A STUDY ON "CATALOG BUYING BEHAVIOR"

by Sua TUMTURK

B.A., in Business Administration, Boğaziçi University, 1986

Submitted to the Institute for Graduate Studies in

Social Sciences in Partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Business Administration

Bogaziçi University

1990

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I gratefully wis to acknowledge the persons who have contributed to this study.

I specially wish to thank to Prof. Dr. Muzaffer BODUR for her must valuable advice and careful guidance throughout this study.

Special thanks to Doç. Dr. Deniz ERDER and Doç. Dr. Hayat KABASAKA for their careful review and constructive evaluations.

I would also like to present my heartfelt thanks to Bengü BALKIR for her cooperation and support in the completion of this thesis.

And I am greatly indebted to the individuals who have participated in the study and cooperated enthusiastically.

ABSTRACT

In this thesis, the market for catalog buying type of retailing was investigated. The basic purpose of the study is to find out whether such a market exists for mail-order catalogs, and to define this market segment.

The study included the literature review and interpretation of the computer analyzed data obtained from the survey conducted in Istanbul, Turkey during November 1989 and January 1990.

In the analysis 158 people constituted the sample Data used for the study were collected by a structured, undisguised, and self-administered questionnaire.

The intentions of the respondents toward catalog purchases were investigated in order to determine the size of this market. Moreov the attitudinal, demographic, and socioeconomic factors were analy to consturct a relationship between those variables and buying motivations of the respondents.

The findings of the analysis revealed that intention of catalog buying is not widespread throughout the sample.

According to the results, shopper convenience orientation, self confidence , liking for trying new product, parking problems difficulty in shopping, trust in well known firms' catalogs,willin to take risk in catalog purchases, impulse buying, frequency of shopping distance to a shopping center, transportation mean used i shopping and foreign language known were found as significantly related to willingness of buying goods from mail-order catalogs.

However, it should be noted that the insufficient sample size brings up a major limitation on generalizing the results.

ÖZET

Bu tezde , son yıllarda önemli bir pazarlama aracı olarak karşımıza çıkan postayla katalogdan alışveriş tekniği için Türkiye'de potansiyel bir pazarın varlığı araştırılmakta, ve bu pazarın kimlere ne şekilde hitap ettiği ortaya konulmak istenmektedir.

Araştırma, bu konuda daha önce yapılmış incelemeleri ve Ekim 1989-Ocak 1990 tarihleri arasında Istanbul'da gerçekleştirilen saha çalış masının sonuçlarını kapsamaktadır.

Analizde, Istanbul'dan 158 örnek kişinin katalogla alışveriş eğilimleri incelenmiş ve postayla alışveriş isteminin örnek grup arasında yaygın bir şekilde yer almadığı gözlenmiştir.

Çeşitli faktörlerin katalogla satın alma davranışı üzerindeki etkileri incelenmiş ve bulgular kişilerin davranış özellikleri, demogfik ve sosyoekonomik özellikleri ile katalogdan alışveriş eğilimler arasında önemli bağlantılar ortaya koymuştur.

Bu Çalışma bulgu ve analizlerin yorumları ile sonuçların katkıların ayrıca sunmaktadır.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF SYMBOLS

cc	:	Contingency Coefficsent
df	:	Degrees of Freedom
n	:	Sample size
p	:	Significance level
r	:	Correlation coefficient
$\bar{X}$	:	Mean
S	:	Standard deviation

INTRODUCTION

The growth of non-store (or"direct") marketing in the past decade has been phenomenal. While the United States Census of Retail Trade has provided some evidence of the growth in non-store retail sales, Davidson and Rodgers (1979) maintain that "non-store retailing must be growing at several times the rate of growth for total retail sales" (p.23).

Non-store marketing includes techniques for marketing products directly to the home via mail, telephone, door-to-door sales, as well as marketing products from locations separate from the retail outlet (such as catalog divisions and vending machines).

Stanford Research Institute, based on a research done in California (1964), estimated that in-home sales currently account for 9% of total general merchandise sales and will capture 10% to 11% of the national market by 1975. Catalog sales have increased about 6% annually in recent years, an impressive rate of growth when compared against a 3.5% annual gain in general merchandise sales during the same period. More recently, an article in Forbes announces that catalog sales in 1971 exceeded ten billion dollars and continued to grow at a faster rate than total retail sales.

There is, indeed, very limited experience about catalog buying type of retailing in Turkey. Beymen a well known national firm in Turkey, has introduced a mail order catalogue, in 1989 named as MOC; a very small one in scope that is, it consists from ready wear textile product broadly and from some gift items to a lesser extent. More recently MILPA introduced a mail order catalog including household goods and electrical home appliances as well as the textile items. In addition to these, a newly established catalog retailer firm named EVPA is in an attempt to measure the consumers tendencies with a test catalog that distribute last month. We were informed that the main catalog to be introduced in the preceeding months will be a very broad are in scope.

It is very early to talk about the success of these firm's attempts, nor the fall, but the ability of a firm to succeed and to capture a larger share of this market will depend increasingly on a deeper understanding of the consumers who comprise it.

This particular thesis was prepared in an attempt to give insight to these marketers by trying to define the existing potential catalog buyer market.

The organization of the chapters is as follows. Chapter 1 describes in detail the studies that this thesis was based on,Studies that examined the motivations and characteristics of in-home shoppers are rewieved in depth.

In chapter 2, the details of an empirical study conducted in Istanbu is discussed. The main purpose of the study was to measure the intentions of the respondents towards buying the goods from mail-order catalogs in order to find out whether there exist such a market and to determine the size of that market also, Next, several of the attitudinal factors and demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents were investigated in order to profile a "catalog buyer segment" that is different from non catalog buyers.

Moreover, shopping patterns of the respondents and presence of any locked-in conditions were searched if there is any correlation between those variables and catalog buying behavior. The research design, the methodology applied, and the finding of the study is broadly discussed in that chapter.

Finally, interpretations of the findings, conclusions and the implications of the study is discussed in the last chapter.

CHAPTER 1

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND & REVIEW OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH

1.1. IN-HOME SHOPPING versus STORE SHOPPING

Shopping activity entails a cost of time, physical and mental energy, and possibly aggravation. However, shopping may also be a pleasurable experience, providing stimulation and social contacts (Darian, 1987).

Shopping involves expenditures of time, energy, and money. First, it usually takes a certain amount of planning. For both store and non-store shopping this may involve obtaining information on available products and prices, and preparing a shopping list. However, store shopping requires additional planning: deciding when and where to go, how often to go, which route to take, and whether to combine a shopping trip with other activities. Second, in the case of store shopping, time and often money are involved in travelling to and from the store. Finally, once in the store, the consumer must find the goods needed, wait to be served, and carry the goods out of the store.

The costs of a particular shopping trip to a customer will depend partly on objective factors such as the distance to the store, the method of transportation, the quality of roads, traffic conditions, and the time spent in the store searching for goods and waiting in the line. But subjective factors also come into play, such as whether or not the consumer enjoys driving and spending time in the store. We should note that the perceived cost of store shopping will also go up when viable alternatives go up.

Studies indicate that the perceived benefits of store shopping include diversion from routines of everyday life, sensory stimulation, social experiences outside the home (Tauber, 1972), and comparing prices and quality of goods (Stone, 1954). These benefits are presumab greatest for goods where texture, color and style are important and price is variable; and least for standardized, pre-packaged goods. There are also variations among consumers. Bellenger and Korgaonkar (1980), divided women surveyed into two groups: recreational shoppers, who either enjoy shopping or enjoy it very much, and economic shoppers, who are either neutral towards shopping, dislike it, or dislike it strongly.

The most obvious advantage of in-home shopping is its convenience The telephone shopper does not have to go through the work of dressing, travelling, walking, waiting, and carrying.
Darian(1987), postulated that there were several different types of convenience that in-home shopping potentially offers:

* In-home shopping could reduce the total amount of time spent on shopping, thus providing more time for other activities. This type of benefit would be most valuable for those who are short of discretionar time.

* In-home shopping could provide more flexibility in the time of shopping. In-home purchases can be made at times of the day, week or year when it is convenient to visit a store.

* In-home shopping can save the physical effort of visiting a store. This benefit should be most valuable for elderly and infirm, those consumers Gillett(1976) referred to as "locked in".

* In-home shopping can save aggravation. This benefit is likely to be particularly appreciated by mothers of preschool children.

* Finally, in-home shopping offers the opportunity to buy on impul in response to an advertisement received at home.

Darian pointed out that when respondents say they value the convenie of in-home shopping, they may be referring to any one, or a combinati of these five types of convenience.

Gillett(1970) examined the relationship between in-home shopping and shopper convenience orientation. He found all the factors regarded as measures of convenience orientation, positively correlated with the level of in-home spending, even after taking into account the effect of income.

Other benefits derived from in-home shopping that has been suggested in the literature were greater product assortment, product uniqueness and lower prices (Rosenberg and Hirschman 1980). However, none of the respondents in Gillett's sample gave merchandise availability, assortment, or quality as a reason for their last telephone order.

Studies of attituades towards telephone and mail shopping reveal tha consumers perceive only one disadvantage to inhome shopping, greater risk.

Bauer (1960) postulated that purchasing a product or service involve risk because the item produces social and economic consequences that the consumer can not anticipate with certainity. Hence, purchase decisions involve different types (social and economic) and levels (high versus low) of risk associated with making an incorrect choice. There has been limited research on the influence of the level of perceived risk on patronage behavior (Hisrich, Dornoff, and Kernan 1972; Cox and Rich 1964; Spece, Engel, and Blackwell 1970; Cox 1967; Dash, Schiffman, and Berenson 1976; Gillett 1976; Prasad 1975).

In a survey of attitudes towards telephone shopping, Cox and Rich (1964) found that consumers' main complaint was that they had no chance personally to inspect merchandise and compare product characteristics, prices, colors and styles. The perceived risk varied considerably with the type of merchandise. Cox and Rich (1964) found that an item high in perceived risk would have medium or low frequency of telephone purchase

Consumers do not mention lack of other benefits of in-store shopping: diversion, sensory stimnulation, and social experiences. This may be because consumers see in-home shopping as a supplement to rather than a substitude for store shopping. Alternatively, consumers may feel it easy to replace these social benefits.

1.2. SELECTED REVIEW of PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Over the years, a number of researchers have examined the in-home shopper. All existing studies of in-home shoppers have found that people who make purchase decisions and order merchandise from their homes are likely to have different demographic characteristics, personalities, and/or attitudes than people who travel to one or more stores andphysically inspect the alternatives before making a purchase. Unfortunately, though, these studies provide different and sometimes conflicting profiles of in-home shoppers.

1.2.1.A Study on Urban In-home Shoppers

Gillett (1970), conducted a research to explain in-home shopping motivations among urban shoppers. The problem areas in his research were as follows:

* What are demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of in-home shoppers?

* Are locked-in shoppers especially likely to order by mail or telephone?

* How and to what extent are shopper's attitudes toward the shopping process related to their in-home buying behavior? Are in-home shoppers particularly convenience-minded?

The reserach data were generated from personal interviews with female shoppers in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

The sample was stratified on two independent variables considered important on the research-family income level and racial composition and households were interwieved on a sequential sampling basis.

Shoppers estimates of their catalog, direct mail, and telephone spending showed that in-home shopping was rather widespread throughout the sample. But while the majority of the sample had shopped at home, results indicated that in-home purchases constituted only a small fraction of total family expenditures for general merchandise.

The study tested the hypothesis that woman locked-in away from store shopping were more likely to order by mail or phone than other women.

Driving time to stores, avaliability of transportation for shopping, shopper employment status, and shopper age and presence of preschool children at home were selected as proxy meansures of locked-in shopping conditions and compared againgst in-home buying totals. Respondent's evaluations of the shopping difficulty were also obtained and compared agains in-home spending totals.

