulated to purchase more or different products is higher. However, this difference is not statistically significant, as χ^2 and its significance levels prove. Thus, hypothesis 15 is accepted as well.

4. Conclusions

The results indicate differences in shopping orientations. Women are primarily motivated by hedonic facets of shopping (finding out the latest trends, relaxing while window shopping, admiring beautifully decorated stores and socializing). Even though they like to search for what they consider the best quality / price ratio and they love discounts, somehow this search may be considered treasure hunting and thus a hedonic orientation. Men, on the other hand, seem to be more motivated by utilitarian aspects and do not show great interest in this activity.

There are certain differences in the frequency of shopping in some of the store formats analyzed for both groceries and apparel and footwear. With respect to shopping centers, men and women show similar shopping behavior. No relationships between gender and acquisitions from shopping centers units may be revealed. The only two exceptions are for two categories of products which are, by their nature, purchased more frequently by women – jewelry and accessories and cosmetics. On average, women do not visit or make purchases at a statistically significant different number of stores than men in shopping centers and spend similar amounts of money and time per visit at a shopping center. Also, men and women display similar behavior in selecting the days to go shopping, the persons to accompany them and the shopping center they visit; women are not willing to travel longer distances than men to go to the shopping center. No evidence has been found, as well, that any of the genders is easier to be influenced to make impulse purchases than the other.

DOES GENDER REALLY AFFECT SHOPPING PATTERNS?

In conclusion, it can be stated that no statistically significant differences in shopping behavior of the two genders can be outlined. Men and women are similar in the amount of time and money spent shopping and all the other facets of shopping included in the study (formats preferred, days of the week spent shopping, distance traveled to the stores, accompanying parties when shopping, impulse shopping behavior). However, since they have different shopping orientations, retailers should take them into consideration and adjust stores and shopping centers environment accordingly. In table 12 a summary of the hypotheses and their situation after data analysis is presented.

Table 12. Summary of hypotheses

	Hypothesis	Conclusion
H1	Gender influences shopping orientations.	Accepted
H1A	Women are more price-motivated than men.	Accepted
H1B	Men are more utilitarian oriented than women.	Accepted
H1C	Women are more hedonic in their shopping orientation.	Accepted
H1D	Women are motivated by search for new trends when going shopping.	Accepted
H1E	Women are more motivated than men by the opportunity to socialize.	Accepted
H2	Gender influences frequency of acquisitions for groceries in various store formats.	Partially accepted
H3	Gender influences frequency of acquisitions for apparel and footwear in various store formats.	Partially accepted
H4	Frequency of shopping centers visits is influenced by gender.	Rejected
H5	Women buy more frequently than men from shopping center stores.	Rejected
H6	Women visit more stores per shopping center trip.	Rejected
H7	Women buy from more stores than men per shopping center trip.	Rejected
H8.1	Women spend more on groceries than men.	Rejected
H8.2	Women spend more on apparel and footwear than men.	Rejected
H8.3	Men spend more on restaurants and cafes than women.	Rejected
H8.4	Overall, women spend more than men.	Rejected
H9	Women spend more time shopping than men.	Rejected
H10	The two genders are similar with regard to the days of the week they patronage shopping centers.	Accepted
H11	Women travel longer distances from home to the shopping centers they visit.	Rejected
H12	Women travel longer distances from work/ education institution to the shopping centers they visit.	Rejected
H13	Both men and women have similar habits when choosing the persons to accompany them at shopping.	Accepted
H14	Women and men display a similar impulse shopping behavior.	Accepted
H15	Store factors influence women's and men's impulse behavior similarly.	Accepted

In conclusion, stores and shopping centers managers must take into account men's desires in designing their marketing mix. Men represent a segment as important as that of women, who shop both in their name and for family or others, often substituting their working partners.

REFERENCES

- 1 Alreck, P. and Settle, R.B. (2002) "Gender effects on Internet, catalogue and store shopping", *Journal of Database Marketing*, Jan 2002, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 150-162.
- 2 Arnold, M.J. and Reynolds, K.E. (2012) "Approach and Avoidance Motivation: Investigating Hedonic Consumption in a Retail Setting", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 88 No. 3, pp. 399-41.
- 3 Bakewell, C. and Mitchell, V.W. (2003), "Generation Y female consumer decision-making styles", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol. 31 No.2, pp. 95-106.
- 4 Banyte, J., Rutelione, A. and Jaruseviciute, A. (2015) "Modelling of male shoppers behavior in shopping orientation context", 20th International Scientific Conference Economics and Management (ICEM), *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 213, pp. 694 - 701.
- 5 Bellenger, D.N. and Korgaonkar, P.K. (1980) "Profiling the Recreational Shopper", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 56 No.3, pp. 77-92.
- 6 Buttle, F. (1992) "Shopping Motives Constructionist Perspective", *The Service Industries Journal*, Vol. 12 No. 3 (July), pp. 349-367.
- 7 Carpenter, J.M. and Brosdahl, D.J.C. (2011) "Exploring retail format choice among US males", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol. 39 No. 12 pp. 886 - 898.
- 8 Chebat, J.C., Chebat, C.G. and Therrien, K. (2005), "Lost in a mall, the effects of gender, familiarity with the shopping mall and the shopping values on shoppers' way finding processes", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 58, pp. 1590- 1598.

