

BESSH-16**Student Mall Shopping Preferences and Mall Spending in the Johannesburg Context**Rubina Jogee^{1*}, Chris William Callaghan²^{1,2}*University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa*

Abstract

There are different segments of the South African mall shopping market. Given the changes inherent in South African society, the study of certain segments of the mall shopping market and their preferences might offer important insights into patterns of mall shopping relationships. This study derives a model of seven core categories of mall shopping preferences from the literature, and empirically tests the relationships between these categories of mall shopping preferences and levels of mall shopping spending within a student sample of over six hundred respondents. Non-parametric structural equation modelling, exploratory factor analysis and multiple linear regression analysis are used to test theory that predicts relationships in this context. In the absence of such knowledge currently, the findings of this study provide mall operators with insight into what mall shopping preferences are associated with higher levels of spending of this segment of mall shoppers. Results suggest that the preferences primarily associated with products are significantly associated with higher levels of daily and month-end spending.

© 2016 The Authors. Published by Academic Fora. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

Peer-review under responsibility of the Scientific & Review committee of BESSH- 2016.

Keywords— Mall Shopping; Marketing; Segment, Shopping Preferences, South Africa, Trends in Mall Shopping

Introduction

Globally, mall shopping behaviour is constantly changing (Nicholls, Li, Kranendonk & Roslow 2002:149). Mall shopping behaviour and preferences within the South African context are however also nested within, and are not independent of, this broader context of global change in mall shopping behaviour (Tustin & Strydom 2006:48). Although some aspects of mall shopping preferences, or motivations, may be common across different societal contexts, the rate at which different societies take up these global trends may differ.

South Africa has faced significant societal and demographic change since the advent of democracy in 1994; the rich diversity of South African society is reflected in its diversity of race, ethnicity and culture (Urban 2006:171). These changes are also reflected in the decentralisation of shopping, as within a South African context of economic upliftment city shopping has migrated to the suburbs, and particularly to malls in suburban areas (Ligthelm 2008:37), within a larger shift from township life to urban living (Tustin & Strydom 2006:48). The phenomenon of 'outshopping' seen in the country reflects the tendency of many within disadvantaged communities to shop outside their communities (Strydom 2011:150); given the importance of customer retention (Roberts-Lombard 2011:3487), mall operators need to be keenly aware of the mall shopping preference profiles of their different markets so as to be competitive in an environment where outshopping can occur.

Notwithstanding the growth in the mall shopping sector (Ligthelm 2008:37), given the dynamic nature of the changes of South African society (Urban 2006:171), we argue in this paper that the specific trajectories of economic upliftment with regard to trends in mall shopping preferences and their relationships with mall spending seem to remain uncharted. This paper makes an attempt to contribute to knowledge of mall shopping preferences, albeit a cross-sectional perspective at a point in time.

Recent work has been done on shopping styles in the Gauteng area: for example, of shoppers aged between 16 to 27 years (Mandhlazi, Dhurup & Mafini 2013:359). Similarly, other work has been done in the South Africa on preferences relating to the features of shops (Dhurup, Mafini & Mathaba 2013:359). However, it is argued that little knowledge exists as to the *contemporary* typology of mall shopping preferences of an important segment of mall shoppers: university students engaged in tertiary educational studies. Studies of individuals enrolled in South African higher education reflect a cohort, namely Generation Y, which has different value and priorities than those of other time periods (Synodinos, Bevan-Dye & De Klerk 2013:17).

*All correspondence related to this article should be directed to Rubina Jogee, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa

Email: rubina.jogee@wits.ac.za

© 2016 The Authors. Published by Academic Fora. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

Peer-review under responsibility of the Scientific & Review committee of BESSH-2016.

Further, mall operators may benefit from knowledge of mall shopping preferences if it allows mall operators to target student shoppers as a mall shopping segment in its own right. In an increasingly competitive market, information about mall shopping preferences might offer competitive advantage to mall operators and allow mall operators to be more responsive to customers.

This study therefore attempts to derive a model of mall shopping preferences from the literature and tests theory that relates different mall shopping preferences to levels of mall spending of a student market segment of the mall shopping market. In doing so, this study therefore extends the body of mall shopping literature into the South African mall shopping context in order to develop a contemporary understanding of the mall shopping characteristics of this segment of the mall shopping market.

This context is considered to be particularly important because Johannesburg is the economic hub of the country; findings in this context might reflect trends that may emerge in other areas of the country. The problem statement is now considered.