None of the above mentioned demographic measures of potential locked-in shopping conditions was significantly related to in-home spending. Similarly, in-home spending did not vary with subjective ratings of shopping difficulty.

In-home shoppers, particularly those spending above the mean, ranked significantly above other shoppers on family income level, shopper education level, and occupation of household head.

Result indicated that the more affluent, highly educated shopper is likely to seek the shopping flexibility and convenience that mail and telephone buying can provide. But, in-home buying intensity was not significantly related to either shopper age, family size, or stage in family life cycle.

he study also investigated the relationship between in-home spending nd shopper convenience orientation as measured by household ossesion of such items as telephone, credit cards, newspapers,and iagazines.

ıll the factors were positively related to the level of in-home spending. The findings suggested that in-home shoppers greater propensity to own such items might reflect greater demand for convenience in many aspects of daily life.

In terms of racial differences no significant differences in spending at home were found when income differences controlled

It was hypothesized that in-home shoppers, being especially convenience minded, would be less tolerant of shopping inconvenience than other women. Result showed that shoppers attitudes were not related to their in-home spending. In-home shoppers generally enjoy shopping in stores and infact shop in them more frequently than the sample average.

Women also compared in-home shopping sources against retail sources on a number of product, price annd convenience advantages. While retail stores were generally favored by wide margins, in-home shoppers were significantly more likely to rate in-home sources on a par with or superior to stores in providing these advantages than other women.

Result showed that, convenience and impulse factors dominated telephone shopping decisions, while catalog shoppers gave importance on lower prices.None of the catalog shoppers, claimed previous experience with the merchandise as primary reason for their last order.

It was concluded that, in-home shoppers were not a captive market; they perceive less than average risk in buying by mail or phone; convenience oriented; more affluent and better educated, but differ little on other demographic characteristics.

1.2.2. A Conflicting Study to Gillett's Findings

In the study of Peters and Ford (1972) characteristics of women who buy their cosmetics under two buying conditions was surveyed. These were heaay in-home cosmetic customers and heavy in-store cosmetic shoppers.

A judgement sample from Madison, Wisconsin was employed from the lists of door-to-door cosmetic firm and a local store.

After questionnaires filled out, woman were classified as either "heavy in-home buyers" or "heavy in-store buyers" if they indicated buying over half of their cosmetics from either source.

To measure the personality factor, the personal adjustment scale of the California Test of Personality (CTP) including following component self reliance, sense of personal worth, sense of personal freedom, feeling of belonging, and the like was employed.

An additional questionnaire was administered with the CTP in order to measure the socioeconomic attributes.

It had been hypothesized that the heavy in-home customer would score lower in personal adjustment than the heavy in-store buyer. The hypothesis tested was that women who buy majority of their cosmetics in the home would tend to be more shy and unsure of themselves and would have less self-reliance. It was believed that such women would choose to buy their cosmetics in her home.

However, the evidence did not support this hypothesis. No significant difference was found between the two types of shoppers on this personality measure. The two types of buyers were also very similar in the amount of money they spent on cosmetics in the month preceeding the survey.

The Peters and Ford study revealed that the profile of the in-home buyer of cosmetics who purchases from a door-to-door sales women to be almost the opposite of the telephone and mail order in-home buyer reported by Gillett (1970). Significant differences discussed below between the heavy in-home and heavy in-store buyers of cosmetics were found using a test for differences between proportions.

The first point where this study seemed to diverge from Gillett's deals with the questions: Does the in-home customer buy there because she is locked-in at home? The results support the idea that the heavy in-home cosmetic buyer is locked-in at home because she has more small children than the in-store buyer. Gillett, however, found no significant difference in family size. Results also revealed that the heavy in-home buyer has considerably less access to a car for day time shopping. Gillett did not find any significant difference between the in-home and other shoppers in regard to the availability of priva transportation for shopping.

Gillett also found that in-home shoppers, particularly those spending above the mean, ranked significantly above other shoppers on family income level, shopper education level, and occupation of household head. Again the Peters and Ford study showed the opposite to be true for women who buy most of their cosmetic needs from door-to-door saleswomen.

The findings concerning occupation of the household head and family income range were not significant at the .05 or .10 levels. But the in-home customer was found to be more likely to be married to a blue collar/clerical worker and have than $15000 income annually.

Respondents were also asked to identify the most important reason for buying cosmetics from their major source of supply. Over half of the drugstore and in-home consumers ranked "more convenient" as their first choice; "better selection" was mentioned by over two fifths of the department store customers. Discount store customers overwhelmingly ranked "less expensive" as their number one reason. Finally, "better quality" was more important to 47% of the specialty shop customers.

1.2.3. A More Decent Study on In-home Buyers

The study conducted by Darian (1987) examined the relationship between demographic characteristics and in-home shopping at the bivariate level, using the chi-squared test of significance, and the multivariate level, using a logit model.

The author claims that, one could expect consumers to be more prone to in-home shopping for one or more the following reasons:

(1) Motivators: they are more strongly motivated to shop at home than others because of a greater desire for convenience or product assortmen

2) Facilitators: a) they either perceive less risk to in-home hopping than others, or are more willing to take risks.

b) they have more negative attitudes toward store hopping

pecific hypothesis tested and their rationale are listed below:

H_1: Compared with other women, a) employed women and b) women with 'oung children are more likely to purchase by mail or phone, since :hese two groups are generally more pressed for time than others.

H_2: Those living in rural areas and small towns are more likely to be in-home shoppers than others,since they generally have access to more limited local retail facilities than others.

H_3: Elderly shoppers are more likely to be in-home shoppers than others, because of a greater need to save energy.

H_4: Shoppers from households above average in income and education and/or younger will be more likely than others to make purchases at home, because these shoppers have greater willingness to take risks.

H_5: Finally, male shoppers are more likely than females to purchase at home, because they are less likely to enjoy shopping than women (Bellenger and Korgaonkar, 1980).

Another factor included in the analysis was the type of merchandise purchased since certain items much more likely to be purchased at home than others.

The sample selected randomly from the National Family Opinion household sample. A questionnaire survey was mailed to 1001 households.

Bivariate analysis results showed that households with employed women were no more likely than others to have made an in-home purchase during the previous month.In addition, those with full time working wives were no more likely than those with part time working wives. Thus, the results for female employment status did not confirm the hypothesis.

The number of children under six years old in the household was significantly related to in-home buying. However, the same was not true for number of children under 18 years old.

The findings related with the relationship between population density and in-home shopping confirmed the hypothesis that those living in nonmetropolitan areas are more likely to purchase at home than others, although differences were not large.

The findings for age did not confirm the hypothesis than those over 65 years were less likely to shop at home than those under 50 years.

Finally, shoppers from households which were in the highest income group and above average in education were no more likely than others to shop at home. Younger shoppers were somewhat more likely than most other age groups to shop at home, but this could be due to a higher presence of preschool children.

Multivariate analysis results showed that, presence of preschool children had no effect on in-home shopping for those employed full time, and the greatest impact for those not employed outside the home.

When looked at patterns by age for women with no preschool children, the percent of young women shopping at home was not higher than other age groups. In fact, the pattern of in-home shopping rates by age was the opposite to that hypothesized. Results showed that the percent shopping at home was the highest for the 40-49 age group and lower for the younger and older women.

Results also showed that, as in the bivariate analysis, education of wife was not significantly related to in-home shopping. After taking into account the effect of merhandise mix purchased, population density was not significant at the .05 level.

After taking into account the effect of life cycle stage and type of merchandise bought, households with incomes in the 15000-29999 range were significantly more likely to shop at home other households.

For life cycle stage, after taking into account income and type of merchandise, two groups were significantly more likely to shop at home than others: households with preschool children where the female head was employed part time or not employed and household where female head was 40-49 years old. Only one groups was significantly less likely than others to shop at home: households with a family head in the 30-39 age bracket and no preschoold children.

It was hypothesized that males were more likely than females to shop at home because males less likely to injoy shopping. The findings indicated that for those under 40 years, males were much more likely to be in-home shoppers than females. For the older group, however, there was no significant difference by sex of householder. When we taken into account the effect of the type of merchandise purchased, the figures remained virtually unchanged.

The present findings that housewives and part time workers with preschool children were most likely to be in-home shoppers suggested that convenience factor of flexibility in the time of shopping might be more important than the opportunity of impulse buying or saving of effort.

Innovators tend to be younger than others and above average in income and education. The results of this study indicated that households with these characteristics did not have above average in-home shopping rates.

Higher income households are more likely than others to purchase greater variety of products. The findings of this study indicated that higher income households were not more likely than others to be in-home shoppers. This suggested that a greater variety of products desired is not an important motivator to shop at home. In addition, those living in rural aras were not significantly more likely to purchase at home when other variables were taken into account.

In the present study males, found were less likely than females to enjoy shopping, were more likely than females to shop at home only if they were under 40 years old. The reasoning by the author for this finding was that; possibly younger males were more flexible and innovative than younger females. On the other hand, the low rates for single females may be due to this group enjoying shopping, particularly for clothes.

1.2.4. A Study on Perceived Risk Differences

The amount of perceived risk was discovered to be the most powerful factor differentiating between those women who shop by telephone and those who do not (Cox and Rich, 1964). This hypothesis was investigated for direct mail versus store/salesman purchase of hospitalization insurance and certain other products by Spence, Engel and Blackwell(1970).

The main purpose of the study reported here was to determine whether or not the consumers perceive greater risk in the act of buying by mail than in buying from a store or a salesman. If, as Cox and Rich found, risk perception differentiates between telephone and store buying, it should logically differentiates between mail order and store/salesman buying.

Three main hypotheses were investigated:

H_1: There is significantly greater perceived risk in buying products by mail than in buying the same products from a salesman or in a retail store.

H_2: The difference in risk in buying by mail versus buying from a salesman or a retail store will be perceived to be significantly less by mail order hospitalization insurance buyers than by equivalen groups of nonbuyers.

H_3: The difference in risk in buying hospitalization insurance by mail versus buying from a salesman will be significantly less among persons who bought hospitalization insurance by mail than by equivalent groups of nonbuyers.

Demographic data were collected and utilized in cross classifying various patterns of response.

A quasi-experimental field study was conducted to test the main hypotheses. Sample was selected randomly; and inhome interwievs were conducted by a professional market research firm.

The Spence, Engel, and Blackwell study differs from the Cox and Rich study and others in that perceived risk was defind as the amount of risk that a respondent says he sees in the purchase of a product in a spencific buying situation. This study attempted to compare the level of perceived risk in two different buying situation. Primary emphasis was placed on comparison of perceived risk levels in different buying situation rather than among different products.

To test the differences between perceived risk in the two buying situations (in a store a salesman, or by mail order) difference scores for several products were computed.

The hypothesis that people perceive more risk in the act of buying by mail than in buying from a store/salesman was confirmed by the data.

The hypothesis that mail order buyers of hospitalization insurance would perceive significantly less risk in mail order buying of other products could not be accepted.

The third hypothesis stated that mail order buyers of the insurance would perceive significanly less risk in the mail order purchase of such insurance than nonbuyers was also found as insignificant.

Further analysis was undertaken to ascertain whether or not there are differences in risk perception among members of the various socioeconomic groupings. Among these, family income produced significant differences. The data revealed a slightly inverse relationship between the level of perceived risk and level of income. Another result was that the risk perveived in buying the products in a store or through a salesman increases as the years of education increases but there was little or no such pattern in purchase by mail.

Respondents were also asked whether or not they had made a purchase within the past year from a catalog. The average perceived risk rating score in the store/salesman situation was significantly higher for persons who had not purchased from catalogs. Somewhat surprisingly, there were no significant differences in perceived risk when purchasing by mail, as might be anticipated. It was expected that those who had previously purchased by mail would show such tendency. Instead, less risk was expressed when buying from a store or a salesman.

In this study for 20 products studied, consumers perceived more risk in the mail order situation than in the store/salesman situation. However, the question of whether perceived risk may present a significant barrier to growth of mail order selling was not really answered by the study.

