

---

# Consumers' perceptions of e-shopping characteristics: an expectancy-value approach

---

Heejin Lim and  
Alan J. Dubinsky

---

## The authors

Heejin Lim is a Doctoral Candidate and Alan J. Dubinsky is Professor, both in the Department of Consumer Sciences and Retailing, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, USA.

---

## Keywords

Electronic commerce, Internet, Shopping, Expectation, Value analysis, Attitudes

---

## Abstract

An increasing number of consumers are turning to the Internet to make their purchases. Yet, many e-tailers are going out of business or retrenching. If e-tailers hope to attract and retain satisfied online shoppers, they need to know what evaluative criteria consumers use when selecting an e-tailer. Past research has provided some insight into what characteristics shoppers assess in cyberspace outlets. The extant work, though, has not been without its limitations. Consequently, the present study utilizes a literature review, qualitative research, and quantitative research to identify the underlying e-store choice dimensions of shoppers. In addition, results of multiple regression analysis show that merchandise and interactivity Web attributes are predictors of consumers' attitude toward online shopping. Implications for e-store managers and future research are also provided.

---

## Electronic access

The Emerald Research Register for this journal is available at  
[www.emeraldinsight.com/researchregister](http://www.emeraldinsight.com/researchregister)

The current issue and full text archive of this journal is available at  
[www.emeraldinsight.com/0887-6045.htm](http://www.emeraldinsight.com/0887-6045.htm)

An executive summary for managers can be found at the end of this article.

Internet shopping is becoming an accepted way to purchase various types of goods and services (Donthu, 1999). In 2001, online sales were \$48.3 billion, representing an annual growth rate of 45.9 percent, and online sales are expected to grow to \$108 billion by 2003 (Shim *et al.*, 2001). Through a computer-mediated shopping environment, online retailers have attracted consumers by offering a reduction in search costs for products and product-related information (Janssen and Moraga, 2000; Shankar *et al.*, 1999).

Attendant with the explosion in Internet shopping is tremendously increasing interest in e-commerce research, particularly with respect to e-shopping attributes. For instance, previous researchers have examined e-store characteristics as predictors of online consumers' intention (Shim *et al.*, 2001), satisfaction (Szymansky and Hise, 2000), and acceptance of new technology (Morrison and Roberts, 1998). In these studies, e-store characteristics were developed from either qualitative research (e.g. Morrison and Roberts, 1998; Szymansky and Hise, 2000; Yoo and Donthu, 2001) or a literature review (e.g. Shim *et al.*, 2001).

Notwithstanding the extant literature, there are limitations in previous studies that demand attention. First, there has been discordance in categorizing e-shopping attributes. For example, some studies have included the navigation function (e.g. access to the Web site, locating an item on the Web site) with convenience characteristics (e.g. Morrison and Roberts, 1998; Shim *et al.*, 2001), yet others have classified these attributes as two independent criteria (e.g. Lohse and Spiller, 1998).

Another problem with prior work on e-store dimensions lies in the inconsistent research methods. For example, Lohse and Spiller (1998) attempted to identify attributes of online retail stores in terms of merchandise, service, promotion, convenience, and navigation. Their findings, however, were predicated on a survey of stores rather than consumers – thus, critical consumer input regarding e-tailer Web site characteristics was overlooked. As a result, they analyzed only descriptive attributes of e-stores (e.g. merchandise, service, promotion, convenience, navigation) but did not consider other attributes that are reported to be important factors affecting cyber shoppers' online transactions, such as security and privacy policies

---

The authors gratefully acknowledge the editor and reviewers for their valuable input and encouragement.



(eMarketer, 2001b, c), as well as download waiting time (Dellaert and Kahn, 1999; Weinberg, 2000).

The foregoing weaknesses in previous research indicate additional empirical work is needed to identify evaluative criteria consumers consider when selecting a cyberspace store. By knowing these criteria, e-tailers should be able to enhance the design of their commercial sites and quality of service fulfillment in order to increase customers' positive attitude about a given e-tailer.