Problem Investigated and Objective of the Research

The problem addressed in this paper is the lack of knowledge (i) of the specific typology of mall motivations, or preferences, of students as a mall shopping segment within the Johannesburg market of mall shoppers and (ii) of the relationships between mall shopping preferences and mall spending. The aim of this research is therefore to investigate the relationships between mall shopping preferences and levels of student mall spending, and derive recommendations for theory and practice that may help malls and marketers to better understand this segment and manage their marketing to it.

The objective of this paper is therefore to test theory that relates differences in mall customer preferences to mall shopping behaviour. More specifically, the objective of the study is to determine the specific typology of mall shopping preferences that relate to this segment of the mall shopping market, and to determine to what extent these preferences are related to the mall shopping expenditure of individuals in this market. Therefore the research questions posed in this paper are the following:

1. What is the specific typology of mall shopping preferences that relates to this segment of the mall shopping market?
2. To what extent are different mall shopping preferences related to higher levels of mall shopping expenditure by individuals in this segment of the market?

Having outlined the problem addressed in this study and the research questions derived in order to address this lack of knowledge, the theoretical framework and hypotheses are now introduced.

Literature Review

The literature review is structured according to the following logic. South African mall shopping behaviour might reflect a temporal framework that shares characteristics with the different development trajectories of other societies. In other words, given the country's historical changes, economically it might be on a developmental path, sharing mall shopping characteristics with other markets at different periods in time. A contribution of this study is therefore to test theory that extends across different environments and across time to offer a contemporary typology of mall preferences at this point in time. Including literature across time and across different environments was therefore considered necessary to be able to do this.

Broad Overview of The Industry and The Field of Study

Mall shopping preferences have been researched extensively in the mall shopping industry. This has resulted in a relatively large body of international work. For example, mall shopping preferences have been studied in relation to needs for products or services (Tauber 1972:46), 'browsing' (Jarboe & McDaniel 1987: 46), gender differences (Hu & Jasper 2004), fashion-orientations (Park, Kim & Forney 2006: 433), store attributes (Hong & Koh 2002: 205), decision-making styles (Wesley, LeHew & Woodside 2006) and a host of other dimensions.

Similarly, across time a host of different typologies of mall shopping preferences have been developed (see Bloch, Ridgway and Dawson 1994:30; Dennis, Marsland and Cockett 2001:221, El-Adly 2007:941, Jarboe and

McDaniel 1987:50; Kuruvilla and Joshi 2010:260; Shim and Eastlick 1998:153; Sproles and Kendall 1986:267 and Stone 1954:36).

Certain of the characteristics of mall shoppers have been also found to be associated with higher levels of mall spending. Stone (1954:36) seminally characterised certain shoppers as economic, or primarily concerned with price, which had implications for the spending levels of these shoppers. Darden and Reynolds (1971:506) found support for Stone's (1954:36) categorisation. Jarboe and McDaniel (1987:51) found the most important, or dominant, mall shopping variables in their study to be brand awareness and the frequency of mall visits. However, what seems to underlie this body of historic mall shopping behaviour are variables that can be classified as mall shopping preferences that have been found to be present at different points in time and across different environments.

The Constructs Relevant to the Study

In the review of the literature which now follows, a categorisation of these mall preferences is derived. This categorisation comprises seven broad categories, namely

1. agglomeration economies (AE), or factors related to convenience, comparability of products and quicker shopping;
2. environmental factors (EF), such as atmosphere, the location of shops in a mall and congestion;
3. product-related factors (PF), such as choice of goods and services, quality, brand preference, affordability, ease of product search and the availability of sale products;
4. location factors (LF), such as proximity to residence and whether other shops are nearby;
5. mall reputation factors (MF), such as the community popularity of a mall, whether friends and family also shop at a mall and the influence of advertisements of the mall in the media;
6. sales tools factors (SF), such as whether a mall offers credit, vouchers, discounts or other offers; and (vii) attitudinal factors (AF), such as whether shopping at a mall is perceived to be the 'norm', 'trendy' or 'cool'.

Such a classification was taken to offer a relatively comprehensive perspective of mall shopping preferences across time and across different environments. For ease of presentation, these abbreviations are used as references in text to relate the discussion to each of these seven categories.

Location (LF) is important for mall operations (Cheng, Li & Yu 2007:884; Rousseau & Venter 2014:2; Susilawati, Yakobus & Sulistyawati 2002: internet), as demographic factors, including size and proximity of markets, can influence mall shopping income. Similarly, promotional mixes (SF) and advertising (MF) are typically found to be associated with mall shopping satisfaction (Singh & Prashar 2013:36; Ubeja & Bedia 2012:60).