1.2.5. A Comparative Study on Food Shoppers

The study conducted by Berkowitz, Walton and Walker(1979) examined the characteristics of in-home purchasers of food.

Self administered questionnaires and return envelopes were inserted into 1500 randomly selected orders delivered to customers of the in-home food retailer.

'he sample of nonusers were obtained randomly from telephone :xchanges in the suburban communities where the service was in ›peration.

Multiple choice questions were used to measure standard demographic ınd socioeconomic variables, such as age, family income, and the respondent's education level and occupation. Additional multiple choice questions measured several variables relevant to the question of whether in-home shoppers are captive or locked-in market segment, such as automobile ownership, number of preschool children, and travel time to the nearest store.

Multiple choice questions were also used to obtain information about the respondent's shopping behavior. These questions examined such things as the frequency of food shopping, average weekly expenditures on food, the frequency of other kinds of in-home shopping and the use charge accounts.

The questionnarie also included a series of attitude statements concerning such things as the desire for convenience, pleasure derived from shopping, price consciousness, and the like. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement

Finally, each respondent was presented with a set of attributes relevant to retail food outlets such as the brands available, prices shopping convenience, etc. Respondents were asked to indicate the importance of each attribute to them in deciding where to buy their food.

The statistical significance of differences between in-home and store shoppers on the multichotomus demographic and behavioral variables was tested with chi-square analysis. For the attitudinal variables pooled t-tests were used.

A comparison of the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of in-home and store food shoppers showed than in-home food shoppers tend to have higher levels of education and that they were more likely to work outside the home and to have higher status occupatio than store shoppers. In-home food shopper was younger than the store shopper and there was no significant difference in the family incomes of the two groups.

Result indicated that in-home food shoppers were not a captive market They were no different in terms of the number of preschool children they have at home, car ownership, or access to public transportation.

Result also showed that the in-home food shoppers attached greater inportance to convenience and to reducing the amount of time spent in shopping. This was most directly evident in their positive attitudes toward convenience and negative attitudes toward shopping activities. This was also apparetnt in other aspects of their shopping behavior, such as the facts they purchase food less frequently and that they make purchases from other kinds of in-home retailers more frequently than store shoppers. Also, the importance they attach to retail attributes showed that the in-home food shoppers were more concerned with convenience and less concerned with food costs when deciding where to shop. On the other hand, in-home purchasers seem unwilling to sacrifice variety of assortment or the quality of the food they buy to obtain greater shopping convenience.

Finally, in-home food shoppers were more flexible and venturesome than the more traditional store shoppers. They were more willing to take risks and less concerned about the social approval of their friends or neighbours. They also possess more national credit cards than store shoppers.

1.2.6. A Study About Catalog Buying Behavior

In his study Reynolds (1974), explored three factors that affect catalog buying behavior: Convenience, offering, degree of risk.

Related hypotheses were as listed below:

<u>Convenience related hypotheses</u>:

- H1: Catalog buying positively related to income
- H2: Catalog buying positively related to presence of younger children at home
- H3: Catalog buying positively related to time consciousness
- H4: Catalog buying positively related to community involvement

<u>Offering related hypotheses</u>:

- H5: Catalog buying inversely related to attitudes towards local shopping conditions
- H6: Catalog buying positively related to attitudes towards large city shopping conditions
- H7: Catalog buying positively related to price consciousness

<u>Degree of risk related hypotheses</u>:

- H8: Catalog buying positively related to venturesomeness
- H9: Catalog buying inversely related to age
- H10:Catalog buying positively related to self-confidence

Data to examine these hypotheses were derived from a survey of female homemakers in a Georgia community of 18000 persons. 1099 self administered questionnaires were mailed to the "Mrs" at each address.

The respondents were classified according to the frequency of their catalog purchases over a year period as; frequent, infrequent, and non buyers.

The independent variables consisting of 85 general life style and 22 specific trade area statements were subjected to factor analysis and 19 factors extracted.

F-test was applied on the groups for the factor variables as well as for the responses given to the demographic and socioeconomic questions

The idea that the benefit of convenient shopping appeals to those who can afford it and need it was only partly supported by the data. Catalog buyers did report a higher family income(H1), and the "need" for convenience was suggested in the findings that catalog buying was more pronounced in families with children under twelve years of age(H2).

Two of the need for convenience hypothese were not supported by the data. Neither time consciousness(H3) nor community involvement (H4) were significantly related to the behavior of frequent catalog buyers.

Catalog buyers, when compared to their nonbuyers neighbours, report lower opinions of local shopping conditions(H5). The notion that catalog buyers are biased toward more extensive merchandise assortments was supported by their favorable attitudes toward shopping conditions in large and small cities and by their higher scores on shopping center orientation(H6). While price may be a conparative consideration for specific items, the hypothesis that catalog buyers are more price conscious than nonbuyers(H7) was not supported by the data.

Each of the hypotheses related to risk taking was supported by the data (H8-10). Catalog buyers tend to be younger, more venturesome, and to express greater self confidence.

To summarize, frequent catalog buyers when compared to the other groups seemed to be motivated by a desire for convenient shopping in some situations but not in others. Rather, it appeared that catalog buying was more a result of the strenght of catalog offerings as revealed in the negative attitudes towards local shopping conditions expressed by the young, affluent risk takers who comprised the frequent buying group.

1.3. IN-HOME SHOPPERS AS A MARKET SEGMENT

It is probably not accurate to generalize the findings to a specific groups labeled "in-home shoppers" because the findings have varied between product types and between method of in-home marketing(Korgaonkar 1982;Gillett 1970; Cunningham and Cunningham 1973). It is possible that shoppers using different in-home shopping methods represent different demographic and psychographic subsegments, and it might be dangerous in practice to assume homogeneity across the different in-home shopper groups (Joel E. Urba W.Wayne Talarzyk 1983).

Most of the existing studies compare in-home shoppers with store shoppers on two sets of variables:

(1) demographic characteristics,

(2) attitudes and perceptions about shopping and about alternative sources of merchandise.

1.3.1. Demographic Descriptors

Several studies showed that in-home shoppers have significantly higher family incomes and education levels than other shoppers. Gillett(1970), for example,found that in-home shoppers were more affluent and better educated than other shoppers but they were not different on other major demographic characteristics, such as age and family size.

Similar income and education differences were reported by Cunningham and Cunningham(1973), in their study of persons who made purchases from catalogs, clubs of the month, credit cards, and newspaper and magazine advertisements. Cox and Rich(1964), in their study of nearly 1200 housewives who ordered merchandise by telephone from department stores, found that the volume of in-home purchasing increased with family income and the possesion of a charge account.

However, in their study Riecken and his colleagues (1980) found catalogue shopping not to be related to education, occupation or income but the catalog shoppers tend to be older. In a later study, Riecken an Yavas (1986), found that outshoppers (including catalog shoppers) were heaviest users of credit cards. Only about 23% of local shoppers had local store credit cards, compared to 71% of catalogue shoppers.

In a study of Chicagoans who made purchases by telephone or by mail, Feldman and Star (1968), found that the proportion of Whites who were in-home shoppers (30%) was more than twice that of non whites(13%). However,the proportion of each racial group that shoppered by telephone or by mail increased significantly at higher income levels.

Similarly, Reynolds(1974) found catalog shoppers to be more affluent and younger. This observation was also true in the study of Berkowitz, Walton, and Walker (1979),that consumers using an in-home grocery shopping service tended to be more educated, younger and to be employed in a professional occupation than were non in-home shoppers.

On the other hand, Peters and Ford (1972) presented a conflicting demographic profile. They found that, in-home shoppers tended to be less educated, were more likely to have family incomes below $15000 per year, and were more likely to be the members of families where the household head was a blue collar worker, sales person, or a clerical employee rather than a professional.

Also, the findings of Darian (1987) that shoppers from households which were in the highest income group and were above average in education were no more likely than others to shop at home seemed as being contrary to the findings before.

Are in-home shoppers a "captive" or "locked-in" market? An important question which is closely linked to demographic differences between in-home and store shoppers is whether in-home shoppers repsesent a "captive" market segment. In other words,do in-home shoppers have demographic characteristics which make it difficult for them to leave the house and travel to retail stores to do their shopping? We could expect those who are more pressed for time to have higher rates of in-home shopping.

Peters and Ford (1972) reported some evidence which suggest that in-home cosmetic buyers were more likely to have children living at home and less likely to have access to a car for day time shopping.

Similarly, Cox and Rich (1964) found that in-home shoppers were more likely to have young children and to live in the suburbs where travel time to the nearest store was relatively great.

However, in their study of women who regularly ordered groceries by phone, Berkowitz et al(1979) found no relationship between number of preschool children at home, car ownership, and access to a public transportation with in-home, shopping motivations. He also found that 54% of in-home shoppers were employed outside the home compared to 35% of women who did not use the in-home service.

In the study of Darian (1987) there was found no relationship between female employment status and in-home shopping rates. But the number of children under six years old in the household is significantly related to in-home buying. There is a relationship also between population density and in-home shopping that people living in nonmetropolitan areas were more likely to purchase at home than others.

Gillett (1970) also found no significant relationship between shopper employement status and in-home shopping. He argues that in-home shoppers are not a "captive" market, but rather, that they make purchases at home on a discretionary basis in order to increase shopping convenience or to quickly obtain an adverti sed item. He found that in-home shoppers were not significantly different from shoppers in terms of travel time from retail outlets, access to public or private transportation, or family size.

In addition, Mc Call (1977) found that working women were less likely than those not working to shop by phone using a mail order catalog. These inconsistent findings could be due to either different samples or to the different product purchased.

1.3.2. Personality Descriptors

In-home shoppers have been described using personality characteristics, althought measurement in these studies has been some what inconsistent.

In rewieving the literature regarding in-home shoppers, Gillett (1976) noted the general "scattered" nature of measurement and results of personality factors in studies about this groups, but he went on to conclude that:

> If any generalizations are warrented, they would seem to support the assumptions drawn elsewhere that the average in-home shoppers tends to be more self-assured, venturesome, and cosmopolitan in outlook and in shopping behavior (than the average non in-home shoppers" (p.86).

Gillett stressed, however, the need to attempt to standardize measures and to replicate the work that has already been done.

"Attutide towards perceived risk" has been examined as a descriptor of in-home shoppers. It is commonly lypothesized that in,home shoppers either perceive less risk associated with such purchases or they are more willing to assume such risks than store shoppers.

In his study, Gillett(1970) found that in-home shoppers perceive less than average risk in buying goods by mail or phone.

Cox and Rich(1964), indicated knowing an item high in perceived risk allowed them to predict 90% of the cases that the item would have medium or low frequency of the phone purchase.

Spence, Engel, and Blackwell(1970) found people perceive more risk in the act of buying by mail than in buying from a store/salesman. However, unlike Cox and Rich they did not find a significant relationship between perceived risk and actual purchase behavior suggesting that in-home shoppers were more willing to take risks.

This was supported by Berkowitz et al(1979), who found that in-home grocery shoppers were more willing than others to try new things and take risks.

"Convenience orientation of in-home shoppers" was examined by Gillett(1970) and found that there is positive relationship between in-home shopping and shopper convenience orientation.

The convenience orientation of in-home shoppers was also supported by Cox and Rich(1964), who found that women who place a high value on shopping quickly were almost one and a half times likely to shop by telephone as those who considered quick shopping not important.

More recently, Berkowits at al(1979) found that shoppers using an in-home grocery service placed a higher value on shopping convenience and had more negative attitudes towards shopping activities than supermarket shoppers.

Riecken at al (1980), and Darian (1987) found catalog shoppers to be somewhat motivated by convenience factors, but Reynolds(1974), found mixed results for the convenience motive.