Consequently, a study was designed to explore consumers' perceptions of e-shopping attributes, including Web site design and service fulfillment, *vis-à-vis* online shopping attitude. We did so utilizing an expectancy-value approach, as promulgated by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975). Although previous studies categorized e-shopping attributes using either a literature review or qualitative research, the present investigation identifies e-shopping attributes through a literature review (i.e. traditional retail stores, home-based shopping such as TV and paper catalogs, online shopping), qualitative research, and quantitative research. Exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis are conducted to create profile categories shared by multiple attributes. Then, multiple regression analysis is employed to examine the impact of these underlying e-store dimensions on consumers' attitude towards online purchase.

An e-store can be defined as a commercial Web site on which consumers can shop and make a purchase. E-stores can be operated by either a pure player (i.e. a retailer that has only an online outlet) or a traditional retailer (i.e. a retailer that owns both brick-and-mortar stores as well as an online outlet). In this study, attributes of general e-stores (i.e. both pure players and traditional retailers) are considered. Essentially, then, the objectives of the study are to:

- (1) determine the underlying dimensions of consumers' perceptions of e-shopping attributes; and
- (2) explore their effect on consumers' attitude toward online purchasing.

## Literature review

Lindquist (1974) has underlined the importance of store image as a predictor of consumers' store choice. A person's behavior is not only a function of knowledge and information but also is predicated on the consumer's image of a product or store. From a marketer's viewpoint, store image is characterized by two elements:

- (1) a store's "tangible or functional qualities" (e.g. merchandise selection, price ranges, credit policies, store layout); and
- (2) "intangible or psychological attributes" (e.g. a sense of belonging, the feeling of warmth or friendliness, a feeling of excitement or interest).

"Attributes" represent the combined concept of functional and psychological factors that exist in a store. When making a store choice decision, consumers evaluate store alternatives on a number of store attributes (Lindquist, 1974). Patrons and non-patrons have different perceptions of a store's image. As such, retailers need to ensure that dimensions that their loyal customers view as being important are designed to be attractive to them.

Similarly, e-store image is likely to have a major influence on online customers when they determine from which e-tailer to buy. E-store image, though, will likely be defined differently from bricks-and-mortar store image. After all, the way in which consumers shop in e-tail venues is different from how they shop in a physical store, owing to the absence of a physical store milieu. Conceivably, then, consumers seemingly will likely assess some unique store attributes in online shopping *vis-à-vis* those utilized in physical store shopping.

Arguably, e-stores do share *some* common features with a physical store in terms of merchandise, service, and promotion. There is also some similarity between traditional modes of in-home shopping, such as TV and catalog shopping, and online shopping. Owing to the nature of computer-mediated communication, however, online retail stores have unique features that do not exist in either the physical store or in-home shopping. Prior to developing *e-stores'* unique attributes, those of the physical store and in-home shopping (TV and catalogs) are discussed. Features of each shopping alternative are identified through a review of literature pertaining to store image and consumer store choice.

### Evaluative criteria of physical retail stores

Sheth (1983) expanded determinants of store choice by classifying consumers' shopping motives into two levels: functional and non-functional. Functional motives involve tangible features (such as price, convenience, and merchandise assortment); non-functional motives involve intangible features (such as store atmosphere, sales personnel service, and psychological reasons for shopping). By evaluating functional and non-functional qualities of a retail store simultaneously, consumers form their store image (Lindquist, 1974). Consumers ultimately choose a store that

maximizes their satisfaction with these perceived qualities (Sheth, 1983). Retail physical store characteristics identified by previous researchers are presented in Table I.

