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Abstract

The main focus of this study is on motivation. In particular, the study aims to investigate the relationship between the in-store experience of shoppers and their motivation for shopping. The in-store experience as defined in this study includes the perception of store atmosphere and cognitive responses. Another interest of the study is to test the relationship between cognitive responses and store atmosphere in two different countries. Lastly, this study explores the relationship between in-store experience and store patronage satisfaction, which in turn can influence shoppers’ repatronage intention. All the hypotheses in this study have been tested in Perth, Australia and Surabaya, Indonesia.

The methodology of the study uses quantitative analysis, as the research problems are exploratory in nature and rely on deductive inquiry. The study finds support for the most of the hypotheses. The relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and shopping motivation is partially supported in Perth, whereas the same relationship is fully supported in Surabaya. Furthermore, the relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and optimum stimulation level (OSL) is partially supported in both places.
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Chapter One
Introduction

To understand people one needs to understand what leads them to act as they do, and to understand what leads them to act as they do one needs to know their goals... (D’Andrade, 1992, p. 31)

1.1 Background to the research

Despite a growing interest in the role of shopping motivation, there is still a lack of interest in the “broader view” of shopping motivation (Hibbert and Tagg, 2001, p. 341). While most shopping motivation researchers have explored and developed shopper typologies, only a few studies have explored a “broader view” of shopping motivation, such as Dawson et al. (1990) and Hibbert and Tagg (2001).

A number of shopping motivation studies have investigated and developed shopping typologies, for example Tauber (1972), Bellenger and Korgaonkar (1980), Westbrook and Black (1985) and Arnold and Reynolds (2003). Tauber (1972) proposed a non-product motivation for acquisition which is expressed in terms of personal and social motives. Since then, most shopping typologies have included this aspect of shopping motivation.

Recently, Arnold and Reynolds (2003) proposed a “hedonic” shopping motivation typology. Hedonic consumption is “similar to the task orientation of utilitarian shopping motives, only the task is concerned with hedonic fulfillment, such as experiencing fun, amusement, fantasy and sensory stimulation” (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003, p. 78).
Nowadays, we find that retailers have tried to improve the atmosphere of their stores. However, the body of literature on shopping motivation reveals a lack of empirical findings as to how hedonic shopping motivation influences the shoppers’ in-store experience in terms of their perception of store atmosphere and their cognitive responses.

The present study is concerned with the relationship between hedonic shopping motivation and the in-store experience of shoppers, measured in terms of their perception of store atmosphere and their cognitive responses, with the intention of filling the gap in previous research. To enrich the study, product acquisition motivation and intrinsic motivation, also referred to as optimum stimulation level (OSL), are included as motivation components.

In addition to investigating the relationship between shopping motivation and in-store experience, this study aims to confirm the relationship between store atmosphere and cognitive responses and to research the relationship between the in-store experience of shoppers and their satisfaction with the store, which in turn affect repatronage intention. All of the relationships will be examined in Perth (Australia) and Surabaya (Indonesia).

This research reports the results of a cross-cultural survey carried out in Perth (Australia) and Surabaya (Indonesia). The findings of the two countries will be compared and contrasted. By employing two distinct samples, the study will be able to isolate any influence of culture. As this could have implications for global retailers, the results will provide needed information.
1.2 Research problem and research questions

There are three main areas of shopping experience to be addressed in this study. The first area is: how does shopping motivation influence the in-store experience of shoppers? The second area is: how does store atmosphere influence their cognitive responses? The final area to be investigated is: how does the in-store experience of shoppers affect their satisfaction with the store, which in turn influences their repatronage intention?

Research questions to be considered in the study are:

1. To what extent are the perceptions of store atmosphere associated with shopping motivation in Perth (Australia) and Surabaya (Indonesia)?

2. To what extent are the perceptions of store atmosphere associated with optimum stimulation level in Perth (Australia) and Surabaya (Indonesia)?

3. To what extent are the cognitive responses of shoppers associated with shopping motivation in Perth (Australia) and Surabaya (Indonesia)?

4. To what extent are the cognitive responses of shoppers associated with optimum stimulation level in Perth (Australia) and Surabaya (Indonesia)?

5. To what extent are the cognitive responses of shoppers associated with the perceptions of store atmosphere in Perth (Australia) and Surabaya (Indonesia)?

6. To what extent is store patronage satisfaction associated with the cognitive responses of shoppers in Perth (Australia) and Surabaya (Indonesia)?

7. To what extent is the store patronage satisfaction associated with the perception of store atmosphere in Perth (Australia) and Surabaya (Indonesia)?
8. To what extent is repatronage intention associated with store patronage satisfaction in Perth (Australia) and Surabaya (Indonesia)?

1.3 Justification for the research

This study can be justified on both practical and theoretical grounds. Knowledge about the role of shopping motivation can extend our understanding of shopping behaviour. Therefore, in terms of the practical application, there is a clear need for any study on shopping motivation to broaden the base of knowledge on which the retailer can build a competitive advantage.

Furthermore, an understanding of how shopping motivations influence the perception of store atmosphere might assist retailers to construct an appropriate strategy for improving store atmosphere. Shopping motivation typology defines the different goals of people visiting the store. These different goals could motivate people to interact differently with the store atmosphere. While the literature has revealed the influence of store atmosphere on retail outcome, this knowledge could be employed in designing the store atmosphere to elicit a particular retail outcome from a particular segment of the market.

This study is also interested in optimum stimulation level (OSL) as an intrinsic aspect of motivation; OSL refers to the predisposition of a particular person who enters the environment and is a function of demographic variables such as age, gender, income and education. The application of OSL can assist retailers in designing the store environment. This effort can be accomplished by identifying the target market in terms of OSL intensity.
Multinational retailers can benefit from the cross-cultural approach adopted in this study. Awareness of the role of culture on the hypothesised relationship could support the multinational retailer in determining whether country-specific store atmosphere strategies are needed.

This study makes a major theoretical contribution to the study of shopper motivation in its investigation of the relationship between shopping motivation and the in-store experience of shoppers and will extend the extant literature on motivation, as the focus of most motivation studies has been to develop shopping typologies.

Another contribution of the study is the application of the optimum stimulation level (OSL) concept to the construction of retailing atmosphere. Although a few studies have explored the relationship between OSL and shopping outcome (see Mittelstaedt et al., 1976; Rogers, 1979 and Raju, 1980), these studies have approached the store environment in terms of information rate and not with reference to the store’s physical environment. The present study employs a different approach to examine the relationship between OSL and shopping outcome.

The cross-cultural research method adds to the research value of the study. The research objective is to confirm the relationship between store atmosphere and cognitive responses as well as the relationship between in-store experience and store patronage satisfaction, which in turn is shown to influence repatronage intention in two different countries. An extensive review of the literature has revealed that store atmosphere studies have been conducted in individualistic countries (i.e., Western countries). A comparative study in Perth (Australia) and Surabaya (Indonesia) makes it possible to apply knowledge of the relationship between these variables in a collectivist country such as Indonesia.

The methodology of this cross-cultural study allows for cross-validation of the measurement concepts. Most of the concepts, such as the measurement of hedonic
shopping motivation and optimum stimulation level, the holistic measurement of store atmosphere, shopping satisfaction and repatronage intention were developed in Western countries. It will be of interest to see if the measurements are consistent across Eastern and Western societies.

1.4 Methodology

The research focuses on the existence of shopping motivation and the extent of its influence on the in-store experience of shoppers, the existence of store atmosphere and the extent of its influence on cognitive responses and the influence of in-store experiences on store patronage satisfaction, which in turn could affect repatronage intention. As these research problems are exploratory in nature and rely on deductive inquiry, this study adopts a quantitative approach (Punch, 2004).

The data is collected from shoppers in three different types of stores in Perth and Surabaya. The stores used are a supermarket, a department store and a specialty store. The use of actual shoppers ensures a realistic application of the study and avoids the effect of artificial manipulation (Doyle and Gidengil, 1977). However, there are many variables that could not be controlled in this study, such as pre-existing image and emotion.

Variables will be measured using previously developed instruments. For example, the optimum stimulation level measurement (OSL) is based on the Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1995) short form OSL measurement. The main advantage of using existing instruments is that they have already been tested (De Vaus, 2002). However, validity and reliability tests are applied to these scales.
The questionnaire is designed to measure the same concepts in Indonesia and Australia. To determine if this has been done, the pattern of factor loadings will be compared. If there is a difference in the pattern of factor loadings, it may be assumed that the measurement has measured different concepts in these countries. If there is no difference in the pattern of factor loading, it may be assumed that the measurement has measured similar concepts.

To test the relationship between variables, regression analysis is performed for the data from each country. The regression analysis will show the significance of the proposed relationship, the significance of each variable in the relationship and the intensity of relationship for each variable.

1.5 Definitions

A review of definitions of motivation in the literature reveals two important aspects of motivation. Firstly, motivation influences behaviour. Secondly, motivation can be represented in terms of its strength and its direction. Thus, shopping motivation in this study is defined as the energising force that influences shopping behaviors through its strength and its direction (Solomon, 2002, p. 102).

The strength of motivation is mainly affected by the arousal level of the subject (Lawson et al., 1996). Optimum stimulation level (OSL) is a factor which can explain motivated behaviour in relation to arousal. OSL illustrates how people’s affective state responds to the stimulation induced by the environment. According to this theory, the response follows an inverted U-shaped function. Therefore, OSL is defined as “a property that characterizes an individual in terms of his general response to environmental stimuli” (Raju, 1980, pp. 272).
The store atmosphere is defined as the physical in-store attributes which can stimulate cognitive responses. The store atmosphere is differentiated into: ambient factors, design factors, social factors and crowding.

The cognitive responses comprise two types of customer perceptions: service quality and merchandise quality. Schiffman et al. (1997) defined perception as “the process by which an individual selects, organizes and interprets stimuli into a meaningful and coherent picture of the world” (pp. 144). The perception of service quality is defined as a multilevel and multidimensional construct which is based on the customer’s evaluation of: 1) the customer-employee interaction, 2) the outcome quality and 3) the quality of the physical environment.

Meanwhile, Steenkamp (1990) defined the perceived product quality as “idiosyncratic value judgments with respect to the fitness for consumption which is based upon the conscious and/or unconscious processing of quality cues in relation to relevant quality attributes within the context of significant personal and situational variables” (p. 317).

Despite the debate on the nature of satisfaction, in this study, store patronage satisfaction is defined as an individual’s emotional reaction to his or her evaluation of the total set of experiences in patronising the retailer (Westbrook and Oliver, 1991; Simintiras, Diamantopoulos and Ferriday, 1997; Menon and Dube, 2000 and Fournier and Mick, 1999). Finally, repatronage intention is the customer’s intention to visit the store again in the future.
1.6 The scope and key assumptions of the study

This study mainly focuses on hedonic shopping motivation. The hedonic shopping motivations typology developed by Arnold and Reynolds (2003), consists of gratification motivation, adventure motivation, ideas motivation, values motivation, role motivation and social motivation. However, to construct a more meaningful study and build upon previous research, a product acquisition motive and optimum stimulation level are also included in the study.

In-store experience consists of the perception of store atmosphere, merchandise quality and service quality. This study treats the store atmosphere as a holistic concept comprising perception of the factors of ambience, design, social experience and crowding. The perception of merchandise quality and interpersonal service quality is a result of cognitive processes. Emotional and physiological states experienced within the store are outside the domain of this inquiry.

While the literature reveals some measurement of shopping outcomes, such as approach-avoidance behaviour, this study concentrates solely on shopping satisfaction and repatronage intention. Shopping satisfaction should be differentiated from product satisfaction. Shopping satisfaction involves an evaluation of the total set of experiences realised from patronising the store. Repatronage intention is the intention arising after visiting the store.

Most store atmosphere studies use either actual retail settings or laboratory settings. This study utilises an actual retail setting. Consequently, some factors could not be controlled in this study such as the pre-existing image, emotional state and mood of customers. Shoppers who have already patronised the store could have a pre-existing image about the store. Pre-existing emotional states and moods could also affect their emotional responses within the store.
This study involves shoppers from three different types of store in Perth (Australia) and Surabaya (Indonesia). These different types of store are supermarkets, department stores and specialty stores which are located in a shopping centre. Other types of store such as discount stores and hypermarkets are outside the domain of this inquiry.

1.7 Outline of this report

The structure of this dissertation can be broadly divided into six chapters. This first chapter discusses the background, the research question, the focus of the study, the value of the study and the structure of the dissertation. In the second chapter, the literature relating to the research topic is reviewed with the aim of forming a foundation for the subsequent conceptual development. The review of extant literature in Chapter Two discusses the concepts of shopping experience, store atmosphere, shopping motivation, the mediating response and the shopping outcome.

Chapter Three discusses the development of the hypotheses. The research method described in Chapter Four is mainly divided into four parts: a discussion of the research procedure, the research sample, the survey instrument and the data analysis. In Chapter Five the research findings are analysed and discussed. In the final chapter of the dissertation, the study’s main findings are summarised and the limitations of the research identified. In light of these findings and their inherent limitations some directions for future research are then suggested. Finally, the implications of this study for store management are discussed.
Figure 1.1 Structure of Dissertation

INTRODUCTION
Background of the study, statement of the problem, focus of the study, model proposed, structure of dissertation

THEORY DEVELOPMENT AND HYPOTHESIS
Shopping experience, store atmosphere studies, shopping motivation, mediating response and response concepts

HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT
Developing a hypothesis to investigate in the study

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
Research procedure, research sample, survey instrument and data analysis

DATA ANALYSIS
Analysis of data and discussion of findings

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION
Summary of the study, conclusion, suggestions for future study, implications of study
1.8 Conclusion

This chapter has explained the foundations for the report and introduced the research problems and research questions. The relevance and contribution of the study to knowledge of shopping experience in both individualistic and collectivist societies have been outlined. The methodology has been briefly described and justified, the report outlined, and the limitations summarised. On these foundations, the report can build detailed descriptions of the research.
Chapter Two
Literature Review

The previous chapter has outlined the research problem and the research questions. In this chapter, the body of knowledge relating to the current research is examined and critiqued. Examining the extant research reveals that which remains unclear about: how shopping motivation and optimum stimulation level affect store atmosphere perception and cognitive response; how store atmosphere induces cognitive responses which in turn influence store patronage satisfaction; and how store patronage satisfaction affects repatronage intention. This review provides both the basis for conceptual development and a starting point for the research component of the study.

The first part of this chapter discusses shopping motivation typologies and empirical studies. The second part reviews the literature on store atmosphere and defines and classifies the store atmosphere for the purpose of this study. Thirdly, the mediating responses induced by the store atmosphere on emotional, physiological and cognitive levels are discussed. The discussion focuses in particular on cognitive responses in terms of concepts explaining the inference process from environmental cues and the extant literature about perceptions of merchandise quality and perceptions of service quality. The fourth part discusses the concept of store patronage satisfaction and extends the empirical findings relating to this phenomenon. In the last part, the extant literature about store repatronage intention is investigated.
2.1 Shopping Motivation

Motivation is an important factor in understanding behaviour. The importance of motivation is reflected in the following definitions.

- *Motivation can be described as the driving force within individuals that impels them to action* (Schiffman et al., 1997, p. 90).

- *Motivation refers to the process that cause people to behave as they do* (Solomon, 2002, p. 102).

- *Motivation is the energizing force that activates behaviour and provides purpose and direction to that behaviour* (Neal et al., 2004, p. 299).

- *Motive is a construct representing an unobservable inner force that stimulates and compels a behavioral response and provides specific direction to that response* (Neal et al., 2004, p. 299).

- *Motive is an inner state that mobilizes bodily energy and directs it in selective fashion toward goals usually located in the external environment* (Lawson et al., 1996, p. 313).

Motivation, then, influences people’s behaviour in the way it stimulates and directs behaviour. Therefore, motivation can be represented in terms of its strength and its direction (Solomon, 2002, p. 103).

This study intends to examine the influence of shopping motivation, in particular hedonic shopping motivation and optimum stimulation level. To construct a more meaningful study, product acquisition motivation is included in the study.
2.1.1 Shopping Goals

As has been previously noted, motivation can be described in terms of the energising power of behaviour and the direction or goal of behaviour. To investigate the direction or goal of behaviour, the study will focus on hedonic shopping motivation. Before discussing hedonic shopping motivations, the general concept of motivation will be explored.

People’s goals are directed to the fulfillment of needs and wants. “Need” refers to human requirements, generally physiological needs such as food, water or clothing (Schiffman and Kanuk, 1997, p. 92). Since the 1920s, researchers have tried to classify human needs. Starch (1923), for example, classified human needs in terms of forty-four separate motives. Maslow’s Hierarchy of Motivation, which is probably the best known classification, identified five distinct needs. Other theorists have provided different classifications, e.g. a trio of needs and a set of twenty psychogenic needs. What is clear from this is that needs are a difficult thing to classify.

Likewise, the “need” for a particular product is often difficult to classify. For example, people buy a pizza because they feel hungry. But why would they prefer to purchase a pizza rather than something else? Needs may develop as acquired needs and wants (Schiffman and Kanuk, 1997, p. 92). Acquired needs are a result of what we experience in our daily lives, such as the need for esteem, prestige, affection, power or learning. Wants are “the expression of needs in actual situations” (Schiffman and Kanuk, 1997, p. 92). These needs and wants can become goals which influence behaviour.

People may go to the store to achieve some of their goals. The literature defines a number of shopping typologies which reflect various goals based on particular variables (see, Stone, 1954; Stephenson and Willet, 1969; Darden and Reynolds, 1971; Darden
and Ashton, 1974; Moschnis, 1976; Williams, Painter and Herbert, 1978; Bellenger and Korgaonkar, 1980; Westbrook and Black, 1985; Bloch, Ridgway and Dawson, 1994; Reynolds, Ganesh and Luckett, 2002 and Rohm and Swaminathan, 2002).

For example, Stone (1954) provides a shopper’s taxonomy based on the orientation of shoppers towards the activity of shopping. According to this taxonomy, shoppers could be broken into four types: (1) the economic consumer, (2) the personalising consumer, (3) the ethical consumer, and (4) the apathetic consumer. The economic shopper approaches shopping from an economic perspective, which emphasises merchandise assortment, the product price and quality. The personalising consumer prefers to have a personal relationship with the seller. Shoppers who place more emphasis on the ethical value are called ethical consumers. Lastly, the apathetic shopper does not have an intrinsic interest in shopping.

Table 2.1 below provides a summary of typologies that have been identified by various researchers.

**Table 2.1 Shopper Typologies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Author and Date</th>
<th>Shopper types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Personalising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Ethical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Apathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Chicago Tribune (1955)</td>
<td>1. Dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Compulsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Individualistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Compulsive or recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Convenience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Price or bargain conscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Reference Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Personalising  
3. Moralistic  
4. Apathetic |
| 5. | Tauber | | Personal motives  
1. Role playing  
2. Diversion  
3. Self-gratification  
4. Learning about new trends  
5. Physical activity  
6. Sensory stimulation |
|   |   | Social motives  
1. Social experiences outside home  
2. Communication with others  
3. Peer group attraction  
4. Affiliation  
5. Power and authority  
6. Stimulation |
2. Fastidious  
3. Convenience  
4. Stamp collectors  
5. Stamp avoiders  
6. Apathetic |
2. Brand loyal  
3. Specials shoppers  
4. Psychosocialising  
5. Name conscious  
6. Problem solving |
| 7. | Williams, Painter and Herbert (1978) | | 1. Low price  
2. Convenience  
3. Involved  
4. Apathetic |
2. Economic |
Another approach utilised to classify shopping typology is the motivation factor. A survey of the literature reveals there are only a few motivation-based shopper typologies. Amongst these are those developed by Tauber (1972), Westbrook and Black (1985) and Arnold and Reynolds (2003). Tauber’s shopping typology reveals the non-product acquired motive. Westbrook and Black (1985) developed a comprehensive shopping typology based on motivation variables. More recently, Arnold and Reynolds (2003) extend the literature by investigating hedonic shopping motivation.
Tauber (1972) conducted an exploratory study to uncover the reasons why people shop. The sample used in the study, both men and women, was quite different to samples used in previous studies such as those of Stone (1954) and the Chicago Tribune (1955). These two studies focused solely on females. By including men in the sample, the study findings may have been enriched.

The most interesting finding from Tauber’s study was the recognition of non-product motives. Tauber stressed that “an understanding of shopping motives requires the consideration of satisfactions which shopping activities provide, as well as the utility obtained from the merchandise that may be purchased” (p. 58). This view provides a new insight on shopping typology.

Specifically, Tauber’s typology is divided into two main categories (pp. 47-48). The first category, personal motives, consists of:

1. *Role playing*. This motive relates to the role of the shopper in the society. Housewives tend to view grocery shopping as one of their roles in society.

2. *Diversion*. Some people use shopping as a recreational activity.

3. *Self-gratification*. In this case shopping is seen as a medium for expressing different emotional states or moods.

4. *Learning about new trends*. Finding information about new products and model provides motivation for some people to go to the store.

5. *Physical activity*. Going shopping is an alternative for doing exercise.
6. *Sensory stimulation.* Some shoppers go to the store in order to gain some sensory benefit.

The second category of shopping motive category is social:

1. *Social experiences outside the home.* Shopping is viewed as a medium for socialising.

2. *Communication with others having a similar interest.* Some people go shopping for the opportunity to interact with others having similar interests.

3. *Peer group attraction.* Shopping is a way to self-express, to be with one’s peer group or a reference group.

4. *Status and authority.* Some people go shopping to gain attention and respect.

5. *The pleasure of bargaining.* Shopping brings pleasure through bargaining over the price.

A later study by Westbrook and Black (1985) concluded that motivation-based shopping typology is the most appropriate way to classify shoppers. This framework is viewed as guiding retail strategy formulation as well as advancing efforts to develop more comprehensive theories of shopping behaviour. In addition, “the consideration of motivation is implicit in extant typologies” (Westbrook and Black, 1985, p. 35).

Westbrook and Black’s shopping typology is as follows (pp. 86-87):
a) *Anticipated utility.* Some people go to the store with the aim of obtaining a particular product. They expect to gain the utility offered by that product.

b) *Role enactment.* The idea of this shopping motivation is arguably similar to role playing in Tauber’s shopping typology. The motive for going to the store is largely affected by the person’s role in society, which is culturally defined.

c) *Negotiation.* Some people gain satisfaction if they can negotiate the price, believing they gain a good value product. Tauber (1972) named this motive as the pleasure of bargaining.

d) *Choice optimisation.* For some people, shopping is a way to find a suitable product to fulfill their need.

e) *Affiliation.* Socialising with other persons in the store is another shopper motivation. Westbrook and Black (1985) added the term of indirect affiliation, to express the intention to interact with a particular group. This idea encompasses three of the motives in Tauber’s shopping typology: social experiences outside the home, communication with others having similar interests and peer group attraction.

f) *Power and authority.* Shopping for some people is seen as a means of improving their social position.

g) *Stimulation.* Some people go to the store with the main purpose of interacting with the store environment in order to feel stimulated. This shopping motive was also raised in Tauber’s shopping typology.
As can be seen, although Westbrook and Black provided different norms and focused on motivation, many of their resulting categories are similar to those proposed by Tauber (1972).

The concept of hedonic shopping motivation is an extension of the concept of hedonic consumption (Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982). Hirschman and Holbrook explained hedonic consumption as something that “designates those facets of consumer behavior that relate to the multisensory, fantasy and emotive aspects of one’s experience with the product” (p. 92).

In the retail context, Arnold and Reynolds (2003) stresses that “hedonic shopping motives are similar to the task orientation of utilitarian shopping motives, only the task is concerned with hedonic fulfillment, such as experiencing fun, amusement, fantasy and sensory stimulation” (p. 78).

The hedonic shopping motivation typology developed by Arnold and Reynolds (2003, pp. 80-81) is as follows:

1. Adventure shopping. According to this motive, going shopping is an adventure. Arnold and Reynolds explain that people with this kind of motive expect to gain “adventure, thrills, stimulation, excitement, and entering a different universe of exciting sights, smells, and sounds” (p. 80).

2. Social shopping. Socialising is the main purpose for some shoppers when they go shopping.

3. Gratification shopping. Life nowadays is so complex and the level of tension has increased in society. Some people go shopping to ease this tension.
4. Idea shopping. Shopping could update people’s knowledge about the
development of new trends and models.

5. Role shopping. Arnold and Reynolds highlight the concept of this motive by
stating “role shopping reflects the enjoyment that shoppers derive from shopping
for others, the influence that this activity has on the shoppers’ feeling and moods,
and the excitement and intrinsic joy felt by shoppers when finding the perfect gift
for others” (p. 81).

6. Value shopping. Some people go shopping to find a good value product.

Role shopping motivation relates to an individual’s role in society, as explained before
in Tauber’s shopping typology and the Westbrook and Black (1985) motivation-based
shopping typology. The main difference between these two typologies and the Arnold
and Reynolds typology is that the former consider that shopping is part of their role in
society. Arnold and Reynolds, however, posit that besides gaining satisfaction from
fulfilling their duty, shoppers also expect to gain personal satisfaction from buying
something for other people.

Hedonic shopping motivation typology, including product acquisition motivation, is the
main interest of this research. Most motivation typologies consider utilitarian and
hedonic motivation because they are the underlying forces that drive all consumption
(Babin, Darden and Griffin, 1994). Babin and Attaway (2000, p. 3) differentiate
utilitarian value as task-related worth and hedonic value as shopping-value worth for
shoppers. These shopping motivations are hypothesised to influence in-store experience
in terms of their perception of store atmosphere and their cognitive responses.
Hilbert and Tagg (2001) use the concept of goal-directed behaviour to explain the hypothesised relationship between shopping motivation and the experience of shopping. According to Pervin (1987), this theory argues that “there is an organized, persistent, directed quality to much of human behaviour and the concept of goal is suggested as a means for directing attention to, and understanding an aspect of human behavior that transcends the immediacy of the particular situation or moment” (p. 228).

To study this theory, Heckhausen (1991, p. 183) differentiates the phases of goal-directed behaviour into: 1) the “pre-decisional phase”, 2) the “pre-actional phase”, 3) the “actional phase” and 4) the “post-actional phase”. The pre-decisional phase is the situation when a person is confronted with alternative goals. A person has to decide which goal to pursue in order to allocate his or her effort or resources. In the pre-actional phase, a person develops a strategy or plan to pursue the goal. In the actional phase, a person acts to pursue the goal and evaluates the process. In the post-actional phase, the person evaluates whether he or she has attained the intended goal.

Motives can influence how people evaluate the product purchased (Lawson, 1996, p. 314). A utilitarian product such as a computer would generate more of a thinking process than a hedonic product. In contrast, hedonic products such as high fashion clothes would involve the hedonic experiences of product symbolism, physical and psychological stimulation.

In the retail setting, few studies have investigated the role of motivation. Dawson et al. (1990) found that shopping motivation could influence the emotions induced by the atmosphere of a store. Specifically, strongly product-motivated customers would experience higher pleasure, while strongly experientially-motivated customers would experience higher arousal. The retail choice and preference are also influenced directly by shopping motivation (pp. 424-425).
Hibbert and Tagg (2005) find that the amount of purposeful effort invested in shopping activity, the spending of more money than intended and willingness to engage with the retail environment could moderate the attainment of shopping goals in craft fairs. The shopping goals comprise gift seeking, epistemic, hedonic and self-gift seeking goals. The interaction of the shopper with the store atmosphere moderates the attainment of all shopping goals.