1.3.3. Relationship Between In-home Shopping and "Innovativeness"

The descritption of the general in-home shopper group provided in the literature, utilizes such adjectives as upscale, venturesome, cosmopolitan (Cunningham and Cunningham,1973), convenience oriented, and able to tolerate more risk in purchase decisions than non in-home shoppers. This description is similar to the description of "innovators" in the diffusion of innovations literature, as summarized by Robertson and Kennedy(1968). These authors contended that innovators can be described, among other things, as venturesome, socially mobile, "privileged" (that is, having a higher financial standing), and cosmopolitan,

The implication of this similiarity is that there may be some relationship between "innovativeness" and use of in-home shopping techniques. This was confirmed somewhat by Berkowits at al (1979) in his findings that non in-home grocery shoppers agreed more with statements indicating that they were "followers" when it comes to purchases of products and that in-home shoppers were more likely to want to try "new" ideas.

However, Darian(1987) found that households carrying innovator characteristics did not have above average in-home shopping rates.

"Liking for shopping" is regarded another factor influencing in-home shopping behavior. Bellenger and Korgaonkar(1980) named people enjoyed shopping as recreational shoppers and those not as economic shoppers.

Bellenger et al(1977), Korgaonkar (1981) found that males were less likely than females to enjoy shopping; and were more likely than females to shop at home.

However, Gillett (1970) found that shopper's attitudes were not related to their in-home spending. In-home shoppers generally enjoy shopping in stores, and infact shop in them more frequently than the sample average.

The findings of the previous studies are summerized in Table 1.1. Only the common variables studied by each researcher were taken into consideration. As seen in the summary Table 1.1., the studies conducted by several authors present differing results that sometimes conflicting to a great extent. The inconsistency between measurement terms and samples used in the analysis as well as the different products analyzed may be the reasons beyond these conflicts and prevents us to make any generalizations about the factors determining or describing the in-home buying behavior.

TABLE 1.1

SUMMARY TABLE of lITERATURE (common variables studied)

Variables	1964 Cox&Rich	1970 Gillett	1972 Peters&Ford	1973 Cunn&Cunn	1979 Berkowitz et.al	1986 Riecken et.al	1987 Darian
Income	+	+	-	+	NS	NS	NS
Education		+	-	+	+	NS	NS
Age		NS			-	+	x
Occupation		+	-		+	NS	NS
Locked-in							
-employment		NS			+		NS
-access to car		NS	+		NS		
-presch child	+	NS	+		NS		x
-distance	+	NS					+
-public transp.		NS			NS		
Converience orient.	+	+	+		+	+	+
Risk	-	-			NS		

\+ indicatesa positive relationship

\- indicatesa negative relationship

x indicates mixed results

NS indicates a not significant relationship

CHAPTER 2.

A SURVEY STUDY ON CATALOG BUYING BEHAVIOR

2.1. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the methodology, and findings of an empirical study conducted in Istanbul will be discussed.

2.1.1. Purpose and Nature of the Study

The purpose of the study is:

(1) First, to find out whether there exists a potential market for catalog buying type of retailing in İstanbul,

(2) Second, to draw a clear profile or this market segment-"defining the market".

The study was conducted in the form of descriptive research. The descriptive research is used when the purpose is to describe the characteristics of certain groups or to estimate the proportion of people in a specified population who behave in a certain way and to make predictions (Churchill, 1983, p.65).

The present study attempts to shed light into a rather new concept in the literature of retailing, that is an in-home selling tool of "catalog buying". Other in-home methods like door-to-door, telephon and home-party selling were excluded from the analysis but ordering from newspaper ads was regarded as catalog buying.

The direction of the research can be explained by the following research questions:

* What are the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of catalog buyers?
* What are the attitudinal and behavioral factors that separate potential catalog buyers from those non-potential buyers?
* Are locked-in shoppers especially likely to order from catalogs?

Hence, the present study is descriptive in nature.
The data for this research is gathered just once, therefore the study is a "cross-sectional" one.

2.1.2. Sampling Plan

Nonprobabilistic convenience sampling was used in selecting the sample units. Out of 175 questionnaires distributed, 158 have been returned and used in the analysis. The profile of the sample participated in the study is presented in the table 2.1.

As seen on Table 2.1. the majority of the respondents who answered the questionnaire are married (60.8%) and consisted mostly from females (78.3%).

Moreover, they are mostly in 26-35 age group (29.9%7) or younger (26.6%),and highly educated. 34% of the sample have a high school degree while 43.6% have a university degree and 6.4% have a master or doctora degree.

TABLE 2.1

SAMPLE PROFILE

		Frequency	%
MARITAL STATUS	Single	54	34.2
	Married	96	60.8
	Divorced/Widow	8	51.1
SEX	Female	123	78.3
	Male	34	21.7
AGE	<25	42	26.6
	26-35	63	39.9
	36-45	23	14.6
	46-55	23	14.6
	>55	7	4.4
EDUCATION	Primary school	12	7.7
	Secondary school	13	8.3
	High school	53	34.0
	University	68	43.6
	Graduate	10	6.4
HAVE A CHILD	Yes	82	78.9
	No	22	21.1
Number of child <than 6 yrs old	None	65	66.4
	One	28	28.6
	More	5	5.0

Number of child <than 12 yrs old	None	75	79.8
	One	16	17.0
	More than one	3	3.2
WORKING STATUS	Non-working	45	28.5
	Full-time working	97	61.4
	Part-time	16	10.1
OCCUPATION	Doctor/Pharmacist	6	3.8
	Student(full-time)	10	6.4
	Engineers/Archit	4	2.5
	Lawyer	2	1.3
	Trading	3	5.1
	Officials/	43	27.2
	Econ./Bus Admin	30	19.1
	Housewife	24	15.3
	Missing	31	19.4
FOREIGN LANGUAGE	None	49	31.4
	One	68	43.6
	More than one	39	25.0
INCOME	<500.000TL	36	24.0
	501-1000TL (000)	42	28.0
	1001-2000TL (000)	39	26.0
	2001-4000TL (000)	27	18.0
	>4000,001TL	6	4.0
AUTOMOBILE	None	81	53.3
	One	64	42.1
	Two	6	3.9
	More than two	1	0.7

NUMBER of NEWPAPER and MAGAZINES READ REGULARLY

None	12	7.6
One	30	19.0
Two	28	17.7
Three	40	25.3
Four	26	16.5
Five and more	22	13.9

NEWSPAPER and MAGAZİNES READ

Hurriyet	43	29.5
Milliyet	26	17.8
Cumhuriyet	25	17.1
Nokta	14	9.6
Sabah	10	6.8
Other	40	19.2

OWNERSHIP of HOUSEHOLD GOODS and CREDIT CARDS

	None	One	More than one
Telephone	9.2%	61.8%	28,9%
Credit Cards	53.7%	18.0%	23.3%
Colored TV	7.1%	55.8%	37.2%
Music Set	11.8%	70.6%	17.6%
Washing Mach.	4.5%	80.0%	15.5%
Deep-freeze	51.7%	42.8%	5.5%
Dish-Wash.M.	37.3%	59.3%	3.3%

Moreover, they are mostly in 26-35 age group(39.9%7)or younger (26.6%), and highly educated. 34% of the sample have a high school degree while 43.6% have a univesity degree and 6.4% have a master or doctora degree.

In terms of working status, only 28.5% of the sample are not working while 61.4% are full-time and 10.1% are part-time workers. Among the marrieds, 78.9% have children. 33.6% of the sample responded as to have at least one children that is under 6 years old.

It is observed that 43.4% of the sample group know one foreign language and 25% know more than one foreign language.

From an occupation standpoint, 27.2% of the respondents are officials and employees, 19.1% are economists or business administrators while 15.3% are housewives, and they are mostly in the middle income group.

Nearly half of the sample group have no private cars(53.3%). 42.1% responded as having one car, and only 4.6% have two or more cars.

In terms of newspaper and magazine readership, 19% of the sample read one magazine or newspaper regularly, 17.7% read two and 25.3 read three newspaper or magazines regularly. Among the newspaper read, Hurriyet is preferred mostly (29.5%), then comes Milliyet and Cumhuriyet with 17.8 and 17.1 percents respectively.

Credit card ownership is not widespread throughout the sample. 58.7% stated that they had no cards at all, while telephone, colored TV, music set and washing mashine ownership were mentioned more frequentl

Examining the demographic and socioeconomic composition, it can be said that respondents are highly educated, full-time workers that are in the middle income group. They know at least one foreign language. They are most likely to be mothers and are less than 35 years old.

2.1.3. Data Collection Procedure and the Instrument

Data for this study was collected from primary sources by a structured, undisguised, and self-administered questionnaire (See Appendix I).

This strategy was adopted because previous researchers have indicated that the response rate to personally delivered questionnaires may be higher than the response rate to questionnaires received in the mail (Lovelock et. al., 1976; Stoven and Stone, 1974).

All respondents received a questionnaire which consisted of 85 variables, in a total of 57 questions.

The dependent variable; catalog buying intention of the respondents is measured by the question 42 on a 5 point scale, ranging from very willing (1) to not willing at all (5).

The independent variables studied could be grouped mainly in three sets:

1) The first set of variables are a series of attitude statements concerning such concepts as; the desire for convenience, time and price consciousness, liking for shopping, attitude toward risk, venturesomeness, self confidence, and the like. Moreover, shopping patterns of the respondents and importance of product characteristics are investigated by several research questions in that part also.

The questions 1-31 were derived from the studies of several authors (Gillett, 1976; Berkowits, Walker, and Walton, 1979; Riecken and Yavas, 1986; Reynolds, 1974; Darian, 1987) and respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement oo a 5 point scale ranging from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree(5 A 5 point scale was also used for the questions 33 and 34, ranging from always (1) to never (5).

The importance of product characteristics (low prices, being a wellknown brand, merchandise quality) as well as the importance of quick shopping and in-store help were asked to the respondents in question 32. Respondents indicated the importance of each attribute on again a 5 point scale, ranging from very important(1) to not important at all(5).

Questions 35, 37 and 38 were employed to measure the shopping patterns of respondents as in the Bellenger and Korgaonkar's study (1980). Questions 35 and 37 were conducted in the worm of multiple choice question 38 was an open-ended question asking the respondents to indicate where they shop most of the time. The responses to this question were grouped into 5 categories

They are described as follows:

(1) those whose primary shopping place is "boutiques" are described as those giving importance to brandname and quality;

(2) those whose primary shopping place is "shopping centers and department stores" are described as those liking to shop and giving importance to product assortment;

(3) those whose primary shopping place is "bazaars" are described as those being price conscious;

(4) those whose primary shopping place is "stores around the place of residence" are described as those being time conscious;

(5) those whose primary shopping place is "previously tried and known stores are described as those giving importance to risk reduction.

The previous experience of catalog buying, as a supplemental question to the risk factor, is measured by question 41. One thing needs to be stressed here again that most of the respondents regarded buying through the newspaper ads as catalog purchases. Since these responses are much widespread throughout the sample, and since infact, both types show very similar characteristics, they are not excluded from the sample analyzed.

On the second part of the same question, the kind of the previous catalog purchase, if there is any, was aimed to be known. The responses were classified as:

(1) cloths, (2) electrical home appliances, (3) durable goods+autos

(4) parfumes+cosmetics+records+books+gifts,, (5) furniture

The risk perceptions of the respondents under two buying conditios was measured by the question 43. This question was designed taking the Spence, Engel, and Blackwell's study (1970) as base. Respondents were asked to indicate how confident they feel in buying several products under two different conditions: a) in a store, from a salesman b) from a mail order catalog.

The questions 56 and 57 were also related with the convenience orientation of the consumers as stated by Gillett (1970). Question 56 is an open-ended question asking the respondents to indicate what they read regularly. The number of their indications is also regarded important and taken into the analysis. An assumption made here is that the first mentioned item was the mostly preferred, and so the most exploratory one. Question 57 asked the respondents, to indicate what they have had among several items that are regarded as convenience measures. Among these, credit card usage as a measure for convenience orientation (Riecken and Yavas, 1986) was also included.