#### Evaluative criteria of in-home shopping

Traditional in-home shopping venues have included chiefly TV and catalog shopping. Shopping via TV affords consumers the opportunity to experience convenience through reduced shopping costs vis-à-vis physical effort. A distinct feature of TV shopping over catalog shopping is the role of the host/hostess. Also, the entertainment aspect of TV shopping appears to be an important factor for senior citizens (*USA Today Magazine*, 1997). Catalog shopping has carried consumers' favor with enhanced merchandise variety, as well as the reliability and security that can be garnered from established companies. Also, consumers seem to like catalog shopping owing to its ease of use: products tend to be clearly portrayed, and product information provides rapid comparisons. Moreover, telephone associates are available to help answer consumers' questions about products and services (*Consumer Reports Buying Guide*, 2000).

In-home shopping, however, can present certain disadvantages, such as the intangibility of products and relatively high shipping and handling fees (thus increasing the catalog's effective cost to the consumer). For example, one study found a

high incidence of consumer complaints about bad quality and poor delivery with TV shopping (Benterud and Stø, 1993). Also, consumers often complain about out-of-stock merchandise (*Consumer Reports Buying Guide*, 2000). For these reasons, consumers likely feel impelled to pay heed to shipping and handling information, satisfaction guarantees, and availability of a toll-free phone number to minimize dissatisfaction from home-based shopping. A summary of in-home shopping attributes is presented in Table II. (It is based solely on paper catalog shopping research, however, as prior work has not investigated TV shopping characteristics.)

#### Evaluative criteria of e-tailers

Online retail stores have some similar features to physical retail stores and catalogs. For example, online retailers offer e-mail addresses of sales associates or frequently asked questions (FAQ) sections to communicate with their customers, just as physical stores have sales personnel. Also, they share common attributes with paper catalogs by providing consumers with the convenience of in-home shopping and purchase delivery. And like catalogs, retail Web sites typically provide a toll-free telephone number through which their customers may contact sales associates for further information. Compared to other retail formats, however, many online retail stores have the advantage of seemingly unlimited merchandise

Table I Relevant attributes of physical retail stores

Factors	Attributes	Berry (1969)	Lindquist (1974)	Tigert (1983)	McDaniel and Burnett (1990)
Merchandise	Wide selection	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Numerous brands		✓		✓
	Well-known brands			✓	✓
	Availability in stock			✓	✓
	Price	✓	✓	✓	
Product quality	Value for money	✓		✓	✓
Convenience	Locational convenience	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Parking		✓		✓
	Moving through a store				✓
	Location of items				✓
	Exchange				✓
Physical facilities	Acceptance of credit cards				✓
	Store attractiveness	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sales personnel	Friendliness/courtesy	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Information service	✓	✓	✓	✓
Service	Ease of returns	✓	✓		
	Delivery service	✓	✓		
Promotions	Sales promotion	✓	✓		
	Advertising	✓	✓		
Institutional factors	Reputation		✓		
	Reliability		✓		
Clientele of a store	Social class appeal		✓		
	Self-image congruency		✓		

Table II Relevant attributes of home-based shopping

Catalog factors	Attributes	Eastlick (1989)	McDonald (1993)	Seaver and Simpson (1995)
Merchandise	Quality	✓		
	Assortment	✓		
	Style	✓		
	Price	✓	✓	✓
	Uniqueness	✓	✓	
	Availability of merchandise in stock	✓	✓	
Convenience	Accessibility	✓		
	Time-saving	✓		
	Effort-saving	✓		
	Ease of order placement	✓	✓	
	Method of payment	✓	✓	
Ease of catalog use	Easy to find merchandise		✓	
	Well-displayed merchandise		✓	
	Easy to read and understand		✓	✓
Home environment Service	Comfort at home	✓		
	Guarantees	✓	✓	
	Ease of merchandise return	✓	✓	
	Delivery service	✓	✓	
Promotions	Clearance			✓
Reputation	Recommendation by friends		✓	
	Well-known national brands		✓	
	Trust company's merchandise		✓	

and product information. Furthermore, e-tailer store design and layout have distinct features compared to those found in physical stores and paper catalogs (Spiller and Lohse, 1998).