Recently, Kaltcheva and Weitz (2006) have revealed that shopping motivation moderates the relationship between pleasure and arousal induced by the store atmosphere. For hedonic shoppers, high arousal has a positive effect on pleasure which increases the likelihood of purchasing and repatronage intention. In contrast, for utilitarian shoppers, high arousal has a negative effect on pleasure.
To summarise, the review of literature on shopping motivation reveals several shopping motivation typologies and indicates that shopping motivation is associated with emotional responses and can direct the attention of shoppers in the retail environment.

2.1.2 Optimum Stimulation Level

The strength of motivation is mainly affected by the arousal level of the individual (Lawson et. al, 1996, p. 318). Drive theory and expectancy theories have been used to explain the magnitude of motivation for certain behaviours (Solomon, 2002, pp. 103-104). For example, drive theory argues that unfulfilled biological needs produce a tension. This tension is caused by the unpleasant state of arousal. People tend to behave to reduce this tension. Expectancy theory argues that behaviour is directed to achieve a desirable outcome.

Schiffman et al. (1997, p. 99) explain that three situations can stimulate arousal needs: biological needs, emotional or cognitive processes and external stimuli in the environment. Biological needs, for example eating or drinking, can generate arousal when these needs are not satisfied. Emotional or cognitive arousal result from thinking or daydreaming. Environment can stimulate arousal since it has collative properties such as novelty, surprise, ambiguity and uncertainty (Lawson et al., 1996, p. 319). These properties can attract people’s curiosity or desire for exploration.

The literature review has covered environment congruity theories such as Berlyne’s (1960) novelty seeking approach, Fiske and Maddi’s (1961) activation theory, Hunt’s (1963) concept of environmental congruity, Helson’s (1959), Hebb’s (1955) and Leuba’s (1955) optimal incongruity concepts and Driver and Streufert’s (1965) general incongruity adaptation level (GIAL). Some theorists have different views on how a person explores the environment, while others have merely extended the previous
concepts. Therefore, for this reason, this review explains the following theories of environment congruity briefly: those of Helson (1959), Hebb (1955), Leuba (1955), Hunt (1963) and Driver and Streufert (1965).

Hebb’s study and Leuba’s study examined the relationship between the level of arousal and the associated cognitive response. According to their results, the cognitive response would be optimised at a moderate level of arousal produced by the cortex. The cortex can produce arousal as a result of environment incongruity. People experience a positive affect when approaching this optimum level and a negative affect when passing the optimum level.

Driver and Streufert’s general incongruity adaptation level (GIAL) concept is similar in its interest in cognitive responses. Although this concept has not been supported by the empirical findings, GIAL can provide a better explanation of the relationship between the cognitive response and environmental incongruity. The adaptation level (AL) concept explains that people can have a particular adaptation level for a particular stimulus such as sound or smell. However, according to the concept of GIAL,

Organisms could average their prior general incongruity experience over time and thus develop general expectations concerning the “normal” (consistent!) amount of general incongruity to expect in their environment. This expectation concerning general incongruity can be termed the General Incongruity Adaptation Level (GIAL) (Streufert and Streufert, 1978, p. 173).

The discrepancy experienced from GIAL results in cognitive responses (Streufert and Streufert, 1978, p.173). When the general incongruity in the environment is less than the GIAL value, people are motivated cognitively to explore the environment in order to approach GIAL. On the other hand, when the general incongruity in the environment is
above GIAL value, people tend to reduce this incongruity through escape or perceptual distortion. Thus, people’s cognitive response seeks to approach the expected value or GIAL value.

In contrast, Helson (1959) and Hunt (1963) investigate the relationship between the incongruity level and emotional or affect arousal, while McClelland (1955) and Haber (1958) introduce the concept of specific adaptation level (AL) (Streufert and Streufert, 1978, p. 150). The basic assumption behind this concept is that the discrepancy between the stimuli and the AL would affect the level of emotional arousal. For example, people could have a particular adaptation level for sound or color stimulus. To some extent a discrepancy between the pattern of sound from the environment and the sound’s AL pattern could produce a positive effect; on the other hand, a massive discrepancy could induce a negative effect.

Hunt utilises Berlyne’s (1960) properties of environment, including novelty, complexity and change. These properties could arouse people when they are in the environment and stimulate the feeling of incongruity. When the incongruity increases, approaching the optimum level, the effect is positive. In contrast, when the incongruity passes the optimum level, the effect is negative. Streufert and Streufert (1978) explain that “lack of correspondence between expectancy and perception may simply have a stimulating (or pleasurable) effect, beyond this point, a disruptive (or unpleasant) effect” (p. 180).

This relationship is different to the relationship explained earlier by McClelland (1955) and Haber (1958). According to Hunt and Berlyne, the intensity of arousal declines when approaching the optimum level and increases when passing the optimum level.
Hunt, Hebb and Leuba hold different views on arousal. As is explained by Streufert and Streufert, Hebb and Leuba argue that the arousal experienced by a person is produced by the cortex. This is called non-affective arousal and can influence cognitive behaviour. On the other hand, Hunt emphasises arousal induced by the environment or affective arousal.

A further concept which can explain behaviour in relation to arousal is optimum stimulation level (OSL). Optimum stimulation level refers to the way in which people’s affective state responds to stimulation induced by the environment (Mittelstaedt, Grossbart and DeVere, 1976; Raju, 1977, 1980; Wahlers and Etzel, 1985 and Steenkamp and Baumgartner, 1992 and 1995). According to this theory, affective response follows an inverted U-shaped pattern, where the intermediate level of the curve is the optimum stimulation level. People can have either a high or low OSL. Those with a high OSL tend to pursue activities resulting in a high stimulation in order to reach the optimum level. In contrast, a low optimum stimulation person would avoid high stimulation activities. Purchasing a new product would generally be considered as a high stimulation activity (Raju, 1980; Steenkamp and Baumgartner, 1995).

The concept of OSL has attracted the interest of a number of consumer behaviour scholars (e.g., Raju, 1977; Mittelstaedt, Grossbart and DeVere, 1976; Wahlers and Etzel, 1985 and Steenkamp and Baumgartner, 1992 and 1995). Grossbart et al. (1976) find that the adoption of new retail format is influenced by OSL. However, most of the studies have identified the relationship between OSL and consumer exploratory behaviour which has been categorised by Raju (1980) as curiosity motivated, variety seeking and risk taking behaviours.

There are different views about the relationship between exploratory behaviour and OSL. Joachimsthaler and Lastovicke (1984, p. 833) argue that OSL does not mediate the
relationship between personality traits and exploratory behaviour. In their study, OSL, social character, and locus of control are found to be related to consumer exploratory behaviour. This is contrary to the view of Raju (1980). Raju (1980) found that OSL mediates the relationship between personality traits and exploratory behaviour (p. 280). The personality traits in his study are intolerance of ambiguity, rigidity and dogmatism.

Recently, Steenkamp and Burgess (2002) reconfirmed the relationship between demographics and OSL. Building on an earlier study by Raju (1980) that uncovered a relationship between age, education, working status and OSL, Steenkamp and Burgess found a relationship with gender as well (p. 146). For example, males may have a higher level of optimum stimulation than females and young people could have a higher level of optimum stimulation than old people. In addition, OSL was found to have positive relationship with income and education.

In this study, OSL is hypothesised to be associated with store atmosphere perception and cognitive response. People who experience a high amount of arousal are likely to explore all available stimuli (Lawson et. al, 1996, p. 322). Therefore, the exploration of store atmosphere is predicted to be influenced by OSL.

Lawson et al. also argue that arousal influences cognitive thinking. This influence is shown in the selection of informational stimuli and the reviewing of stored knowledge. Therefore, optimum stimulation is associated with cognitive responses, particularly the perception of merchandise quality and service quality.
2.2 The Perception of Store Atmosphere

The store atmosphere model posits that store atmosphere can induce mediating responses, which in turn influence approach-avoidance behaviour (Bitner, 1992). This review follows the structure of the store atmosphere model.

2.2.1 The Environment as a Source of Information

Cumulative impressions of environment can result in spatial knowledge and a personally meaningful perception which are a result of a person’s interface with the environment (Schiffman et al., 1997). Ittelson (1973) explains the individual predisposition to interact with the environment:

One cannot be a subject of an environment; one can only be a participant. The environment surrounds, enfolds, engulfs and nothing and no one can be isolated and identified as standing outside of, and apart from, it. One does not, indeed cannot, observe the environment: one explores it. Environments, in addition, are always multi-modal. It may be possible to conceive of an environment which offers information through only one sense modality, but it would probably be impossible to build. (pp. 13-15)

Hence, interaction with the environment can be characterised as a multi-modal learning process. This multi-modal learning process affects spatial knowledge and how various aspects of spatial experience are represented in the memory (Golledge, 1987; Evans and Garling, 1992; Thorndyke and Hayes-Roth, 1982 and Taylor and Tversky, 1992).

With regard to retailing, the literature reveals that store atmosphere can help to develop and facilitate the shopping experience of patrons. Kerin, Jain, and Howard (1992)
reported that shopping experience is a result and a function of consumer interaction with the store atmosphere and the customer-related policies and practices of the store. Additionally, it is generally held that shopping experience can affect the attitudinal and behavioural responses of consumers in both retail and service sectors (p. 379).

This is relevant to the definition of retail environment which is adopted in the present study. The store atmosphere is defined as the physical in-store attributes which can stimulate cognitive responses.

2.2.2 The Classification of Store Atmosphere

While the existence of store spatial knowledge seems plausible, there are a number of distinct views about the classification of store atmosphere (e.g. Kotler, 1973; Mehrabian and Russell, 1974; Baker, 1986 and Berman and Evans, 1995). Kotler defines atmosphere as “the effort to design buying environments to produce specific emotional effects in the buyer that enhance his purchase probability” (p. 50).

According to this definition, store atmosphere induces emotional responses which affect purchasing decisions. The store environment is divided into: 1) visual dimensions such as colour, brightness, size and shapes; 2) arousal dimensions such as volume and pitch; 3) olfactory dimensions such as scent and freshness; and 4) tactile dimensions such as softness, smoothness and temperature (p. 51).

Mehrabian and Russell (1974) divide environmental stimuli into two parts, modality variables and information rate. The purpose of this environmental stimuli classification is to measure temporal variation within each modality. The Mehrabian and Russell model is mostly employed to explain how emotional responses influence approach
avoidance behaviour (Donovan and Rossiter, 1982 and Donovan et al., 1994). The present study aims to find the relationship between the perceptions of store atmosphere and shopping behaviour; therefore, this approach can not be utilised to achieve this aim.

A third approach to the classification of store atmosphere is that of Berman and Evans (1995). They divide the store atmosphere into: 1) the exterior of the store; 2) the general interior; 3) the layout and design variables and 4) the point of purchase and decoration variables. This store atmosphere classification measures the spatial aspect of the store environment and is similar to the method used in the current study. However, the general exterior is not relevant to the present study which is interested in the store’s internal variables.

This leads to the consideration of a fourth approach represented by the work of Baker (1986). Baker has developed a store atmosphere classification which consists of ambience, design, and social factors. Ambience factors are background features that may or may not be consciously perceived but that affect human senses. These features include air quality, noise, scent and cleanliness. A person tolerates unpleasing ambient factors to a certain level. However, when an unpleasing environment reaches a particular level, a person consciously perceives and is affected by it (p. 81).

Design factors refer to features directly perceptible by consumers, such as aesthetics and functionality. Aesthetic design factors comprise architecture, colour, scale, materials, texture or pattern, shape, style and aesthetics. Functional design factors are layout, comfort and signage (p. 81).

Lastly, social factor refers to the people in the environment, that is, other customers and service personnel. Baker explains that the appearance, behaviour and number of people
can influence the consumer’s perception of the service firm. In relation to social factors, this study includes crowding as a component of the social factors (p. 81).

Crowding has been studied in environmental psychology and social ecology since the 1970s. Behaviour constraint, control and overload or arousal theories have emerged as the three leading theories in these fields (Evans and Lepore, 1992, p. 164). Behaviour constraint theory argues that the restriction of movement created by high density will create an uncomfortable feeling among people in the environment (Proshansky et al., 1970; Stokols, 1972; Evans and Lepore, 1992). Control theory states that a high density environment can result in a loss of control, which in turn has negative outcomes (Milgram, 1970; Altman, 1975 and Schmidt and Keating, 1979). Overload or arousal theory explains that the feeling of overload is caused by an overload in the sensory system in a high density environment.

Surprisingly, there are only a few studies of crowding in the retail field (e.g. Harrell, Hutt and Anderson (1980), Eroglu and Harrell (1986), Eroglu and Machleit (1990) and Hui and Bateson (1991)). Harrell et al. were the first to study retail crowding. The model they developed illustrates how physical density, in terms of the number of shoppers in the store, creates perceived crowding. Feeling confined and crowded, buyers will try to adapt to the situation by deviating from their planned shopping time. This adaptation strategy takes the form of reducing the time spent in the store. Thus, shopping satisfaction and enjoyment time consumption are adversely affected during a shopping trip (p. 47).

Eroglu and Harrell (1986) propose a model which has three main parts: antecedents, retail density and crowding perceptions and consequences (see Figure 2.2). The antecedents, which consist of environmental cues, shopping motives, constraints and expectations, will affect the consumers’ perception of crowding. Eroglu and Harrell use
the term “cue utilization” to describe the process by which the customer changes the antecedents to the perception of retail density or crowding. Shoppers will match their perception of retail density against their shopping motives. For example, a product-oriented shopper will perceive crowding more sensitively than a recreation-oriented shopper (p. 350).

Therefore, crowding occurs when there is a lack of correspondence between the shopper’s anticipatory shopping motives and the perceived retail density. Some shoppers, however, will perform an adaptive strategy in order to neutralise the effect of crowding. Failure to employ an adaptive strategy will lead to avoidance behaviour amongst shoppers (p. 350).

**Figure 2.2 A Model of Retail Crowding**

A high density of the store environment could create an experience of over-crowding (Eroglu and Machleit, 1990, p. 204). Eroglu and Machleit extend the concept of crowding to include the “crowdedness” of other stimuli such as signs and shopping carts. The study also confirms the relationship between shopping motives and perceived retail crowding. Drawing on the Bellenger and Korgaonkar (1980) shopping motives concept, Eroglu and Machleit (1990) find that utilitarian shoppers may perceive greater retail crowding than recreational shoppers do. Utilitarian shoppers perceive retail crowding as a function of the amount of perceived risk associated with the purchase and the degree of time pressure (p. 205).

2.3 Mediating Responses

Studies of the influence of atmosphere in a retail context are based on the premise that the design of a retail environment could stimulate mediating responses of a physiological, emotional and cognitive nature, which may affect shopping behaviour (Bitner, 1992, p. 60). Figure 2.3 below shows the Servicescape model proposed by Bitner.
Figure 2.3 - The Servicescape Model

2.3.1 Physiological Response

Store environments affect shoppers physiologically (Eroglu and Machleit, 1990; Yalch and Sprangenberg, 1990; Bitner, 1992 and Fiore et al., 2000). This is a result of the response of sensory receptors to qualities of the environment (Fiore et al., 2000).

Only a few authors have researched the influence of physiological responses (Fiore et al., 2000) which can influence approach-avoidance behaviour (Sprangenberg et al., 1996) and may influence unrelated beliefs and feelings about the place and the people (Griffitt, 1970 and Bitner, 1992, p. 60). Uncomfortable feelings would result in less affective response to strangers (Griffitt, 1970).

2.3.2 Emotional Response

Mehrabian and Russell (1974), Donovan and Rossiter (1982) and Donovan et al. (1994) argue that emotional responses may help to explain the variation in approach avoidance behaviour. Mehrabian and Russell’s environmental psychology concept explains the role of emotional responses as mediating variables consisting of pleasure, arousal, and dominance. Pleasure is defined as:

Feeling states that can be assessed readily with self-report, such as semantic differential measures, or with behavioral indicators, such as smiles, laughter and, in general positive versus negative facial expressions. (p. 18)

Engel, Blackwell, and Miniard (1995) explain that pleasure refers to feelings of happiness or sadness and physiological arousal refers to feelings of alertness or drowsiness. Dominance refers to the extent to which the individual feels in control of, or free to act in the situation (Donovan and Rossiter, 1982, p. 38).
Mehrabian and Russell’s model is the only one to include the arousal component in their emotional response measurement (Machleit and Eroglu, 2000, p.102). Plutcnik (1980) and Izard (1977) simply measure the pleasure part. Plutcnik’s (1980) eight emotion categories are anger, joy, sadness, acceptance, disgust, expectancy, surprise and fear. Izard’s (1977) ten fundamental emotions are joy, sadness, interest, anger, guilt, shame, disgust, contempt, surprise and fear. Most studies have adopted the Mehrabian-Russell model because the model offers pleasure, arousal and dominance variables, while Plutcnik and Izard focus only on the pleasure variable.

Emotional responses could influence cognitive responses. Shiv and Fedorikhin (1999, p. 280) introduced a theory of how affect and cognition interact and combine to influence behaviour. Exposure to a stimulus event might be described as three processes:

1) “Basic and automatic responses related to the stimulus before the onset of cognitive processes such as appraisal, interpretation, schema, attribution, and strategy”.

2) “Higher order processing which may serve to strengthen or weaken the action tendencies arising from lower-order affective actions”.

3) “Higher order affective reactions and action tendencies that are engendered relatively slowly compared to lower-order affective reactions since the information is subject to more deliberative processes before these reactions can occur”.

Moreover, Shiv and Fedorikhin explain that if the availability of information is limited, the consumer’s decision-making may be dominated by affective reactions, whereas if the availability of processing resources is not limited, the consumer’s decision-making may be dominated by cognitive reactions.
However, Stoel et al. (2004, p. 1067) argue that an emotional reaction when the customer is in the shopping mall is a result of the ongoing cognitive evaluation process. This emotional response becomes an important factor in evaluating the shopping visit.

2.3.3 Cognitive Response

A person is at all times motivated to interact with the environment (Ittelson, 1973, p. 13). The environment offers non-verbal communication for individuals (Broadbent, Bunt, and Jencks, 1980; Rapoport, 1982 and Bitner, 1992). This view is supported by Ittelson (1973) in his characterisation of environments:

...environment always provide more information than can possibly be aroused. Environment always represents, simultaneously, instances of redundant information, of inadequate and ambiguous information, and of conflicting and contradictory information. (p.75)

Therefore, the shoppers’ interaction with the store environment could result in a personally meaningful perception, influencing people’s beliefs about a place, people, and product (Rogers, 1979; Golledge, 1987; Kaplan and Kaplan, 1982; Rapoport, 1982).

In the retail field, the literature on store image started to emerge in 1958 when Martineau stated the idea of retail personality and defined the store image as: “The way in which the store is defined in the shopper’s mind, partly by its functional qualities and partly by an aura of psychological attributes” (p. 47).

Further, Kunkel and Berry (1968) explain that store image is how the image of the store is formed in the shopper’s mind as the result of previous differential reinforcement (p.
22). This definition emphasises the importance of previous patronising behaviour in creating the store image.

Dichter (1985) explains that the store image is the global or overall impression of the store. Others have included attitude as part of the store image, for example:

a) Store image is an attitude toward the store (Doyle and Fenwick, 1974, p. 42)

b) Store image is a set of attitudes based on the attributes important to the customer (James, Durand, and Dreves, 1974, p. 25)

c) Store image is a type of attitude, which is measured across a number of dimensions (Engel et al., 1986, p. 498)

The concepts of store image and store atmosphere should be differentiated (Baker et al., 1994, p. 329). Lindquist (1974) and Zimmer and Golden (1988) argue that perceptions of store atmosphere, merchandise quality and the service quality are the components of store image. However, Baker et al. (1994) find that perceptions of merchandise quality and service quality mediate the relationship between the store atmosphere and the store image. Perception of merchandise quality and service quality are the result of customer inference process (Greenberg, Sherman and Schiffman, 1983, p. 152).

Mazursky and Jacoby (1986) define store image as:

a cognition and/or affect (or a set of cognitions and/or affects), which is/are inferred, either from a set of ongoing perceptions and/or memory inputs attaching to a phenomenon (i.e., either an object or event such as store, a product, a ‘sale’, etc.) and which represent(s) what that phenomenon signifies to an individual” (p. 147).

This definition will be utilised in this study.
While the existence of personal perceptions of retail environment seems plausible, the literature has adopted different concepts of store image development, such as: attribute-based processing theory, category-based processing theory, inference theory, schema theory, the theory of affordances and the means-end chain model (see Mazursky and Jacoby, 1986; Ward et al., 1992 and Sirgy et al., 2000).

According to the attribute-based processing theory, the customer evaluates the store atmosphere on an attribute basis (Keaveney and Hunt, 1992, p. 167). Furthermore, attributes are evaluated individually and the final judgment is based on combining the isolated attributes (Fiske and Linville, 1980; Fiske and Pavelchak, 1984 and Keaveney and Hunt, 1992). For example, a shopper evaluates merchandise and salespeople in order to make a conclusion about the store. Keaveney and Hunt (1992) argue that the weakness of this concept is that it ignores prior experience.

The weakness of the attribute-based processing theory is addressed by the category-based processing theory (Keaveney and Hunt, 1992, p. 168). According to this theory, when the buyers come to the store, they will try to compare the store environment against information stored in their memory. Specifically, they will categorise the environment according to known categories stored in their memories. If the existing category matches a memory, the relevant schema will be activated. The overall store image is a result of the schemata. When the environment does not find a match in the memory, a new sub-category will be created containing the additional information about the unique properties of the store (Keaveney and Hunt, 1992).

Mazursky and Jacoby (1986) propose a model of the store image formation process. Their model consists of two basic fields: the external world or objective reality and the consumer’s subjective impressions of selected elements of that world or perceived reality (p. 149). The model illustrates how the customer forms beliefs and feelings based
on certain features from their reality which are congruent with their idiosyncratic cognitive configuration (p. 149). The store image is created by inferring various beliefs and feelings from perceptions. In addition to the proposed framework, Mazursky and Jacoby also explain that the store image can be characterised as having several code facets (e.g., price and merchandise information) as well as other more peripheral facets (e.g., policy and service) (p. 149).

Ward et al. (1992) introduce the theory and measurement approaches to categorisation in order to study the meaning of retail environments. According to this approach, customers categorise a retail store by comparing the attributes of a stimulus to prototypical representations of categories. The typicality of the store can be measured by the degree of similarity based on exterior and interior physical environment. Further, Ward et al. explain that the categorisation will result in prompt inferences and expectations about the categorised stimulus (pp. 127-128).

Sirgy, Grewal and Mangleburg (2000) propose an integrative model of retail environment, self-congruity, and retail patronage. The model can be used to analyse how shoppers match their self-concept and their ideal utilitarian store attributes with the retail images created by the retail environment. The matching process, called self-congruity, will drive retail patronage. Interestingly, the store attributes utilised include location, merchandise, price, and promotion cues as parts of the retail environment beside other atmosphere cues.

The Means-End Chain Model based on the categorisation process offers a more comprehensive concept than the previous ones. Gutman (1982) defines the Means-End Chain as “a model that seeks to explain how a product or service selection facilitates the achievement of desired end states” (p. 60). Kerin et al. (1992) applied the model to a shopping experience study. They found that perceived store shopping experience affects
the perceived value, but is mediated by perceived price and quality. In addition, the perceived store shopping experience influences the perceived value directly. This finding implies three levels of abstraction: shopping experience perception (the lowest level of abstraction), perceived price and quality (a higher level of abstraction), and perceived value (the highest level of abstraction).

Others theories that support the cognitive response induced by the store environment are inference theory, schema theory, and the theory of affordances (Baker et al., 2002, p. 122). Inference theory posits that people will utilise environment cues in order to make judgments of unknowns. This is supported by the theory of affordances which states that people perceive their environment as a meaningful entity. Schema theory posits that inferences about the environment are based on past experience.

The interrelation of these theories is examined in the Baker et al. study. The store atmosphere can stimulate the perception of interpersonal service quality, merchandise quality, monetary price, time or effort cost and psychic cost. These perceptions are found to relate to the perception of merchandise value. The perception of all these variables can influence behavioural intention in terms of store repatronage intention (p. 122).

The present study will focus on merchandise quality perception and interpersonal service quality perception. These perceptions are important for the consumer’s decision making (Zeithaml, 1988 and Kerin, Howard and Jain, 1992), the store image (Baker et al., 1994) and repatronage intention (Baker et al., 2002).
2.3.3.1 The Perception of Merchandise Quality

Steenkamp (1990) defined the perceived product quality as:

an idiosyncratic value judgment with respect to the fitness for consumption
which is based upon the conscious and/or unconscious processing of quality cues
in relation to relevant quality attributes within the context of significant personal
and situational variables. (p. 317)

Factors which could affect the perception of merchandise quality are store atmosphere,
intrinsic cues of the product, price, store image, service environment, brand image and
promotional message (Schiffman et al., 1997, p. 181).

The extant literature reveals that store atmosphere can influence the perception of
Specifically, ambient and social factors can influence the perception of merchandise
quality. As well as the service quality, the merchandise quality mediates the influence of
ambient and social factors on the store image. However, in the later study, Baker et al.
found that perception of store design is the only factor to influence the perception of
merchandise quality, which in turn influences the perception of merchandise value,
which associates with repatronage intention.

2.3.3.2 The Perception of Service Quality

The Nordic model (Gronroos, 1984) and the SERVQUAL model (Parasuraman,
Zeithaml and Berry, 1988) are two important conceptualisations in the body of perceived
service quality literature (Brady and Cronin, 2001, p. 34). Both models are based on the disconfirmation model. Perceived service quality is a result of comparative evaluation of perceived service and expected service. According to the Nordic model, technical quality and functional quality are the perceived service quality dimensions. Functional quality is how the service is delivered, while technical quality is the result of the service (p. 35). In contrast to the Nordic model, the SERVQUAL model has five perceived service quality dimensions. These dimensions are reliability, responsiveness, empathy, assurances and tangibles (p. 35).

Other service quality conceptualisations develop the Nordic and SERVQUAL models; these include the three-component model (Rust and Oliver, 1997), the multilevel model (Dabholkar, Thorpe and Rentz, 1995) and the hierarchical approach (Brady and Cronin, 2001). The three-component model identifies service product, service delivery and service environment as the service quality components. The multilevel model recognises the service quality components as antecedents; therefore the service quality concept is hierarchical in nature. The structure of the service quality construct has three levels: the overall perceptions of service quality, primary dimensions and sub-dimensions (p. 35).

Brady and Cronin (2001) combined the three-component model and the multilevel model. Perceived service quality comprises interaction quality, physical environment quality and outcome quality. In detail, interaction quality comprises attitude, behaviour and expertise; outcome quality consists of waiting time, tangibles, valence and social factors. Physical environment quality comprises ambient conditions, design and social factors. Therefore, the perceived service quality is defined as a multilevel and multidimensional construct which is based on the customer’s evaluation of the customer-employee interaction, the outcome quality and physical environmental quality (pp. 35-36).
The review of perceived service quality conceptions emphasises the importance of the influence of the physical environment on the perception of service quality. The SERVQUAL model (Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry, 1988) includes the tangible component, representing physical evidence of the service. The three-component model identifies the service environment as one of the components in the model affecting the perceived service quality. The hierarchical model (Brady and Cronin, 2001) takes account of physical environment quality.

The relationship between the retail store atmosphere and the perceived service quality is also supported by theoretical arguments such as those of Baker (1986) and Bitner (1992) and by empirical findings such as those of Baker et al. (1994) and Baker et al. (2002). Baker et al. (1994) tested the relationship between the store atmosphere, the perception of merchandise quality, the perception of service quality and store image in an experimental setting, using a card and gift store to represent prestige-image and discount-image conditions. The perception of service quality and the perception of merchandise quality were found to be antecedents to store image rather than components of the store image (pp. 332-3).

