



Mobile shopping behavior among fashion adoption groups

Seung-Hee Lee, Southern Illinois University, USA
Jane E. Workman, Southern Illinois University, USA
Kwangho Jung, Seoul National University, Korea

Keywords: Mobile shopping, fashion adoption groups

Conceptual framework. This study of fashion adoption groups and mobile shopping behavior was framed within the *theory of adoption and diffusion of innovations* (Rogers, 1995). Adoption and diffusion of an innovative product or practice stems from consumers' receptivity to newness. An innovative practice such as mobile shopping can cause consumer uncertainty and a reluctance to adopt the new practice until other consumers have demonstrated its success. Consumers who regularly adopt innovations early in the life cycle are not only receptive to newness but are likely to influence adoption and diffusion of innovations within their social groups (Rogers, 1995).

Mobile shopping is the delivery of electronic commerce capabilities directly into the consumer's hand, anywhere, via wireless technology, such as a Smartphone, Tablet, or other portable electronic device (Difference between, 2015). Two shopping orientations can be applied to perceptions of mobile shopping: convenience (shopping as task-related, rational, and efficient; Babin, Darden, & Griffin, 1994) and recreational (shopping as fun, entertaining; Donthu & Garcia, 1999). A recreational (vs. convenience) orientation may lead to more impulsive buys (Bellenger & Korgaonkar, 1980). Benefits of mobile shopping are saving time and effort, thus, mobile shopping is ideal for convenience shoppers because convenience features (e.g., search engines, product reviews) make shopping more efficient. Mobile shopping can also appeal to recreational shoppers with features designed to increase shopping pleasure and excitement (e.g., notification of sales or new products). Pessimistically, mobile shopping may provide plentiful chances for impulse buying. However, links among perceptions of mobile shopping benefits, use of mobile convenience and recreational features, and impulse buying have not been confirmed.

Purpose of the study. The purpose of the study was to examine differences among fashion adoption groups regarding mobile shopping behaviors. Five hypotheses were proposed: H1: Fashion adoption groups will differ in perceptions of mobile shopping convenience. H2: Fashion adoption groups will differ in perceptions of mobile shopping recreational benefits. H3: Fashion adoption groups will differ in use of mobile convenience shopping features. H4: Fashion adoption groups will differ in use of mobile recreational shopping features. H5: Fashion adoption groups will differ in impulsive buying via mobile shopping.

Method. The questionnaire contained demographic items and measures of fashion innovativeness and opinion leadership (Hirschman & Adcock, 1978), perceptions of mobile shopping convenience and recreational benefits, use of mobile convenience and recreational shopping features, and impulsive buying via mobile shopping (adapted from Kim & LaRose, 2004). A definition of mobile shopping was provided (see second paragraph above). Participants indicated agreement with items about mobile shopping convenience and recreational benefits

using a 7-point response (strongly agree/strongly disagree) and statements about use of shopping features and impulsive buying using a 5-point response (very often/never). Participants were 122 men and 105 women (n = 229, 2 missing data) with a mean age of 21.77 who were students at a large mid-western US university. The questionnaire was distributed, completed, and collected in large lecture classes. Data were analyzed with descriptive statistics, Cronbach's alpha, and MANOVA/ANOVA. Scale reliability was acceptable ranging from .78 to .89.

Results. Fashion adoption groups were identified using mean and standard deviation of scores on fashion innovativeness and opinion leadership: change agents (n=38), early adopters (n=78), late adopters (n=68) and reluctant adopters (n=45). MANOVA with fashion adoption groups as independent variable and mobile shopping variables as dependent variables was significant [F(15, 669)=4.62, p<.001]. ANOVA was significant (p<.000) for all mobile shopping variables except perceptions of mobile shopping convenience. Change agents perceived more mobile recreational benefits than early adopters, late adopters, or reluctant adopters. Reluctant adopters used fewer mobile convenience shopping features than late adopters, early adopters and change agents. Change agents and early adopters used more mobile recreational shopping features and bought impulsively more often via mobile than late adopters and reluctant adopters. All hypotheses except H1 were supported.

Discussion/Implications. Results supported the idea that earlier adopters are receptive to innovative practices such as mobile shopping. Consumers who adopt innovations early in the life cycle (i.e., change agents, early adopters) perceived more mobile recreational shopping benefits, used more mobile recreational features, and engaged in more impulsive buying via mobile than consumers who adopt innovations later in the life cycle (i.e., late adopters, reluctant adopters). The fashion adoption groups agreed in their perceptions of the convenience of mobile shopping. These results would help fashion marketers or corporations develop their mobile promotional strategies for different consumer segments. Further research is needed regarding factors that influence consumers to adopt or resist adopting an innovative practice such as mobile shopping. Also, it would be meaningful to explore mobile shopping behavior in different cultural contexts.

References

- Babin, B. J., Darden, W. R., & Griffin, M. (1994). Work and/or fun: Measuring hedonic and utilitarian shopping value. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20(4), 644-656.
- Bellenger, D. N., & Korgaonkar, P. K. (1980). Profiling the recreational shopper. *Journal of Retailing*, 56(3), 77-92.
- Difference between e-commerce and m-commerce. (2015, December 15). Retrieved January 21, 2016 from <http://researchpedia.info/difference-between-e-commerce-and-m-commerce/>
- Donthu, N. & Garcia, A. (1999). The Internet shopper. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 39, 50-58.
- Hirschman, E., & Adcock, W. (1978). An examination of innovative communicators, opinion leaders, and innovators for men's fashion apparel. In H.K. Hunt (Ed.) *Advances in consumer research* (pp. 303-314). Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research.
- Kim, J., & LaRose, R. (2004). Interactive e-commerce: Promoting consumer efficiency or impulsivity? *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 10(1), 00-00.
- Rogers, E. M. (1995). *Diffusion of innovations*. 4th Ed. New York: Free Press.