The e-shopping attributes presented in Table III were drawn from an analysis of literature pertaining to physical retail stores, paper catalogs, and e-tailers. However, store dimensions of a physical store that are *not* applicable for online outlets (e.g. clientele of the store, physical facilities, store atmosphere) were excluded.

E-shopping attributes presented in Table III are now discussed.

#### *Merchandise characteristics*

Merchandise can be defined as either goods or services offered by a retail store (Eastlick, 1989; Lindquist, 1974). Because of the unique nature of the Internet-mediated shopping environment, consumers' evaluation criteria for e-tailer merchandise might be somewhat different from those for traditional retailers. For instance, unlike

Table III Summary of e-shopping attributes used in previous studies

E-store factors	Attributes	Examples
Merchandise	Product information	The perceived depth of product information
	Brand selection	Well-known national brands
	Price	Merchandise price
Convenience	Timely delivery	Delivery on time, delivery options
	Ease of ordering	Fast check-out, order confirmation by e-mail
	Product display	Product lists with both click buttons and pictures
Interactivity	Customer support	Software downloading, e-form inquiry, order status checking, customer comment and feedback
	Personal-choice helper	Keyword search, improved search function
Reliability	Surfer postings	Customers' review of product/service experience
	Reputation	Company information
	Security	Information on transaction security
	Privacy	Privacy policies for personal information
Promotions	Promotion on the cybermall home page	Clearance, free shipping, frequent buyer incentives, prize for participation
Navigation	Time to get to home pages	The time taken from ads on other sites to home pages
	Expected waiting time	The perceived duration of the time to download pages on the site
	Waiting information	Duration information at the beginning of the wait, countdown information

a physical store, e-tailers can provide customers with as much variety as they want without physical space restrictions. Also, consumers can compare product prices more easily than ever before. E-tailer dimensions traditionally ascribed to merchandise-related aspects include product information, brand selection, and price.

As in catalog shopping, accurate reproduction of descriptive and experiential *product information* is a critical factor influencing consumers' choice in electronic shopping because consumers cannot touch or see products (Alba *et al.*, 1997; Lohse and Spiller, 1998; Lynch and Ariely, 2000; Ward and Lee, 2000). Interestingly, despite the advantage of the lower cost in delivering text and images through the Internet versus paper catalogs, more than 50 percent of e-tailer sites provide fewer than three lines of text describing each product (Lohse and Spiller, 1998).

Previous studies about store attributes have shown that merchandise selection has an influence on consumers' store choice (Berry, 1969; Lindquist, 1974; McDaniel and Burnett, 1990; Tigert, 1983). The vast number of product alternatives is a key benefit for online retailers. However, Alba *et al.* (1997) argue that consumers might become tired and stressed by examining information on hundreds of products. Lohse and Spiller (1998) dispute the importance of merchandise variety in e-tailing. In particular, their work showed that the number of products increases e-store traffic, but it does not affect sales. Apparently, whether or not an e-tailer has a specific product a customer is looking for is more important than simply having a large variety of items (Lohse and Spiller, 1998). Therefore, *brand selection* might well be more likely to affect customers' buying decisions and subsequent e-store patronage than merchandise variety (Degeratu *et al.*, 2000). Indeed, brand names also appear to affect consumers' buying decisions, especially when they are unfamiliar with an e-tailer (Ernst & Young, 1998). Further, when consumers have difficulty in searching for products on the Internet, they tend to rely on brand names (Ward and Lee, 2000).

*Price* is a key attribute for customers when forming perceptions of retailers (Berry, 1969; Eastlick, 1989; Lindquist, 1974; McDonald, 1993; Tigert, 1983). Online shopping enables consumers to reduce search costs and compare product information and prices simultaneously. This benefit, concomitantly, has accelerated retailers' competition and made e-tailers especially concerned about consumers' increasing price sensitivity (Shankar *et al.*, 1999; Ward and Lee, 2000). However, previous studies have also found that price sensitivity can be reduced by increasing

the usability and perceived depth of online information (Lynch and Ariely, 2000; Shankar *et al.*, 1999).