Using videotapes to illustrate the store environment, Baker et al. (2002) confirm the relationship between store atmosphere, the perception of merchandise quality and the perception of service quality. Specifically, the social factor has a positive relationship with interpersonal service quality, which in turn influences store repatronage intentions.

In summary, the literature review offers substantial support for the relationship between store atmosphere and cognitive responses, in particular the perception of merchandise quality and the perception of service quality.
2.4 Store Patronage Satisfaction

Store atmosphere studies have used a range of different shopping behaviour measurements. Donovan and Rossiter (1982) adapted the Mehrabian-Russell approach-avoidance behaviour measurement to an actual retail setting. Since then, a number of others researchers have utilised this approach (see Bateson and Hui, 1987 and 1991; Yalch and Spangenberg, 1988; Chebat et al., 1993; Belizzi et al., 1983; Belizzi and Hite, 1992 and Baker et al., 1992). Approach-avoidance behaviour, which measures customer intention, consists of store patronage intention, in-store search and exposure to product offerings, interaction with sales personnel and floor staff, repeat shopping frequency, and reinforcement of time and money expenditures in the store.

Donovan et al. (1994) extended the 1982 study by measuring the buyer’s behaviour. In addition, two other measurements were included: money and time spent in the store. While the measurement of time spent in the store has been used in other studies (e.g., Smith and Curnow, 1966; Milliman, 1982 and 1986; Yalch and Spanganberg, 1988, 1990 and 1993; Gulas and Schewe, 1994 and Arini and Kim, 1993), the majority of studies involving store atmosphere are more interested in sales measurement (e.g., Cox, 1964; Kotzan and Evason, 1969; Curham, 1972; Wilkinson et al., 1982 and Gagnon and Osterhaus, 1985).

The present study measures shopping behaviour in terms of satisfaction as well as intention to return and proposes that satisfaction would influence return intention. This relationship, tested by Stoel et al. (2004) in a shopping mall setting, is illustrated in figure 2.3.
Many scholars have attempted to define satisfaction: Hunt (1977), Oliver (1981, 1997), Westbrook (1987), Zeithaml and Bitner (2000) and Fournier and Mick (1999). Oliver defined satisfaction as:

…the customer fulfillment response. It is a judgment that a product or service feature, or the product or service itself, provided (or is providing) a pleasurable level of consumption-related fulfillment, including levels of under-or over-fulfillment. (p. 13)

Oliver’s definition is similar to that of Zeithaml and Bitner who defined satisfaction as the result of the customer’s evaluation process in terms of whether their needs or expectations have been fulfilled. Fournier and Mick defined satisfaction as:
a context-dependent process consisting of a multi-model, multi-modal blend of motivations, cognitions, emotions, and meanings, embedded in socio-cultural settings that transforms during progressive and regressive consumer-product interactions. (p. 16).

This definition, although it can be considered as an expansion of previous concepts, is proposed together with consumer-product satisfaction.

Most of the researchers studying satisfaction have yet to agree on its nature (Babin and Griffin, 1998; Bagozzi et. al., 1999; Crooker and Near, 1998). Satisfaction model formulations such as predictive expectations, desire expectations, equity expectations, and experience-based norms are clearly cognitively based models (Fournier and Mick, 1999, p. 6).

However, each model has a different source of pre-consumption product standard:

a) Predictive expectation is based on attribute performance (Tse and Wilton, 1988; Oliver and DeSarbo, 1988; Oliver, 1997 and Fournier and Mick, 1999).

b) Desire expectation is derived from features and benefits that are considered ideal in the product domain (Oliver and DeSarbo, 1988; and Fournier and Mick, 1999).

c) Equity expectation is based on what reasonably should occur, comparing value and price of the product (Oliver and DeSarbo, 1988; Oliver and Swan, 1989; and Fournier and Mick, 1999).

d) Experience-based expectation is derived from personal experiences or information received from other people (Fournier and Mick, 1999).
After consuming the product, these expectations will be evaluated and the consumer will feel satisfied if his or her expectations are confirmed. In contrast, expectations that are not met will result in feelings of dissatisfaction.

Other researchers, such as Westbrook and Oliver (1991), Simintiras, Diamantopoulos, and Ferriday (1997), Menon and Dube (2000) and Fournier and Mick (1999) have emphasised emotions as another component of satisfaction. Still others such as Oliver (1997), Stauss and Neuhaus (1997) and Liljander and Strandvik (1997) have suggested models or prototypes to measure the various emotions involved in customer satisfaction. Table 2.2 shows these models of emotions for measurement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Contentment</td>
<td>1. Optimism/confidence</td>
<td>1. Happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Surprise</td>
<td>5. Indifference/resignation</td>
<td>5. Depressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although a number of studies have explored product satisfaction, the literature reveals that only a few satisfaction studies have been conducted in the retail context. Amongst these studies are Oliver’s 1981 study exploring the measurement and evaluation of the satisfaction process, Westbrook’s 1981 study focusing on the sources of shopping satisfaction, Swan’s and Trawick’s 1981 study focusing on the application of
disconfirmation of expectations and satisfaction in restaurants, Bloemer and Ruyter’s 1998 study exploring the relationship between store image, satisfaction and loyalty, and Bloemer and Odekerken-Schroder’s 2002 study focusing on store satisfaction and loyalty. These studies will be discussed further in order to lay the foundation for the current study.

Swan and Trawick (1981) maintained that Swan (1977) was the earliest study to apply the satisfaction concept in the retail setting, using a newly opened restaurant. In their study, Swan and Trawick confirmed the applicability of disconfirmation of expectation theory in order to explore the satisfaction concept in retail service. Their study broke down the concept of shopper disconfirmation, a process of comparing the actual results with the expectation, into inferred disconfirmation and perceived disconfirmation. When the shopper compares the actual store attributes with expected store attributes, this is inferred disconfirmation. When the shopper concludes the performance to be better or worse, the process is known as perceived disconfirmation (pp. 50-53).

Figure 2.4 The basic satisfaction model – Swan and Trawick (1981), p. 52
Oliver (1981) maintained that a shopper who buys a product in the store will experience three distinct satisfactions, a store satisfaction, a product satisfaction and a redress activities satisfaction. Figure 2.5 below shows the Oliver retail satisfaction model. Here, retail satisfaction is explicitly related to product satisfaction and product satisfaction affects the redress or overall activities satisfaction. Both satisfactions use expectation and disconfirmation components in order to explain satisfaction. Furthermore, Oliver (1981) argues that expectations in a retail setting relate to the store image. As an example, shoppers who visit a discount store have an expectation of low price products.

This expectation will be confirmed at the end of their visit to the store. If the expectation is fulfilled or exceeded, the shopper will feel satisfied. In contrast, when the expectation is not fulfilled, perhaps because of higher than expected prices, the shopper feels dissatisfied (Swan, 1977; Oliver, 1981; Westbrook, 1981; and Swan and Trawick, 1981).
Figure 2.5 The retail satisfaction model – Oliver (1981)

Stage 1: Store / Purchase

Stage 2: Product Consumption

Stage 3: Redress Activities

While Swan and Trawick (1981) and Oliver (1981) confirm the applicability of expectation and disconfirmation theory in retail settings, Westbrook (1981) identifies the sources of shopper satisfaction. Based on his study, eight factors emerge as the sources of shopper satisfaction. These factors are: store salesperson, store environment, merchandising policies, service orientation, product or service satisfaction, clientele, value or price relationship, and special sales. Of these, store salesperson, special sales, product or service and value-price relationship were found to be the most influential factors affecting shopper satisfaction (pp. 77-78).

Bloemer and Ruyter (1998) identified the relationship between store image, store satisfaction and store loyalty. Store satisfaction is differentiated into manifest and latent satisfaction in terms of the presence of the evaluation process as to whether the expectation is fulfilled. If the expectation is evaluated and found to be fulfilled or exceeded, the shopper will gain a manifest satisfaction. On the other hand, if the expectation is not evaluated and the shopper is satisfied, this is called a latent satisfaction. Manifest satisfaction was found to have a greater effect on store loyalty than latent satisfaction. The main finding of Bloemer and Ruyter’s (1998) study was that the relationship between store image and store loyalty is mediated by store satisfaction (pp. 502-03).

Recently, Bloemer and Odekerken-Schroder (2002) explored the relationship between store satisfaction and store loyalty from a different perspective. Store loyalty was conceptualised into four components: word of mouth, price insensitivity, purchase intentions and complaint behavior. The authors found that consumer satisfaction was related to the shopper’s positive affect as a result of the interaction between consumer relationship proneness and store image. These satisfied shoppers give trust and commitment to the store. This commitment is positively related to the four components of store loyalty (pp. 71-72). Figure 2.6 below exhibits all the relationships.
Figure 2.6 The retail satisfaction model - Bloomer and Odekerken–Schroder (2002)

Other researchers, such as Bitner and Hubbert (1994), followed by Jones and Suh (2000), developed the concept of satisfaction with their concept of transaction-specific satisfaction. This was interpreted as “the consumer dis/satisfaction with a discrete service encounter” while overall satisfaction was viewed as “the consumer’s overall dis/satisfaction with the organization based on all encounters and experiences with that particular organization” (Bitner and Hubbert, 1994, pp. 76-77).

Despite the debate on the concept of satisfaction, this study defines satisfaction as an individual’s reaction to his or her evaluation of the total set of experiences in patronising the retailer (Westbrook and Oliver, 1991; Simintiras, Diamantopoulos and Ferriday, 1997; Menon and Dube, 2000 and Fournier and Mick, 1999).

The relationship between the concepts of satisfaction and repurchase intention has long been of interest to researchers (e.g., Oliver and Swan, 1989; Bitner, 1990; Anderson and Sullivan, 1993; Bitner and Hubbert, 1994; Parasuraman et al., 1994; Bolton and Lemon, 1999 and Jones and Suh, 2000). Jones and Suh (2000) summarised the relationship between variables and differentiated three models, as shown in figure 2.7.
In the first model, overall satisfaction mediates the relationship between transaction-specific satisfaction and repurchase intentions. In other words, repurchase intention is influenced by transaction-specific satisfaction via overall satisfaction. According to this model, store patronage satisfaction, as a transaction-specific satisfaction, will influence the customer’s overall satisfaction regarding the product bought in the store. This overall satisfaction will in turn influence the likelihood of the customer repurchasing the product in the future.

The second model posits that transaction-specific satisfaction can directly influence the repurchase intention as well as indirectly influence it via overall satisfaction. As in the previous model, overall satisfaction also directly affects repurchase intention. Based on this model, the customers will consider their experience when they buy the product in the store. If they have a satisfying experience, they are likely to repurchase the product.

The last model emphasises the role of overall satisfaction as a partial mediator and moderator of the relationship between transaction-specific satisfactions and repurchase intention. This moderator role is an expansion of the second model. Applying this model to the retail context, the influence of store patronage satisfaction on repurchase intention is moderated by overall satisfaction. Further, regardless of whether or not a consumer is dissatisfied after visiting the store, they will purchase the product due to high level of overall satisfaction.

There is also debate in the literature about the relationship between the perception of service quality and satisfaction (Bitner, 1990; Bitner and Hubbert, 1994; Taylor and Tversky, 1992; Anderson and Sullivan, 1993 and Brady and Robertson, 2001). Brady and Robertson (2001) explain that there are three ways of approaching the relationship between perceived quality and satisfaction. The first approach is that the situation or the context of the research influences the relationship between perceived quality and
satisfaction (Dabholkar et al., 1995 and Brady and Robertson, 2001). More affectively dominated countries such as Latin American countries may place satisfaction as the antecedent to perceived service quality, which in turn affects behavioural intentions. In contrast, more cognitively dominated countries such as the United States of America could identify the perception of service quality as the antecedent to satisfaction, which in turn influences behavioural intentions.

The second approach identifies the relationship between perceived service quality and satisfaction as “satisfaction – perceived service quality – behavioral intention”. According to this approach, satisfaction is an antecedent to the perception of service quality which in turn influences behavioural intention.

The last approach recognises the relationship between perceived service quality and satisfaction as “perceived service quality – satisfaction – behavioural intention”. According to this approach, the evaluation of service quality which is cognitive in nature could influence satisfaction, which in turn affects behavioural intentions (Parasuraman et al., 1988; Oliver, 1997 and Brady and Robertson, 2001). Rust and Oliver (1997) explain that perceived service quality is one dimension that influences satisfaction.

2.5 Repatronage Intention

Repatronage intention aims to measure the likelihood that the shopper will patronise the store in the future. This behavioural intention is the ultimate shopping outcome measurement in this study. A number of researchers (Jones and Sasser, 1995; Olivia et al., 1992; Wakefield and Blodgett, 1994; Babin and Darden, 1996; Babin and Griffin, 1998, Brady et al., 2001 and Stoel et al., 2004) argue that higher levels of satisfaction lead to repeat purchase.
Most recently, Grace and O’Cass (2005) investigated the antecedents of repatronage intention across department stores and discount stores. The study found that satisfaction, perceived value for money and consumption feelings are the antecedents of the intention to revisit the store. Satisfaction is the strongest variable to influence repatronage intention.

2.6 A Cross Cultural Perspective

The main aim of this study is to investigate the relationship that exists between shopping motivation, optimum stimulation level, perception of store atmosphere, perception of merchandise value, perception of service quality, retail patronage satisfaction and repatronage intention. The proposed relationships are tested in two countries, Australia and Indonesia. The following section provides a brief overview of the cultures of Indonesia and Australia and of cross-cultural shopping behaviour studies.

2.6.1 The culture of Indonesia and Australia

Two theoretical frameworks assist in identifying the cultural differences between Indonesia and Australia. Firstly, Hofstede (2005) explains that to identify a culture, four cultural dimensions can be used. These four dimensions are: culture-power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism and masculine/feminism. Secondly, Trompenaars and Hampden (1997) defined five cultural dimensions: universal or multiple cultures, individualism or collectivism, affective or neutral cultures, specific or diffuse cultures and achievement- or ascription-oriented cultures.

According to Hofstede (2005), the dimension of culture-power distance refers to the degree of acceptance of inequality and the unequal distribution of power. Indonesia has
the highest score in the culture-power distance dimension in the world. This indicates that Indonesia has a high level of inequality of power and wealth within the society. Indonesia has a lower score for the dimension of individualism than other countries. Consequently, Indonesia is classified as a collectivist country. As a collectivist country, most Indonesians prioritise “a close long term commitment to the member group, whether that is a family, extended family, or extended relationships” (Hofstede, 2005). Furthermore, Indonesia has a lower score in uncertainty avoidance than the Asian average of 58. This shows Indonesian has a moderate tolerance for uncertainty.

Australia has a lower power distance index than Indonesia. The index is 36, well below the world average of 55. This indicates that Australia has a high level of equality of power and wealth within the society. In contrast to Indonesia, Australia has the second highest individualism index in the world, that is, 90. As an individualistic country, “individuality and individual rights are paramount within the societies” and “individuals in these societies may tend to form a larger number of looser relationships” (Hofstede, 2005). Finally, Australia has a moderate uncertainty avoidance index.

In summary, the power distance and the individualism indexes reveal that Indonesia and Australia have very different cultures. In Indonesia, people “reinforce extended families and collectives where everyone takes responsibility for fellow members of their group” and there is low degree equality in the society (Hofstede, 2005). In contrast, Australians “tend to form a large number of looser relationships” and have a high of degree equality.

According to Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997), the universalism versus particularism or rules versus relationships index indicates that Australia is a highly rules oriented country, whereas Indonesia emphasises relationships. The communitarianism versus individualism index shows that Australia is a more individualistic country than Indonesia. The neutral versus emotional measurement reveals that there is not much
difference in the degree of emotion displayed between the countries. The diffuse versus specific measurement indicates that Australians tend to engage in more specific areas of life than Indonesians. The achievement versus ascription index shows that in Indonesia, the background of people influences their status. On the other hand, in Australia status depends on what people have done.

To sum up, the Trompenaars and Hampden (1997) model of cultural dimensions supports the difference of cultures in Australia and Indonesia.

2.6.2 Studies of Cross Cultural Shopping Behaviour

The literature on shopping behaviour reveals different findings on the role of culture in shopping behaviour. For example, Cleveland et al. (2003) suggest that there are similarities amongst American, Canadian and English societies in the importance of gender difference in determining the extent and type of information searching.

Another stream of research finds differences that are relevant to marketers. Brady et al. (2001) find that Americans and Ecuadorians differ in their consciousness of expense, price and value. Sternquist, Byun and Jin (2004) surveyed Korean and Chinese shoppers and found dissimilarities in price perception and its influence on shopping behaviour. Ackerman and Tellis (2001) maintain that the difference in consumer’s shopping behaviour and the perception of product prices in grocery stores is due to cultural orientation.

In shopping behaviour, China, as a collectivist country, is identified by Ackerman and Tellis to be more conscious in relation to value and price and more sophisticated in money-handling than America, as an individualistic country.
Culture is an important factor in understanding shopping behaviour. The importance of culture is seen in the characterisation of shopping as “a social event whose meaning is likely to be even more closely tied to culture than the meaning of the product” (Ackerman and Tellis, 2001, p. 62). Thus, testing the proposed relationship in two such different cultures as Indonesia and Australia could help generalise the findings.

2.7 Summary

The literature review has discussed concepts and studies in the following areas: shopping motivation, store atmosphere and the influence of culture on shopping behaviour. Shopping motivation typologies and optimum stimulation level are examined. Major findings on shopping motivation support the influence shopping motivation can have on the perception of store atmosphere and cognitive responses in terms of the perception of merchandise value and service quality.

The existing literature shows that store atmosphere can have a major influence on the perception of merchandise quality and service quality. The perception of service quality affects repatronage intention. The perception of merchandise quality influences the perception of merchandise value which in turn affects repatronage intention.

Westbrook (1981) identifies the sources of shopping satisfaction as: store salespersons, store environment, merchandising policies, service orientation, product orientation, clientele, value or price relationship, and special sales.

Jones and Suh (2000) analyse how store patronage satisfaction affects repatronage intention. Firstly, overall satisfaction mediates the relationship between transaction-
specific satisfaction and repurchases intentions. Secondly, transaction-specific satisfaction can directly influence repurchase intentions as well as indirectly affect them via overall satisfaction. Thirdly, the role of overall satisfaction is as a partial mediator and moderator of the relationship between transaction-specific satisfactions and repurchase intentions.

According to Hofstede (2005) and Trompenaars and Hampden (1997), Indonesia and Australia have different cultures. Indonesia is a collectivist country, in contrast to Australia which is an individualistic country. Ackerman and Tellis (2001) show that China as a collectivist country is more conscious of value and price and more sophisticated in money handling than America. Therefore, culture does affect shopping behaviour (Ackerman and Tellis, 2001).
Chapter Three
Hypothesis Development

The majority of shopping motivation studies focus on developing shopping motivation typologies. There are only a few studies to investigate a broader view of motivation (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003 and Hibbert and Tagg, 2001). This study is interested in developing such a broader view. In particular, this study investigates the relationship between shopping motivation, optimum stimulation level and in-store experience. As explained earlier, the in-store experience comprises the perception of store atmosphere and the cognitive response of shoppers to that atmosphere.

To support the hypothesised relationship between these influences on shopping behaviour, the theory of goal-directed behaviour is the foundation of the study. According to Pervin (1987), this theory argues that:

There is an organized, persistent, directed quality to much of human behavior and the concept of goal is suggested as a means for directing attention to, and understanding an aspect of human behavior that transcends the immediacy of particular situation or moment. (p. 228)

According to this theory, motivation or goal can influences people’s behaviour in the way it stimulates and direct behaviour. Therefore it is hypothesized that:

**H1:** The perceptions of store atmosphere are associated with shopping motivation in Perth and Surabaya.
The concept of OSL has attracted the interest of a number of consumer behaviour scholars (e.g., Raju, 1977; Mittelstaedt, Grossbart, Curtis and De Vere, 1976; Wahlers and Etzel, 1985 and Steenkamp and Baumgartner, 1995). Most of the studies have identified the relationship between OSL and the consumer exploratory behaviour which has been categorised by Raju (1980) as curiosity motivated, variety seeking and risk taking behaviours. Lawson et al. (1996) explain that people who experience a high amount of arousal are likely to explore all available stimuli. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

**H2**: The perceptions of store atmosphere are associated with optimum stimulation level (OSL) in Perth and Surabaya.

The motives of shoppers influence how they evaluate the product (Lawson, 1996). For example, utilitarian products such as computers would generate more of a thought process than hedonic products. In contrast, hedonic products, such as high fashion clothes, are evaluated by the shopper for the symbolic significance of their brand name and sex appeal and in response to the physical and psychological stimulation they evoke.

Similarly, shopping motivation influences how people perceive the environment and how they process information (Lawson, 1996). Utilitarian shoppers tend to focus on acquiring the product, while hedonic shoppers focus on the experiential side of shopping, and are more likely to be involved in exploring the store atmosphere than are utilitarian shoppers. As a result, they are influenced by more factors in the decision making process (Dawson et al., 1990 and Arnold and Reynolds, 2003).

Empirical research shows shopping motivation influences the emotion stimulated by the store environment (Dawson et al., 1990). In particular, strongly product-motivated shoppers experience higher pleasure, while strongly experientially-motivated shoppers
experience higher arousal. In addition, retail choice and preference are influenced directly by shopping motivation. Based on these findings, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H3**: The shopper’s cognitive responses are associated with shopping motivation in Perth and Surabaya.

Streufert and Streufert (1978) argue that the discrepancy from general incongruity adaptation level (GIAL) results in cognitive responses. They define GIAL as people’s expectation concerning general incongruity in their environment. When the general incongruity in the environment in less than GIAL value, people are motivated cognitively to explore the environment in order to approach GIAL. On the other hand, when the general incongruity in the environment is above GIAL value, people tend to reduce this incongruity through escape or perceptual distortion. Thus, people’s cognitive response aims to approach the expected value or GIAL value. In addition, Lawson et al. (1996) explain that arousal influences cognitive thinking. This influence is shown in the selection of informational stimuli and the reviewing of stored knowledge.

**H4**: The shopper’s cognitive responses are associated with optimum stimulation level (OSL) in Perth and Surabaya.

Store atmosphere stimulates the emotional, cognitive and physiological responses of shoppers which in turn may influence approach avoidance behaviour in the service sector (Bitner, 1992). Most store atmosphere studies concentrate on how store atmosphere induces emotional responses, which in turn influence shopping outcomes. Some studies such as those of Baker et al. (1994) and Baker et al. (2002) found that store atmosphere stimulates cognitive responses such as the perception of merchandise quality and service quality.
Baker et al. (1994) studied ambient, design and social factors in the store environment. They found that ambient and social factors enhance the customers’ perception of merchandise quality. In contrast, social factors influence the perception of service quality.

In a later study, Baker et al. (2002) investigated the relationship between store atmosphere, the perception of merchandise value and repatronage intention. They hypothesised that merchandise value is associated with the customers’ perceptions of service quality, merchandise quality, monetary price, time or effort cost and psychic cost. The study found that the customers’ perception of service quality is influenced by their perception of the store employees, in other words, the social factor. In contrast, their perception of design factors enhances their perception of the quality of the merchandise.

This leads to the next hypothesis:

**H5:** The shopper’s cognitive responses are associated with store atmosphere in Perth and Surabaya.

The literature reveals a debate about the relationship between the perception of service quality and store patronage satisfaction (Bitner, 1990; Bitner and Hubbert, 1994; Taylor and Tversky, 1992; Anderson and Sullivan, 1993 and Brady and Robertson, 2001). Brady and Robertson (2001) explain that there are three approaches to the relationship between perceived quality of service and satisfaction. The first approach is that the situation or the context of the research influences the relationship between the perceived quality and satisfaction (Dabholkar et al., 1995 and Brady and Robertson, 2001). More affectively dominated countries may place satisfaction before perceived service quality, which in turn affects the behavioural intention of customers. In contrast, more cognitively dominated countries may identify the perception of service quality as the
antecedent to satisfaction, which in turn influences the behavioural intention of customers.

The second approach identifies the relationship between perceived service quality and satisfaction as “satisfaction $\rightarrow$ perceived service quality $\rightarrow$ behavioural intention”. According to this approach, satisfaction is an antecedent to the perception of service quality, which in turn influences behavioural intention.

The last approach recognises the relationship between perceived service quality and satisfaction as “perceived service quality $\rightarrow$ satisfaction $\rightarrow$ behavioural intention”. According to this approach, the evaluation of service quality, which is cognitive in nature, may influence satisfaction, which in turn affects behavioural intention (Parasuraman et al., 1988; Oliver, 1997 and Brady and Robertson, 2001). Rust and Oliver (1994) also explain that the perception of service quality is one dimension that influences satisfaction. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

**H6:** Store patronage satisfaction is associated with the cognitive responses of customers in Perth and Surabaya.

Satisfaction can be differentiated between transaction-specific satisfaction and overall satisfaction (Bitner and Hubbert, 1994 and Jones and Sasser, 1995). Bitner and Hubbert defined transaction-specific satisfaction as “the customer dis/satisfaction with a discrete service encounter” while overall satisfaction is “the customer’s overall dis/satisfaction with the organization based on all encounters and experiences with that particular organization” (pp. 76-77).
In the retail field, shopping may arouse three distinct satisfactions: store satisfaction, product satisfaction and redress activities satisfaction (Oliver, 1981). According to Oliver’s concept, shoppers firstly experience store patronage dis/satisfaction which may influence product consumption satisfaction. The dis/satisfaction is a result of the expectation and disconfirmation process.

Westbrook (1981) identified a number of sources of shopping satisfaction. These sources were store salesperson, store environment, merchandising policies, service orientation, product or service satisfaction, clientele, value or price relationship and special sales. Of these, store salesperson, special sales, product or service and value and price relationship emerged as the most influential factors on shopping satisfaction.

Another factor that might affect shopping satisfaction is store image (Bloomer and Ruyter, 1998). Since the store atmosphere literature suggests store atmosphere can stimulate cognitive responses, this study will test the relationship between the cognitive responses of shoppers in terms of their perception of merchandise quality, service quality and store patronage satisfaction, based on the following hypothesis.

**H7:** Store patronage satisfaction is associated with the store atmosphere in Perth and Surabaya.

Store patronage satisfaction has been found to influence store loyalty (Bloemer and Ruyter, 1998), word of mouth, price insensitivity, purchase intentions and complaint behaviour (Bloemer and Odekerken-Schroder, 2002). Stoel et al. (2004) found that satisfaction with mall attributes is an antecedent for store repatronage intention. Building on this, the current study intends to examine the relationship between store patronage satisfaction and repatronage intention.
H8: Repatronage intention is associated with the store patronage satisfaction in Perth and Surabaya.

In summary, the study has been constructed on the basis of eight hypotheses, which have been tested in both Perth and Surabaya.
Chapter Four
Research Methodology

This chapter discusses the details of the research methodology adopted in the study. In the first part of this chapter, the aim is to explain the research procedure used in Australia and Indonesia, the considerations used in deciding the sample and the strategies employed to reach the sample. The biases that occurred in the cross cultural study and how the study deals with these are discussed in the second part of this chapter. In the third part, the measurement instruments used to answer the research question are described. Specifically, the section discusses shopping motivation, optimum stimulation level, perception of store atmosphere, cognitive response, satisfaction and repatronage intention measurements. The fourth part of the chapter explores the questionnaire testing. Fifthly, there is a discussion of statistical tools used to analyse the data. The last part explores the ethical issues in this study.