2) The second set of variables relevant to the question of whether in-home shoppers are a "captive" or "locked-in" market segment were measured by the multiple questions 36. 39 and 40. Socioeconomic question 55 (automobile ownership), and demographic questions 49 (presence of children under 6 years old) and 50 (Presence of children under 12 years old) were also assumed to be related with the presence of a locked-in condition.

3) The last part of the questionnaire consists of a set of questions which measure the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of the sample group (question 44-47).

2.1.4. Data Analysis Procedure

After all questionnaires were coded, the SPSS-X computer program has been utilized for analyzing the data.

In analyzing the data following statistical analyses were used: Frequency analysis (Subprogram Frequency), contingency tables and related measures of association (Subprogram Crosstabs), bivare Correlation analysis (Subprogram Pearson Correlation), and factor analysis (Subprogram Factor)

2.1.5. Limitations of Study

This study has certain limitations which should be taken into account when analyzing the results.

One important limitation is the sampling procedure, since the sample mostly consisted of people with whom the writer was already familiar with or distributed by snowball sampling procedure, it es not random. Also, the sample size of 158 persons is not sufficient to generalize the results.

Antoher limitation may come from the data collection procedure. Althought the questionnaires were personally delivered, because of lack of time, they were filled by respondents without an interwiever. Though, thiy may be good for removing interwiever bias, but also led to insufficient responses sometimes.

2.2. RESEARCH FINDINGS

2.2.1. Willingness to Buy from a Catalog

The first purpose of this study is to find out whether there exist a potential market for catalog buying type of retailing in Turkey.

In order analyze this, responses given to question 42 were subjected to frequency analysis. As seen in Table 2.2. results show that only 1.9% of respondents say they are "very willing" to buy from catalogs; 23.6% are "somewhat willing". In spite of a 38.2% "indifferent", there are 28.7% saying that they are unwilling" and a 7.6% "not willing at all".

TABLE 2.2.

Frequency Analysis of Respondent's Intention Toward Catalog Buying.

	n	%
"Very Willing"	3	1.9
"Somewhat Willing"	37	23.6
"Indifferent"	60	38.2
"Unwilling"	45	28.7
"Not Willing At All"	12	7.6

It was observed from the results that intention of catalog buying is not widespread throughout the sample. The cumulative percentage of the group that having negative attitudes toward buying goods from a catalog (unwilling and not willing at all groups together) is higher than the group stated positive attitudes(very willing and somewhat willing groups together). However, the possible catalog buyer group, consisting 25.5% of the sample is a clear evidence against any thought that there is a potential market that exists in Istanbul. The main problem here is first, to "define" the catalog buyer group with a deeper understanding of their needs, desires, their motivations, and also characteristics whether socieconomic ones, as well as the demographic. This brings us to the second part of our analysis.

Beyond this, seeing the indifferent group holds the majority with 38% draws our attention to finding the ways of reaching to this group also. Here might suggest that further research is needed to draw the profile of this indecisive respondents.

2.2.2. Attitudes Toward Catalog Buying

Our second objective in the study is to clarify the profile of the catalog buyer group. Several of the attitudinal, demographic and socioeconomic factors are investigated to construct a relationship between them and catalog buying intentions.

In this part, bivariate analysis of Pearson correlation was used for most of the attitudinal variables (question 1-34). The frequency results for those variables are presented in Table 2.3. For the others that are in categorical form, and for the demographic and socieconomic ones Chi-square analysis fas used, and results were discussed broadly in further pages of the study.

TABLE 2.3.

Frequency Analysis Results of Attitudinal Variables (in percentages) (n=158)

Attidunal Variables	SA	A	NN	DA	SDA	X	S
Not secure to buy from catalogs	17.7	27.8	32.3	20.3	1.9	2.61	1.06
Safer to buy a well known firm's	22.2	51.3	16.5	8.9	1.3	2.16	0.91
Problems harder to solve in catalog purchases	22.3	47.8	14.0	14.6	1.3	2.25	1.00
Like to stay at home	7.0	20.4	10.2	36.3	26.1	3.54	1.27
Enjoy shopping	38.2	47.1	7.0	7.0	0.6	1.85	0.88
parking problems are boring	51.9	40.4	7.1	0.6	0.0	1.56	0.65
Check prices in stores	31.6	48.1	9.5	8.9	1.9	2.01	0.97
Prefer high quality regardless price	14.0	36.3	14.0	30.6	5.1	2.76	1.18
Check prices of even small ones	14.7	41.7	11.5	25.0	7.1	2.68	1.20
Spend time on inspecting	9.6	30.6	14.0	36.9	8.9	3.05	1.19
Like to try new thing	5.7	34.2	25.9	27.2	7.0	2.96	1.06
Like to experiment	7.6	39.2	33.5	14.6	14.0	2.70	0.98
Tried and true ways are the best	19.6	41.8	17.7	18.4	2.5	2.42	1.08
Like new ideas in job and life	19.6	57.6	15.8	6.3	0.0	2.09	0.78

	SA (1)	A (2)	NN (3)	DA (4)	SDA (5)	X	S
Like to be considered a leader	19.6	43.0	13.9	20.9	2.5	2.44	1.10
İnfluence the others purchases	13.4	47.1	12.1	24.8	2.5	2.56	1.08
See what others think before buy	7.7	38.5	14.7	29.5	9.6	2.95	1.17
Get bored in shopping	3.2	11.7	7.1	50.6	27.3	3.87	1.05
Get fun in shopping	31.4	47.4	11.5	9.0	0.6	2.00	0.92
Seek the lowest price when buying	15.9	31.2	14.6	32.5	5.7	2.81	1.22
Hidden prices in catalogs	5.1	20.4	36.3	33.8	4.5	3.12	0.96
Harder to negotiate prices in catalogs	29.3	51.0	12.7	6.4	0.6	1.98	0.86
Buy from the most convenient place	19.1	32.5	6.4	37.6	4.5	2.76	1.26
Shop where it saves time	20.3	41.1	12.0	23.4	3.2	2.48	1.15
Buy a new brand just to try	4.4	9.5	15.2	47.5	23.4	3.76	1.06
Feel more independent than others	12.7	54.8	14.0	18.5	0.0	2.38	0.93
Think having lots of ability	17.3	51.9	18.6	12.2	0.0	2.26	0.89
Catalogs Prov time for oth things	7.0	40.8	25.5	22.3	4.5	2.76	1.02
Catalogs provide flexibility	5.7	52.2	21.0	17.8	3.2	2.61	0.95
Catalogs provide energy saving	11.5	57.1	15.4	13.5	2.6	2.39	0.95
Catalogs provide impuse buying	6.3	41.1	24.1	22.8	5.7	2.80	1.04

	VI (1)	I (2)	NN (3)	NI (4)	NIA (5)	X	S
Low price is important	20.8	55.2	13.0	9.1	1.9	2.16	0.93
İn-store help is important	24.7	44.2	16.9	10.4	3.9	2.25	1.06
Quality is important	72.2	26.6	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.29	0.48
Brand-name is important	27.6	38.5	28.2	5.1	0.6	2.13	0.90
Quick shopping is important	36.1	41.3	14.8	6.5	1.3	1.96	0.94

	AL (1)	AA (2)	S (3)	NF (4)	N (5)	X	S
Know what will buy before go shopping	27.2	58.2	12.0	0.6	1.9	1.92	0.77
Continue to shop after a purchase	5.1	26.6	54.4	13.3	0.6	2.78	0.76

SA = Strongly agree
A = Agree
NN = Neither agree nor disagree
DA = Disagree
SDA = Strongly disagree

VI = Very important
I = İmportant
NN = İndecisive
NI = Not important
NIA = Not important at all

AL = Always
AA = Almost always
S = Sometimes
NF = Not frequency
N = Never

As seen in Table 2.3., the majority of the sample agreed in the statement that problems are harder to solve in catalog purchases, and they prefer well known firms' catalogs.

They don't like to stay at home. Almost all of them enjoy from shopping to a great extent, but complaining a lot about parking problems when shopping.

The sample are price conscious and think catalog prices as not negotiable. They also give importance to quality, brandname, in-store help and quick shopping.

They are self confident and like new ideas but they also value on experience. Only 13.9 of the sample group buy a ne brand just totry. The sample group analyzed in the study value catalogs for its flexibility, energy saving, impulse buying attributes and for the attribute that it provides time for other activities. They are time conscious and previous planners.

Before applying the pearson correlation analysis, a factor analysis for the attitudinal statements was applied in order to reduce the number of variables that will take part in further analysis.

Responses to the 38 statements were subjected to principal components analysis and varimax roration was applied. Original communality assignments were unity, and all components with eigen values greater than unity were subjected to rotation. Thirteen factors were extracted Table 2.4, lists the factors related to the study, and the loadings of items on each factor (only loading greater than (.55) were taken).

As seen from the Table 2.4., variables 28,29 and 30 have the highest factor loadings on Factor 1 which measures the "convenience orientation" of the respondents. Factor 2 includes the variables 5, 18, 19, and labeled as "liking for shopping" Factor 3 consists of the variables 7, 9, 10 and is related with the "price consciousness" of the respondents.

The "time consciousness" attribute was reflected with variables 23, 24, 36 and appreared under Factor 4.

Factor 5 measures "self confidence" with variables 15, 26, 27, and Factor 6 "liking for trying new products" with variables 11 and 12. Factor 7 reflects the "worth of experience"with Variable 13, while Factor 8 measures the "concept of catalog prices" with variable 22. "Quality versus price" concept was measured by variable 8 and presented as Factor 9. Factor reflects "liking of home" attribute with variables 4 and 38. Factor 11 was labeled as "Parking problems difficulty in shopping" (variable 6); Factor 12 as "trust in well-known firm's catalogs" (variable 2); and Factor 13 named as "venturesomeness" (variable 14).

These 13 factors, then, were subjected to Pearson correlation analysis to see whether there is a significant relationship between those variables and the intention to catalog buying. To do that, the

TABLE 2.4.

FACTOR ANALYSIS of ATTITUDINAL VARIABLES

Variables	FACTOR1	FACTOR2	FACTOR3	FACTOR4	FACTOR5
Not secure to buy from catalogs					
Safer to buy a wellknown firm's					
Problems harder to solve					
Like to stay at home					
Enjoy shopping		.74817			
Parking problems boring					
Check prices in stores			.64884		
Prefer high quality regardless px					
Check prices of even small ones			.76941		
Spend time on inspecting			.69345		
Like to try new things					
Like to experiment					
Tried and true ways are the best					
Like new ideas in job and life					
Like to be considered a leader					.68389
Influence the other' spurchases					
See what others think before buy					
Get bored in shopping		-.80789			
Get fun in shopping		.88026			
Seek the lowest price when buying					
Hidden prices in catalogs					
Harder to negotiate px in catalogs					
Buy from the most convenient place				.78437	
Shop where it saves time				.82900	
Buy a new brand just to try					
Feel more independent than others					.66199
Think having lots of ability					.69344
Catalogs prov time for oth things	.86269				
Catalogs provide flexibility	.87980				
Catalogs provide energy saving	.79582				
Catalogs provide impulse buying					
Low price is important					
In-store help is important					
Quality is important					
Brandname is important					
Quick shopping is important				.65246	
Know what will buy before go shopping					
Continue to shop after a purchase					
EIGEN VALUES	4.0116	3.5108	2.8916	2.5460	2.1557
PCT of VARIANCE	10.6	9.2	7.6	6.7	5.7
CUMMULATIVE PCT	10.6	19.8	27.4	34.1	39.8

FACTOR6	FACTOR7	FACTOR8	FACTOR9	FACTOR10	FACTOR11	FACTOR12	FACTOR13	COMMUNALITY
								.60576
						.70631		.60057
								.65441
				.70109				.72038
								.65034
					.77198			.68994
								.59170
			.80788					.72278
								.63233
								.62662
.78277								.77968
.86118								.77983
	.69334							.63062
							.79767	.77006
								.67900
								.66249
								.69845
								.73350
								.85111
								.72874
								.67270
		.71851						.66723
								.74522
								.77464
								.69491
								.54549
								.55268
								.76668
								.81808
								.73493
								.56506
								.67930
								.77407
								.53240
								.62838
								.58031
								.60641
				.70476				.64985

1.6515	1.5869	1.4157	1.3755	1.2662	1.2182	1.1351	1.0320
4.3	4.2	3.7	3.6	3.3	3.2	3.0	2.7
44.1	48.3	52.0	55.6	59.0	62.2	65.2	67.9

statement within each factor were combined (recoded if necessary), each constructed a new variable and took the same factor name. Then pearson correlation of each factor by question 42 was applied.