The more knowledgeable customers are, the more likely it is that shops will need to take their preferences into account (Blois, Mandhachitara & Smith 2001:476). Preferences are not homogenous, however, and mall shoppers may prioritise different preferences over others. Mall shoppers with a strong preference for their favourite brands, or for a particular store, are typically less sensitive to the collective convenience (AE) offered by malls (Jarboe & McDaniel 1987:47). Sproles and Kendall (1986:267) classified certain mall shoppers as *price conscious* or 'value for money' consumers. Kuruvilla and Joshi (2010:260) also found certain mall shoppers to fall into a category they termed *price conscious shoppers* who support malls but are unhappy with the prices of items in malls (PF; SF). What is not clear from these findings, however, are whether these types of customers spend more or less in mall shopping.

The tension between price sensitivity and the lack of price sensitivity associated with luxury purchase preferences is present in the literature, but it is not clear which type of student customer spends more in gross terms. El-Adly (2007:938) found a category, *luxury*, to emerge, which related to the external appearance (EF) of the mall and its popularity. Bloch *et al.* (1994:33) also found a cluster, which they termed "*Mall Enthusiasts*", to purchase more, use the mall more and to be more inclined toward experiential (EF) consumption (Bloch *et al.* 1994:33). In other environments, students have been found to prefer accessibility (AE), the design of a mall (EF), entertainment facilities and food outlets (PF) (Astri, Kusuma & Tedjo 2011).

Anic and Radas (2006:730) tested relationships between levels of mall spending and physical surroundings, social surroundings (EF), time related factors, types of shopping task, and antecedent state, or number of stores patronised (AE). Time spend in a store (AE), social surroundings, high perceived density (EF) and large scale shopping (AE) were found to be associated with higher levels of mall spending, yet no differences in spending were found for types of shoppers grouped by their responses to store atmosphere (EF), time taken to travel to a store or time of the day shopping (AE) (Anic & Radas 2006:730). Wesley *et al.* (2006:545) found a positive relationship between planned mall expenditure levels and global mall shopping satisfaction. They conclude that the "dictum that shopping is more fun when you plan to spend money bears up" (Wesley *et al.* 2006:545).

Wesley *et al.* (2006:546) also found an interaction effect by gender and whereas annual income was found to be associated with planned spending levels, and more so for females than males, males with low incomes were found to have very low average expenditures. These relationships, however, cannot necessarily be assumed to generalise into the South African environment.

Different aspects of shopping-related behaviour have been studied in South Africa. Examples of research into shopping spending include studies of motor vehicle purchases (Beneke, Human & Wu 2010:129), consumer attitudes towards different types of products (PF), such as those relating to environmentally sensitive products in the form of green cosmetics (Beneke, Frey, Deuchar, Jacobs & Macready 2010) and image attributes (AF) associated with consumer store selection in Southern Gauteng (Dhurup & Oosthuyzen 2010:380).

Dhurup and Oosthuyzen (2010:380) found the following six attributes to be associated with store satisfaction and store loyalty: (i) employee interaction (EF), (ii) atmospherics (EF), (iii) merchandise variety (AE), (iv) facilities (EF), (v) value for money (PF; SF) and (vi) convenience (AE).

Employee interaction (EF) and convenience (AE) were not found to predict store satisfaction or store loyalty (Dhurup & Oosthuyzen 2010:391). Although these studies relate to subordinate aspects of mall shopping, they do not relate to mall shopping itself. Although conducted in the South African market, these studies also do not relate to student populations.

Mandhlazi *et al.* (2013:153), in their study in the Kempton Park region of Gauteng, found South African Generation Y consumers (the age cohort of those born between 1980 and 1994) to fall into seven primary shopping styles; these being (i) quality conscious shoppers (PF); (ii) brand conscious shoppers (PF); (iii) novelty seeking shoppers (EF); (iv) hedonistic shoppers (EF;PF); (v) shoppers confused by overchoice (EF); (vi) habitual and brand loyal shoppers (PF); and (vii) fashion conscious shoppers (AF). They also found younger shoppers to be more likely to be confused by overchoice than older shoppers (Mandhlazi *et al.* 2013:153). Understanding Generation Y is important because there are differences between this cohort and its predecessors in terms of loyalty, stated purchasing preferences and perceptions of brand personalities (PF) (Hwa, Lee & Cheng 2011:1083).

Dhurup and Tusiime (2011:517) found South African students' impulsive apparel buying motivations to fall into four component categories, or factors: (i) fashion involvement (AF), (ii) hedonic motivation (AF), (iii) emotional gratification (AF) and (iv) affect (AF). They also found hedonic motivation and emotional gratification related to impulsive buying tendencies to differ between males and females (Dhurup & Tusiime 2011:517).