#### *Convenience characteristics*

Convenience is a key motive behind in-home shopping (Eastlick and Feinberg, 1994). Convenience is measured by effort savings (e.g. ease of a locating a product in a store) and locational convenience (e.g. ease of locating a store and finding a parking space) (Lindquist, 1974). In online shopping, convenience includes timely delivery, ease of ordering, and product display (Lohse and Spiller, 1998).

Lohse and Spiller (1998) discerned that several factors can be subsumed under the convenience attribute of online shopping: number of links into the site, number and type of different shopping modes, average number of items per product menu listing, number of lists that require scrolling, presence of price information in product listings, and type of product lists. Among these attributes, they found that *product display* has a significant impact on site visits and sales. Specifically, displaying product lists using *both* click buttons and pictures leads to more positive reactions from consumers than simply displaying a product list using only a button or pictures in online catalogs.

*Ease of ordering* appears to influence home-shoppers' buying decisions (Eastlick, 1989; McDonald, 1993). Therefore, order processing on Web sites should be easy for customers to do. Moreover, receiving order confirmations via e-mail, including information about shipping, returns, and order tracking numbers, facilitates order-processing behavior. If order processing is time consuming and complicated, customers will likely become frustrated and give up purchasing from the e-tailer (Lohse and Spiller, 1998).

With in-home shopping, physical store dimensions of convenience, such as geographical location and parking, do not exist. Instead, in-home shoppers seek convenience through use of mail or phone shopping and through *timely delivery* (to home). A Price Waterhouse Coopers study revealed that "the biggest sources of dissatisfaction among e-shoppers had to do with gifts not arriving on time for the [Christmas] holidays" (eMarketer, 2001d).

#### *Interactivity characteristics*

Interactivity on the Internet refers to the degree to which customers and retailers can communicate directly with one another anywhere, any time (Blattberg and Deighton, 1991). For e-tailers, the degree of interactivity influences the perceived quality of the Web site (Ghose and Dou, 1998). Ghose and Dou (1998) surveyed 101 Web sites to identify key interactivity factors that influence Web

site appeal by usage frequency of each factor. They found that *customer support* was the interactivity aspect most frequently used by customers. In addition to customer support, several additional dimensions can be classified as “interactivity” characteristics – personal-choice helper, surfer postings, and promotion.

E-tailers provide several types of online service that can increase interactivity with customers, such as software downloading, e-form inquiry, order status tracking, customer comment, and feedback. In a physical store, customers interact with sales personnel; their friendliness and knowledge can affect consumers' purchasing decision (Berry, 1969; Lindquist, 1974; McDaniel and Burnett, 1990; Tigert, 1983). On the Internet, e-tailers offer consumers with sales clerk service in different forms, such as a toll-free phone number, e-mail addresses, FAQs, and customer feedback. Research has found that having FAQ sections and feedback increases e-store visits and sales (Lohse and Spiller, 1998). Empirical work about the usage frequency of *customer support* functions (e.g. e-inquiry, comments, and feedback) reveals that customers prefer two-way communication with e-tailers rather than merely being passive recipients of information (Ghose and Dou, 1998).

Online outlets provide various forms of search functions for customers to locate items for which they are searching. Ghose and Dou (1998, p. 32) define a *personal-choice helper* as “a function that can make relatively sophisticated recommendations on consumers' choices based on their input of preferences and decision criteria”. This function (such as a keyword search) gives customers more refined alternatives. For example, multi-layered information assists customers to narrow down target items based on their decision criteria (e.g. [www.apartmentsplus.com](http://www.apartmentsplus.com); Shankar *et al.*, 1999).