4.1 Sampling

Three sampling frames are involved in the design: respondents, retail environments and time of day. A total of 618 shoppers, 288 shoppers in Australia and 330 shoppers in Indonesia were recruited randomly to serve as subjects. The number of respondents was determined by the following guidelines suggested by other researchers:

1. Hair et al. (1998) indicate the number of respondents should be a ratio of 14 observations to each variable in order to perform factor analyses. Therefore, the number of respondents in Perth and Surabaya is adequate.
2. Further, to employ a regression technique, Hair et al. (1998) suggested that a ratio of between 15 and 20 observations for each independent variable is desirable in order to generalise the finding. The numbers of observations – 288 in Australia and 330 in Indonesia- are well above the suggested ratio.

3. In addition, Green (1991) implies the number of respondents for multiple regressions should be 50 plus eight times the number of independent variables. This rule of thumb is preferable if the number of independent variables is less than seven variables. The sample sizes in Perth and Surabaya are well above the sample size suggested by Green.

The store environments chosen for the study are supermarkets, specialty stores and department stores. Ideally, each type of store should be similar in terms of store design between Australia and Indonesia. However, this aim was difficult to achieve. The following stores were selected in Australia: Woolworths (supermarket), Target (department store) and Jeans West (specialty store). All stores were located in the Murray street shopping centre, Perth, Western Australia. The stores in Indonesia were: Hero (supermarket), Matahari (department store) and a local jeans store (specialty store).

The number of respondents was equally distributed between types of stores. The data was collected in two shifts over 30 days at each store. The two shifts were a morning shift from 10.00 a.m. to midday and an afternoon shift from 3.00 to 5.00 p.m. It was expected that the different times and days would provide different types of shopper: household, professional worker and student.

The data was collected by approaching potential respondents as they finished shopping in the particular type of store. The research assistants helped the respondents, explaining all the instructions.
The following strategies were utilised to reach the sample:

1. The researcher offered a pen as an incentive to each respondent in Australia and Indonesia. This pen was given to motivate the respondent to answer the questionnaire.

2. The researcher was accompanied by four research assistants in each country. The research assistants were university students experienced in market research.

Collecting the data in an actual retail setting should produce a significant contribution since most store atmosphere studies have not used actual shoppers as their sample (e.g. Donovan & Rossiter, 1982; Belizzi et al., 1983; Andrus, 1986; Gardner & Siomkos, 1986; Bateson & Hui, 1987; Iyer, 1989; Hui & Bateson, 1991; Belizzi & Hite, 1992; Crowley, 1993; Chebat, Chebat, & Filiatrault, 1993; Pinto and Leonidas, 1994; Wakefield & Blodgett, 1994; Dube et al., 1995; Mitchel et al., 1995 and Hui et al., 1997). On the other hand, this study does not allow the researcher to control variables such as pre-existing image and pre-existing emotion.

4.2 The Study Bias

Due to the cross-cultural nature of this study, special attention has been given to potential biases. Harkness et al. (2003) differentiate three types of bias in cross-cultural studies: construct bias, method bias, and item bias. The study attempts to address these biases so that comparisons can be made between the Australian and Indonesian findings.

Construct bias occurs mainly when the same construct is not measured across countries or groups (Harkness et al., 2003). This different concept interpretation could be caused by an overlap in the definitions of construct, the differential
appropriateness of the behaviours associated with the construct, inappropriate sampling, and an incomplete questionnaire which does not include all the relevant aspects of the construct. As suggested by Van de Vijver (2003), this study employed exploratory factor analysis to ensure the questionnaire measured the same constructs between Indonesia and Australia. Further detail of this analysis is provided in the section that outlines the data analysis.

The second type of bias is method bias, which occurs as a result of sample incomparability, instrument differences, tester and interviewer effects, and the mode of administration (Harkness et al., 2003). In order to address these biases, the study has used the same questionnaire in Australia and Indonesia. This method is known as “Ask-the-same-question” model (Harkness et al., 2003). Furthermore, to ensure equivalence, the questionnaire provides detailed instructions for respondents and the researcher has developed a detailed manual for administration and scoring. Using shoppers as the sample population in Australia and Indonesia could reduce the method bias because the same sampling frame is used in both countries.

The third type of bias, called item bias, refers to the item level and is identified as differences in the mean score of the item even though the respondents from different countries have a similarity in construct standing (Van de Vijver, 2003). The sources of this bias are poor translation, nuisance factors, and cultural specifics. To deal with item bias, the questionnaire in Indonesian has been cross-checked by some Indonesian postgraduate students and pre-tested at the Widya Mandala Catholic University by students studying Marketing Research.

4.3 Measurements

This study used measurement instruments developed by other researchers. The main consideration in borrowing an existing measurement is that it has been established to
measure particular concepts. De Vaus (2002) suggests using an established measurement in preference to constructing a new measurement.

A review of current literature reveals Arnold and Reynolds (2003) as the only scholars to develop the hedonic shopping motivation measurement. To develop this measurement, Arnold and Reynolds employed depth interviews and surveys. Depth interviews aim to discover hedonic shopping motivations; meanwhile survey methodology validates the shopping typology. The statistical parameters to validate this measurement such as reliability analysis and confirmatory factor analysis indicate this is a satisfactory measurement.

Part A of the questionnaire contained 18 statements designed to assess the predisposition of the shopper to hedonic shopping motivation. The respondents are asked to express their agreement or disagreement with the statements. The response scale is structured on 7-point Likert scales.

a) The construct of adventure shopping is measured by: “To me, shopping is an adventure”; “I find shopping stimulating”; and “Shopping makes me feel like I am in my own universe”.

b) Three items for gratification shopping motivation are “When I’m in a down mood, I go shopping to make me feel better”; “To me, shopping is a way to relieve stress”; and “I go shopping when I want to treat myself to something special”.

c) Role shopping motivation is measured by “I like shopping for others because when they feel good I feel good”; “I enjoy shopping for my friends and my family”; and “I enjoy shopping around to find the perfect gift for someone”.

d) Three items for measuring value shopping motivation are “For the most part, I go shopping when there are sales”; “I enjoy looking for discounts when I shop”; and “I enjoy hunting for bargains when I shop”.
e) The constructs measuring social shopping are “I go shopping with my friends or family to socialise”; “I enjoy socialising with others when I shop”; and “Shopping with others is a bonding experience”.

f) Idea shopping motivation is measured by “I go shopping to keep up with the trends”; “I go shopping to keep up with the new fashions” and “I go shopping to see what products are available”.

g) Product acquisition motivation is measured by choice optimisation motivation in the Westbrook and Black (1985) shopping motivation typology. The measurements are “Finding exactly what I want in the least amount of time” and “Finding exactly the right product when I have a gift to buy for someone”.

Part B of the questionnaire related to the shoppers’ perception of store atmosphere. As the majority of store atmosphere studies have used an experimental or laboratory setting, the literature reveals limited options for store atmosphere measurement. The store atmosphere measurement of Sherman, Mathur and Smith (1997) emerges as an appropriate alternative, as this measurement differentiates the store environment into ambient, design and social factors.

The measurement of store atmosphere perceptions comprises of 18 semantic differentials phrases. This is also structured on 7-point Likert scales. The measurements are as follows:

1. Social factors consist of:
   a) Lively – unlively
   b) Cheerful – depressing
   c) Boring – stimulating
   d) Courteous salespeople – discourteous sales people
2. Design factors are:

a) Large – small

b) Roomy – cramped

c) Colorful – drab

d) Unattractive – attractive

e) Dirty – clean

f) Comfortable – uncomfortable

g) Cluttered aisles – uncluttered aisles

h) Crammed merchandise – well-spaced merchandise

i) Impressive interior – unimpressive interior

j) Well-organised layout – unorganised layout

3. Ambience factors consist of:

a) Pleasant – unpleasant

b) Relaxed – tense

c) Dull – bright

d) Pleasant smelling – unpleasant smelling

The perception of crowding is measured by the following scale adopted from the Harrell et al. (1980) study: 1) confined or closed feeling and 2) crowded or restricted movement. The respondents are asked to express their agreement on the statements. This is structured on 7-point Likert scales.
Questions in Part C are designed to measure the Optimum Stimulation Level (OSL). This measurement is based on Steenkamp and Baumgartner’s (1995) short form OSL measurement. This short form OSL measurement is well established, as the measurement has been validated in three different countries. The coefficient alpha for this measurement in Steenkamp and Baumgartner’s study is satisfactory in US, Belgium and Holland. The measurement is designed on 7-point Likert scales.

Steenkamp and Baumgartner simplified the 95 item Change Seeker Index into the following scale “I like to continue doing the same things rather than try new and different things”; “I like to experience novelty and change in my daily routine”; “I like a job that offers change, variety, and travel, even if it involves some danger”; “I am continually seeking new ideas and experience”; “When things get boring, I like to find some new and unfamiliar experience”; and “I prefer a routine way of life to an unpredictable one full of change”.

Part D includes measurement of cognitive responses which are thought to be induced by store atmosphere perception. Cognitive response refers to the merchandise quality and service quality perception. Both of these responses are based on the study by Baker et al. (2002). In their study, these measurements’ coefficient alphas are 0.72 and 0.84 respectively.

Merchandise quality perception was measured by asking the level of agreement on “Product purchased from this store would be high in quality” and “The workmanship of gifts purchased in this store would be high”.

Furthermore, the service quality perception is measured using the following statements: “This store’s employees would be willing to help customers”; “This store would offer high quality service”; “Employees of this store would not be too busy to respond to customers’ request promptly”; and “Employees of this store could be expected to give customers personal attention”. Both measurements are designed according to 7-point Likert scales.
Part E of the questionnaire deals with shopping satisfaction measurement. This measurement is based on Magi’s (2003) shopping satisfaction measurement. Satisfaction is defined as an overall evaluation rather than a transaction-specific post-purchase evaluation (Magi, 2003, p. 101). In her study, the Cronbach alpha for this measurement is 0.84. The measurement comprises the following items: “I am satisfied with this store”; “This store matches my expectation” and “This store is close to my perfect store”. All measurements are structured on 7-point Likert scales.

Part F measures repatronage intention. The scale of measurement is based on the Stoel et al. (2004) study. The reliability coefficient of this measurement in the Stoel et al. study is 0.81. The measurement comprises the following statements: “I will consider repurchasing from this store if I have a choice”; “If needed, I will select this store again”; and “I am willing to do more business with this store in the future”. The respondents are asked to express their agreement on these statements. All measurements are designed according to 7-point Likert scales.

Part H of the questionnaire addresses the respondent planning. The alternatives provided for the respondent are:

a. The respondents plan which store to visit, which product and which brand to buy
b. The respondents plan which store to visit and which product to buy, but they do not plan which brand to buy
c. The respondents plan which store, but they do not plan which product and brand to buy
d. The respondents do not plan the store, but plan the product and brand to buy
e. The respondents do not plan the store and the brand to buy, but they plan the product to buy
f. The respondents do not plan the store, the product or the brand to buy.
Finally, demographic information regarding such as gender and age of shoppers, the number of accompanying adults or children, and the number of times they visited the store was collected.

4.4 Questionnaire Testing

The questionnaire was pre-tested to identify and eliminate potential problems. All aspects were tested, including question content, wording, sequence, layout, question difficulty, and instructions. Using a convenience sample, the pre-test was conducted with 50 respondents in Perth (Australia). Any problems of wording and instruction were detected by the pre-test. Improvements of wording and instructions were made before the questionnaire was translated to Indonesian.

The Australian questionnaire was translated by an Indonesian student. Another student then translated the Indonesian questionnaire back to Australian in order to ensure the similarity of the questions. This method is known as back translation (Harkness et al., 2003).

The Indonesian version was pre-tested in two phases. Firstly, the questionnaire was tested on three Indonesian students studying in Perth. They were asked to comment on the question wording, difficulty and instructions. Feedback received was used to revise the questionnaire. Secondly, the questionnaire was tested on 50 respondents in Surabaya (Indonesia). The main purpose was to make sure that the questionnaire was understandable. As a result of the test, some revisions of wording were made.
4.5 Data Analysis

Due to the nature of cross-cultural studies, data analysis consisted of psychometric adequacy tests of the instrument or the preliminary test, and the testing of the hypotheses or model proposed (Van de Vijver and Leung, 1997). The preliminary test consists of the internal reliability test and the unidimensionality test. Furthermore, special attention was placed on the biases because of the nature of cross-cultural study. At this stage, exploratory factor analysis and analysis of variance were used in order to address the biases. The second stage aimed at testing the hypotheses and developing the role of the store atmosphere model.

4.5.1 Preliminary Data Analysis

In this first stage, factor analyses were performed on shopping motivation, store atmosphere perception, cognitive response, satisfaction and repurchase intention measurements in order to test the internal reliability. Specifically, the study applied the varimax rotation of factors with eigenvalues greater than or equal to 1.0. Moreover, reliability coefficients were obtained by computing the average of the highest loading items (for example the three highest loading items) on a particular factor. Malhotra et al. (1996) define coefficient alpha as a measure of internal consistency reliability which is the average of all possible split-half coefficients resulting from different splitting of the scale items. This coefficient varies from 0 to 1, and a value of 0.6 or over is viewed as a reliable measurement.

To deal with structural equivalence issue, the responses in Australia and Indonesia were factor analysed separately. The number of factors extracted followed the explanation above. Following this, the pattern of factors extracted in Australia and Indonesia was compared. A different pattern of factors extracted from the two countries could indicate measurement variance. In contrast, a similar pattern could be a sign of measurement invariance.
4.5.2 Testing the Hypothesis

Regression analysis can provide output to test the hypothesis and to investigate the extent of the relationship. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) produces the F value and the significance level associated with the value of F can help decide whether to accept the hypothesis. Moreover, the adjusted R square can help to identify the extent of the relationship.

4.6. Ethical Issues

The study conforms to the ethics guidelines of the University of Notre Dame Statement and Guidelines on Research Practice. The Guidelines are informed by the National Health and Medical Research Council (NH&MRC) on Ethical Conduct in Research involving Humans. Efforts were made to satisfy the following standards of research ethics.

- The respondents’ identity will not be revealed without their consent to anyone not directly involved in the study, or used for any non-research purposes.

- The results of the questionnaire will not be made public in any form, which could lead to the identification of participants. Respondents will be informed that the study will only be published in an academic journal.

- Nobody will be adversely affected or harmed as a direct result of participating in the study. The researcher will explain the study is only for academic purposes. Consequently, the publication of the study will be in a scientific journal. Further, the information requested is of a non-personal nature, that is buyer behaviour.

- Respondents will be able to check the identity and bona fides of the researcher without difficulty. Researchers will introduce themselves, explain the purpose of the study, give the university contact number to the respondents, and carry the University ID.
Introduction

Results from the empirical analysis of this thesis are presented here along with a review of the data analysis techniques used. The discussion is structured as follows: 1) the preliminary data analysis, 2) the regression analysis and 3) the summary of the chapter.

5.1 Preliminary data analysis

The preliminary data analysis provides the characteristics of the sample respondents, an analysis of the reliability of the measurement and the exploratory factor analysis.

5.1.1 The characteristics of the respondents

Respondent characteristics comprise the respondent’s gender, age, the number of accompanying people shopping and the number of times they visited the store.
Table 5.1 Characteristics of respondents (by percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karakteristik</th>
<th>Perth</th>
<th>Surabaya</th>
<th>Total sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Male</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Female</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Less than 18 years old</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 18 - 24 years old</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 25 - 29 years old</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 30 - 34 years old</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. 35 - 40 years old</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. More than 40 years old</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of accompanying people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. None</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 1 - 3 people</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 4 - 6 people</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. More than 6 people</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of times respondents visited the store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Never visited the store</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 1 - 3 times</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 4 - 6 times</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. More than 6 times</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Analysis of survey data

5.1.1.1 Gender

There was a total of 618 shoppers in the current study. Of this entire sample, 288 shoppers participated in the study in Perth, Western Australia and 330 shoppers in Surabaya, Indonesia. As can be seen in Table 5.1, the majority of the participants were females, accounting for 65.3 percent of the total Perth respondents and 63.0 percent in Surabaya. This pattern was anticipated, as females have a higher involvement in shopping than do males.
5.1.1.2 Age

Age was broken down into six categories as shown in Table 5.1. In Perth, most of the respondents were aged 18-24 years old. This age group accounts for 42.4% of the entire sample (122 respondents). The next largest categories were less than 18 years old and 30-34 years old. Both categories record 42 people or 14.6 percent of the total population in the Perth study. This reflects a considerable decrease from the first category. One possible reason for this may be that the age group from 18 to 24 has more time to shop than do other age groups.

Similarly, in Surabaya, most of the respondents were aged 18-24 years old. This age group accounts for 61.2% of the entire sample (202 respondents). The next largest category was 25-29 years old. This age group had 82 people or 24.8 percent of the total respondents in Surabaya.

The age distribution of the samples is comparable in Perth and Surabaya with respondents aged 18-24 year old representing the largest group. However, as can be seen in the table, in Perth, there is a larger percentage of respondents aged 30-34 (14.6% vs. 6.4%) and over 40 (5.9% vs. 0.6%). This discrepancy may be due to the higher percentage of older people shopping in the sample surveyed in Perth than in the Surabaya sample.

5.1.1.3 Number of people accompanying the shoppers

The last two questions regarding the respondents’ characteristics relate to the shopping pattern. These questions were included to determine the number of accompanying people and the number of times the store was visited. In the Perth sample, the majority of respondents (51.7 percent) shopped unaccompanied. A slightly lesser percentage (40.6 percent) shopped accompanied by 1-3 people. These results are markedly different from those found in Indonesia. As can be seen, in Table 5.1, the majority of respondents in Surabaya were accompanied by 1-3 people.
The overall figure for respondents shopping accompanied is 89.1, compared to only 46.5% in Perth. Culture may be the reason for this difference. Hofstede (2005) identifies Australia as an individualistic country and Indonesia is identified as a collectivist country. This collectivism is reflected in the tendency of shoppers to treat shopping as a social activity in Indonesia.

5.1.1.4 Number of times the store was visited

The last question asked how many times respondents had visited the store. This question was used to determine familiarity. If respondents are familiar with the store and environment, they may react differently to the environment.

Table 5.1 indicates that the majority of Perth respondents (56.3%) had visited the store more than six times and that only a small percentage of people (2.8%) had not visited the store before. These results indicate that the sample had a high level of knowledge about the store and had most likely been satisfied with the previous visits.

As was the case in Perth, most of the Indonesian respondents had shopped at the particular venue more than six times while 37% of the sample had visited the store from one to three times. There was only one respondent who had not been to the store before. Again, this would indicate that high levels of knowledge and satisfaction kept the shoppers surveyed returning.

5.1.2 The analysis of the reliability of measurement

Churchill (1979) suggests that the analysis of the reliability measurement “should be the first measure one calculates to assess the quality of measurement” (p. 68). Such an analysis can ensure that a set of measurement items performs well in capturing the
concept. In this study, the reliability module of SPSS 12.0 was used to obtain the value of Coefficient Alpha.

As can be seen in Table 5.2, in Perth, all of the measures were reliable, ranging from 0.652 to 0.892. Similar results were found in the Indonesian sample with coefficients ranging from 0.675 for repatronage intention measurement to 0.859 for shopping motivation measurement. This suggests that there is sufficient consistency among the measurement variables of most constructs studied in the survey (Malhotra et al., 1996).

The patterns of coefficients differ between the two samples. For example, in Indonesia, shopping motivation is the most reliable measurement, followed by store patronage satisfaction, optimum stimulation level, the perception of store atmosphere, cognitive response and repatronage intention measurements.

On the other hand in Australia, repatronage intention measurement is the most reliable measurement, followed by shopping motivation, cognitive response, the perception of store atmosphere, store patronage satisfaction and optimum stimulation level measurements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Perth</th>
<th>Surabaya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shopping Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To me, shopping is an adventure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping is a thrill to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping makes me feel like I am in my own universe</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratification Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I’m in a down mood, I go shopping to make me feel better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To me, shopping is a way to relieve stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I go shopping when I want to treat myself to something special

*Role Motivation*
I like shopping for others because when they feel good I feel good
I feel good when I buy things for the special people in my life
I enjoy shopping for my friends and my family

*Value Motivation*
For the most part, I go shopping when there are sales
I enjoy looking for discounts when I shop
I enjoy hunting for bargains when I shop

*Social Motivation*
I go shopping with my friends or family to socialise
I enjoy socialising with others when I shop
Shopping with others is a bonding experience

*Idea Motivation*
I go shopping to keep up with the trends
I go shopping to keep up with the new fashions
I go shopping to see what new products are available

*Product Motivation*
Finding exactly what I want, in the least amount of time
Shopping for a brand new item to replace an older one

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optimum Stimulation Level</th>
<th>0.652</th>
<th>0.714</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like to continue doing the same things rather than try new and different things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to experience novelty and change in my daily routine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like a job that offers change, variety, and travel, even if it involves some danger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am continually seeking new ideas and experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When things get boring, I like to find some new and unfamiliar experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer a routine way of life to an unpredictable one full of change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atmosphere Perception</th>
<th>0.760</th>
<th>0.707</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambient factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Smelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Design factors
- Cluttered aisles
- Large
- Roomy
- Unattractive
- Dirty
- Comfortable
- Crammed merchandise
- Impressive interior
- Well-organised layout

### Social Factors
- Lively
- Cheerful
- Boring
- Courteous salespeople

### Crowding
- Confined or close feeling
- Crowded or restricted movement

### Cognitive Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product perception</th>
<th>Service quality perception</th>
<th>Overall satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Products purchased from this store would be high in quality</td>
<td>This store’s employees would be willing to help customers</td>
<td>To what extent were you satisfied with the final outcome?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workmanship of gifts purchased in this store would be high</td>
<td>This store would offer high quality service</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the way my purchase was handled by the staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees of this store would not be too busy to respond to customers’ requests promptly</td>
<td>To what extent would you prefer another, more ideal, final outcome?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees of this store could be expected to give customers personal attention</td>
<td>Overall, to that extent were you satisfied that you got what you wanted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent were you satisfied with the personal treatment that you received while in the store?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0.863</th>
<th>0.707</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>0.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repatronage intention</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will consider repurchasing from this store if I have a choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If needed, I will select this store again</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to do more business with this store in the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Analysis of survey data

Therefore, the reliability analyses of measurements confirm that all measurements perform adequately to measure the intended concepts, or there is sufficient consistency among the measurement items to measure the concept in Perth and Surabaya.

5.1.3 The exploratory factor analysis

Exploratory factor analysis aims to uncover the structure of the relationship amongst measurements (Hair et al., 1998; De Vaus, 2002). Therefore, the factor analysis can help determine measurement validity. For the current study, exploratory factor analysis is performed on all measurements: a) shopping motivation, b) optimum stimulation level, c) the perception of store atmosphere, d) the cognitive response, e) the store patronage satisfaction and f) repatronage intention. To determine if the factors are consistent across countries, each sample was factor analysed separately. The type of rotation used in the study is the varimax rotation.

5.1.3.1 Shopping motivation

Shopping motivation is defined as “the energizing force that influences shopping behaviours in terms of its strength and direction” (Solomon, 2002, p. 103). Shopping motivation in this study mainly centers on the hedonic shopping typology developed by Arnold and Reynolds (2003). Arnold and Reynolds’s hedonic shopping motivation typology consists of gratification, adventure, idea, social, value and role shopping motivations. However, in order to enrich the study, product acquisition...
motivation as identified by Westbrook and Black (1985) is also included in this study.

a. Factor analysis in Perth

Based on Arnold and Reynolds (2003) and Westbrook and Black (1985), one would expect that the factor analysis of shopping motivations would produce seven different factors. However, as can be seen in the table 5.3, the factor analysis results in only six different factors. These factors are role, idea, adventure, social, value and product acquisition motivations. While the factors are mostly consistent with what previous literature has suggested, gratification motivation for shopping does not comprise a separate factor. Instead, it loads with the first factor. Although the first factor contains variables previously used to define both role motivation and gratification motivation, the role motivation variables provided larger loadings. Therefore, it was decided to name the factor “role motivation”.

Table 5.3 Rotated component matrix of shopping motivation for Perth sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Motivation 1</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like shopping for others because when they feel good I feel good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Motivation 2</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel good when I buy things for the special people in my life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Motivation 3</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy shopping for my friends and family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratification Motivation 2</td>
<td>.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To me, shopping is a way to relieve stress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratification Motivation 1</td>
<td>.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I’m in a down mood, I go shopping to make me feel better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratification Motivation 3</td>
<td>I go shopping when I want to treat myself to something special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Motivation 1</td>
<td>I go shopping to keep up with trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Motivation 2</td>
<td>I go shopping to keep up with the new fashions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Motivation 3</td>
<td>I go shopping to see what new products are available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Motivation 2</td>
<td>Shopping is a thrill to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Motivation 1</td>
<td>To me, shopping is an adventure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Motivation 3</td>
<td>Shopping makes me feel like I am in my own universe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Motivation 1</td>
<td>I go shopping with my friends or family to socialise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Motivation 3</td>
<td>Shopping with others is a bonding experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Motivation 2</td>
<td>I enjoy looking for discounts when I shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Motivation 1</td>
<td>For the most part, I go shopping when there are sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Motivation 3</td>
<td>I enjoy hunting for bargains when I shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Acquisition 1</td>
<td>Finding exactly what I want, in the least amount of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Acquisition 2</td>
<td>Shopping for a brand new item to replace an older</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Factor analysis in Surabaya

The factor analysis on shopping motivation in Surabaya also reveals six factors. However, these factors reflect different factor loadings from those found in Perth. The factors identified are adventure, idea, social, role, value and product acquisition shopping motivation. While the findings are mostly consistent with what the literature has suggested, again, gratification shopping motivation does not appear as a separate factor. In addition, in Indonesia, this shopping motivation is more closely aligned with adventure shopping motivation. This factor is deemed to represent adventure shopping motivation, since this motivation measurement loads heavier than the gratification shopping motivation measurement.

Table 5.4 Rotated component matrix of shopping motivation for Surabaya sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Motivation 3 Shopping makes me feel like I am in my own universe</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Motivation 1 To me, shopping is adventure</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Motivation 2 Shopping is a thrill to me</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratification Motivation 1 When I’m in a down mood, I go shopping to make me feel better</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratification Motivation 2 To me, shopping is a way to relieve stress</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>-.371</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratification Motivation 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go shopping when I want to treat myself to something special</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Motivation 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go shopping to keep up with the trends</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Motivation 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go shopping to keep up with the new fashions</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Motivation 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go shopping to see what new products are available</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Motivation 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy socialising with others when I shop</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Motivation 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go shopping with my friends or family to socialise</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Motivation 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping with others is a bonding experience</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Motivation 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel good when I buy things for the special people in my life</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Motivation 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like shopping for others because when they feel good I feel good</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Motivation 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy shopping for my friends and family</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Motivation 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the most part, I go shopping when there are sales</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Motivation 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy looking for discounts when I shop</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Motivation 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy hunting for bargains when I shop</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Acquisition 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding exactly what</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The findings of the factor analyses indicate that shopping motivation has different factor loading patterns in Perth and Surabaya. Although the factor analysis provides the same number of factors in both samples, gratification motivation loads with role motivation in Perth and with adventure motivation in Surabaya. This difference of the factor loading patterns could indicate differences in the interpretation of concepts. Therefore, it appears that the concept of shopping motivation is interpreted differently in Perth and Surabaya.