On the basis of the literature reviewed above, the following hypothesis is derived: that *mall shopping preferences are significantly associated with levels of mall shopping spending*. The methodological processes applied in the study in order to test the hypothesised relationships between these categories and mall spending are now explained and discussed.

Methodology

Research Design

A cross-sectional research design was applied. The study was grounded in the post-positivist paradigm (Cresswell 2003). First, a categorisation was undertaken, and seven overarching dimensions of mall shopping preferences were derived on the basis of a thorough exploratory review of the literature. Then multiple linear regression analysis was applied.

Study Population

Given that the international context of mall shopping is dynamic and is always changing (Nicholls *et al.* 2002:149), and that the South African mall shopping context is no exception (Tustin & Strydom 2006:48), in order to provide an up to date, or contemporary, perspective of the relationships under study, a 2014 sample was required. A first year Economics class at a large regional South African university was used as the population for this study.

A demographic profile of the respondents was compiled. Of the 641 respondents, 13.1% identified themselves as Black, 4.2% as White, 17.9% as Coloured, 1.2% as Indian, 1.1% as Asian, and 49.9% either indicated their race as 'other' or used this category instead of the others. Ethics committee approval was obtained from the university's Ethics Committee. Participation was voluntary. Of those choosing to participate, 641 usable responses formed the basis for data analysis.

From Table 1, which reports the descriptive statistics for the preference items, it can be seen that respondents are most likely to report high preferences for a pleasant atmosphere in a mall and for its proximity to where one lives. Least highly valued across the sample are cheap products and mall advertising.

Sampling Design

A process of non-probability comprehensive sampling was used. All the students present on certain days were sampled, using hard copies of questionnaires. This resulted in a sample size of over six hundred respondents. Anonymity was guaranteed, and no attempt was made to subsequently contact those who did not agree to participate. An acknowledged limitation of this process is that students with poor attendance may be underrepresented in the sample.

Another limitation arose from the sampling process. Students seemed to object to being categorised by 'race' and almost half classified themselves as 'other'. Similarly, due to the high numbers of respondents that did not classify themselves as female or male, these items were dropped from the analysis. The other categories of items were not affected.

Design of the Questionnaire

The design of the questionnaire was based on precedent. It was first piloted using a sample of 492 respondents, of which about half were students and half were not. Non-probability convenience sampling was used for the pilot study. Seven dimensions of mall shopping preferences were first derived from the mall shopping literature. In order to operationalise these dimensions, Likert-type scale items were developed, while faithfully following the principles of content validity. Other scale items were used to capture demographic information and to measure self-report measures of daily and month-end mall spending.

The individual scale items that were used in this study are reported in the results and discussion sections that follow. These items can therefore be used in further research to replicate these findings. In order to avoid the 'file drawer problem', where bias accumulates in the literature due to only positive associations or findings being submitted to journals (and results end up remaining in 'file drawers'), or where only significant relationships are published (Rosenthal 1979:638; Scargle 2000:91), further researchers are encouraged to replicate this study using the same scales. Table 1, below, reports the descriptive statistics for the mall shopping preference variables.

Table 1:
Descriptive Statistics for Mall Shopping Preference Variables

| VARIABLES | Mean | Median | Std. deviation | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|--|------|--------|----------------|----------|----------|
| AGGLOMERATION ECONOMIES | 6.05 | 7 | 1.377 | -1.648 | 2.482 |
| AE2-"I can compare similar products in shops close to each other" (Comparison) | 5.05 | 5 | 1.679 | -.577 | -.343 |
| AE3-"I can get my shopping done faster" (Time Saving) | 5.35 | 6 | 1.658 | -.851 | -.011 |
| ENVIRONMENT (ENV1)- "Due to its pleasant atmosphere" (Atmosphere) | 5.43 | 6 | 1.634 | -.901 | .122 |
| ENV2- "I like the way in which the shops in this mall are located" (Layout) | 5.09 | 5 | 1.654 | -.624 | -.310 |
| ENV3- "There is less congestion and crowds" (Density) | 4.14 | 4 | 1.908 | -.172 | -.952 |
| PRODUCTS (PROD1)- "It offers a greater choice of goods and services" (Choice) | 5.49 | 6 | 1.574 | -.984 | .405 |
| PROD2-"It offers better quality products than elsewhere" (Quality) | 4.61 | 4 | 1.624 | -.241 | -.354 |
| PROD3-"It offers more famous brands than elsewhere" (Brands) | 4.26 | 4 | 1.764 | -.176 | -.596 |