Within the 13 factors extracted, 5 of them were found to be significantly related to catalog buying intention of the respondents (at the significance level p=<.10). These are; convenience orientation (F1), self confidence (F5), liking for experiment (F6) parking problems difficulty in shopping (F11), and trust in well known firm's catalogs (F12). The pearson correlation results are presented in Table 2.5

Convenience Orientation

The results revealed that the convenience orientation attribute were significantly and positively corrolated with the catalog buying intentions. The correlation coefficient is .4252, with a significance level where p=.000.

Self Confidence

The Factor 5 was also found to be significantly related to catalog buying (r=.1456. p=.04). This explains that the self confident people have positive attitudes toward buying from the catalogs.

Liking for Trying New Products

People who likes to try new products were found to be more likely to buy from catalogs. This significant relationship can be seen by the pearson correlation coefficient of r=.1360, with p=.05.

TABLE 2.5.

PEARSON CORRELATİON ANALYSIS RESULTS -FACTOR and CATALOG BUYING INTENTIONS

Correlations	n	r	p
Convenience Orientation (V28+29+30) and intention to buy from a catalog	153	.4252	.000
Self Confidence (V15+26+27) and intention to buy from a catalog	141	.1461	.042
Liking for Experiment (V11+12) and intention to buy from a catalog	153	.1360	.047
Parking problems in shopping (V06) and intention to buy from catalog	155	-.1054	.096
Trust in well known Firm's Catalogs (V02) and itention to buy from a catalog	157	.1925	.008

Parking Problems Difficulty in Shopping

The statement that parking problems is getting boring when shopping was found to be negatively and significantly correlated with catalog buying intentions ($r=^{-}.1054$, $p=.10$). This finding is the opposite of whatwas expected. We expect that those who are the most complaining ones about parking problems when shopping prefer the convenience that the catalog offers. However, the results in Table 2.3, we see that almost all of the respondents in the sample group agree with the statement but this does not prevent them from store shopping. An explanation to this observation may be that probably they do not refard catalog buying as a substitude to store buying and that they are most unlikey willing to sacrifice from the benefits they get from store shopping by using mail-order catalogs. The more they shop, the more they complain about parking problems but the less they buy from catalogs.

Trust in Well Known Firm's Catalogs

Factor 12, consists of the question 2, stating that it is safer to buy from a catalog put out by a large, established company. This statement was found significantly correlated with catalog buying intentions ($r=.1525$, $p=.01$). The positive correlation suggests that people in the sample are very much in doubt about the goodwill of the catalog firms.

The remaining factors were found not to be significantly related to catalog buying intentions of the sample group. Time consciousness, price consciousness, liking for shopping, worth of experience, catalog someness were found as not significant factors affecting the buying intentions of the respondents from mail order catalogs.

The variables that were not significantly loaded to any factor and having a communality of $<.60$ were thought to be unique explorers of the situation and were taken into another analysis. Those variables 1. 31, 34, and 37 were subjected to again a pearson correlation analysis with catalog buying intentions. The significant findings are presented in Table 2.6.

TABLE 2.6.

Relationship between variables Not Loaded to any Factor With Catalog Buying Intentions

Correlations	n	r	p
Relationship between Perceived Risk in Catalog Purchases and Catalog Buying Intentions	157	-.3011	.000
Relationship between Impulse Buying and Catalog Buying Intentions	157	.4112	.000

Risk Inherent in Catalog Buying

Frequency results show that people see catalog buying a high risk activity (45.5%) and this finding were found to be significantly and negatively correlated with their intentions toward catalog purchases ($r=-.3011$, $p=,000$). The more the people perceive risk in catalog purchases, the less their intentions will be toward buying their goods from such catalogs.

Opportunity to Buy at Home on Impulse

Catalogs offer the opportunity to buy on impulse in response to an advertisement received at home. Another significant finding emerging from the study is related with that attribute of catalogs. A positive and significant correlation ($r=.4112$, $p=.000$) suggests that people value catalog purchases because they provide opportunity for an impulse buying.

2.2.3. Shopping Patterns and Catalog Buying

For the questions that are in categorical form, Chi-square analysis was applied to see if there exist any significant differences among certain groups in relation to catalog buying intentions of that groups.

In order to get more meaningful results, and to avoid insufficient cell frequencies, the groups were combined where felt neccesary. The independent variable; intention of catalog buying was also restructed as: very willing and somewhat willing together (group 1);
unwilling and not willing at all together (group 5).
and the indecisive group was omitted in the analysis. The results presented in Tables 2.7.a, 2.7.b, and 2.7.c were regarded as significant if $p\leq.10$.

Frequency of Shopping

Chi-square analysis results showed that significant differences existed between groups of frequent buyers and infrequent buyers in terms of their intentions toward catalog purchases. Nearly 31% of the buyers who shop less than or equal to once in a month for clothing purchases (group 1) said that they are willing to buy from catalogs and 68.8% that they are unwilling. However, 61.3% who shop more than once in a month indicated that they are willing, and 38.7% that are not willing to buy goods from catalogs.

TABLE 2.7.a.

Relationship between Shopping Frequency and Catalog Buying Intentions

	Willing	Unwilling	Total
Shop < once in a month for clothing	19	42	
	31.1	68.9	66.3
Shop > once in a month for clothing	19	12	
	61.3	38.7	33.7
	41.3	58.7	

Chi-square = 6.51001
d.f = 1
Significance= .0107
phi = .28936

Distance to a Shopping Center

Cross Tabulation results revealed that the distance to the shopping centers creates significant and somewhat surprising differences among the groups as seen in Table 2.7.b.

TABLE 2.7.b

Shopping Distance and Intentions Toward Catalog Purchases

	willing	unwilling	
Dist. to a shop. center<10 minutes	3 37.5	5 62.5	8.2
Dist. to a shop. center 10-30 min.	30 52.6	27 47.4	58.8
Dist. to a shop center >30 minutes	7 21.9	25 78.1	33.0
	41.2	58.8	

Chi-square = 8.05080

d.f = 2

Significance= .0179

c.c = .27683

37.5% of the group living less than 10 minutes away from a shopping center stated that they are willing to shop from a catalog, and 62.5% stated an unwillingness. 52.6% of the group, living 10-30 minutes away from a shopping center stated that they are in favor of catalogs, and 47.4% that are against buying from a catalog. Among the last group living more than 30 minutes away from a shopping center 21.9% stated that they are willing and 71.8% that they are unwilling to do a purchase from a mail-order catalog. The idea that distance to a shopping center may be a motivator to shop at home from a mail order catalog is partly explained by these results. It is clear that people who live closest to the stores do not feel the need to replace catalogs with retail stores because they have no timing or transportation difficulties.The group living 10-30 minutes away from the stores are somewhat indifferent, while the farthest away group does not seem willing to buy from catalogs, very surprisingly. This suggests that they do not regard reaching to a shopping center as difficult or troublesome and time consuming activity, rather they prefer to delay their purchases, make plans and shop accordingly.

Transportation Mean Used in Shopping

Another significant finding is that the people using private cars when shopping are indifferent in terms of buying goods from a catalog (Table 2.7.c.). The ones going to shopping by walking, stated slightly different responses, 56.3% saying they are in favor of catalog buying and 43.8% are unwilling. However of the group that possibly has the most difficulty in reaching to a shopping center 29.5% responded that they are willing to do catalog buying and 70.5% had negative intentions.

TABLE 2.7.c.

Transportation Mean Used in Shopping and Catalog Buying Intentions.

	willing	Unwilling	Total
Transportation mean in shop (by priv. car)	18 50.0	18 50.0	37.5
Transportation mean in shop (by walking)	9 56.3	7 43.8	16.7
Transportation mean in shop (by dolmus or bus)	13 29.5	31 70.5	45.8
	41.7	58.3	

Chi-square = 5.08831
d.f. = 2
significance = .0785
c.c. = .22436

These finding together with the finding related with distance to a shopping center suggests that people do not seem to give up shopping from retail stores, because it is difficult to reach to a shopping center. Infact, the results prove they do not think so either . People gave responses to the question 39 (is it a problem for you to reach to a shopping center) as 73.9% saying no; and this variable was also found as not significantly related with their catalog intentions.

2.2.4. Demographic and Socio-economic Profile of Shoppers from a Catalog.

Chi-square analysis results revealed only one significantly finding in terms of relationship between demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the respondents with their buying intentions from a catalog. The significant cross tabulation results is presented in Table 2.8.

Foreign Language Known

The cross-tabulation results showed significant diffirences exist between the group in terms of the foreign language known and catalog buying intentions of that groups. Results reveal that people who do not know any foreign language were found to be more unlikely to buy from catalogs than those who know at least one foreign language. Among the group, knowing at least one foreign language, 48.5% say that they are willing to buy goods from catalogs, and 51.5% say that they are unwilling. Whereas, among the group that do not know any foreign language, 25.9% say they are willing in spite of a 74.1% saying that are unwilling.

As for the remaining demographic and socioeconomic variables, age sex, marital status, education level, having a child and age of that child, working status, occupation, income level and automobile ownership, the number of newspaper and magazines read regularly, and the number of household goods and credit cards owned were found to be insignificantly related to catalog buying intention of the respondents.

Among these, in spite of the fact that there were no significant results, some deserve attention. These are as follows:

a) Males were more likely in favor of catalog buying than females. 55.6% of males stated that they are willing to purchase from a catalog and 44.4% are unwilling in comparison with the females stating 38.5% willingness, and 61.5% unwillingness.

b) In terms of occupation, the group consisting of doctors pharmacists, architecs and engineers, lawyers, economists and business administractors were found to be more willing to buy from a mail order catalog (56.5%), whereas the other groups consisting of trading, officers and employees, housewives stated they are unwilling with a frequency of 73.3% - 80.0%. Only the students were somewhat indif-

TABLE 2.8.

Relationship between Foreign Language Known and Catalog Buying Intentions

	Willing	Unwilling	Total
knows no foreign language	7	20	28.4
	25.9	74.1	
knows at least one for. lang.	33	35	71.6
	.5	51.5	
	42.1	57.9	

Chi-square = 3.17647
d.f. = 1
Significance= .0747
phi = .20649

ferent with a 42.9% in favor and 57.1% against to catalog buying.

c) The results also show that as the level of income increases,the percentage of the people having positive intentions to catalog purchases rises. The respondents having an income of up 2 million TL are against (60.3%) to such purchases, the group between 2-4 million income level are also against to catalog buying with a lesser percentage (56.3%), and the high income group that is having more than 4 million TL income is indifferent by a 50.0%

2.2.5 Other Findings

In terms of the importance of product characteristics as well as importance of quick shopping and in-store help on people's catalog buying intentions, there was no significant positive or negative relationship.

As it was mentioned before frequent shoppers are significantly most likely to order merchandise from catalogs. Beyond this there was found no significant relationship between shopping patterns of respondents and their motivations toward catalog purchases. They almost always have an idea of what they will buy (85.4%); most likely continue to shop after a purchase, and spend 1-3 hours per shopping trip. Boutiques are mostly preferred stores, meaning that brand name and quality image is widespread throught the sample shopping centers and department stores coming after. But none of these sample profiles were found to be related with catalog buying intentions.