5.1.3.2 Optimum stimulation level

Optimum stimulation level (OSL) is defined as “a property that characterizes an individual in terms of his general response to environmental stimuli” (Raju, 1980, p. 272). The measurement of OSL is based on Steenkamp and Baumgartner’s (1995) short form of OSL measurement. According to Steenkamp and Baumgartner, OSL comprises one factor. The current factor analysis was undertaken to determine if the same factor existed in an individualistic country such as Australia and a collectivist country such as Indonesia.

a. Factor analysis in Perth

The factor analysis on the OSL measurement in Perth produces two factors. The first factor represents the respondent’s novelty seeking behaviour. In contrast, the variables that load most heavily on the second factor reflect a routine response. According to the concept of OSL, as defined by Steenkamp and Baumgartner, the
first factor more closely represents the concept of OSL. Therefore, only this factor is employed for further analysis.

Table 5.5 Rotated component matrix of OSL for Perth sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSL 4 I am continually seeking new ideas and experience</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSL 5 I like continually changing activities</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSL 6 When things get boring, I like to find some new and unfamiliar</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSL 3 I like a job that offers change, variety and travel, even if it</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involves some danger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSL 2 I like to experience novelty and change in my daily routine</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSL 1 I like to continue doing the same things rather than try new and</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different things</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSL 7 I prefer a routine way of life to an unpredictable one full of change</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy = 0.836; Barlett’s (sig.) = 0.000; Eigenvalues (%) = 69.629
Source: Analysis of survey data
Using a 7 Point Likert scale
All items highlighted are deemed to load on that factor

b. Factor analysis in Surabaya

In contrast to the factor loadings in Perth, all OSL variables, with the exception of OSL 1 in Surabaya, load on the same factor. Consequently, this factor is identified as optimum stimulation level, and the one variable, OSL1, is deleted from further analysis.
Table 5.6 Rotated component matrix of OSL for Surabaya sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSL 4 I am continually seeking new ideas and experience</td>
<td>0.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSL 7 (R) I prefer a routine way of life to an unpredictable one full of change</td>
<td>0.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSL 6 When things get boring, I like to find some new and unfamiliar experience</td>
<td>0.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSL 2 I like to experience novelty and change in my daily routine</td>
<td>0.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSL 3 I like a job that offers change, variety, and travel, even if it involves some danger</td>
<td>0.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSL 5 I like continually changing activities</td>
<td>0.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSL 1 (R) I like to continue doing the same things rather than try new and different things</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy = 0.842; Barlett’s (sig.) = 0.000; Eigenvalues (%) = 48.565

Source: Analysis of survey data
Using a 7 Point Likert scale
All items highlighted are deemed to load on that factor

The results of the factor analysis reveal that optimum stimulation level has a different factor loading pattern in Perth and Surabaya. The number of factors is different. The factor analysis of the Australian sample yields two factors, whereas the factor analysis of the Indonesian sample produces one factor. Therefore, the difference in factor loading could reflect different perceptions of the concept in each sample.

5.1.3.3 Store atmosphere

The perception of store atmosphere measurements is based on Sherman et al.’s (1997) store atmosphere measurement. This measurement aims to measure ambient factors, design factors and social factors. This study builds on the previous study by including crowding, as identified by Harrell et al. (1980), as another aspect of store
atmosphere. Therefore, the factor analysis in Perth and Surabaya is expected to result in four factors.

a. Factor analysis in Perth

The factor analysis in Perth did not provide results consistent with the previous studies. The first identified factor consists of measurements of both ambient and design factors. The underlying relationship could be that an impressive interior and well-organised layout induces feelings of being pleasant, relaxed and comfortable. Therefore, this first factor is named interior layout.

The second factor consists of elements of ambient, design and social factors. The relationship amongst measurements could be that perceived store attractiveness is affected by the perception of dirtiness and of a boring and dull interior. Therefore, this factor is named store attractiveness.

The third factor comprises measurements of social factors such as lively, cheerful and courteous salespeople. Accordingly, this is called the social factor. The fourth factor consists of measurement of design factors. Specifically, the measurements loaded in this factor are large and roomy space. The relationship derived from these measurements is the store space. Consequently, this factor is named store space.

The fifth factor comprises crowding measurements. Particularly, a confined or close feeling and crowded or restricted movement load significantly on this factor. For that reason, this factor is named crowding. The last factor also comprises design factor measurements. Cluttered aisle and crammed merchandise are the design factor measurements loaded in the sixth factor. Therefore, this factor is called aisle merchandise.

To sum up, factor analysis of the perception of store atmosphere measurements in Perth produces six factors. This finding is inconsistent with what the measurements intend to measure. As the study includes the crowding measurement in the store
atmosphere measurements, the factor analyses should result in the ambient, design, social factors and crowding measurements (Sherman et al., 1997). However, the measurement results in factors termed interior layout, store attractiveness, social, store space, aisle merchandise and crowding factors. These different factors may be a result of the changing store environment over the existing period.

Table 5.7 Rotated component matrix of store atmosphere for Perth sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design 9 Well-organised layout</td>
<td>.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient 1 Pleasant</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient 2 Relaxed</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design 6 Comfortable</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design 8 Impressive interior</td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient 4 Pleasant smelling</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design 5 – Reverse Dirty</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social 3 – Reverse Boring</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design 4 – Reverse Unattractive</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient 3 – Reverse Dull</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social 1 Lively</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social 2 Cheerful</td>
<td>.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social 4 Courteous salespeople</td>
<td>.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design 2 Large</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roomy</td>
<td>.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confined or close feeling</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowded or restricted movement</td>
<td>-.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluttered aisles</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crammed merchandise</td>
<td>-.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy = 0.801; Barlett’s (sig.) = 0.000; Eigenvalues (%) = 65.988
Source: Analysis of survey data
Using a 7 Point Likert scale
All items highlighted are deemed to load on that factor

b. Factor analysis in Surabaya

Factor analyses of the store atmosphere perception measurement in Surabaya results in fewer factors than in Perth. Specifically, the factor analysis results in four factors. These factors are interior layout, design factors, social factors and store attractiveness.

The first factor comprises ambient, design and social factors. The underlying relationship could be the feeling of being comfortable, pleasant and relaxed because of the impressive interior and well-organised layout. Thus, the first factor is labeled as interior layout. The second factor mainly consists of design and crowding measurements. This second factor is named the design factor, as most of the measurements of the design factor load in this factor.

The third factor comprises measurements of design factors and social factors. The social factor has the highest factor loading. In addition, this factor has more social factor measurement than the design factor. As a result, this is named the social factor. The fourth factor consists of social, ambient and design factor measurements. The
underlying relationship could be that store unattractiveness induces the feeling of a boring and dull atmosphere. Therefore, this fourth factor could be called store attractiveness.

Table 5.8 Rotated component matrix of store atmosphere for Surabaya sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design 9 Well-organized layout</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>-.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient 1 Pleasant</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design 8 Impressive interior</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>-.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient 2 Relaxed</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design 6 Comfortable</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social 2 Cheerful</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient 4 Pleasant smelling</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowding 2 Crowded or restricted movement</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.836</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design 3 Roomy</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design 5 (Reverse) Dirty</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design 7 Crammed merchandise</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design 1 (Reverse) Cluttered aisle</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowding 1 Confined or close feeling</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>-.447</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social 4 Courteous salespeople</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design 2 Large</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>-.082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indonesian shoppers and Australian shoppers also have different interpretations of store atmosphere. Australian shoppers perceive the store atmosphere in terms of interior layout, design factor, social factor, store space, store attractiveness and crowding. Indonesian shoppers identify store atmosphere as interior layout, design factor, social factor and store attractiveness. There are two main differences between these two samples. Firstly, the number of factors is different. Store space and crowding are missing in the Indonesian sample. Secondly, the measurements that load on the factors are different. For example, the measurements that load on the interior and layout in Perth and Surabaya are different. Therefore, the difference in factor loading could reflect different perceptions of the concept in each sample.

5.1.3.4 Cognitive responses

Following on from Baker et al. (1994), cognitive response is measured in terms of the perception of merchandise quality and service quality. The perception of merchandise quality comprises two questions, and the perception of service quality consists of four questions.

a. Factor analysis in Perth

In Perth, these measurements have loaded on the same factor. This factor is labeled the perception of store quality.
Table 5.9 Rotated component matrix of cognitive responses for Perth sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality 2</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This store would offer high quality service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality 1</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This store’s employees would be willing to help customers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality 4</td>
<td>.777</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Employees of this store could be expected to give customers personal attention | |}
| Merchandise Quality 1                                                        | .776      |
| Products purchased from this store would be high in quality                  |           |
| Merchandise Quality 2                                                        | .733      |
| The workmanship of gifts purchased in this store would be high              |           |
| Service Quality 3                                                           | .693      |
| Employees of this store would not be too busy to respond to customers’ requests promptly | |}

KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy = 0.830; Barlett’s (sig.) = 0.000; Eigenvalues (%) = 59.750

Source: Analysis of survey data

Using a 7 Point Likert scale

All items highlighted are deemed to load on that factor

b. Factor analysis in Surabaya

In Surabaya, the factor analysis yields two factors. In order to find the implicit relationship underlying the factors, the measurements of perceptions merchandise quality 2 is eliminated from the first factor. The reason for this elimination is that the measurements do not have any meaning in the first factor. After eliminating this measurement, the first factor could be identified as the perception of service quality.

The perception of service quality measurement, “employees of this store would not be too busy to respond to customers’ requests promptly”, loads in the second factor significantly, occupying the highest factor loading coefficients. The second highest factor loading coefficient is the perception of merchandise quality measurement 1, “products purchased from this store would be high in quality”. The relationship derived from these measurements is that salesperson availability may indicate the
The quality of merchandise quality sold in the store. Therefore this factor is named the perception of merchandise quality.

Table 5.10 Rotated component matrix of cognitive responses for Surabaya sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This store would offer high quality service</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This store’s employees would be willing to help customers</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise Quality 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workmanship of gifts purchased in this store would be high</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees of this tore could be expected to give customers personal attention</td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees of this tore would not be too busy to respond to customers’ request promptly</td>
<td>-.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise Quality 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products purchased from this store would be high in quality</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy = 0.713; Barlett’s (sig.) = 0.000; Eigenvalues (%) = 63.726
Source: Analysis of survey data
Using a 7 Point Likert scale
All items highlighted are deemed to load on that factor

The results of factor analyses indicate that cognitive response has a different factor loading pattern in Perth and Surabaya. The Australian sample has one factor; in contrast, the Indonesian sample has two factors. This difference in factor loading reflects the different perception of the cognitive response in each sample.

5.1.3.5 Store patronage satisfaction

Store patronage satisfaction measure the individual’s emotional reaction to his or her evaluation of the total set of experiences realised from patronising the retailer.
(Westbrook and Oliver, 1991; Simintiras, Diamantopoulos and Ferriday, 1997; Dube and Menon, 2000 and Fournier and Mick, 2000). A total of five questions was used to measure store patronage satisfaction.

a. Factor analysis in Perth

The factor analysis in Perth has produced two factors. The first factor has most of the satisfaction concept measurements, while the second factor only comprises one measurement. Therefore, the study concentrates on the first factor.

Table 5.11 Rotated component matrix of satisfaction for Perth sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent were you satisfied with the</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final outcome?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the way my purchase was</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handled by staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, to what extent were you satisfied</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that you got what you wanted?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent were you satisfied with the</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal treatment that you received while in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent would you prefer another,</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more ideal, final outcome?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy = 0.818; Barlett’s (sig.) = 0.000; Eigenvalues (%)= 77.774
Source: Analysis of survey data
Using a 7 Point Likert scale
All items highlighted are deemed to load on that factor

b. Factor analysis in Surabaya

The factor analysis in Surabaya also yields two factors. As with the pattern of factor loadings in Perth, the first factor has most of the satisfaction concept measurements,
while the second factor only comprises one measurement. Therefore, the study concentrates on the first factor.

Table 5.12 Rotated component matrix of satisfaction for Surabaya sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 5 To what extent were you satisfied with the</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal treatment that you received while in the store?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 1 To what extent were you satisfied with the final outcome?</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 4 Overall, to that extent were you satisfied that you got</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what you wanted?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 2 I am satisfied with the way my purchase was handled by the</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 3 To what extent would you prefer another, more ideal, final</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outcome?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy = 0.765; Barlett’s (sig.) = 0.000; Eigenvalues (%) = 74.416
Source: Analysis of survey data
Using a 7 Point Likert scale
All items highlighted are deemed to load on that factor

The findings of factor analyses indicate that store patronage satisfaction has the same factor loading pattern in Perth and Surabaya. The Australian and Indonesian samples have two factors. This similarity in factor loading reflects the similarity of perceptions of store patronage satisfaction in each sample.

5.1.3.6 Repatronage intention

Repatronage intention aims to measure the likelihood of shoppers visiting the store again in the future. Three questions were used to measure this repatronage intention.
a. Factor analysis in Perth

All measurements of repatronage intention load heavily on the same factor in Perth. As a result, this factor is identified as repatronage intention.

Table 5.13 Rotated component matrix of repatronage intention for Perth sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repatronage Intention 2</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If needed, I will select this store again</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repatronage Intention 1</td>
<td>0.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will consider repurchasing from this store if I have a choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repatronage Intention 3</td>
<td>0.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to do more business with this store in the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy = 0.750; Barlett’s (sig.) = 0.000; Eigenvalues (%) = 82.600  
Source: Analysis of survey data  
Using a 7 Point Likert scale  
All items highlighted are deemed to load on that factor

b. Factor analysis in Surabaya

The factor analysis in Surabaya also produces one factor, albeit with weaker factor loadings than in Perth. Accordingly, this factor is identified as repatronage intention.

Table 5.14 Rotated component matrix of repatronage intention for Surabaya sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repatronage Intention 1</td>
<td>0.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will consider repurchasing from this store if I have a choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repatronage Intention 2</td>
<td>0.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If needed, I will select this store again</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repatronage Intention 3</td>
<td>0.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to do more business with this store in the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy = 0.615; Barlett’s (sig.) = 0.000; Eigenvalues (%) = 61.137  
Source: Analysis of survey data  
Using a 7 Point Likert scale  
All items highlighted are deemed to load on that factor
The results of this factor analysis indicate that the Australian and Indonesian sample have similar perceptions of repatronage intention.

In summary, the factor analysis of Perth’s and Surabaya’s data generates different results from what the literature suggests regarding shopping motivation, optimum stimulation level, atmosphere perception, cognitive response and satisfaction measurements. The repatronage intention measurement is the only one that provides results consistent with previous findings. In addition, factor analyses in Perth and Surabaya produce a different number of factors. The number of factors in Perth is higher than in Surabaya.

The findings of the factor analyses indicate that some measurements such as shopping motivation, optimum stimulation level, the perception of store atmosphere and cognitive response have different factor loading patterns in Australia and Indonesia, whereas the store patronage satisfaction and repatronage intention measurements have the same factor loading pattern in both countries.

5.2 The regression analysis

Multiple and simple regression analyses were carried out to test the hypotheses developed in this study. The results of each hypothesis are provided below.

5.2.1 The relationship between perception of store atmosphere and shopping motivations

The first hypothesis investigates the relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and shopping motivation. As previously noted, factor analysis of the store atmosphere measurement in Perth and Surabaya resulted in a different number
of factors in each set of data. Therefore, testing the first hypothesis involves regression between this set of store atmosphere factors and shopping motivation.

Table 5.15 Regression of the perception of store atmosphere on shopping motivations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>F value (Sig.)</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The perception of store atmosphere and shopping motivations in Perth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Interior layout and shopping motivations</td>
<td>5.512 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Store attractiveness and shopping motivations</td>
<td>1.701 (0.121)</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Social factors and shopping motivations</td>
<td>6.527 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Store space and shopping motivations</td>
<td>3.425 (0.003)**</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Crowding and shopping motivations</td>
<td>1.845 (0.091)</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Aisle merchandise and shopping motivations</td>
<td>1.375 (0.225)</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The perception of store atmosphere and shopping motivations in Surabaya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Interior layout and shopping motivations</td>
<td>14.946 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Design factors and shopping motivations</td>
<td>5.918 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Social factors and shopping motivations</td>
<td>9.987 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Store attractiveness and shopping motivations</td>
<td>6.944 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (two-tailed test)

Source: Analysis of survey data
5.2.1.1 Regression analysis in Perth

Table 5.15 provides the results of the regression analysis for Perth. As can be seen, several of the store atmosphere factors reflect a significant association with shopping motivation in Perth. Specifically, interior layout, social factors and store space associate with shopping motivation. In contrast, store attractiveness, crowding and aisle merchandise are not associated with shopping motivation.

Table 5.16 shows the standardized beta weights and the standard errors for the relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and shopping motivations in Perth.

Table 5.16 Regression of the perception of store atmosphere on shopping motivations in Perth – standardized beta weights and standard errors (in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Interior layout</th>
<th>Store attractiveness</th>
<th>Social factors</th>
<th>Store space</th>
<th>Crowding</th>
<th>Aisle merchandise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role motivation</td>
<td>0.131 (0.023)*</td>
<td>-0.061 (0.306)</td>
<td>0.159 (0.006)**</td>
<td>0.014 (0.807)</td>
<td>0.031 (0.610)</td>
<td>-0.023 (0.706)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure motivation</td>
<td>0.135 (0.020)*</td>
<td>-0.079 (0.191)</td>
<td>0.284 (0.000)**</td>
<td>0.058 (0.324)</td>
<td>0.019 (0.755)</td>
<td>-0.045 (0.454)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social motivation</td>
<td>0.173 (0.003)**</td>
<td>0.039 (0.516)</td>
<td>0.108 (0.059)</td>
<td>0.070 (0.232)</td>
<td>0.124 (0.039)*</td>
<td>-0.105 (0.081)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value motivation</td>
<td>0.047 (0.413)</td>
<td>-0.065 (0.277)</td>
<td>-0.021 (0.712)</td>
<td>0.124 (0.035)*</td>
<td>0.053 (0.380)</td>
<td>-0.050 (0.407)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea motivation</td>
<td>0.111 (0.054)</td>
<td>0.144 (0.017)*</td>
<td>0.040 (0.481)</td>
<td>0.108 (0.067)</td>
<td>0.127 (0.035)*</td>
<td>0.021 (0.726)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product motivation</td>
<td>0.167 (0.004)**</td>
<td>-0.011 (0.859)</td>
<td>0.047 (0.414)</td>
<td>0.185 (0.002)**</td>
<td>0.063 (0.295)</td>
<td>0.117 (0.052)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (two-tailed test)
Source: Analysis of survey data
a. The relationship between interior layout and shopping motivations

The regression analysis for the relationship between the interior layout component of store atmosphere and shopping motivations produced an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.090 ($F = 5.512, p = 0.000$). These figures indicate that shopping motivations accounted for 9 percent of the variance in interior layout and that this was unlikely to be due to chance. Therefore, we can conclude that the perception of interior layout is influenced by shopping motivations.

The $t$ value measures the probability that a linear relationship exists between interior layout and each type of shopping motivation. The $t$ test ($p < 0.05$) indicates that role, adventure, social and product acquisition motivations have statistically significant relationships with the perception of interior layout. The reported betas for these motivations are 0.131, 0.135, 0.173 and 0.167 respectively. These figures show that social motivation has the strongest association with the perception of interior layout.

b. The relationship between store attractiveness and shopping motivations

The regression analysis for the relationship between the store attractiveness component of store atmosphere and shopping motivations produced an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.015 ($F = 1.701, p = 0.121$). The $p$ test ($p < 0.05$) indicates that the hypothesis that $R^2$ is zero in the population can not be rejected. Therefore, we can conclude that the perception of store attractiveness is not influenced by shopping motivations.

c. The relationship between social factors and shopping motivations

The regression analysis for the relationship between the perception of the social factors component of store atmosphere and shopping motivations produced an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.103 ($F = 6.527, p = 0.000$). These figures indicate that shopping motivations accounted for 10.3 percent of the variance in social factors and that this
was unlikely to be due to chance. Therefore, we can conclude that the perception of social factors is influenced by shopping motivations.

The t value measures the probability that a linear relationship exists between the perception of social factors and each type of shopping motivation. The t test \( p < 0.05 \) indicates that role and adventure motivations have statistically significant relationships with the perception of social factors. The reported betas for role and adventure motivations are 0.159 and 0.284. These figures show that adventure motivation has a bigger influence on the perception of social factors than role motivation.

d. The relationship between store space and shopping motivations

The regression analysis for the relationship between the perception of store space component of store atmosphere and shopping motivations produced an adjusted \( R^2 \) of 0.050 \( (F = 3.425, p = 0.003) \). These figures indicate that shopping motivations accounted for 5 percent of the variance in store space and that this was unlikely to be due to chance. Therefore, we can conclude that the perception of store space is influenced by shopping motivations.

The t value measures the probability that a linear relationship exists between store space and each type of shopping motivation. The t test \( p < 0.05 \) indicates that value and product motivations have statistically significant relationships with the perception of store space. The reported betas for value and product motivations are 0.124 and 0.185. These figures show that product acquisition motivation has a stronger influence on the perception of store space than does value motivation.
e. The relationship between crowding and shopping motivations

The regression analysis for the relationship between the perception of crowding component of store atmosphere and shopping motivations produced an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.018 ($F = 1.845$, $p = 0.091$). The $p$ test ($p < 0.05$) indicates that the hypothesis that $R^2$ is zero in the population can be accepted. Therefore, we can conclude that the perception of crowding is not influenced by shopping motivations.

f. The relationship between aisle merchandise and shopping motivations

The regression analysis for the relationship between the perception of aisle merchandise component of store atmosphere and shopping motivations produced an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.008 ($F = 1.375$, $p = 0.225$). The $p$ test ($p < 0.05$) indicates that the hypothesis that $R^2$ is zero in the population can be accepted. Therefore, we can conclude that the perception of aisle merchandise is not influenced by shopping motivations.

5.2.1.2. Regression analysis in Surabaya

The factor analysis of measurements of the perception of store atmosphere in Surabaya resulted in fewer factors than in Perth. The factors in Indonesia are interior layout, design factor, social factors and store attractiveness. Table 5.15 provides the results of the regression analysis for Surabaya. All store atmosphere factors have significant relationships with shopping motivations.

Table 5.17 shows the standardized beta weights and standard errors for the relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and shopping motivations in Surabaya.
Table 5.17 Regression of the perception of store atmosphere on shopping motivations in Surabaya – standardized beta weights and standard errors (in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Interior layout</th>
<th>Design factors</th>
<th>Social factors</th>
<th>Store attractiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role motivation</td>
<td>0.102 (0.042)*</td>
<td>-0.097 (0.067)</td>
<td>0.191 (0.000)***</td>
<td>-0.257 (0.000)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure motivation</td>
<td>0.337 (0.000)***</td>
<td>-0.260 (0.000)***</td>
<td>-0.038 (0.476)</td>
<td>0.067 (0.206)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social motivation</td>
<td>0.271 (0.000)***</td>
<td>-0.115 (0.030)*</td>
<td>0.276 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.181 (0.001)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value motivation</td>
<td>0.082 (0.101)</td>
<td>0.037 (0.485)</td>
<td>0.162 (0.002)**</td>
<td>-0.073 (0.166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea motivation</td>
<td>0.012 (0.804)</td>
<td>-0.048 (0.363)</td>
<td>0.107 (0.043)*</td>
<td>-0.038 (0.471)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product motivation</td>
<td>0.126 (0.012)**</td>
<td>-0.072 (0.176)</td>
<td>0.108 (0.040)*</td>
<td>-0.070 (0.185)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (two-tailed test)

Source: Analysis of survey data

- The relationship between interior layout and shopping motivations

The regression analysis for the relationship between the interior layout component of store atmosphere and shopping motivations produced an adjusted R² of 0.207 ($F = 14.946$, $p = 0.000$). These figures indicate that shopping motivations accounted for 20.7 percent of the variance in the perception of interior layout, and that this was unlikely to be due to chance. Therefore, we can conclude that perception of interior layout associates with shopping motivations.

The t value measures the probability that a linear relationship exists between the perception of interior layout and each type of shopping motivation. The $t$ test ($p < 0.05$) indicates that adventure, social, role and product motivations have statistically significant relationships with the perception of interior layout. The reported betas for
role, adventure, social and product motivations are 0.102, 0.337, 0.271 and 0.126 respectively. These figures show that adventure motivation has a bigger influence on the perception of interior layout than do other motivations.

\(b. \text{The relationship between design factors and shopping motivations}\)

The regression analysis for the relationship between the design factors component of store atmosphere and shopping motivations produces an adjusted \(R^2\) of 0.082 (\(F = 5.918, p = 0.000\)). These figures indicate that shopping motivations accounted for 8.2 percent of the variance in perception of design factors and that this was unlikely to be due to chance. Therefore, we may confirm a significant relationship between perception of design factors and shopping motivations.

The \(t\) value measures the probability that a linear relationship exists between the perception of design factors and each type of shopping motivation. The \(t\) test \((p < 0.05)\) indicates that adventure and social motivations have statistically significant relationships with the perception of design factors. The reported betas for adventure and social motivations are -0.260 and -0.155 respectively. These figures show that adventure motivation has a bigger influence on the perception of design factors than do other motivations.

\(c. \text{The relationship between social factors and shopping motivations}\)

The regression analysis for the relationship between social factors and shopping motivations results in an adjusted \(R^2\) of 0.148 (\(F = 9.987; p = 0.000\)). This statistic explains that shopping motivations accounted for 1.84 percent of the variance in perception of social factors. Therefore, we can conclude that perception of social factors associates with shopping motivations.
The t value measures the probability that a linear relationship exists between the perception of social factors and each type of shopping motivation. The t test \( p < 0.05 \) indicates that role, social, value, idea and product motivations have statistically significant relationships with the perception of social factors. The reported betas are 0.191, 0.276, 0.162, 0.107 and 0.108 accordingly. These figures indicate that social motivation has a bigger influence on the perception of social factors than do other motivations.

\[d. \text{The relationship between store attractiveness and shopping motivations}\]

The regression analysis for the relationship between store attractiveness and shopping motivations produces an adjusted \( R^2 \) of 0.100 \( (F = 6.944, p = 0.000) \). This statistic reveals that shopping motivations accounted for 10 percent of the variance in perception of store attractiveness and that this unlikely to be due to chance. Therefore, we can conclude that perception of store attractiveness associates with shopping motivations.

The t value measures the probability that a linear relationship exists between the perception of store attractiveness and each type of shopping motivation. The t test \( p < 0.05 \) indicates that role and social motivations have statistically significant relationships with the perception of store attractiveness. The reported betas for role and social motivations are –0.257 and 0.181. These figures show that role motivation has a bigger influence on the perception of store attractiveness than does social motivation.

In summary, the results of factor analyses in Perth suggest that store atmosphere should be differentiated into six different factors. Accordingly, the first hypothesis is broken up into six sub-hypotheses. The store atmosphere factors that have significant relationships with shopping motivations are interior layout, social factors and store space. In contrast, store attractiveness, crowding and aisle merchandise do not have significant relationships with shopping motivations.
The results of factor analyses in Surabaya suggest that store atmosphere should be differentiated into 4 different factors. As a result, the first hypothesis is broken up into four sub-hypotheses. All store atmosphere factors have significant relationships with shopping motivations, with interior layout having the strongest relationship.

5.2.2 The relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and optimum stimulation level (OSL)

The second hypothesis investigates the relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and OSL. Like the first hypothesis, the second hypothesis involves the relationships between the set of store atmosphere factors and OSL.