| | | | | | |
|--|------|---|-------|--------|--------|
| PROD4-“Due to the unique brands offered by retailers” (Unique Brands) | 4.8 | 5 | 1.789 | -.531 | -.489 |
| PROD5-“The products are generally cheaper” (Cost) | 3.56 | 4 | 1.629 | -.034 | -.413 |
| PROD6-“I always find products I am looking for”(Ease of Search) | 5.41 | 6 | 1.581 | -.935 | .291 |
| PROD7-“I can buy a large amount of sale products together” (Cost Volume) | 4.59 | 4 | 1.675 | -.324 | -.454 |
| LOCATION (LOC1)-“It is close to my home” (Proximity) | 5.54 | 7 | 1.999 | -1.164 | .014 |
| LOC2-“There are no similar shops close to my home” (Geographic Scarcity) | 4.75 | 5 | 2.126 | -.553 | -1.026 |
| MALL REPUTATION (MALLREP1) “It is popular in my community” (Community) | 4.99 | 5 | 1.867 | -.725 | -.382 |
| MALLREP2-“My friends and family shop here also” (Family and Friends) | 4.59 | 5 | 1.999 | -.492 | -.880 |
| MALLREP3-“Due to the advertisements I have seen of this mall in the media” (Media) | 3.02 | 3 | 1.737 | .394 | -1.000 |
| SALES TOOLS (ST1)-“Some of the mall retailers offer credit”(Credit) | 4.2 | 5 | 1.906 | .409 | -.646 |
| ST2-“Some mall retailers provide vouchers, discounts and other offers” (Savings) | 4.05 | 4 | 1.973 | -.122 | -.766 |
| ATTITUDES1- “It is the ‘norm’ to shop in a shopping mall” (Norm) | 3.93 | 4 | 2.01 | -.069 | -1.017 |
| ATTITUDES2- “It is ‘trendy’ and ‘cool’ to shop in a shopping mall” (Image) | 3.74 | 4 | 2.055 | .081 | -1.101 |

N=224

Source: Author’s own analysis. SPSS 22 used for calculations

Results and Discussion

Due to poor convergent and discriminant validity, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used in order to better understand the component categories underlying the measures. Six component categories were found to emerge (Table 2). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy value (0.795) and Bartlett’s test of sphericity (Chi-Square=3190.79;df=231;p<0.0001) results suggested that the sampling adequacy of the EFA was acceptable. The six categories are discussed as follows.

Table 2:
Rotated component matrix of mall factor preference factors

| | Component | | | | | |
|----------|-----------|-------|------|-------|-------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| AGGECON1 | .078 | -.135 | .508 | .522 | -.079 | .101 |
| AGGECON2 | .228 | -.124 | .311 | -.032 | .141 | .528 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| AGGECON3 | .015 | -.063 | .630 | .307 | .028 | .161 |
| ENVIRON1 | .547 | -.013 | .541 | -.050 | .022 | -.054 |
| ENVIRON2 | .433 | .188 | .425 | -.037 | .136 | .146 |
| ENVIRON3 | .085 | .172 | .659 | -.112 | -.071 | -.094 |
| PRODUCTS1 | .756 | -.063 | .133 | .035 | .049 | .126 |
| PRODUCTS2 | .757 | .130 | .144 | -.061 | -.007 | -.052 |
| PRODUCTS3 | .744 | .154 | -.069 | -.136 | .121 | -.009 |
| PRODUCTS4 | .667 | .209 | .004 | -.028 | .034 | .137 |
| PRODUCTS5 | -.089 | .325 | -.095 | .167 | -.123 | .581 |
| PRODUCTS6 | .602 | -.114 | .131 | .265 | -.064 | .169 |
| PRODUCTS7 | .239 | .098 | -.003 | -.014 | .063 | .680 |
| LOCATION1 | -.287 | -.007 | .118 | .730 | -.044 | .086 |
| LOCATION2 | -.138 | .026 | -.008 | .257 | .315 | .238 |
| MALLREP1 | .179 | .232 | -.079 | .633 | .342 | -.011 |
| MALLREP2 | .248 | .433 | -.092 | .497 | .138 | -.267 |
| MALLREP3 | .139 | .629 | -.061 | .144 | .117 | -.062 |
| SALESTOOLS1 | .026 | .791 | .085 | -.021 | .075 | .115 |
| SALESTOOLS2 | .084 | .661 | .170 | -.044 | .103 | .344 |
| ATTITUDES1 | -.037 | .078 | -.046 | .047 | .827 | .002 |
| ATTITUDES2 | .253 | .181 | .054 | .019 | .770 | .013 |
| Notes: | | | | | | |
| SPSS 22 used for calculations. | | | | | | |
| Extraction Method: Principal component analysis | | | | | | |
| Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization | | | | | | |
| Rotation converged in 15 iterations | | | | | | |
| Source: Authors' own analysis | | | | | | |