The previous experience of catalog buying was not widespread throughout the sample. 72.2% of the respondents have no such prior experience in catalog, however, this seems not affecting this sample's attitudes toward catalogs. We might expect that those who had a prior experience would perceive less risk in such purchases, so would be more willing towards catalog buying. Results proved there was no such relationship. It is noteworthy to mention here, the kind of such purchases done before. Among these, cloths take the front lines by 30.9%, then comes electrical appliances (28.6%), household durables (19.0%), furniture (14.3%), and cosmetics, records and books (7.2%).

The risk perceptions of the respondents when buying the goods under two different conditions either in a store from a salesman or from a mail-oredr catalog can be seen in the Table 2.9. It is very obvious that for all of the products studied, people perceive buying from a store as a less riskier (almost no risk), and buying the same goods from a catalog as a high activity. However, one may diffirentiate the product and categorize them as high risk or low risk items by examining at their frequencies in Table 2.9.

The cumulative percentages (very confident + somewhat confident; unconfident + not confident at all) show us that the shoes, cloths and furnitures may be regarded as high risk items with related frequencies of 65.7%, 47.0%, 35.5% respectively, and records,electrical home appliances, and automobiles low risk items with related frequencies 58.9%, 47.9%, 42.8% respectively. The indecisive group was not taken into consideration in making these interpretations.

Among the attitudinal, demographic, and socioeconomic factors investigated in the analysis, same of them were found as significant

TABLE 2.9.

Frequency Table of Respondents Risk Perceptions When Buying Goods In Two Sources

PRODUCT	in a store VC (1)	SC (2)	NN (3)	NC (4)	NCA (5)	$\bar{X}$	S	from a catalog VC (1)	SC (2)	NN (3)	NC (4)	NCA (5)	$\bar{X}$	S
Parfumes	40.9	46.9	11.0	1.3	0.0	1.91	1.34	12.9	18.5	35.0	20.7	13.9	3.70	2.21
Shoes	47.7	48.4	2.6	1.3	0.0	1.72	1.18	2.1	7.3	24.8	34.3	31.4	4.54	1.99
Record/books	51.3	39.3	6.7	2.7	0.0	1.98	1.78	23.4	35.5	25.5	11.4	4.2	3.09	2.30
Clots	42.6	47.7	9.0	0.7	0.0	1.82	1.20	3.9	11.2	38.5	35.1	11.9	4.27	2.19
Elect. home	34.7	50.0	11.3	4.0	0.0	2.21	1.75	15.5	32.4	27.5	19.7	4.9	3.30	2.19
furniture	33.6	55.5	7.7	1.7	1.3	1.96	1.24	6.5	21.8	36.2	27.5	8.0	3.84	2.20
automobile	41.6	45.0	11.4	1.3	0.7	2.16	1.84	10.9	31.9	30.4	16.7	10.1	3.61	2.32
gits	42.3	48.1	7.7	1.9	0.0	1.79	1.07	6.6	24.8	38.0	24.0	6.6	3.79	2.25

VC = very confident

SC = somewhat confident

NN = neither confident nor not

NC = not confident

NCA = not confident at all

in determining the respondents' intentions toward catalog purchases, and some found as insignificant. The conclusion draw from these findings and implications for the concerned parties is this ussed in the next chapter of our study.

CHAPTER 3

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

In this chapter, the conclusions drawn from the findings and implications for some concerned parties will be discussed.

3.1. CONCLUSIONS

The objective of this study was to "define" a market for catalog buying type of retailing in Istanbul.

The study was conducted with 158 people through a nine page questionnaire including the statement to measure the attitudinal, demographic, and socioeconomic characteristics of respondents.

The data were analyzed by computer programs like frequency distributions, cross tabulations, factor analysis, and pearson correlations.

According to the findings of this study, the intention of catalog buying is not widespread among the consumers. This type of retailing can appeal to only 25.5% of the total market remanining a 38.0% of indecisive group in question.

The catalog buyer segment knows at least one foreign language, more likely to be males, and have higher status occupations. Their intentions towards buying the goods from catalogs are more likely to increase as their income level increases. They are self confident and likes to try new products, motivated by convenience factors, and possibly risk takers. These findings suggests that they carry to some extent, that the characteristics of "innovators".

A significant proportion of respondents (45.5%) stated that they see catalog buying as a high risk activity and this is reflected in their buying decisions.

Previous experience on catalog purchases does not seem to have an effect on mail-order buying decisions as found also in the Spence, Engel, and Blackwell study (1970). Nearly 30% of the sample group had previous experience of some catalog purchase but they are not different in terms of willingness to buy from catalogs in comparison with the group that have no such experience (70%).

It was observed that respondents are very much in doubt about the catalog firms' work ethic, that they trust to well-known and established company's catalogs.

For all the product analyzed, people perceive more risk in buying the goods from a catalog whereas they perceive almost no risk in store/salesman situation, and this result is highly consistent with the findings of Spence, Engel, and Blackwell (1970). In the present study shoes, clothes, and furniture were regarded as high risk items whereas records and books and electrical home appliancess were regarded as low risky ones when buying through a catalog.

The observation that perceived risk appears as a deterrent a factor in catalog purchases suggest that the potential catalog buyers either perceive less than average risk in buying goods from catalogs or are more willing to take such risks.

Gillett(1970) defines in-home shoppers as convenience oriented, affluent, highly educated, to have high status occupations and perceiving less risk in such purchases. He states also that they are not different on toher major demographic characteristics, such as age and family size. The same holds true in our study also. The catalog buyers segment in the present study were found as convenience oriented, more likely to be upscale in terms of occupation and income level, but differ very little on age, marital status, and presence of children at home. The only divergion from the Gillett:S study is that is that in the present study there was found no significant relationship between education and intention of catalog buying, but foreign language known was found to be an important determining factor in their motivations.

In addition, male shoppers were found to be more likely than females to purchase at home. This finding is consistent with the findings of Berkowits et. al(1977), Korgaonkar (1981) and can be described as male shoppers are less likely than females to enjoy shopping and are more likely than females to shop at home.

In terms of household goods owned, and number of newspaper and magazines read regularly, no relationship existed between those variables and catalog purchase decisions.

None of the "locked-in" conditions were found to have an effect on catalog buying intentions of the respondents. The presence of pre-school children, possesion of a car shopper employment status and the difficulty in reaching to a shopping center have no effect on buying decisions from a catalog. The distance to a shopping center and transportation means used in shopping were thought to be motivators in catalog purchases, but results proved there was no relationship. Instead, we see that catalog buyer segment consisted from those that live 10-30 minutes away from a shopping center and go to shopping by walking, while the farthest groups is the most unwilling among all for a catalog purchase.

Catalog buyers were also observed as not being under pressure of some "time" constraints, since they are the frequent shoppers and shop in stores more than the sample average. In these terms, the sample analyzed presents very similar results with those of Gillett's (1970) and Berkowitz et. al's (1979). In all the three studies, in-home shoppers were not found as to be a "captive" market.

In terms of product characteristics, the results proved that the sample is more likely to give importance to brandname and quality by stating their primary shopping place as boutiques (35.3%). However, product characteristics was found as to have no effect on buying decisions.

Catalog buyers value mail-order purchases for its convenience attribute. They are not "locked-in"s, nor they are under any time pressure. Instead, they are the frequent shoppers. This suggests that they shop from catalogs on a discretionnary basis, in order to avoid an extra shopping trip to pick up a gift or a forgotten item, or buy on impulse. They are not thinking catalogs as substitudes for store shopping, rather being a supplement that provides them more flexibility and also more time to be consumed in more pleasurable ways.

3.2. IMPLICATIONS

This study has some implications for mail-order catalog retailers and for further researchers which will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

3.2.1. Implictaions for Retailers

The success of the organizations in this market lies on the fact that focusing in the proper target market and employing appropriate procedures and strategies, so that they can compete effectively with established retail stores.

It was observed that people were very suspicious about the work ethic of catalog firms and that deterred their purchase decisions. To overcome this fact, firm image may be streghened by television or newspaper advertisements so that trust in firm's catalogs may be provided.

Catalog divisions within favorite stores or showrooms near shopping centers may appeal to those that are frequent shoppers and liking to shop to a great extent.

Impulse buying can be maintained with the help of TV ads by stressing the unique feature of the product advertised that the catalog offers.

Since in-home buying typically is a discreationary decision, the demand for in-home shopping services is quite elastic. These firms by giving high importance on firm's image, and also the convenience themes, should be targeted to standardized items at least initially. We see from the results that in spite of the fact that cloths being the mostly purchased items from the catalogs, are regarded among the high risky ones throughout the sample. However, the electrical appliances are the second frequently purchased and regarded as low risky when bought from a mail-order catalog. This observation may be useful in order to build a starting point for a catalog retailer.

It is suggested that the future strength of the catalog lies in those items that are self-confident and innovative frequent catalog buyer. This observation is consistent with the fact that catalog sales have been shifting relatively from the traditional general catalogs to the smaller supplemental catalogs directed at specialty items.

Another observation is that a significant proportion of shoppers are unaware of the advantages that a catalog provides.They are not against the catalogs nor in favor of them because lack of information or interest The group should be targeted next, with a deeper understanding of their desires,, motivations and needs.

3.2.2. Implications for Further Research

Factors affecting buying intentions of the other groups (indecisive and unwilling) should be studied also. A discriminant analysis may be useful to profile each groups so that effective strategies can be developed to appeal to them also.

For each group, the product categories preferred (from catalogs) should be determined.

Importance of product characteristics should be analyzed for each decision group. The attributes of store shopping should be carefully analyzed for each segment in order to develop strategies against it.

Finally, it would be valuable to replicate and expand on the results of the present study using more recent data.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bauer, Raymand A. "Consumer Behavior as Risk Taking" in Dynamic Marketing for a Changing World", Robert s. Hancock, (ed) Chicago, "American Marketing Association, 1960, pp. 389-398.

Bellenger, Danny N., and Korgaonkar, Pradeep K., "Profiling the Recreational Shoppers", Journal of Retailing, V.56,pp.77-92, Fall 1980.

Bellenger, Danny N.; Robertson, Dan H.; and Greenberg, Barnett A., Shopping center Patronage Motives" Journal of Retailing, V.56,pp.77-92, Fall 1980.

Berkowitz, Eric N.; Walton, John R.; Walker, Orville C. Jr, In-Home Shoppers: The Market For Innovative Distribution Systems", Journal of Retailing, V.55,Nr 2 Summer 1979.

Chain Store Age Executive (1984), "The Sale is in the Mail", 60 (March), 44 in Darian, Jean C., "In-home Shopping: Are there Consumer Segments?", Journal of Retailing, V. 63, Nr 2, pp. 162-185, summer 1987.

Cox, Donald F. and Rich, Stuart V., "Perceived Risk and Consumer Decision Making-The Case of Telephone Shopping", Journal of Marketing Research, V.1, pp. 32-39, November 1964.

Cox, Donald F., "Risk Taking and Information Handling in Consumer Behavior", Boston;Harward University, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, 1967.

Cunningham, Isabella C.M. and Cunningham, Willing H., "The Urban In-Home Shopper: Socioeconomic and Attitudinal Characteristics", Journal of Retailing, V.49, pp. 42-50, Fall 1973.

Darian, Jean C., "In-Home Shopping:Are There Consumer Segment?", Journal of Retailing, V.63, Nr 2, pp.162-185, Summer 1987.

Dash, Joseph F., Schiffman, Leon G., and Berenson, Conrad,"Risk and Personality-Related Dimensions of Store Choice", Journal of Marketing, V.40 (January), 1976,pp. 32-39.