Table 5.18 Regression of the perception of store atmosphere on OSL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>$F$ value (Sig.)</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The perception of store atmosphere and optimum stimulation level (OSL) in Perth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Interior layout and OSL</td>
<td>7.752 (0.006)**</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Store attractiveness and OSL</td>
<td>0.027 (0.870)</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Social factors and OSL</td>
<td>7.018 (0.009)**</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Store space and OSL</td>
<td>0.282 (0.596)</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Crowding and OSL</td>
<td>2.888 (0.090)</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Aisle merchandise and OSL</td>
<td>0.090 (0.764)</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The perception of store atmosphere and optimum stimulation level (OSL) in Surabaya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Interior layout and OSL</td>
<td>27.178 (0.000)**</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Design factors and OSL</td>
<td>0.678 (0.411)</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Social factors and OSL</td>
<td>78.734 (0.000)**</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Store attractiveness and OSL</td>
<td>0.712 (0.399)</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<0.05$, **$p<0.01$, ***$p<0.001$ (two-tailed test)

Source: Analysis of survey data
5.2.2.1 Regression analysis in Perth

Table 5.18 provides the results of the regression analysis in Perth. As can be seen, the store atmosphere factors that reflect a significant association with OSL are interior layout and social factors. However, perceptions of store attractiveness, store space, crowding and aisle merchandise are not influenced by OSL.

Table 5.19 shows the standardized beta weights and standard errors for the relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and OSL in Perth.

**Table 5.19 Regression of the perception of store atmosphere on OSL in Perth – standardized beta weights and standard errors (in parentheses)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Interior layout</th>
<th>Store attractiveness</th>
<th>Social factors</th>
<th>Store space</th>
<th>Crowding</th>
<th>Aisle merchandise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSL</td>
<td>0.166 (0.006)**</td>
<td>0.010 (0.870)</td>
<td>0.158 (0.009)**</td>
<td>0.032 (0.596)</td>
<td>0.102 (0.090)</td>
<td>-0.018 (0.764)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (two-tailed test)

Source: Analysis of survey data

a. The relationship between the perception of interior layout and OSL

The regression analysis for the relationship between the perception of interior layout and optimum stimulation level (OSL) produces an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.024 ($F = 7.752, p = 0.006$). These figures indicate that OSL accounted for 2.4 percent of the variance in interior layout and that this was unlikely to be due to chance. The standardized beta weight of OSL is 0.166. Therefore, we can conclude that the perception of interior layout is influenced by OSL.

b. The relationship between the perception of store attractiveness and OSL

The regression analysis for the relationship between the perception of store attractiveness and OSL produced an adjusted $R^2$ of -0.004 ($F = 0.027, p = 0.870$).
The p test \( (p < 0.05) \) indicates that the hypothesis that \( R^2 \) is zero in the population cannot be rejected. The standardized beta weight of OSL is 0.010. Therefore, we can conclude that the perception of store attractiveness is not influenced by OSL.

c. The relationship between the perception of social factors and OSL

The regression analysis for the relationship between the perception of social factors and OSL produced an adjusted \( R^2 \) of 0.021 \( (F = 7.018, p = 0.009) \). These figures indicate that OSL accounted for 2.1 percent of the variance in social factors and that this was unlikely to be due to chance. The standardized beta weight of OSL is 0.158. Therefore, we can conclude that the perception of social factors is influenced by OSL.

d. The relationship between the perception of store space and OSL

The regression analysis for the relationship between the perception of store space and OSL produced an adjusted \( R^2 \) of -0.003 \( (F = 0.282, p = 0.596) \). The p test \( (p < 0.05) \) indicates that the hypothesis that \( R^2 \) is zero in the population cannot be rejected. Therefore, we can conclude that the perception of store space is not influenced by OSL.

e. The relationship between the perception of crowding and OSL

The regression analysis for the relationship between the perception of crowding in the store and OSL produced an adjusted \( R^2 \) of 0.007 \( (F = 2.888, p = 0.090) \). The p test \( (p < 0.05) \) indicates that the hypothesis that \( R^2 \) is zero in the population cannot be rejected. Therefore, we can conclude that the perception of crowding is not influenced by OSL.
5.2.2. Regression analysis in Surabaya

Table 5.18 provides the results of the regression analysis in Surabaya. As can be seen, several of the store atmosphere factors reflect a significant association with OSL. In particular, interior layout and social factors associate with OSL. On the other hand, store attractiveness and design factors are not influenced by OSL.

Table 5.20 shows the standardized beta weights and standard errors for the relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and OSL in Surabaya.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Interior layout</th>
<th>Design factors</th>
<th>Social factors</th>
<th>Store attractiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSL</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)***</td>
<td>(0.411)</td>
<td>(0.000)***</td>
<td>(0.399)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<0.05$, **$p<0.01$, ***$p<0.001$ (two-tailed test)

Source: Analysis of survey data

a. The relationship between the perception of interior layout and OSL

The regression analysis of the relationship between the perception of interior layout and optimum stimulation level (OSL) results in an adjusted R square of 0.076 ($F =$...
27.178, \( p = 0.000 \). The standardized beta weight of OSL is 0.280. As a result, the null hypothesis that there is no linear relationship between the perception of interior layout and OSL can be rejected and we may conclude that there is a significant relationship.

\[ b. \text{The relationship between the perception of design factors and OSL} \]

The regression analysis for the relationship between the perception of design factors and OSL results in an adjusted \( R^2 \) of -0.001 (\( F = 0.678, \ p = 0.411 \)). These figures indicate that the null hypothesis that there is no linear relationship between the perception of design factors and OSL can not be rejected. Therefore, we may conclude that the perception of design factors is not influenced by OSL.

\[ c. \text{The relationship between the perception of social factors and OSL} \]

The regression analysis for the relationship between the perception of social factors and optimum stimulation level (OSL) produces an adjusted \( R^2 \) of 0.200 (\( F = 78.752, \ p = 0.000 \)). These figures indicate that OSL accounted for 20 percent of the variance in social factors and that this was unlikely to be due to chance. The standardized beta weight of OSL is 0.451. Therefore, we can conclude that the perception of social factors is influenced by OSL. This relationship is by far the strongest relationship between the different perceptions of store atmosphere and OSL in Perth and Surabaya.

\[ d. \text{The relationship between the perception of store attractiveness and OSL} \]

The regression analysis for the relationship between the perception of store attractiveness and OSL results in an adjusted \( R^2 \) of -0.001 (\( F = 0.712, \ p = 0.399 \)). These figures indicate that the null hypothesis that there is no linear relationship between the perception of store attractiveness and OSL can not be rejected.
Therefore, we can conclude that the perception of store attractiveness is not influenced by OSL.

In summary, the store atmosphere factors that have significant relationships with OSL in Perth are the interior layout and social factors. Store attractiveness, store space, crowding and aisle merchandise do not have significant relationships with OSL. The store atmosphere factors that have significant relationships with OSL in Surabaya are also interior layout and social factors. Design factors and store attractiveness do not have significant relationships with OSL.

5.2.3 The relationship between cognitive responses and shopping motivations

The third hypothesis investigates the relationship between cognitive responses and shopping motivations. In Perth, this hypothesis examines in particular the relationship between the perception of store quality and shopping motivations. The reason is that the factor analysis of the cognitive response measurements in Perth resulted in one factor, the perception of store quality. On the other hand, the factor analysis in Surabaya produced merchandise and service quality factors. Therefore, the regression in Surabaya comprises two regression analyses.

Table 5.21 Regression of cognitive response on shopping motivations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>F value (Sig.)</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The perception of store quality and shopping motivations in Perth</td>
<td>5.388 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cognitive responses and shopping motivations in Surabaya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Merchandise quality and shopping motivation</td>
<td>10.738 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Service quality and shopping motivation</td>
<td>16.164 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (two-tailed test)

Source: Analysis of survey data
5.2.3.1 Regression analysis in Perth

Table 5.21 provides the results of the regression analysis in Perth. As can be seen, the regression analysis for the relationship between the perception of store quality and shopping motivations produce an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.088 ($F = 5.388, p = 0.000$). This statistic shows that shopping motivations accounted for 8.8 percent of the variance in the perception of store quality and that this was unlikely to be due to chance. Therefore, we can confirm that the perception of store quality has a significant relationship with shopping motivations.

Table 5.22 shows the standardized beta weights and the standard errors for the relationship between the perception of store quality and shopping motivation in Perth. The $t$ value measures the probability that a linear relationship exists between the perception of store quality and each type of shopping motivation. The $t$ test ($p<0.05$) indicates that some motivations have statistically significant relationships with the perception of store quality. The reported betas for adventure, social, idea and product motivations are 0.173, 0.119, 0.169 and 0.157. These figures indicate that adventure motivation has a stronger influence on the perception of product quality than do other motivations.

### Table 5.22 Regression of cognitive response on shopping motivations in Perth – standardized beta weights and standard errors (in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Store quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role motivation</td>
<td>0.052 (0.369)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure motivation</td>
<td>0.173 (0.003)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social motivation</td>
<td>0.119 (0.040)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value motivation</td>
<td>0.073 (0.206)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea motivation</td>
<td>0.169 (0.004)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product motivation</td>
<td>0.157 (0.007)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<0.05$, **$p<0.01$, ***$p<0.001$ (two-tailed test)

Source: Analysis of survey data
5.2.2.2. Regression analysis in Surabaya

As noted earlier, the factor analysis of cognitive response measurements in Surabaya results in two different factors, merchandise and service quality. Therefore, the second hypothesis in Surabaya is separated into two relationships. Table 5.21 shows the results of the regression analysis in Surabaya.

Table 5.23 shows the standardized beta weights and the standard error for the relationship between cognitive responses and shopping motivation in Surabaya.

Table 5.23 Regression of cognitive responses on shopping motivations in Surabaya – standardized beta weights and standard errors (in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Merchandise Quality</th>
<th>Service Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role motivation</td>
<td>0.217 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.024 (0.626)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure motivation</td>
<td>0.211 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.066 (0.186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social motivation</td>
<td>0.121 (0.019)*</td>
<td>0.364 (0.000)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value motivation</td>
<td>-0.054 (0.295)</td>
<td>0.220 (0.000)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea motivation</td>
<td>0.141 (0.006)**</td>
<td>0.246 (0.000)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product motivation</td>
<td>0.197 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.068 (0.169)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (two-tailed test)

Source: Analysis of survey data

*a. The relationship between the perception of merchandise quality and shopping motivations*

The regression analysis for the relationship between the perception of merchandise quality and shopping motivations produces an adjusted R² of 0.152 (F = 10.738, p =
0.000). This statistic indicates that shopping motivations explained 15.2 percent of
the variance in the merchandise quality and that this was unlikely to be due to
chance. As a result, we can conclude that the perception of merchandise quality
associates with shopping motivations.

The t value measures the probability that a linear relationship exists between the
perception of merchandise quality and each type of shopping motivation. The t test
\((p<0.05)\) indicates that most motivations have statistically significant relationships
with the perception of merchandise quality. The reported betas for role, adventure,
social, idea and product motivations are 0.217, 0.211, 0.121, 0.141 and 0.197
accordingly. These figures show that role motivation has a stronger influence on the
perception of merchandise quality than do other motivations.

**b. The relationship between the perception of service quality and shopping
motivations**

The regression analysis for the association between the perception of service quality
and shopping motivations results in an adjusted \(R^2\) of 0.222 \((F = 16.164, p = 0.000)\).
These figures reveal that shopping motivation explained 22.2 percent of the variance
in the service quality and that this was unlikely to be due to chance. Therefore, we
can confirm that the perception of service quality associates with shopping
motivations.

The t value measures the probability that a linear relationship exists between the
perception of service quality and each type of shopping motivation. The t test
\((p<0.05)\) indicates that social, idea and value motivations have statistically
significant relationships with the perception of merchandise quality. The reported
betas for social, value and idea motivations are 0.364, 0.220 and 0.246 accordingly.
These figures show that social motivation has a stronger influence on the perception
of service quality than do other motivations.
In summary, the study in Perth and Surabaya supports the relationship between cognitive responses and shopping motivation. The perception of store quality is associated with shopping motivation in Perth, while the perception of merchandise quality and service quality are influenced by shopping motivation in Surabaya. However, in Surabaya, the perception of service quality is more strongly influenced by shopping motivation.

5.2.4 The relationship between cognitive responses and optimum stimulation level (OSL)

The fourth hypothesis investigates the relationship between cognitive responses and OSL.

**Table 5.24 Regression of cognitive responses on OSL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>F value (Sig.)</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The perception of store quality and optimum stimulation level in Perth</td>
<td>11.440 (0.001)**</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cognitive responses and optimum stimulation level in Surabaya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Merchandise quality and OSL</td>
<td>10.803 (0.001)**</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Service quality and OSL</td>
<td>76.903 (0.000)**</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (two-tailed test)
Source: Analysis of survey data

5.2.4.1. Regression analysis in Perth

Table 5.24 provides the regression results in Perth. The regression analysis for the relationship between the perception of store quality and store atmosphere produced an adjusted R² of 0.037 (F = 11.440, p = 0.001). This statistic indicates that OSL explained 3.7 percent of the variance in the perception of store quality. This
relationship is significant. As a result, we may conclude that the perception of store quality is influenced by OSL.

Table 5.25 shows the standardized beta weight and standard error for the relationship between cognitive response and OSL in Perth. The standardized beta weight of OSL is 0.201.

Table 5.25 Regression of cognitive response on OSL in Perth – standardized beta weight and standard error (in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Store quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSL</td>
<td>0.201 (0.001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * * p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (two-tailed test)
Source: Analysis of survey data

5.2.4.2. Regression analysis in Surabaya

As explained earlier, the factor analysis of cognitive response measurements in Surabaya results in two different factors, merchandise and service quality. Therefore, the second hypothesis in Surabaya is separated into two relationships. Table 5.24 shows the regression results in Surabaya.

Table 5.26 shows the standardized beta weights and standard errors for the relationship between cognitive responses and OSL in Surabaya.

Table 5.26 Regression of cognitive responses on OSL in Surabaya – standardized beta weights and standard errors (in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Merchandise quality</th>
<th>Service quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSL</td>
<td>0.417 (0.001)**</td>
<td>0.179 (0.000)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * * p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (two-tailed test)
Source: Analysis of survey data
a. The relationship between the perception of merchandise quality and optimum stimulation level (OSL)

The simple regression for the relationship between the perception of merchandise quality and OSL produces an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.029 ($F = 10.803, p = 0.001$). This statistic indicates that OSL explained 2.9 percent of the variance in the merchandise quality and that this was unlikely to be due to chance. The standardized beta weight of OSL is 0.417. As a result, we can conclude that the perception of merchandise quality associates with OSL.

b. The relationship between the perception of service quality and optimum stimulation level (OSL)

The linear relationship between the perception of service quality and OSL is also supported. The regression analysis for the relationship between the perception of service quality and OSL results in an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.193 ($F = 76.903, p = 0.000$). These figures show that OSL explained 19.3 percent of the variance in the service quality. Meanwhile, the OSL standardized beta weight is 0.179.

In summary, the studies in Perth and Surabaya support the relationship between cognitive responses and OSL. Specifically, the perception of store quality is influenced by OSL in Perth, whereas the perception of merchandise quality and service quality are found to associate with OSL in Surabaya. Here, the perception of service quality is more strongly influenced by OSL than the perception of merchandise quality.
5.2.5 The relationship between cognitive responses and store atmosphere

The fifth hypothesis investigates the relationship between cognitive responses and the perception of store atmosphere. In Perth, this hypothesis specifically examines the relationship between the perception of store quality and the store atmosphere. In Surabaya, on the other hand, this hypothesis tests the relationship between perception of merchandise and service quality and the store atmosphere.

Table 5.27 Regression of cognitive responses on the store atmosphere

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>$F$ value (Sig.)</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The perception of store quality and the perception of store atmosphere in Perth</td>
<td>39.923 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cognitive responses and the perception of store atmosphere in Surabaya:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Merchandise quality and store atmosphere</td>
<td>13.114 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Service quality and store atmosphere</td>
<td>48.152 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * * $p<0.05$, ** $p<0.01$, *** $p<0.001$

Source: Analysis of survey data

5.2.5.1. Regression analysis in Perth

Table 5.27 provides the regression results for Perth. The regression analysis for the relationship between the perceptions of store quality and of the store atmosphere produce an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.465 ($F = 39.923$, $p = 0.000$). This statistic indicates that the store atmosphere explained 46.5 percent of the variance in the perception of store quality. This relationship is highly significant. As a result, the hypothesis that the perception of store quality associates with the store atmosphere can be accepted.

Table 5.28 shows the standardized beta weights and the standard errors. The reported betas indicate that the perception of store quality is not associated with every part of
store atmosphere. The perception of store quality has a significant relationship with interior layout, store attractiveness, social factors, and store space. The betas are 0.576, 0.103, 0.333 and 0.157 respectively and significant by the t test at p < 0.05. These results show that the perception of store quality does not have a significant relationship with crowding and store attractiveness.

**Table 5.28 Regression of cognitive response on the store atmosphere in Perth – standardized beta weights and standard errors (in parentheses)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Store quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interior layout</td>
<td>0.576 (0.000)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store attractiveness</td>
<td>0.103 (0.021)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social factors</td>
<td>0.333 (0.000)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store space</td>
<td>0.157 (0.001)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowding</td>
<td>-0.057 (0.205)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisle merchandise</td>
<td>0.003 (0.946)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (two-tailed test)
Source: Analysis of survey data

**5.2.3.2 Regression analysis in Surabaya**

Table 5.27 shows the results of the regression analysis in Surabaya. Table 5.29 shows the standardized beta weights and the standard errors for the relationship between cognitive responses and the perception of store atmosphere.

**Table 5.29 Regression of cognitive responses on the store atmosphere in Surabaya – standardized beta weights and standard errors (in parentheses)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Merchandise quality</th>
<th>Service quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interior layout</td>
<td>0.074 (0.176)</td>
<td>0.391 (0.000)***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Design factors | -0.264 (0.000)*** | 0.227 (0.000)***
Social factors | 0.272 (0.000)*** | 0.413 (0.000)***
Store attractiveness | -0.120 (0.028)* | 0.077 (0.094)

* p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (two-tailed test)
Source: Analysis of survey data

a. The relationship between the perception of merchandise quality and the store atmosphere

The regression analysis for the relationship between the perception of merchandise quality and the store atmosphere results in an adjusted R² of 0.141 (F = 13.144, p = 0.000). These statistics inform us that the store atmosphere accounted for 14.1 percent of the variance in the perceptions of merchandise quality and that this was unlikely to be due to chance. Therefore, we can confirm that the perception of merchandise quality is associated with the store atmosphere.

The reported betas show that the perception of merchandise quality associates with most parts of the store atmosphere. The betas for design factor, social factor and store attractiveness are -0.264, 0.272 and -0.120 and significant by the t test at p < 0.05. These figures indicate that the social factor has the strongest influence on the perception of merchandise quality and the design factor and social attractiveness have inverse relationships with the perception of merchandise quality. Interior layout is the only aspect of store atmosphere that does not associate with the perception of merchandise quality.
b. The relationship between the perception of service quality and the store atmosphere

The regression analysis for the association between the perception of service quality and the store atmosphere produce an adjusted R² of 0.393 (F value of 48.152, \( p = 0.000 \)). These figures inform us that the store atmosphere accounted for 39.3 percent of the variance in the perception of service quality. This relationship is statistically significant. As a result, the hypothesis that the perception of service quality associates with the store atmosphere can be accepted.

The reported betas indicate that the perception of service quality also associates with most parts of the store atmosphere. The betas for interior layout, design factor and social factor are 0.391, 0.227 and 0.413 accordingly and significant by the t test at \( p < 0.001 \). The perception of service quality does not associate with store attractiveness.

In summary, the studies in Perth and Surabaya support the relationship between cognitive responses and the perception of store atmosphere. The perception of store quality is influenced by the perception of store atmosphere in Perth. The perception of merchandise and service quality is also associated with the perception of store atmosphere in Surabaya. The perception of service quality has a stronger association with the perception of store atmosphere than does the perception of merchandise quality.

5.2.6 The relationship between store patronage satisfaction and cognitive responses

The sixth hypothesis is aimed at testing the relationship between store patronage satisfaction and cognitive responses. In Perth, cognitive response is identified as the
perception of store quality, while cognitive responses are identified as the perception of merchandise and service quality in Surabaya.

Table 5.30 Regression of store patronage satisfaction on cognitive response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>F value (Sig.)</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Store patronage satisfaction and the perception of store quality in Perth</td>
<td>410.476 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Store patronage satisfaction and the perception of merchandise and service quality in Surabaya</td>
<td>134.359 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (two-tailed test)

Source: Analysis of survey data

5.2.6.1 Regression analysis in Perth

Table 5.30 provides the results of the regression analysis in Perth. The regression analysis for the relationship between store patronage satisfaction and the perception of store quality produces an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.613 ($F = 410.476, p = 0.000$). These figures indicate that the perception of store quality accounted for 61.3 percent of the variance in the store patronage satisfaction and this was unlikely to be due to chance. Therefore, we can conclude that store patronage satisfaction is influenced by the perception of store quality.

Table 5.31 shows the standardized beta weight and standard error for the relationship between store patronage satisfaction and the perception of store quality in Perth. The standardized beta weight for store quality is 0.784.
Table 5.31 Regression of store patronage satisfaction on cognitive response in Perth – standardized beta weight and standard errors (in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Store patronage satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Store quality</td>
<td>0.784 (0.000)***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<0.05$, **$p<0.01$, ***$p<0.001$ (two-tailed test)

Source: Analysis of survey data

5.2.4.2 Regression analysis in Surabaya

Table 5.30 provides the results of the regression analysis in Surabaya. The regression analysis for the relationship between store patronage satisfaction and cognitive responses in terms of the perception of merchandise and service quality produces an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.463 ($F = 134.359$, $p = 0.000$). These figures indicate that cognitive responses accounted for 46.3 percent of the variance in the store patronage satisfaction and this was unlikely to be due to chance. Therefore, we can conclude that store patronage satisfaction is influenced by cognitive responses.

Table 5.32 shows the standardized beta weights and standard errors for the relationship between store patronage satisfaction and cognitive responses in Surabaya. The $t$ value measures the probability that a linear relationship exists between store patronage satisfaction and the perception of merchandise or service quality. The $t$ test ($p<0.05$) indicates that the perception of merchandise and service quality have significant relationships with the store patronage satisfaction. The reported betas for the perception of merchandise and service quality are 0.161 and 0.663. These figures show that the perception of service quality has a bigger influence on store patronage satisfaction than does the perception of merchandise quality.
Table 5.32 Regression of store patronage satisfaction on cognitive responses in Surabaya – standardized beta weights and standard errors (in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Store patronage satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise quality</td>
<td>0.161 (0.000)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service quality</td>
<td>0.663 (0.000)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (two-tailed test)
Source: Analysis of survey data

In summary, the studies in Perth and Surabaya confirm the relationship between store patronage satisfaction and cognitive responses. Store patronage satisfaction is influenced by the perception of store quality in Perth. Meanwhile, store patronage satisfaction is associated with the perception of merchandise and service quality in Surabaya. Store patronage satisfaction is more strongly influenced by the perception of service quality than it is by merchandise quality.

5.2.7 The relationship between store patronage satisfaction and store atmosphere

The seventh hypothesis tests the relationship between store patronage satisfaction and store atmosphere. As explained earlier, the number of store atmosphere factors in Perth is greater than it is in Surabaya.

Table 5.33 Regression of store patronage satisfaction on the store atmosphere

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>F value (Sig.)</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Store patronage satisfaction and the perception of store atmosphere in Perth</td>
<td>30.907 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Satisfaction and store atmosphere perception in Surabaya</td>
<td>47.870 (0.000)***</td>
<td>0.387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (two-tailed test)
Source: Analysis of survey data
5.2.7.1. Regression analysis in Perth

The regression analysis for the relationship between store patronage satisfaction and store atmosphere produces an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.407 ($F = 30.907, p = 0.000$). This figure shows that store atmosphere explains 40.7 percent of the variance in store patronage satisfaction and that this is unlikely to be due to chance. Therefore, we can confirm that store patronage satisfaction associates with store atmosphere.

The $t$ value measures the probability that a linear relationship exists between store patronage satisfaction and each store atmosphere factor. The $t$ test ($p<0.05$) indicates that the perception of interior layout, social factors and store space have statistically significant relationships with store patronage satisfaction. The betas for interior layout, social factors and store space are 0.558, 0.258 and 0.185 respectively. The figures show that the perception of interior layout has a bigger influence on store patronage satisfaction than do other store atmosphere factors. Satisfaction does not associate with store attractiveness, crowding and aisle merchandise.

Table 5.34 Regression of store patronage satisfaction on the store atmosphere in Perth – standardized beta weights and standard errors (in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Store patronage satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interior layout</td>
<td>0.558 (0.000)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store attractiveness</td>
<td>-0.019 (0.693)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social factors</td>
<td>0.258 (0.000)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store space</td>
<td>0.185 (0.000)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowding</td>
<td>-0.093 (0.051)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisle merchandise</td>
<td>-0.040 (0.402)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<0.05$, **$p<0.01$, ***$p<0.001$ (two-tailed test)

Source: Analysis of survey data
5.2.7.2. Regression analysis in Surabaya

The regression analysis for the association between the store patronage satisfaction and store atmosphere result in an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.387 ($F = 47.870, p = 0.001$). These figures show that store atmosphere explains 38.7 percent of the variance in store patronage satisfaction and that this is unlikely to be due to chance. Therefore, we can confirm that store patronage satisfaction associates with store atmosphere in Surabaya, as it does in Perth.

The reported $t$ values measure the probability that a linear relationship exists between store patronage satisfaction and each store atmosphere factor. The $t$ test ($p<0.05$) indicates that the perception of interior layout, social factors and store attractiveness have statistically significant relationships with store patronage satisfaction. The betas for the perception of interior layout, social factors and store attractiveness are 0.415, 0.415 and 0.139 respectively. These figures show that the perception of interior layout and social factors have a bigger influence on store patronage satisfaction than does the perception of store attractiveness in Surabaya.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Store patronage satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interior layout</td>
<td>0.415 (0.000)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design factors</td>
<td>0.010 (0.830)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social factors</td>
<td>0.415 (0.000)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store attractiveness</td>
<td>0.139 (0.003)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<0.05$, **$p<0.01$, ***$p<0.001$ (two-tailed test)
Source: Analysis of survey data

In summary, the studies in Perth and Surabaya support the relationship between store patronage satisfaction and the perception of store atmosphere. The perception of
interior layout and social factors emerge as store atmosphere factors to influence store patronage satisfaction in both places.

5.2.8 The relationship between repatronage intention and store patronage satisfaction

The last hypothesis is intended to test the relationship between repatronage intention and store patronage satisfaction. It is expected that repatronage intention associates with satisfaction in Perth and Surabaya.

5.2.8.1 Regression analysis in Perth

Table 5.36 provides the results of the regression analysis in Perth. The regression analysis for the relationship between repatronage intention and store patronage satisfaction produces an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.482 ($F = 244.144$, $p = 0.000$). These figures indicate that store patronage satisfaction accounted for 48.2 percent of the variance in repatronage intention and that this was unlikely to be due to chance. Therefore, we can conclude that the repatronage intention is influenced by store patronage satisfaction.

**Table 5.36 Regression of repatronage intention on the store patronage satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>$F$ value (Sig.)</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Repatronage intention and store patronage satisfaction in Perth</td>
<td>244.144 (0.000)*****</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Repatronage intention and store patronage satisfaction in Surabaya</td>
<td>125.478 (0.000)*****</td>
<td>0.276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<0.05$, **$p<0.01$, ***$p<0.001$ (two tailed test)

Source: Analysis of survey data
Table 5.37 shows the standardized beta weight and standard error for the relationship between repatronage intention and store patronage satisfaction in Perth. The standardized beta weight for store patronage satisfaction is 0.696.