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Two models were run using multiple linear regression analysis. First, a model was calculated for levels of spending per day as dependent variable. The R value for this regression model was 0.219, the R-Squared value was 0.048 and the adjusted R-Squared value was 0.039, with a standard error of the estimate value of 1.211. The model was significant ($F=5.323; p<0.0001$). The models were checked for the requirements of multiple linear regression analysis, and were found to be acceptable. The regression model equation is shown below as Equation 1. The first item in the equation is the intercept. Each of the other terms in the equation start with the unstandardised Beta coefficient, followed by the name of the component category, and these are followed in turn by the standardised Beta value and the p value which denotes the significance of the association.

$$Y = 2.888(p < 0.0001) + 0.239 \text{ Products}(\beta = .193; p < 0.0001) + 0.015 \text{ Media Factors}(\beta = .012; p < 0.749) + 0.023 \text{ Convenience}(\beta = 0.019; p < 0.624) - 0.061 \text{ Residence}(\beta = -0.049; p < 0.205) + 0.031 \text{ Image}(\beta = 0.025; p < 0.515) - 0.104 \text{ Cost}(\beta = -0.084; p < 0.031)$$

Equation 1

Next, a model was calculated for levels of spending at month ends as dependent variable. The R value for this regression model was 0.139, the R-Squared value was 0.019 and the adjusted R-Squared value was 0.01. The model returned an F value that was on the border of the five percent level of significance ($F = 2.096$; $p < 0.052$). The equation for this regression equation model is shown below as Equation 2.

$$Y = 3.891(p < 0.0001) + 0.147 \text{ Products}(\beta = .107; p < 0.007) + 0.035 \text{ Media Factors}(\beta = 0.026; p < 0.516) + 0.06 \text{ Convenience}(\beta = 0.044; p < 0.265) - 0.058 \text{ Residence}(\beta = -0.043; p < 0.277) + 0.031 \text{ Image}(\beta = 0.023; p < 0.566) - 0.075 \text{ Cost}(\beta = -0.055; p < 0.162)$$

Equation 2

According to Equation 1, there is a significant and positive association between the product component category (Factor 1) and daily mall spending. Individuals with a preference for low cost shopping (Factor 6) are found to be associated with significantly lower levels of daily mall shopping spending. These are the only two significant variables in the equation. On the basis of these results, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

The significance of the 'Products' component category (comprising pleasant atmosphere, layout, choice of goods and services, quality products, famous brands, unique brands and being able to find products) echoes the literature that has identified brands as a dominant aspect of mall shopping (Jarboe & McDaniel 1987:51). It also reflects South African literature relating to store attribute preferences for atmosphere, product variety, which were found to be related to store satisfaction and loyalty (Dhurup & Oosthuizen 2010:380).

These findings, however, contrast with other findings that store atmosphere is not necessarily associated with mall spending (Anic & Radas 2006:730). It is also possible that the significance of the 'Products' component category may also be related to store preferences. It is possible that store characteristics are the primary factor in this model that underlies levels of mall spending in general.

This component category is also aligned with two of the seven primary shopping styles of Generation Y shoppers, namely those that relate to quality consciousness and brand consciousness (Mandhlazi *et al.* 2013:153). It is possible that the higher spending segment of the student market have product related preferences which makes the portfolio of shops within a mall and what they sell particularly important for malls wanting to compete for this market.

The lack of significant associations of the 'Media Factors' component category with mall spending might suggest that shoppers with a preference for media factors may be 'spread out' across those with different levels of spending. This is therefore not taken to potentially be a factor that differentiates high or low spending market segments for this market. The same can be said for a preference for convenience, proximity to residence and image value of the mall.

A preference for cheaper products, sales products and the comparison of products in shops close to each other, however, does seem to be a component category that malls might be able to use to differentiate low spending student shoppers from the rest of their cohort. This factor has a long history in the mall shopping literature as a dominant characteristic of shoppers (Darden & Reynolds 1971:506; Dhurup & Oosthuizen 2010:380; Kuruvilla & Joshi 2010:260; Sproles & Kendall 1986:267; Stone 1954:36).

According to Equation 2, notwithstanding the non-significance of the model, only the product component category (Factor 1) is significantly associated with month end spending. This result conforms to the discussion above, at least as it relates to daily spending. It is possible that for monthly spending, a concern for costs is not unique to a segment any longer but may be relatively more common; sufficiently so that this cannot be used to differentiate

segments within this market. Having discussed the results, implications in the form of recommendations for the management of mall shopping are now considered.