- 9 Cho, S. and Workman, J.(2011), "Gender, fashion innovativeness and opinion leadership, and need for touch", *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 15 No.3, pp. 363 – 382.
- 10 Dittmar, H., Long, K. and Meek, R. (2004) "Buying on the Internet: Gender Differences in On-line and Conventional Buying Motivations", *Sex Roles*, Vol. 50 No. 5/6, pp. 423-444.
- 11 Evans, K.R., Christiansen, T. and Gill, J.D. (1996) "The Impact of Social Influences and Role Expectations on Shopping Center Patronage Intentions", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 208-218.
- 12 Fischer, E. and Arnold, S.J. (1994), Sex, Gender Identity, Gender Role Attitudes, and Consumer Behavior, *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 163-182.
- 13 Hansen, T. and Jensen, J.M. (2009),"Shopping orientation and online clothing purchases: the role of gender and purchase situation", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 43 No. 9/10, pp. 1154 – 1170.
- 14 Harmon, S.K. and Hill, C.J. (2003) "Gender and coupon use", *The Journal of Product and Brand Management*, Vol. 12 No. 2/3, pp. 166-179.
- 15 Helgesen, O. and Nettet, E., (2010) "Gender, store satisfaction and antecedents: a case study of a grocery store", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 114 – 126.
- 16 Hernández, B., Jiménez, J. and Martín, M.J. (2011) "Age, gender and income: do they really moderate online shopping behaviour?", *Online Information Review*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp. 113 – 133.
- 17 Hirschman, E.C and Holbrook, M.B. (1982) "Hedonic Consumption: Emerging Concepts, Methods and Propositions", *Journal of Marketing*; Vol. 46 No. 3, pp. 92-101.
- 18 Hu, H. and Jasper, C.R. (2004) "Men and Women: A Comparison of Shopping Mall Behavior", *Journal of Shopping Center Research*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 113-131.
- 19 Jackson, V., Stoel, L. and Brantle, A. (2011) "Mall attributes and shopping value: Differences by gender and generational cohort", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 18, pp. 1–9.
- 20 Kang, J. and Park-Poaps, H. (2010) "Hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations of fashion leadership", *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 312- 328.

- 21 Kim, H.S. and Hong, H. (2011) "Fashion Leadership and Hedonic Shopping Motivations of Female Consumers", *Clothing & Textiles Research Journal*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 314-330.
- 22 Lee, Y.I. and Trim, P.R.J. (2006) "Retail Marketing Strategy", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 24 No. 7, pp. 730 – 745.
- 23 Luceri, B. and Latusi, S. (2012), "The importance of consumer characteristics and market structure variables in driving multiple store patronage", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 19, pp. 519-525.
- 24 Maurer Herter, M., Pizzutti dos Santos, C. and Costa Pinto, D. (2014), "Man, I shop like a woman!" The effects of gender and emotions on consumer shopping behaviour outcomes", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol. 42 No. 9, pp. 780 – 804.
- 25 Meyers-Levy, J. and Sternthal, B. (1991) "Gender Differences in the Use of Message Cues and Judgments", *Journal of Marketing Research*; Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 84-96.
- 26 Mortimer, G. (2012), "Toward a shopping typology of primary male grocery shoppers", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol. 40 No. 10, pp. 790 – 810.
- 27 Noble, S.M., Griffith, D.A. and Adjei, M.T. (2006) "Drivers of local merchant loyalty: Understanding the influence of gender and shopping motives", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 82 No. 3, pp. 177–188.
- 28 Otnes, C. and McGrath, M.A. (2001) "Perceptions and realities of male shopping behavior", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 77, pp. 111-137.
- 29 Pan, Y. and Zinkhan, G.M. (2006) "Determinants of retail patronage: A meta-analytical perspective", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 82, No. 3, pp. 229–243.
- 30 Polegato, R. and Zaichkowsky, J.L. (1994) "Family food shopping: Strategies used by husbands and wives", *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, Vol.28 No. 2, pp. 278-299.
- 31 Raajpoot, N.A., Sharma, A. and Chebat, J.C (2008) "The role of gender and work status in shopping center patronage", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 61, pp. 825–833.
- 32 Seock, Y.K. and Bailey, L.R. (2009) "Fashion promotions in the Hispanic market", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol. 37 No. 2 pp. 161-181.

- 33 Seock, Y.K. and Sauls, N. (2008) "Hispanic consumers' shopping orientation and apparel retail store evaluation criteria", *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 12 No 4, pp. 469 – 486.
- 34 Shephard, A.J., Kinley, T.R. and Hosiam, B.M. (2014) "Fashion leadership, shopping enjoyment, and gender: Hispanic versus, Caucasian consumers' shopping preferences" *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 21, pp. 277-283.
- 35 Shim, S. (1996) "Adolescent Consumer Decision-Making Styles: The Consumer Socialization Perspective", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 13 No. 6, pp. 547-569.
- 36 Sohail, M.S. (2015) "Gender differences in mall shopping: a study of shopping behaviour of an emerging nation", *Journal of Marketing and Consumer Behaviour in Emerging Markets*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 36-46.
- 37 Stoltman, J.J., Gentry, J.W. and Anglin, K.A. (1991) "Shopping Choices: The Case of Mall Choice", *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 18, pp. 434-440.
- 38 Visser, E.M. and Du Preez, R. (2001) "Apparel shopping orientation: Two decades of research", *Journal of Family Ecology and Consumer Sciences*, Vol. 29, pp. 72-81.
- 39 Wolin, L.D and Korgaonkar, P. (2003), "Web advertising: gender differences in beliefs, attitudes and behavior", *Internet Research*, Vol. 13 No. 5, pp. 375 – 385.
- 40 Workman, J.E. and Cho, S. (2012) "Gender, Fashion Consumer Groups, and Shopping Orientation", *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, Vol. 40, No. 3, pp. 267-283.