Table 5.37 Regression of repatronage intention on the store patronage satisfaction in Perth – standardized beta weight and standard error (in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Repatronage intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Store patronage satisfaction</td>
<td>0.696 (0.000)*****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (two-tailed test)
Source: Analysis of survey data

5.2.8.2 Regression analysis in Surabaya

Table 5.36 provides the results of the regression analysis in Surabaya. The simple regression for the relationship between repatronage intention and store patronage satisfaction produces an adjusted R² of 0.276 (\( F = 125.478, \ p = 0.000 \)). These figures indicate that store patronage satisfaction accounted for 27.6 percent of the variance in repatronage intention and that this was unlikely to be due to chance. Therefore, we can conclude that repatronage intention is influenced by store patronage satisfaction.

Table 5.38 shows the standardized beta weight and standard error for the relationship between repatronage intention and the store patronage satisfaction in Surabaya. The standardized beta weight for store patronage satisfaction is 0.528.

Table 5.38 Regression of repatronage intention on store patronage satisfaction in Surabaya – standardized beta weight and standard error (in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Repatronage intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Store patronage satisfaction</td>
<td>0.528 (0.000)*****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (two-tailed test)
Source: Analysis of survey data
In summary, the studies in Perth and Surabaya confirm the relationship between repatronage intention and store patronage satisfaction. The intensity of the relationship is stronger in Perth than Surabaya.

5.3 Summary

The preliminary data analysis shows that most of the respondent characteristics in the samples studied in both countries are comparable. The majority of respondents are female in both places and are aged 18 – 24 years old. However, the majority of respondents in Perth shop by themselves, while most respondents in Surabaya are accompanied by one to three other people. In both places, the majority of respondents have already visited the store.

The exploratory factor analyses indicate different factor loadings between the two countries, in particular for optimum stimulation level, store atmosphere and cognitive response measurements. Despite the same factors occurring, shopping motivation measurement in each place has a different factor loading pattern. Store patronage satisfaction and repatronage intention measurements, on the other hand, have similar factor loadings.

The study has performed regression analyses to test the first hypothesis. The first regression analysis aims to test the relationship between store atmosphere and shopping motivation. Several sub-hypotheses have been developed to test this relationship, as a result of the findings of the factor analysis. The hypotheses are different for Perth and for Surabaya. The relationship between store atmosphere and shopping motivation is partially supported in Perth and is fully supported in Surabaya.
Table 5.40 Summary of the findings for the first hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The perception of store atmosphere and shopping motivations in Perth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Interior layout and shopping motivations</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Store attractiveness and shopping motivations</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Social factors and shopping motivations</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Store space and shopping motivations</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Crowding and shopping motivations</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Aisle merchandise and shopping motivations</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The perception of store atmosphere and shopping motivations in Surabaya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Interior layout and shopping motivations</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Design factors and shopping motivations</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Social factors and shopping motivation</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Store attractiveness and shopping motivations</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second hypothesis investigates the relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and optimum stimulation level (OSL). The studies in Perth and Surabaya have supported this hypothesis partially. Interior layout and social factors are the store atmosphere factors that are influenced by OSL in both places.
The third hypothesis tests the relationship between cognitive responses and shopping motivation. In Perth, the factor analysis of cognitive response measurement results in one factor, namely the perception of store quality. In contrast, the factor analysis in Surabaya produces two factors, labeled the perception of merchandise and of service quality. Here, the perception of store quality, merchandise and service quality are significantly associated with shopping motivation.

Table 5.41 Summary of the findings for the second hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The perception of store atmosphere and optimum stimulation level (OSL) in Perth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Interior layout and OSL</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Store attractiveness and OSL</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Social factors and OSL</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Store space and OSL</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Crowding and OSL</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Aisle merchandise OSL</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The perception of store atmosphere and OSL in Surabaya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Interior layout and OSL</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Design factors and OSL</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Social factors and OSL</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Store attractiveness and OSL</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.42 Summary of the findings for the third hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The perception of store quality and shopping motivations in Perth</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cognitive response and shopping motivations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Merchandise quality and shopping motivations</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Service quality and shopping motivations</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth hypothesis investigates the relationship between cognitive responses and optimum stimulation level (OSL). The studies in Perth and Surabaya support this relationship. Specifically, the perception of store quality is influenced by OSL in Perth. The perceptions of merchandise and service quality are found to be associated with OSL in Surabaya. The perception of service quality is more strongly influenced by OSL than is the perception of merchandise quality.

Table 5.43 Summary of the findings for the fourth hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The perception of store quality and OSL in Perth</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cognitive response and OSL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Merchandise quality and OSL</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Service quality and OSL</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fifth hypothesis is interested in the relationship between cognitive responses and store atmosphere. The finding is that the perception of store quality, merchandise and service quality relate to store atmosphere. However, these cognitive responses are not associated with all store atmosphere components.

Table 5.44 Summary of the findings for the fifth hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The perception of store quality and the perception of store atmosphere in Perth</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cognitive response and the perception of store atmosphere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Merchandise quality and store atmosphere</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Service quality and store atmosphere</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sixth hypothesis studies the relationship between store patronage satisfaction and cognitive responses. Store patronage satisfaction significantly associates with perceptions of store quality in Perth and with perception of merchandise and service quality in Surabaya.

5.45 Summary of the findings for the sixth hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Store patronage satisfaction and the perception of store quality</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Store patronage satisfaction and the perception of merchandise and service quality</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The seventh hypothesis uncovers the relationship between store patronage satisfaction and store atmosphere. Store patronage satisfaction is found to relate to store atmosphere in both Perth and Surabaya.

### 5.46 Summary of the findings for the seventh hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Store patronage satisfaction and the perception of store atmosphere in Perth</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Store patronage satisfaction and the perception of store atmosphere in Surabaya</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last hypothesis investigates the relationship between repatronage intention and store patronage satisfaction. This hypothesis is also supported in both places.

### 5.47 Summary of the findings for the eight hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Repatronage intention and store patronage satisfaction in Perth</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Repatronage intention and store patronage satisfaction in Surabaya</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, this study finds supports for the most of the hypotheses. The relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and shopping motivation is partially supported in Perth, whereas the same relationship is fully supported in Surabaya. Furthermore, the relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and optimum stimulation level (OSL) is partially supported in both places.
Chapter Six
Summary and Conclusions

This last chapter discusses the research summary, the nature of the results, the summary of the results, the limitations of the study, its theoretical contribution and managerial application, directions for future research and conclusions to be drawn from the study.

6.1 Research summary

The main focus of this study is on the broader view of motivation. In particular, the study aims to investigate the relationship between the in-store experience of shoppers and their motivation for shopping. The in-store experience as defined in this study includes the perception of store atmosphere and cognitive responses. Another interest of the study is to test the relationship between cognitive responses and store atmosphere in two different countries. Lastly, this study explores the relationship between in-store experience and store patronage satisfaction, which in turn can influence shoppers’ repatronage intention.

All the hypotheses in this study have been tested in Perth, Australia and Surabaya, Indonesia. In testing the hypotheses in these two different places, this study offers a significant contribution to shopping motivation research. Firstly, it increases the validity of the study, as the findings can be compared and contrasted. Secondly, it extends the literature by confirming the relationship between cognitive responses and store atmosphere in two culturally different countries.
The methodology of the study uses quantitative analysis, as the research problems are exploratory in nature and rely on deductive inquiry (Punch, 2004). The measurement instruments have been developed by previous researchers. To ensure the reliability and validity of the instruments, reliability tests and factor analysis have been applied. All measurement instruments have been found to have sufficient reliability coefficients.

Factor analysis has shown that some measurements have different factor loadings than the literature suggests and have different factor loading patterns between Perth and Surabaya, in particular, the measurements of shopping motivation, optimum stimulation level, store atmosphere and cognitive measurements. On the other hand, store patronage satisfaction and repatronage intention measurements are equivalent. For this reason, separate analyses were performed on each country.

6.2. Discussion of the results

The discussion of results is divided into eight sections. Each section discusses each hypothesis developed in this study.

6.2.1 The relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and shopping motivations

The first hypothesis suggests a direct relationship between the perceptions of store atmosphere and shopping motivation. The survey results in Perth (see Table 5.18) imply that some of the perceptions of store atmosphere are associated with shopping motivation. Specifically, perception of layout and interior, social factors and store space were found to be related to shopping motivation. In contrast, the store attractiveness, store space, aisle and merchandise and crowding were not associated
with shopping motivation. Therefore, there is partial support for the first hypothesis in Perth.

The Surabaya results (see Table 5.19) suggest that all perceptions of store atmosphere are associated with shopping motivation, but the strongest influence is on the perception of interior and layout and social factors. The perception of design factors and store attractiveness are less influenced by shopping motivation. Therefore, the first hypothesis is well supported in Surabaya.

In this study, the store atmosphere is defined as the physical in-store attributes which can stimulate cognitive responses. Samples surveyed show that the Indonesian shoppers and Australian shoppers have different interpretations of store atmosphere. Australian shoppers perceive store atmosphere in terms of interior layout, design factor, social factors, store space, store attractiveness and crowding. On the other hand, Indonesian shoppers perceive store atmosphere in terms of interior layout, design factor, social factors and store attractiveness.

The theory of goal-directed behaviour can explain the existence of the relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and shopping motivations. According to this theory,

There is an organized, persistent, directed quality to much of human behavior and the concept of goal is as a means for directing attention to, and understanding an aspect of human behaviour that transcends the immediacy of the particular situation or moment. (Pervin, 1987, p. 228)

In the retail context, shopping goals can direct attention and influence behaviour. In addition, most motivation definitions emphasise that motivation is an important influence on people’s actions (Lawson et al., 1996; Schiffman et al., 1997, Solomon, 2002 and Neal et al., 2004).
The literature has not yet addressed the relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and shopping motivation. However, some empirical studies have found a relationship between shopping motivation, in-store experience and shopping outcome (e.g. Roy and Tai, 2003; Kaltcheva and Weitz, 2006 and Hilbert and Tagg, 2001). Roy and Tai (2003) find that the utilitarian shopper who experiences a high imaginary elaboration would have positive approach-avoidance behaviour. In contrast, for the hedonic shoppers, imaginary elaboration does not influence approach-avoidance behaviour. The concept of imaginary elaboration is related to the cognitive responses that are induced by the store atmosphere.

Kaltcheva and Weitz (2006) find that shopping motivation moderates the relationship between arousal and pleasure. High arousal has a positive influence on pleasure when shopping goals are hedonic or recreational in orientation; in contrast, high arousal has a negative affect on pleasure when the shopping goal is utilitarian.

Hilbert and Tagg (2001) discover that some factors influence the relationship between shopping goals and shopping goal achievement for craft fair shoppers. Shopping effort moderates the relationship between the goal of seeking a gift for oneself and the achievement of this goal. Spending more money than intended moderates the relationship between gift-seeking and self-gift-seeking goals and the achievement of these goals. Lastly, interaction with the store atmosphere moderates the relationship between gift-seeking, hedonic, self-gift-seeking and epistemic goals and their attainment.

A possible reason why the first hypothesis is partially supported in Perth is that the majority of Perth respondents shop unaccompanied (51.7%). In contrast, most of Surabaya respondents shop accompanied (89.1%). This difference may influence the way shoppers interact with the store environment. Unaccompanied shoppers tend to spend less time and to relax less than accompanied shoppers. As a result, unaccompanied shoppers are not so strongly influenced by all the store atmosphere factors in achieving their goals in Australia. For Australian shoppers, store
attractiveness, aisle and merchandise and crowding are not perceived as relevant to the achievement of their goals. In contrast, the questionnaire elicited that Indonesian shoppers consider that all store atmosphere components can help them to achieve their shopping goals.

Another factor which can influence the perception of store atmosphere is the pre-existing mood or pre-existing emotion of the shopper (Bitner, 1992, p. 65). Shoppers experiencing a negative mood are likely to avoid interaction and perceive the store environment negatively.

6.2.2 The relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and optimum stimulation level (OSL)

The second objective of this study was to examine the relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and OSL. The study found partial support for this relationship in both countries. Specifically, OSL is associated with the perception of interior layout and social factors in Perth and Surabaya (see Tables 5.20 and 5.21). The extent of the relationship in both countries is mostly very low. An exception is the relationship between social factors and OSL in Surabaya.

OSL refers to the way in which people’s affective state responds to stimulation induced by the environment (Mittelstaedt et al., 1975; Raju, 1977 and 1980; Wahlers and Etzel, 1985 and Steenkamp and Baumgartner, 1992 and 1995). According to this theory, affective response follows an inverted U-shaped function, where the intermediate level of the curve is the OSL. People can have either a high or low OSL. Those with a high OSL tend to pursue activities resulting in high stimulation in order to feel satisfied.
Empirical findings show that OSL influences curiosity-motivated, variety-seeking and risk-taking behaviours (Raju, 1977 and 1980; Wahlers and Etzel, 1985 and Steenkamp and Baumgartner, 1992 and 1995), adoption of retail format (Grossbart et al., 1975) and shopping behaviour (Rogers, 1977). Rogers (1977) explains that shoppers who have a low OSL tend to interact with a static display and spend more time with that kind of environment.

As explained earlier, the study found partial support for the relationship between store atmosphere and OSL. The findings indicate that the extent of most relationships between store atmosphere factors and OSL in both places are low and that OSL does not affect shoppers’ interaction with some store components such as store attractiveness, store space or crowding. A possible explanation is that shoppers in Perth and Surabaya have a high degree of familiarity with the stores. The majority of Perth (95.1%) and Surabaya (99.8%) respondents had visited the store before the survey was conducted. Familiarity may cause these shoppers to find most of the store atmosphere factors less stimulating. Hence the study found that most of the store atmosphere factors do not have significant relationships with OSL and the significant relationships that do exist are low.

Another possible explanation is that OSL has more influence on curiosity-motivated, variety-seeking and risk-taking behaviours (Raju, 1977 and 1980; Wahlers and Etzel, 1985 and Steenkamp and Baumgartner, 1992 and 1995) and the adoption of a retail format (Grossbart et al., 1975). OSL may influence how shoppers decide on their shopping goals.

An interesting finding is the strong relationship between the perception of social factors and OSL in Surabaya. This finding indicates that, although there is a high degree of familiarity, social factors can to some extent stimulate shoppers to achieve their stimulation level in a collectivist country. This may due to the high value placed on social life in collectivist countries.
6.2.3 The relationship between cognitive responses and shopping motivations

The third hypothesis proposes a relationship between cognitive responses and shopping motivation in Perth and Surabaya. The hypotheses developed for the study in Perth and for that in Surabaya are different because of the factor analysis output. In Perth, it is proposed that perceptions of store quality are associated with shopping motivation. For Surabaya, there are two hypotheses. Firstly, the perception of merchandise quality is posited to associate with shopping motivation and secondly, the perception of service quality is proposed to associate with shopping motivation.

The difference of the findings on factor analyses is likely to be caused by the differences in the degree and nature of social values in Australia and Indonesia. Differences in social conformity in different countries can affect the perception of cues in the store environment, which in turn can influence the store image (Hu, 2002). Indonesia is identified as a collectivist country, whereas, Australia is an individualistic country. This indicates that the Indonesians place a higher value on social life than the Australian. Therefore, Indonesians may spend more time shopping and perceive the store environment as important in more ways than Australians do.

The proposed relationships are confirmed in both places. In Perth, the perception of store quality is associated with shopping motivation (see Table 5.22). In Surabaya, perceptions of merchandise and service quality are related to shopping motivation (see Table 5.23). Therefore, the third hypothesis is well supported in both places.

As with the first hypothesis, the theory of goal-directed behaviour can explain the significance of the third hypothesis. According to this theory, goals influence people’s behaviour (Pervin, 1987). This study supports the theory that shopping motivation or goals influence the cognitive responses of shoppers.
Empirical studies have found a relationship between in-store experience and shopping motivation (Dawson et al., 1990 and Roy and Tai, 2003). Dawson et al. (1990) reveal that shopping motivation can affect the emotional responses which are stimulated by the store atmosphere. Strongly product-motivated shoppers are likely to experience higher pleasure, while strongly experientially motivated customers are likely to experience higher arousal.

Roy and Tai (2003) find that the utilitarian shopper who experiences a high imaginary elaboration would have positive approach-avoidance behaviour. In contrast, for the hedonic shoppers, imaginary elaboration does not influence approach-avoidance behaviour. This imaginary elaboration concept is related to the cognitive responses that are induced by the store atmosphere.

6.2.4 The relationship between cognitive responses and optimum stimulation level (OSL)

The fourth hypothesis aims to test the relationship between cognitive responses and OSL in Perth and Surabaya. The hypotheses developed for the study in Perth and for that in Surabaya are different because of the factor analysis output. It is proposed that the perception of store quality associates with OSL in Perth. There are two hypotheses in Surabaya. Firstly, the perception of merchandise quality is posited to associate with OSL and secondly, the perception of service quality is proposed to associate with OSL.

The relationship between the cognitive responses and OSL is confirmed in both places. In Perth, the perception of store quality is associated with OSL (see Table 5.24). In Surabaya, the perceptions of merchandise and service quality are associated with OSL (see Table 5.25). The extent of the relationships between the perception of service quality and OSL is much stronger than the other relationships.
As explained earlier, the cognitive responses of shoppers are also influenced by OSL. Lawson et al. (1996) explain that arousal influences cognitive thinking. This influence is shown in the selection of informational stimuli and the reviewing of stored knowledge. In addition, Hebb (1955) and Leuba (1955) examined the relationship between the level of arousal and cognitive responses. According to their results, cognitive responses are optimised at a moderate level of arousal.

The points of view of Lawson et al. (1996), Hebb (1955) and Leuba (1955) are supported by the findings of this study. Perceptions of store quality are associated with OSL in Perth and perceptions of merchandise and service quality are associated with OSL in Surabaya. However, in Surabaya, the perception of service quality has a stronger relationship with OSL than has the perception of merchandise and store quality. A possible reason is that social factors are associated strongly with OSL in Indonesia and other collectivist countries, and have a strong influence on the perception of service quality.

6.2.5 The relationship between cognitive responses and store atmosphere

The fifth hypothesis investigates the relationship between cognitive responses and store atmosphere in Perth and Surabaya. The hypotheses developed for the study in Perth and for that in Surabaya are different because of the factor analysis output. In Perth, it is posited that perceptions of store quality are associated with store atmosphere. In Surabaya, there are two hypotheses. Firstly, the perception of merchandise quality is posited to associate with store atmosphere and secondly, the perception of service quality is proposed to associate with store atmosphere.

The study finds that cognitive responses are associated with store atmosphere in both places. In Perth, the perception of store quality is associated with the store atmosphere (see Table 5.26). In Surabaya, the perception of merchandise quality and of service quality correlates with the store atmosphere (see Table 5.27).
This finding confirms the inference theory and the theory of affordances (Baker et al., 2002). Inference theory posits that people will utilise environmental cues in order to make judgments of unknowns. This is supported by the theory of affordances which explains that people perceive their environment as a meaningful entity. People can evaluate the environment on the basis of attribute or category (Keaveney and Hunt, 1992) or of an idiosyncratic cognitive configuration (Marzursky and Jacoby, 1986) in order to make judgments about the environment. The study finds that shoppers in Perth and Surabaya employ their perceptions of store environment to make judgments of store quality, merchandise quality and service quality.

6.2.5.1 The relationship between the perception of store quality and store atmosphere

This study finds that the perception of store quality is strongly associated with that of store atmosphere. Particularly, it is associated with most perceptions of store atmosphere, such as interior layout, social factors, store space and store attractiveness. Interior layout and social factors are the major predictor variables that influence perceptions of store quality, but crowding and aisle merchandise have no significant influence. The possible reasons are that shoppers try to avoid a crowded store environment and regard aisle merchandise from a functional point of view.

The literature has not yet examined the relationship between the perceptions of store quality and store atmosphere. However, empirical studies show that there is a relationship between these two factors (Baker et al., 1994 and Baker et al., 2002). Lueder (2001) explains that store quality comprises the perception of merchandise and of service quality. Thus, the current literature has already indicated an indirect relationship between the perception of store quality and the store atmosphere.

This study confirms that shoppers take their store quality cues from the store environment cues, but that they do not utilise all store environment cues to form their perceptions of store quality. The study finds that shoppers give different meanings to components of the store atmosphere in relation to the perception of store quality.
This is consistent with the definition of perception as “the process by which an individual selects, organizes and interprets stimuli into a meaningful and coherent picture of the world” (Schiffman and Kanuk., 1997, p. 144).

6.2.5.2 The relationship between the perception of merchandise quality and store atmosphere

In Surabaya, as explained earlier, the cognitive responses of shoppers comprise the perception of merchandise and service quality. The perception of merchandise quality is associated with social factors, design factors and store attractiveness. Interior layout is not associated with merchandise quality. Design factors and store attractiveness have inverse relationships with the perception of merchandise quality, whereas social factors have a positive relationship with that perception.

The perception of merchandise quality is defined as,

   An idiosyncratic value judgment with respect to the fitness for consumption which is based upon the conscious and/or unconscious processing of quality cues in relation to relevant quality attributes within the context of significant personal and situational variables (Steenkamp, 1990, p. 317).

Based on this definition, quality cues emerge as an important factor that influences the perceptions of merchandise quality. These cues can be differentiated into intrinsic and extrinsic cues (Zeithaml, 1988 and Eroglu and Machleit, 1990). Intrinsic cues include merchandise material and colours (Mazursky and Jacoby, 1986), while examples of extrinsic cues are brand names, perceived level of advertising and price and store image (Lueder, 2001). Store atmosphere contributes to the perception of store image.
The previous studies show the inconsistency of findings on the relationship between the perception of merchandise quality and of store atmosphere. The study of Belizzi, Crowley and Hasty (1983) shows a mixed result on the influence of colour on merchandise quality. Baker et al. (1994) find that the perception of merchandise quality is associated with ambient factors and social factors. The perception of design factors does not affect the perception of merchandise quality. In a later study, however, Baker et al. (2002) find that the perception of merchandise quality is only influenced by the perception of design factors.

This study also finds that the perception of merchandise quality is not associated with all components of store atmosphere. As explained earlier, the perception of merchandise quality is not associated with layout and interior. The possible reason why this relationship is not supported is that shoppers perceive layout and interior in terms of the functional purpose. The purpose of layout and interior is to facilitate and attract the shopper’s interest in exploring the store. Thus, this aspect of store atmosphere is not utilised as a quality cue.

Another interesting finding is that the perception of merchandise quality has an inverse relationship with the design factor and store attractiveness. A well designed and attractive store can shift a shopper’s attention from the merchandise to the physical store. Shoppers are then more concerned with the store appearance than with the merchandise offered in the store.

The study also finds that merchandise quality has a positive relationship with social factors. A lively atmosphere and courteous salespeople can help to enhance the perception of merchandise quality. A lively atmosphere, in the form of enthusiastic and energetic salespeople, can encourage the shopper to search actively and develop a positive image about the merchandise. Likewise, courteous salespeople can indicate a willingness to answer all the merchandise questions from the shoppers, which in turn can influence their perception of merchandise quality.
6.2.5.3 The relationship between the perceived service quality and store atmosphere

The perception of service quality has a positive association with social factors, interior layout and design factors. Store attractiveness emerges as the only aspect of store atmosphere which is not associated with service quality. Social factors and interior layout are the two major predictor variables.

The perceived service quality is defined as a multilevel and multidimensional construct which is based on the customer’s evaluation of the customer-employee interaction, the outcome quality and physical environment quality (Brady and Cronin, 2001, pp. 35-36). The findings of this study in Surabaya support this definition of perceived service quality in terms of the customer-employee interaction and physical environment. In addition, Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry’s (1988) SERVQUAL model includes the tangible component to represent physical evidence of the service.

Baker et al. (1994) found that perceptions of ambient factors and social factors influence perceptions of service quality. Later, Baker et al. (2002) found that ambient, design and social factors influence perceptions of service quality. This study confirms and extends the previous findings, as most aspects of the store atmosphere were found to influence the perceptions of service quality.

6.2.6 The relationship between store patronage satisfaction and cognitive responses

The sixth hypothesis investigates the relationship between store patronage satisfaction and cognitive responses. Satisfaction is strongly affected by the perception of store quality in Perth (see Table 5.28). Likewise, in Surabaya, satisfaction is influenced by the perception of merchandise quality and service
quality (see Table 5.29). The perception of service quality is clearly the major predictor variable to influence satisfaction in Surabaya.

In this study, store patronage satisfaction is defined as an individual’s emotional reaction to his or her evaluation of the total set of experiences gained from patronising the retailer (Westbrook, 1981, p. 70). Store patronage satisfaction is different from the satisfaction gained from product acquisition. It is simply the shopper’s evaluation of his or her shopping experience. Therefore, on the basis of this definition, perceptions of store atmosphere and the cognitive responses of the shopper are expected to influence store patronage satisfaction.

This study supports the above points of view, as the store atmosphere and the cognitive responses of shoppers are found to be associated with store patronage satisfaction. The emergence of the perception of service as the most important variable to influence satisfaction is reasonably acceptable. Shoppers put a higher priority on service quality than on merchandise quality in evaluating their shopping experience.

6.2.7 The relationship between store patronage satisfaction and store atmosphere

The seventh hypothesis observes the relationship between store patronage satisfaction and store atmosphere. This relationship is found to be highly significant both in Perth and Surabaya. In Perth, patrons’ satisfaction is influenced by the interior layout, social factors and store space (see Table 5.30). Store patronage satisfaction is associated with most of the store atmosphere components in Surabaya, particularly with interior layout, social factors and store attractiveness (see Table 5.31).
Westbrook (1981) explains that there are eight sources of shopper satisfaction: store salesperson, store environment, merchandising policies, service orientation, product or service satisfaction, clientele, value or price relationship and special sales. Parasuraman et al. (1988), Rust and Oliver (1997), Oliver (1997) and Brandy and Robertson (2001) suggest that the evaluation of service quality, which is cognitive in nature, could influence satisfaction.

6.2.8 The relationship between repatronage intention and store patronage satisfaction

The eighth hypothesis examines the relationship between store patronage satisfaction and repatronage intention. This study confirms the relationship between repatronage intention and store patronage satisfaction in Perth (see Table 5.32) and extends the findings of previous studies in regard to a collectivist country such as Indonesia (see Table 5.33). However, the extent of the relationship is much weaker in Surabaya than in Perth.

The literature review has revealed that higher levels of satisfaction lead to repeat purchases (Jones and Sasser, 1995; Olivia et al., 1992; Wakefield and Blodgett, 1994; Babin and Darden, 1996; Babin and Griffin, 1998; Brady et al., 2001 and Stoel et al., 2004). Grace and O’Cass (2005) find that satisfaction is the strongest variable to influence repatronage intention. Parasuraman et al. (1988), Rust and Oliver (1997), Oliver (1997) and Brandy and Robertson (2001) suggest that the shoppers’ evaluation of service quality could influence satisfaction, which in turn affects repatronage intention.

The literature also reveals that perceived value for money, consumption feelings, commitment to and involvement with the service and the specific brand play a significant role (Grace and O’Cass, 2005). The findings of this study suggest that these factors may have a stronger influence in Surabaya than in Perth.
6.3 Summary of discussions

The relationship between perception of store atmosphere and shopping motivation is partially supported in the study. Possible explanations for this are: shoppers are not strongly influenced by some store atmosphere components in pursuit of their hedonic shopping goals; the role of pre-existing emotion or mood in shoppers’ behaviour; and the role of shopping motivations in moderating the relationship between arousal and pleasure. This study supports the relationship between cognitive responses and shopping motivation. The theory of goal-directed behaviour and the importance of motivation, as evidenced by some definitions of motivation, explain the relationship.