Conclusions And Recommendations

The objective of this research was to test a model that predicted that certain categories of mall shopping customer preferences would be associated with higher levels of daily and month end spending. After testing the factor structure of these preferences, it was found that they loaded on six component categories different to the initial model. These component categories related to 'Products', 'Media Factors', 'Convenience', 'Residence', 'Image', and 'Cost'. However, only two of these component categories (Products, which was positively associated with levels of daily mall spending, and Cost, which was negatively associated with daily mall spending) were found to be associated with higher levels of daily spending.

Only the Products category was positively associated with month end spending. On the basis of these results it is suggested that only these two categories might be useful in identifying market segments of the student mall shopping market that spend significantly more or less within this target market.

It is recommended that mall operators and marketers in an environment of scarce resources focus on brand communications to student markets that stress atmosphere, the way shops are laid out, greater choice in goods and services, the quality of products available, the variety of famous brands, unique products offered and the availability of products in a mall. By focusing on these aspects of mall shopping above others, it might be possible to satisfy the highest spending segment of the student mall shopping market. More specifically, we recommend that these areas be a special focus for mall operators, over and above a focus on competing priorities.

It is argued that this study provides value to mall operators and marketers in an environment of outshopping, where members of communities are increasingly shopping outside the geographical area of their community (Strydom 2011:150). Individuals falling into the higher spending segment of the student market were not found to have preferences relating to residential proximity.

This suggests that in order to attract this segment shopping malls cannot rely on geographical advantages alone; malls may be facing competition from other malls on the basis of factors other than geography (in this case product-related factors in particular). In order to attract this segment, and not to lose the custom of this segment of the student market, if malls are better able to service their communities, then they can reduce the risk of losing market share from this group through outshopping, and through competition with other malls (Strydom 2011:150), or even with the retail offerings of the city centre, which also include low cost offerings of street traders (Callaghan 2010:100; 2012:83). These results therefore suggest that these people do not simply shop at the mall that is closest to them.

Given that South African shoppers can differ in their shopping behaviours in relation to other international markets (Petzer 2011:384), it remains important to continually provide knowledge of relatively up-to-date mall shopping preferences, particularly in the form that future research can combine in meta-analysis studies to predict trends in mall shopping over time, particularly in potentially high income markets such as business-related professional fields.

References

- Anić, I., & Radas, S. (2006). The impact of situational factors on purchasing outcomes in the Croatian hypermarket retailer. *Ekonomski pregled*, 57(11), 730-752.
- Sari, A. A., Kusuma, H. E., & Tedjo, B. (2015). A Strategic Planning For A College Student-Segment Shopping Mall. *International research journal of business studies*, 4(2).
- Bell, S. M., McCallum, R. S., & Cox, E. A. (2003). Toward a research-based assessment of dyslexia using cognitive measures to identify reading disabilities. *Journal of learning disabilities*, 36(6), 505-516.
- Beneke, J., Frey, N., Deuchar, F., Jacobs, A., & Macready, L. (2010). Towards an understanding of the influences on attitude towards green cosmetics in South Africa. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 7, 477-491.
- Beneke, J., Human, G., & Wu, J. (2010). An investigation into South African consumers' willingness to purchase new Chinese and Indian motor vehicles. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 7, 129-145.
- Bloch, P. H., Ridgway, N. M., & Dawson, S. A. (1994). The shopping mall as consumer habitat. *Journal of retailing*, 70(1), 23-42.