Davidson, William R. and Rodgers, Alice, "Non,store Retailing:Its Importance on Merchandise Suppliers and Competitive Channels," in The Growth of Non-store Retailing : Implications for Retailers Manufacturers, and Public Policy Makers Conference, New York: New York University, Institute of Retail Management, 1979,pp.22-29

Feldman, Lawrence P. and star, Alvin D., "Racial Factors in Shopping Behavior", in Keith Cox and Ben Enis (eds), "A New Measure of Respon sibilty for Marketing",Chicago, American Marketing Association, 1968, pp.216-226.

Forbes, "Pretty Penny", March 15, 1972, p.46 in Reynolds, Fred D. "An Analysis of Catalog Buying Behavior", Journal of Marketing", July 1974, pp.47-51.

Gillette, Peter L., "A Profile of Urban In-Home Shoppers" Journal of Marketing, V.34,pp 42-50,July 1070.

Gillette, Peter L., "In-Home Shoppers-An Overwiew, "Journal of Marketing, V.40,pp.81-88, October 1976.

Hisrich, Robert D., Dornoff, Ronald J., and Kernan, Jerome B., "Perceived Risk in Store Selection", Journal of Marketing Research V.9 (November), 1972, pp.453-459.

Korgaonkar, Pradeep K." Consumer Preferences for Catalog Showroom and Discount Stores:The Moderating Role of Product Risk", Journal of Retailing, V. 58, Nr 3, Fall 1982.

Korgaonkar, Pradeep K., "Shopping Orientatios of Catalog Showroom Patrons", Journal of Retailing, V.57, Nr 1, Spring 1981.

Mc Call, Suzanne H. Meet the Workwife", Journal of Marketing, 1977, pp.55-56.

Peters, William H. and Ford, Neil M., "A Profile of Urban In-home Shoppers: The Other Half", Journal of Marketing, V.36, pp.62-64, January 1972.

Prased, Kanti V., "Socioeconomic Product Risk and Patronage Preferences of Retail Shoppers", Journal of Marketing, V.39(July), 1975, pp.42-47.

Reynolds, Fred D., "An Analysis of Catalog Buying Behavior", Journal of Marketing, V.38, pp. 47-51, July 1974.

Riecken, G.; Yavs, U. and Samli, A.C. "Catalog Shopping:Problems and Prospects in Small Communities", Proceedings:Academy of Marketing Science, 1980, pp.204-208.

Riecken, Glen and Yavas, Ugur, "A Taxonomy of Outbuyers:A New Perspective", International Journal of Retailing, V.3, Nr 1,1986.

Riecken, Glen; Yavas, Ugur and Samli A.C., "Catalog Shopping: Problems and Prospects in Small Communities", Proceedings: Academy of Marketing Science, pp.204-208,1980.

Rosenberg, Larry J. and Hirscham, Elizabeth C., "Retailing Without Stores", Harward Business Review, V.58 (July-August), pp.103-113

Robertson, Thomas S., and Kennedy, J.N., "Predation of Consumer Innovators:Application of Multiple Discriminant Analysis", Journal of Marketing Research, V.5 (May), 1968, pp.64-69.

Rich, Stuart U., "Shopping Behavior of Department Store Customers" Boston:Division of Research, Haeward Business School, 1963.

Spence, Homer E.; Engel, James F.; Blackwell, Roger D., "Perceived Risk in Mail-Order and Retail Store Buying", Journal of Marketing Research, V.7 pp.364-369, August 1970.

Stanford Research Institude, Industrial Economics Division, "In-Home Selling Report No:255" (Memlo Park, California:Stanford Reseach Institude, October, 1964), pp.2-3,5.

Stone, Gregory P., "City Shoppers and Urban Identification: Observations on the Social Psychology of City Life"- Journal of Marketing Research, V.7 (August), 1954, pp. 364-369.

Tauber, Edward M., Why Do People Shop", Journal of Marketing V.36(October), 1972, pp. 46-49.

Urbany, Joel E.; Talarzyk, Wayne W., "Videotex: Implications for Retailing", Journal of Retailing, V.59, Nr 3, Fall 1983, pp. 76-90.

APPENDIX I

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE

taf = tamamen aynı fikirdeyim
af = aynı fikirdeyim
k = kararsızım
afd = aynı fikirde değilim
kk = Kesinlikle karşıyım

	taf	af	k	adf	kk
1) Katalogdan alışverişi güvenilir bulmam(V01)					
2) Büyük ve tanınmış bir mağazanın katalogundan alışveriş daha güvenlidir(V02)					
3) Katalogla alışverişlerde malla ilgili problem lerin halledilmesi daha güç olur (V03)					
4) Evde oturmayı severim (V04)					
5) Alışveriş etmeyi ve mağazalara bakınarak yürümeyi severim(V05)					
6) Alışverişlerde park problemleri can sıkıcı olmaya başladı (V06)					
7) Satın alacağım bir malın fiyatını birkaç mağazada karşılaştırırım (V07)					
8) Fiyatını fazla önemsemeden kaliteli malı satın almayı tercih ederim (V08)					
9) Alacağım en ufak şeylerin bile fiyatını kontrol ederim (V09)					
10)Karar vermeden önce alacağım malları ince- leyip karşılaştırma yapmaya epey vakil harcarım (V10)					
11)Reklamlarda gördüğüm yeni ürünleri denemeyi severim(V11)					

taf af k afd kk

12) Yeni ürün ve markaları tecrübe etmeyi severim(V12)

13) Bence işte ve yaşamda denenmesi ve başarıya ulaşması tatbik etmek en iyi yöntemdir(V13)

14) Genellikle işimde ve yaşamımda yeni fikirleri denemekten hoşlanırım.(V14)

15) Öncü olarak kabul edilmeyi severim(V15)

16) Bazen, arkadaş ve komşularımın satın alımlarını etkilediğimi hissederim(V16)

17) Bir ürünü satın almadan önce arkadaş ya da komşularımın o mal hakkında ne düşündüklerini öğrenmek isterim (V17)

18) Alışverişten sıkılırım(V18)

19) Alışveriş etmek eğlencelidir(V19)

20) Satın alımlarımda en fazla dikkate ettiğim şey o malı mümkün olan en düşük fiyata almaktır(20)

21) Bir malın katsalog fiyatı dükkana göre daha pahalıdır(21)

22) Katalogla alışverişlerde fiyat konusunda pazarlık etmek zordur(V22)

23) Alışverişlerimde daima bana en kolay gelen dükkandan yaparım(V23)

24) Alışverişlerimi daima en hızlı şekilde yapabileceğim yerden yaparım(V24)

25) Rafta yeni ber marka görürsem, çoğu zaman sadece ne ise yaradığını görmek için alırım (V25)

26) Birçok insandan daha fazla bağımsızımdır. (V26)

27) Pekçok kişisel kabiliyetim vardır (V27

28) Katalogla yapılan alışverişler daha az vakit alır, dolayısıyla başka şeylere vaktim oulr. (V28)

29)Katalogla alışverişler vakti kendime göre ayarlayabilirim (V29)

30)Katalogla alışveriş daha az yorucudur (V.30)

31) Katalogdan alışveriş, reklamlarda gördüğümüz birşeyleri anında satın almanıza olanak sağlar (V31)

32) Alişverişlerinizde, aşağıda belirtilen şeylerin sizce önemi ne kadardır?

	co	o	f	od	hod
-düşük fiyatlar(V32)					
-mağaza içi yardım(V33)					
-satılan malın kalitesi(V34)					
-iyi tanınmış bir marka oluşu(35)					
-alışverişte çabukluk(V36)					

co = çok önemli
o = önemli
f = farketmez
od = önemlli değil
hod = hiçönemli değil

	daima	çoğu zaman	bazen	pek sık değil	hiç
33) Giyecek alışverişlerinizde; alışverişe çıkmadan önce ne satın alacağınıza dair belirli bir fikriniz var mıdır?(V37)					
34) Giyecek alışverişlerinizde; bir alışveriş yaptıktan sonra genelde alışverişinize devam edermisiniz?(V38)					

35) Giyecek alışverişleriniz için; ne sıklıkta alıverişe çıkarmısınız?(V39)

- Ayda bir kez
- Ayda iki kez
- Ayda üç kez
- Haftada bir
- Haftada birden fazla

36) Giysi alışverişlerinizi yaptığınız dükkanlara ulaşımınız ne kadar sürmektedir?

- 10 dakikadan az
- 10-30 dakika arası
- Yarım saatten fazla

37) Giysi alışverişlerinizde; alışverişiniz süresince ne kadar zaman harcarsınız?(V41)

- 1 saatten az
- 1-2 saat arası
- 2-3 saat arası
- 3 saatten fazla

38) Giysi alışverişlerinizi nereden yaparsınız? Belirtiniz?(V42)

____

39) Alışveriş merkezlerine ulaşımınız güçmüdür? (V43)

- Evet
- Hayır

40) Alışverişlerinize;

- Kendi arabanızla
- Yürüyerek
- Dolmuşla
- Belediye otobüsleri ile gidersiniz(V44)

41) şimdiye kadar bir katalogdan alışveriş yaptınız mı?(V45)

-Evet

-Hayır

evet is aldığınız malın cinsi nedir, belirtin---------(V46)

42) Genel olarak, katalogla alışveriş etmeye

ne ölçüde isteklisiniz?(V47) ci oi k pid hid

ci = çok istekliyim

oi = oldukça istekliyim

k = karasızım

pid = pek istekli değilim

hid = hiç istekli değilim

43) Aşağıdaki ürünleri 2 değişik şekilde alırken kendinizi ne ölçüde güvenli hissedersiniz? Belirtin

		Mağazadan						Katalogdan				
		çğ	og	k	pgd	hgd		çğ	og	k	pgd	hgd
Parfüm	V48						V56					
ayakkabı	V49						V57					
kitap+plak	V50						V58					
giyecek	V51						V59					
elekt. ev aletleri	V52						V60					
ev eşyası	V53						V61					
otomobil	V54						V62					
hediyelik eşya	V55						V63					

cğ = çok güvenli

og = oldukça güvenli

k = kararsızım

pgd = pek güvenli değil

hgd = hiç güvenli değil

1) Medeni haliniz (V64)
- Bekâr
- Evli
- Boşanmış/dul

2) Cinsiyetiniz(V65)
- Kadın
- Erkek

3) Yaşınız (V66)
- <25
- 26-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- >56

4) Eğitim durumunuz(V67)
- ilkokul
- Ortaokul
- Lise
- Universite
- Master/doktora

5) Çocuğunuz var mı?(V68)
- Evet
- Hayır

6) Sahip olduğunuz 6 yaşından küçük çocuk adedi (V69)
- Hiç
- Bir
- Birden fazla

7) Sahip olduğunuz 7-12 yaşları arasındaki çocuk adedi(V70)
- Hiç
- Bir
- Birden fazla

8) Çalışma durumunuz(V71)
- Çalışmıyorum
- tam zamanlı çalışıyorum.
- Yarı zamanlı çalışıyorum

9) Mesleğiniz (V72)

- doktor/eczacı
- öğrenci(tam zamanlı)
- mühendis/mimar
- avukat/hukukçu
- tüccar
- memur
- ekonomist/işletmeci
- ev-kadını
- diğer...........(V73)

10) Bildiğiniz yabancı dil sayısı (V74)

- hiç
- bir
- birden fazla

11) Gelir seviyeniz (V75)

- < 500000
- 500000-1 milyon
- 1 milyon- 2 milyon
- 2 milyon- 4 milyon
- > 4 milyon

12) Sahip olduğunuz otomobil sayısı (V76)

- hiç
- bir
- iki
- ikiden fazla

13) Düzenli olarak okumakta olduğunuz dergi ve gazeteler nelerdir?

Belirtiniz(V78)

number of mentions (V77) ....

14) Lütfen aşağıdakilerden hangisine sahip olduğunuzu ve bunların adedini belirtiniz

	hiç	bir	birden fazla
telefon(V79)			
kredi kartı(V80)			
renkli televizyon(V81)			
Müzik seti(V82)			
çamaşır makinesi(V83)			
deep-freeze(V84)			
bulaşık makinesi (V85)			