The relationship between cognitive responses and store atmosphere is also supported in the study. The findings support the inference theory and the theory of affordances, Bitner’s (1992) Servicescape model and some empirical findings such as those of Donovan et al. (1994), Baker et al. (1994) and Baker et al. (2002). This study extends the literature in confirming the relationship between cognitive responses and store atmosphere in Indonesia.

The relationship between store patronage satisfaction and store atmosphere and between store patronage satisfaction and cognitive responses are confirmed in this study. This finding supports previous empirical findings such as those of Westbrook (1981), Parasuraman et al. (1988), Oliver (1997) and Brady and Robertson (2001). These relationships are further established by this study in Australia and Indonesia.

The relationship between repatronage intention and store patronage satisfaction is also supported. A significant number of studies support this relationship, for example, those of Jones and Sasser (1995), Olivia et al. (1992), Wakefield and Blodgett (1994) and Babin and Darden (1996). Again, this finding extends the field in which the relationship exists, as the relationship is established in two places.
6.4 Limitations of the study

While the present study contributes to our knowledge of shopping motivation and store atmosphere in Australia and Indonesia, it has several limitations. Firstly, this study purposely focuses on hedonic shopping motivation. This shopping typology developed by Arnold and Reynolds (2003) comprises the motivation of gratification, adventure, idea, value and social needs. As a result, the interpretation of the findings involving shopping motivations should be focused on hedonic shopping motivations.

Secondly, the literature reveals that the mediating responses which are induced by store atmosphere are emotional and physiological in nature (Bitner, 1992). This study focuses on cognitive responses, comprising the perception of merchandise quality and service quality. Other cognitive responses such as the perception of merchandise value and prices are not part of this study.

Thirdly, as a result of using real retail settings rather than experimental ones, some factors such as pre-existing image, pre-existing emotional state and pre-existing mood could not be controlled in this study. Shoppers who have already patronised the store may have a pre-existing image of the store, whereas, shoppers who have not been to the store may not have one.

Fourthly, this study may suffer from the effect of memory recall. Respondents are approached after they have finished shopping. To answer the questionnaire, they have to remember their experiences when they were in the store. It is possible the respondents had difficulty remembering their experience. However, this possibility can be considered to be very small, since the shoppers were asked to answer the questionnaire immediately after finishing shopping.
Fifthly, this study groups all types of stores together. The types of store in this study are supermarket, department and specialty store. The relationships are not analysed separately for each type of store.

Lastly, all proposed relationships are examined in two countries only. Therefore, caution is needed in generalising these findings to all geographic locations.

6.5 Theoretical contribution and managerial application

While the main aim of this study is to fill a gap in the literature of retailing, it also has some managerial applications. The following sections suggest the theoretical contribution and managerial applications.

6.5.1 The perception of store atmosphere and shopping motivation

The relationship between store atmosphere and shopping motivation is partially supported in Perth and is fully supported in Surabaya. This finding extends the previous literature in terms of confirming the relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and shopping motivation and how culture influences the existence of this relationship.

Previous empirical studies concentrate on the role of shopping motivation as a moderating variable, for instance, Hilbert and Tagg (2001), who discover that some factors influence the relationship between shopping goals and shopping goal achievement, Roy and Tai (2003) who find the relationship between shopping motivation, imaginary elaboration and approach-avoidance behaviour and Kaltcheva and Weitz (2006) who find that shopping motivation moderates the relationship between arousal and pleasure.
As the research findings indicate that shopping goals are an important factor to influence the perception of store atmosphere, retailers in Perth and Surabaya should consider this factor when designing store atmosphere. In Perth, retailers should think about shopper motivation when designing interior layout, social factors and store space. For example, in relation to social factors, retailers should have courteous salespeople and a lively, cheerful and stimulating store environment in order to generate a positive feedback from role and adventure shoppers.

In Surabaya, retailers should consider shopper goals when designing all store atmosphere components: interior layout, design factors, social factors and store attractiveness. For example, in relation to interior layout, retailers should have a well-organised layout and an impressive interior in order to enhance a response from adventure, social, role and product motivation shoppers.

6.5.2 The perception of store atmosphere and optimum stimulation level (OSL)

Most OSL studies focus on the relationship between exploratory behaviour and OSL: for example, Raju (1977 and 1980), Grossbart et al. (1975), Wahlers and Etzel (1985) and Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1992 and 1995). This study extends the literature by confirming the relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and OSL. The study found a relationship between OSL and some store atmosphere factors such as interior layout and social factors in Perth and Surabaya.

Furthermore, optimum stimulation level (OSL) has a slight effect on how shoppers interact with most components of store atmosphere. The only exception is the relationship between social factors and OSL. Shopper interaction with social factors in Indonesia is strongly affected by OSL. Therefore, Indonesian retailers, when they design the store’s social factors such as availability and appearance of employees, should consider the target market’s OSL.
6.5.3 Cognitive responses and shopping motivation

The relationship between cognitive responses and shopping motivation is fully supported in Surabaya. This finding extends the previous literature in terms of confirming that relationship. As explained earlier, the previous empirical studies concentrate on the role of shopping motivation as a moderating variable, for example, Hilbert and Tagg (2001), Roy and Tai (2003) and Kaltcheva and Weitz (2006).

Retailers should pay attention to shopping goals, as they are associated with cognitive responses. This study reveals that the way shoppers perceive the quality of the store as whole, the merchandise and the service is influenced by their shopping goals and OSL. In Perth, the shoppers’ role, social and value motivation do not affect the perception of store quality, but OSL does have an effect.

In Surabaya, shopping motivation has more influence on the perception of service quality than on that of merchandise quality. Value motivation does not affect the perception of the merchandise quality, and role and product motivation do not affect the perception of service quality. This finding shows that store atmosphere in Surabaya has less importance for value, role and product motivation, as these do not influence cognitive responses in terms of the perception of merchandise and service quality.

6.5.4 Cognitive responses and optimum stimulation level (OSL)

As explained earlier, most OSL studies focus on the relationship between exploratory behaviour and OSL for example, Raju (1977 and 1980), Grossbart et al. (1975) Wahlers and Etzel (1985) and Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1992 and 1995). This study extends the literature by confirming the relationship between cognitive responses and OSL.
In Perth, the perception of store quality is influenced by OSL. The perceptions of merchandise and service quality are found to be associated with OSL in Surabaya. For retailers, this finding indicates that OSL is useful as a segmentation variable in both places.

6.5.5 Cognitive response and store atmosphere

The literature reveals that store atmosphere can induce cognitive responses (Bitner, 1992; Baker et al., 1994 and Baker 2002). As most studies investigating the relationship between cognitive responses and store atmosphere are done in individualistic countries, this study extends the literature by testing and confirming the relationship in both individualistic and collectivist countries.

The study reports a significant relationship between cognitive responses and store atmosphere. In Perth, the perception of store quality is associated with store atmosphere. Specifically, the study finds that interior layout, social factors, store space and store attractiveness all influence perceptions. Interior layout and social factors emerge as the most important components. Therefore, retailers in Perth should pay attention particularly to these components in order to enhance the perception of store quality in their customers.

In Surabaya, the perception of merchandise and service quality relates to store atmosphere. The store atmosphere has more influence on the perception of service quality than on the perception of merchandise quality. To develop a superior service quality perception, retailers should emphasise social factors, layout interior and design factors.
Retailers in Surabaya should take care in designing the store atmosphere if they want to increase the perception of merchandise quality. An interesting design and positive store attractiveness would not necessarily result in a more positive merchandise quality perception. To enhance the perception of merchandise quality, retailers need to improve social factors, for instance, by employing attractive and enthusiastic salespersons.

Multinational retailers should learn that store atmosphere has different roles in enhancing the store image in different countries such as Indonesia and Australia. The finding of this study suggests that multinational retailers need to use a customised store atmosphere strategy.

6.5.6 Store patronage satisfaction and store atmosphere

The literature has identified some sources of shopping satisfaction such as the quality of store salespersons, store environment, merchandising policies, service orientation, product or service orientation, clientele, value or price relationship and special sale (Westbrook, 1981). This study extends the literature by confirming the relationship of these factors with satisfaction in individualistic and collectivist countries.

The findings of this study suggest that store patronage satisfaction is strongly influenced by the perception of store atmosphere. However, it also reveals that satisfaction is not affected by all store atmosphere components. In Perth, interior layout, social factors and store space affect satisfaction. In Surabaya, interior layout, social factors and store attractiveness influence satisfaction. Therefore, retailers in both places should carefully design the mix of their store atmosphere.
6.5.6 Store patronage satisfaction and cognitive responses

The literature has identified some sources of shopping satisfaction such as store salesperson, store environment, merchandising policies, service orientation, product or service orientation, clientele, value or price relationship and special sales (Westbrook, 1981). This study extends the literature by confirming the relationship of these factors with satisfaction in individualistic and collectivist countries.

This finding suggests that store patronage satisfaction is influenced by cognitive responses. In Perth, it is affected by the perception of store quality. In Surabaya, it is more strongly influenced by the perception of service quality than it is by that of merchandise quality. Therefore, retailers should increase the perception of store quality and the perception of merchandise and service quality in order to increase store patronage satisfaction. This satisfaction can, in turn, increase shoppers’ repatronage intentions.

6.5.7 Store patronage satisfaction and store atmosphere

The findings of this study suggest that store patronage satisfaction is strongly influenced by the perception of store atmosphere. However, it also reveals that satisfaction is not affected by all store atmosphere components. In Perth, interior layout, social factors and store space affect satisfaction. In Surabaya, interior layout, social factors and store attractiveness influence satisfaction. Therefore, retailers in both places should carefully design the mix of their store atmosphere.

6.5.8 Repatronage intention and store patronage satisfaction

Grace and O’Cass (2005) explain that satisfaction, perceived value for money and consumption feelings are the antecedents of intention in Australia. This study
extends this point of view by confirming the relationship of repatronage intention and store patronage satisfaction in individualistic and collectivist countries.

For retailers in both places, this finding indicates that retailers should try to enhance store patronage satisfaction in order to increase the likelihood of the shopper patronising the store in the future.

6.6 Future research

It would be useful for future research to employ other shopping motivation typologies such as those of Westbrook and Black (1985) or Tauber (1972). The use of other shopping motivation typologies could help to validate the findings from this research, particularly the relationship between the perception of store atmosphere and shopping motivation and that of cognitive responses and shopping motivation.

Upcoming studies could also investigate the relationship between pre-existing emotions and cognitive responses. In this study, the extent of the relationship between cognitive responses and store atmosphere has been found to be low. Therefore, examining the relationship between pre-existing emotions and cognitive responses can be expected to expand our understanding of cognitive responses in relation to shopping motivation.

Future research could study the relationships that have been developed in this study in the context of different types of stores. This study can not apply the data to different types of store than those selected, as the number of respondents for each type is not adequate for further statistical analysis. The main reason this study has selected respondents from different types of store is to take account of differences in
store atmosphere and shopping motivation. It is reasonable to hypothesise that a wider range of stores studies will reveal further differences.

Future research can include behavioral measurements such as money or time spent in the store. This would allow the researcher to explore how store patronage satisfaction influences money or time spent in the store.

6.7 Conclusion

This study highlights the importance of shopping motivation in the in-store experience of shoppers. Shopping motivation influences the way shoppers perceive the retail environment. To achieve their shopping goals, shoppers place different degrees of importance on the components of store atmosphere. Shoppers in Perth found that store attractiveness, aisle merchandise and crowding are not important in the achievement of their goals, which are mostly measured in hedonic terms.

On the other hand, shoppers in Surabaya reported that all components of store atmosphere help them to accomplish their goals. Particularly, layout and interior, design factors, social factors and store attractiveness are important to assist the achievement of shopping goals. The main difference in the relationship between store atmosphere and shopping motivation for shoppers in Perth and Surabaya may be the social value gained from the experience of shopping.

Another aspect of the relationship between the in-store experiences of shoppers and their shopping motivation is the relationship between cognitive responses and shopping motivation. The current literature indicates that shopping motivation acts as a moderating variable to influence cognitive responses (Roy and Thai, 2003).
However, this study establishes a *direct* relationship between cognitive responses and shopping motivation.

The perception of store quality is associated with shopping motivation in Perth and the perception of merchandise and service quality is related to shopping motivation in Surabaya, where the perception of service quality has a stronger relationship with shopping motivation than does that of merchandise quality.

The literature has indicated the relationship between cognitive responses and store atmosphere (Donovan et al., 1994; Baker et al., 1994 and Baker et al., 2002). This relationship has been confirmed and extended in this study. The relationship is established both in an individualistic country, Australia, and in a collectivist country, Indonesia.

The literature reveals the relationship between the perception of service quality, satisfaction and behavioural intention (Parasuraman et al., 1988; Oliver, 1997 and Brady and Robertson, 2001). This study confirms this relationship in the retail field. The perception of store atmosphere and cognitive response are associated with store patronage satisfaction, which in turn influences repatronage intention.
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Hi,

As valued shopper, your experiences and opinions are very important. The purpose of this study is to develop a better understanding of your shopping experience preferences and so to develop strategies to serve you better. We therefore ask you to share these experiences with us by completing the attached questionnaire.

This research is being conducted by Tjong Budisantoso, a research Ph.D. student, who is working under the supervision of Assoc. Prof. A. Pecotich from the University of Western Australia. I will ensure that your responses will be treated confidentially and that all reporting of our results will preserve the anonymity of each participant. In any publication, information will be provided in such a way that you cannot be identified. Comments or enquiries are welcome and may be directed to

The Research Ethics Committee  
Centre of Research and Graduate Studies  
The University of Notre Dame Australia  
Fremantle 6160, Australia  
Telephone: (08) 9433 0555

We hope you would take 10-15 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Your participation in this survey is important and greatly appreciated. In doing so, you will be helping the store to improve its store environment and the University to extend the human knowledge.

Thank you,

Tjong Budisantoso
“Shopping always makes me hungry.”
A. On the basis of the following set of responses, we hope to get a better understanding of your motivation for the last store’s shopping trip. Please circle a number on the response scale of 7 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree), adjacent to each statement, to indicate the extent to which the statement describes your motivations in the last store’s shopping trip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>RESPONSE SCALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a.</td>
<td>To me, shopping is an adventure</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b.</td>
<td>Shopping is a thrill to me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.</td>
<td>Shopping makes me feel like I am in my own universe</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d.</td>
<td>When I’m in a down mood, I go shopping to make me feel better</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e.</td>
<td>To me, shopping is a way to relieve stress</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f.</td>
<td>I go shopping when I want to treat myself to something special</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g.</td>
<td>I like shopping for others because when they feel good I feel good</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1h.</td>
<td>I feel good when I buy things for the special people in my life</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1i.</td>
<td>I enjoy shopping for my friends and family</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1j.</td>
<td>For the most part, I go shopping when there are sales</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1k.</td>
<td>I enjoy looking for discounts when I shop</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1l.</td>
<td>I enjoy hunting for bargains when I shop</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1m.</td>
<td>I go shopping with my friends or family to socialize</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1n.</td>
<td>I enjoy socializing with others when I shop</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1o.</td>
<td>Shopping with others is a bonding experience</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p.</td>
<td>I go shopping to keep up with the trends</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1q.</td>
<td>I go shopping to keep up with the new fashions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r.</td>
<td>I go shopping to see what new products are available</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s.</td>
<td>Finding exactly what I want, in the least amount of time</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1t.</td>
<td>Shopping for a brand new item to replace an old one</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Please circle a number on the response scale of 7 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree), adjacent to each statement, to indicate the extent to which the statement describes your perceptions of the last store’s atmosphere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>RESPONSE SCALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a.</td>
<td>Lively</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b.</td>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c.</td>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>STATEMENTS</td>
<td>RESPONSE SCALES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d.</td>
<td>Courteous salespeople</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e.</td>
<td>Cluttered aisles</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f.</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g.</td>
<td>Roomy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h.</td>
<td>Unattractive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2i.</td>
<td>Dirty</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2j.</td>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2k.</td>
<td>Crammed merchandise</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2l.</td>
<td>Impressive interior</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m.</td>
<td>Well-organized layout</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2n.</td>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2o.</td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p.</td>
<td>Dull</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2q.</td>
<td>Pleasant smelling</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2r.</td>
<td>Confined or close felling</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s.</td>
<td>Crowded or restricted movement</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. On the basis of the following set of responses, we hope to get a better understanding of your optimum stimulation level. Please circle a number on the response scale of 7 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree), adjacent to each statement, to indicate the extent to which the statement describes your optimum stimulation level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>RESPONSE SCALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a.</td>
<td>I like to continue doing the same things rather than try new and different things</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3b. I like to experience novelty and change in my daily routine | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3c. I like a job that offers change, variety, and travel, even if it involves some danger | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3d. I am continually seeking new ideas and experience | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3e. I like continually change activities | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3f. When things get boring, I like to find some new and unfamiliar experience | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3g. I prefer a routine way of life to an unpredictable one full of change | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

D. On the basis of the following set of responses, we hope to get a better understanding of your response to the last store’s characteristics. Please circle a number on the response scale of 7 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree), adjacent to each statement, to indicate the extent to which the statement describes your response to the last store’s characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>RESPONSE SCALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a.</td>
<td>Products purchased from this store would be high in quality</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b.</td>
<td>The workmanship of gifts purchased in this store would be high</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c.</td>
<td>This store’s employee would be willing to help customers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d.</td>
<td>This store would offer high-quality service</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e.</td>
<td>Employees of this store would not be too busy to respond to customers’ requests promptly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4f. Employees of this store could be expected to give customers personal attention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>RESPONSE SCALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not at All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I will consider repurchasing from this store if I have a choice</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Please circle a number on the response scale of 7 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree), adjacent to each statement, to indicate the extent to which the statement describes your satisfaction when shopping in the store on the last’s store shopping trip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>RESPONSE SCALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not at All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>To what extent were you satisfied with the final outcome</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the way my purchase was handled by the staff</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>To what extent would you prefer another, more ideal, final outcome?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d</td>
<td>Overall, to that extent were you satisfied that you got what you wanted?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5e</td>
<td>To what extent were you satisfied with the personal treatment that you received while in the store</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Please circle a number on the response scale of 7 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree), adjacent to each statement, to indicate the extent to which the statement describes what is your repatronage intention toward the last store.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>RESPONSE SCALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>I will consider repurchasing from this store if I have a choice</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6b. If needed, I will select this store again
6c. I am willing to do more business with this store in the future

G. The aim of these questions is to help us understand your background. Please indicate your response to each statement. If you are uncomfortable with some of the questions, please feel free to skip to the next question.

7. Are you:
- Male
- Female

8. How old are you?
- Less than 18 years old
- 18 – 24 years old
- 25 – 30 years old
- 30 – 35 years old
- 35 – 40 years old
- More than 40 years old

9. Number of accompanying adults or children
- None
- 1-3 people
- 4-6 people
- More than 6 people
10. How many times have you visited the store?

- None
- 1-3 times
- 4-6 times
- More than 6 times

---------Thank you---------
Dengan hormat,
Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mendapatkan pemahaman pengalaman berbelanja yang lebih baik. Karena itu saya sangat mengharapkan anda dapat berbagi pengalaman berbelanja anda dengan mengisi kuesioner ini.

Penelitian ini dilakukan oleh saya, Tjong Budisantoso, pelajar program studi Doctor of Philosophy, yang melakukan penelitian atas pengarahan Associate Professor Anthony Pecotich dari the University of Western Australia, Australia. Jawaban anda akan dijamin kerahasiannya dan pelaporan hasil penelitian ini tidak akan mencantumkan nama.
Komentar dan pertanyaan dapat di sampaikan ke:

The Research Ethics Committee  
Centre of Research and Graduate Studies  
The University of Notre Dame Australia  
Fremantle 6160, Australia  
Telephone: (08) 9433 0555


Hormat saya,

Tjong Budisantoso
“Shopping always makes me hungry.”
Contoh-contoh dibawah ini menggambarkan bagaimana anda menyatakan persetujuan terhadap pernyataan-pernyataan yang diberikan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTOH : Pernyataan</th>
<th>SKALA TANGGAPAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sangat Tidak Setuju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagi saya, berbelanja adalah sebuah petualangan.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagi saya, berbelanja dapat membangkitkan semangat.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbelanja membuat saya merasa berada di dunia saya.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Lihat pernyataan dibawah ini dan nyatakan persetujuan anda terhadap motivasi anda mengunjungi toko yang baru anda kunjungi dengan melingkari nomor dengan skala dari 7 (sangat setuju) sampai 1 (sangat tidak setuju).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>PERNYATAAN</th>
<th>SKALA TANGGAPAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sangat Tidak Setuju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Bagi saya, berbelanja adalah sebuah petualangan.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Bagi saya, berbelanja dapat membangkitkan semangat.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Berbelanja membuat saya merasa berada di dunia saya.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Pada saat saya merasakan suasana hati yang tidak enak, saya pergi berbelanja untuk menghilangkan perasaan tersebut</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1e. Bagi saya, berbelanja dapat menghilangkan stress.
1f. Saya pergi berbelanja pada saat saya ingin memanjakan diri dengan sesuatu yang istimewa.
1g. Saya menyukai berbelanja untuk orang lain karena pada saat mereka merasa senang saya merasakan senang juga.
1h. Saya menyukai berbelanja untuk mencari hadiah yang menarik untuk seseorang.
1i. Saya menyukai berbelanja untuk keperluan keluarga dan teman.
1j. Seringkali, saya pergi berbelanja kalau ada barang yang dijual obral.
1k. Saya suka mencari potongan harga ketika berbelanja.
1l. Saya menikmati mencari harga yang tepat ketika berbelanja.
1m. Saya pergi berbelanja dengan teman dan keluarga untuk bersosialisasi.
1n. Saya menikmati bersosialisasi dengan orang-orang ketika berbelanja.
1o. Berbelanja dengan orang-orang di sekeliling adalah pengalaman yang mengesankan.
1p. Saya pergi berbelanja untuk mengikuti trend terbaru.
1q. Saya pergi berbelanja untuk mengikuti model terbaru.
1r. Saya pergi berbelanja untuk melihat produk baru yang tersedia.
1s. Menemukan barang yang saya cari dalam waktu yang sesingkat-singkatnya
1t. Berbelanja untuk mengganti produk lama dengan produk baru

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>PERNYATAAN</th>
<th>SKALA TANGGAPAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a.</td>
<td>Menyegarkan</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b.</td>
<td>Menggembirakan</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c.</td>
<td>Membosankan</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d.</td>
<td>Karyawan toko yang sopan</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e.</td>
<td>Ventilasi udara yang kacau</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f.</td>
<td>Luas</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g.</td>
<td>Menyesakkan</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h.</td>
<td>Tidak menarik</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2i.</td>
<td>Kotor</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2j.</td>
<td>Membetahkan</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2k.</td>
<td>Barang-barang terlihat berjejal</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2l.</td>
<td>Interior yang menarik</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m.</td>
<td>Barang-barang tersusun rapi</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2n.</td>
<td>Menyenangkan</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2o.</td>
<td>Santai</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Lihat pernyataan-pernyataan dibawah ini dan nyatakan persetujuan anda terhadap persepsi lingkungan atau situasi toko yang baru anda kunjungi dengan melingkari nomor dengan skala dari 7 (sangat setuju) sampai 1 (sangat tidak setuju).
C. Lihat pernyataan-pernyataan dibawah ini dan nyatakan persetujuan anda terhadap **tingkat rangsangan optimal anda** dengan melingkari nomor dengan skala dari 7 (sangat setuju) sampai 1 (sangat tidak setuju).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>PERNYATAAN</th>
<th>SKALA TANGGAPAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sangat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a.</td>
<td>Saya menyukai melakukan hal yang sama daripada mencoba sesuatu yang baru dan berbeda.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b.</td>
<td>Saya senang mengalami perubahan dalam kehidupan rutin.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c.</td>
<td>Saya menyukai pekerjaan yang menawarkan perubahan, variasi, meskipun mempunyai resiko yang tinggi.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d.</td>
<td>Saya seringkali mencari ide dan pengalaman baru.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e.</td>
<td>Saya seringkali merubah kegiatan.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f.</td>
<td>Ketika merasa bosan, saya senang mencari sesuatu yang baru.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3g.</td>
<td>Saya lebih memilih jalan hidup yang tidak monoton dan banyak perubahan.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Lihat pernyataan-pernyataan dibawah ini dan nyatakan persetujuan anda terhadap produk dan kualitas pelayanan di toko yang baru anda kunjungi dengan melingkari nomor dengan skala dari 7 (sangat setuju) sampai 1 (sangat tidak setuju).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>PERNYATAAN</th>
<th>SKALA TANGGAPAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sangat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a.</td>
<td>Barang yang dibeli di toko ini mempunyai kualitas yang tinggi.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b.</td>
<td>Barang yang dibeli di toko ini diproduksi dengan baik.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c.</td>
<td>Karyawan di toko ini mampu menolong pembeli</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d.</td>
<td>Toko ini menawarkan pelayanan yang baik terhadap pembeli</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e.</td>
<td>Karyawan di toko ini terlalu sibuk untuk melayani permintaan pembeli</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f.</td>
<td>Karyawan di toko ini dapat diharapkan untuk memberikan perhatian yang lebih terhadap pembeli</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Lihat pernyataan-pernyataan dibawah ini dan nyatakan persetujuan anda terhadap kepuasan berbelanja setelah mengunjungi toko yang baru anda kunjungi dengan melingkari nomor dengan skala dari 7 (sangat setuju) sampai 1 (sangat tidak setuju).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>PERNYATAAN</th>
<th>SKALA TANGGAPAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sangat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.</td>
<td>Saya merasa puas dengan hasil kunjungan berbelanja saya.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b.</td>
<td>Saya merasa puas pada cara staff toko menangani pembelian produk saya.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c.</td>
<td>Saya lebih memilih hasil berbelanja yang lain daripada yang saya peroleh sekarang.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d.</td>
<td>Secara keseluruhan, saya merasa puas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
karena memperoleh apa yang saya inginkan.

5e. Saya merasa puas atas pelayanan yang diberikan toko.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>PERNYATAAN</th>
<th>SKALA TANGGAPAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sangat Tidak Setuju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a.</td>
<td>Jika saya bisa memilih, saya akan mempertimbangkan membeli kembali di toko ini.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b.</td>
<td>Jika dibutuhkan, saya akan memilih kembali toko ini.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c.</td>
<td>Saya bersedia untuk melakukan transaksi dengan toko ini di masa yang akan datang.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Lihat pernyataan-pernyataan dibawah ini dan nyatakan persetujuan anda terhadap keinginan untuk mengunjungi kembali toko yang baru anda kunjungi dengan melingkari nomor dengan skala dari 7 (sangat setuju) sampai 1 (sangat tidak setuju).

G. Anda dapat menyatakan persetujuan anda terhadap pertanyaan-pernyataan dibawah ini dengan menyilang (X) pilihan yang anda rasakan mewakili latar belakang anda. Jika anda merasa ada pertanyaan yang kurang berkenan, silahkan anda melewati pertanyaan tersebut.

7. Apakah anda?

☐ Pria ☐ Perempuan
8. Berapakah usia anda?

☐ Kurang dari 18 tahun
☐ 18 – 24 tahun
☐ 25 – 30 tahun
☐ 30 – 35 tahun
☐ 35 – 40 tahun
☐ Lebih dari 40 tahun

9. Jumlah orang yang menemani berbelanja (termasuk anak-anak kalau ada)

☐ Tidak ada
☐ 1-3 orang
☐ 4-6 orang
☐ Lebih dari 6 orang

10. Berapa kali anda telah mengunjungi toko ini?

☐ Belum pernah
☐ 1-3 kali
☐ 4-6 kali
☐ Lebih dari 6 kali

----------------Terima Kasih------------------