- Blois, K., Mandhachitara, R., & Smith, T. (2001). Retailing in Bangkok: An intriguing example of agglomeration. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 29(10), 472-479.
- Callaghan, C. W. (2010). *Entrepreneurial orientation and entrepreneurial performance of central Johannesburg informal sector street traders* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Callaghan, C. (2012). The effect of financial capital on inner-city street trading. *Journal of Economic and Financial Sciences*, 5(1), 83-102.
- Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological bulletin*, 56(2), 81.
- Cheng, E. W., Li, H., & Yu, L. (2007). A GIS approach to shopping mall location selection. *Building and Environment*, 42(2), 884-892.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- Darden, W. R., & Reynolds, F. D. (1971). Shopping orientations and product usage rates. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 8(4), 505-508.
- Dennis, C., Marsland, D., & Cockett, W. A. (2001). The mystery of consumer behaviour: market segmentation and shoppers' choices of shopping centres.
- Dhurup, M., & Tusiime, R. (2011). Impulsive buying behaviour of apparel merchandise among university students in southern Gauteng. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 8, 517-539.
- Dhurup, M., & Oosthuizen, A. (2010). Salient store image attributes in consumer store selection decisions and the relationship with store satisfaction and loyalty.
- Dhurup, M., Mafini, C., & Mathaba, R. L. (2013). Store Image Factors Influencing Store Choice among Sportswear Consumers: Baseline Findings from South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(14), 359.
- Ismail El-Adly, M. (2007). Shopping malls attractiveness: a segmentation approach. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 35(11), 936-950.
- Hair Jr, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2016). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Sage Publications.
- Hong, H., & Koh, A. (2002). Benefit segmentation of the Korean female apparel market: importance of store attributes. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 20(4), 205-214.
- Hu, H., & Jasper, C. R. (2004). Men and women: a comparison of shopping mall behavior. *Journal of Shopping Center Research*, 11(1), 113-131.
- Hwa, E. T. B., Lee, E. L. W., & Cheng, R. (2011). Generation y and choice of mobile service provider: A study on their purchasing decisions in choosing a mobile service provider. In *2nd International Conference on Business and economic Research Proceeding* (pp. 1083-1101).
- Jarboe, G. R., & McDaniel, C. D. (1987). A profile of browsers in regional shopping malls. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 15(1), 46-53.
- Kuruvilla, S. J., & Joshi, N. (2010). Influence of demographics, psychographics, shopping orientation, mall shopping attitude and purchase patterns on mall patronage in India. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 17(4), 259-269.
- Ligthelm, A. A. (2008). The impact of shopping mall development on small township retailers. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 11(1), 37-53.
- Mandhlazi, L., Dhurup, M., & Mafini, C. (2013). Generation Y consumer shopping styles: evidence from South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(14), 153.
- Nicholls, J. A. F., Li, F., Kranendonk, C. J., & Roslow, S. (2002). The seven year itch? Mall shoppers across time. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 19(2), 149-165.
- Joo Park, E., Young Kim, E., & Cardona Forney, J. (2006). A structural model of fashion-oriented impulse buying behavior. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 10(4), 433-446.
- Petzer, D. J. (2011). Investigating mobile marketing acceptance of urban South Africans residing in Gauteng. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 8, 384-407.
- Roberts-Lombard, M. (2011). Customer retention through customer relationship management: The exploration of two-way communication and conflict handling. *African journal of business management*, 5(9), 3487.
- Rosenthal, R. (1979). The file drawer problem and tolerance for null results. *Psychological bulletin*, 86(3), 638.
- Rousseau, G. G., & Venter, D. J. (2014). Mall shopping preferences and patronage of mature shoppers. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 40(1), 01-12.
- Scargle, Jd. (2000). Publication bias: The "file-drawer" problem in scientific inference. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 14(1), 91-106.

- Shim, S., & Eastlick, M. A. (1998). The hierarchical influence of personal values on mall shopping attitude and behavior. *Journal of Retailing*, 74(1), 139-160.
- Singh, H., & Prashar, S. (2013). Factors Defining Shopping Experience: An Analytical Study of Dubai. *Asian Journal of Business Research*, 3(1).
- Sprotles, G. B., & Kendall, E. L. (1986). A methodology for profiling consumers' decision-making styles. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 20(2), 267-279.
- Stone, G. P. (1954). City shoppers and urban identification: observations on the social psychology of city life. *American Journal of Sociology*, 36-45.
- Strydom, J. W. (2011). Retailing in disadvantaged communities: the outshopping phenomenon revisited. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 8, 150-172.
- Susilawati, C., Yakobus, S., & Sulistyawati, L. (2002). The influence of travel time and size of shopping center towards the frequencies of visiting customers in shopping centers in surabaya. In *PRRES Conference Proceedings*. Pacific Rim Real Estate Society.
- Synodinos, C., Bevan-Dye, A. L., & De Klerk, N. (2013). Influence of Conative Attitudes towards Green Advertising on Black Generation Y Students' Environmental Behaviour. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(3), 17.
- Tauber, E. M. (1972). Why do people shop?. *The Journal of Marketing*, 46-49.
- Tustin, D. H., & Strydom, J. W. (2006). The potential impact of formal retail chains' expansion strategies on retail township development in South Africa. *Southern African Business Review*, 10(3), 48-66.
- Ubeja, S. K., & Bedia, D. D. (2012). Customer satisfaction in shopping malls: an empirical study. *Pacific Business Review International*, 5(2), 60-72.
- Urban, B. (2006). Entrepreneurship in the rainbow nation: Effect of cultural values and ESE on intentions. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 11(03), 171-186.
- Wesley, S., LeHew, M., & Woodside, A. G. (2006). Consumer decision-making styles and mall shopping behavior: Building theory using exploratory data analysis and the comparative method. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(5), 535-548.