Web sites provide customers with interactivity not only with e-tailers but also with online communities. Ghose and Dou (1998) found that online customers frequently use *surfer postings*, which are customers' reports of their feelings and experiences with products and e-tailers. E-tailers often provide a page of customer reviews (e.g. [www.amazon.com](http://www.amazon.com)), which gives customers indirect experience with the products and service.

Consumer behavior tends to be influenced by external environments, such as *promotion*. The behaviorist approach in consumer research posits that “the reinforcement of a series of behaviors will gradually bring the consumer to the desired final behavior” (Wilkie, 1994, p. 271). For instance, a “clearance sale” sign on a store window can stimulate consumer store traffic. In physical stores,

the purpose of promotional activities for particular products is to encourage consumers to buy either a particular product or some other products. Spiller and Lohse (1998) have drawn analogies among retail store, paper catalogs, and online catalogs and have characterized e-store promotion activities as being special offers, online games and lotteries, links to other sites of interest, and appetizers. Subsequently, they have also discerned that hours of promotion on the e-store entrance appears to increase consumers' buying decisions (Lohse and Spiller, 1998).

#### *Reliability characteristics*

Company reliability is an important criterion consumers utilize when making a store choice decision (Lindquist, 1974). Consumers might wish to protect themselves from unreliable e-tailers by paying close attention to company information. According to GVVU's WWW user surveys (Graphics, Visualization, and Utilization Center, 1998), reliability of online companies is the third most important attribute consumers consider. In addition, security and privacy are gaining increased concern among online users (Bellman *et al.*, 1999) and thus merit research attention.

In home-based shopping, a retailer's *reputation* has a significant influence on consumers' purchase decisions (McDonald, 1993). The provision of service information (including company history) can help a customer feel more comfortable about dealing with a given firm and about sending credit card information through the Internet (Lohse and Spiller, 1998). So, in-depth company information might abate consumers' uncertainty and perceived risk in dealing with e-retailers.

Transactions in online shopping tend to be made with a credit card. However, consumers have been warned not to release their credit card information online but to make a phone order for online purchasing (Furger, 1996). Nearly two out of three Americans do not trust e-tailers, and consumers are worried about the security of credit card information (Jeffrey, 1999). By informing customers about the *security* of online transactions, e-tailers can help reduce online risk perceived by customers (Ernst & Young, 1998).

Company Web sites collect a vast amount of customer information through the Internet, which is a fundamental asset for companies. Consumers, in contrast, may feel uncomfortable releasing their personal information (such as credit card and social security numbers) via the Web (Ernst & Young, 1998). The top privacy concern of US consumers appears to be whether or not a Web site asks permission to share personal information with other companies (eMarketer, 2001c). A recent report reveals that almost 65 percent of respondents gave up online purchasing because of

*privacy* concerns (eMarketer, 2001c). Consumers are discomfited when they receive e-mail from a company with which they are unfamiliar (Sheehan, 1999).

#### *Navigation characteristics*

Lowering search costs for shopping is a key motivation for consumers to shop online. As the total number of working hours of households increases, online shopping has attracted working families, thus enabling them to save time by purchasing products and services in a non-traditional way. In physical-store shopping, consumers seek to lower their search costs (e.g. time and efforts): physical effort is employed when going into a store, finding products, and comparing alternatives across stores (Bell *et al.*, 1998). In online shopping, navigation time and efforts are analogous to the physical effort expended to locate items in traditional shopping.

Gupta and Chatterjee (1997) define search costs on the Internet as:

- (1) Internet connection time;
- (2) actual time and effort taken for the user to search an e-tailer's site (e.g. use of online search engines, links from related pages, suggestions from newspapers/magazines/friends); and
- (3) time to download information from an e-store (which essentially depends on the connection speed, usage charges, traffic on the network, traffic at the site, and the kind of information being obtained).

Internet users are not tolerant of the *waiting time* to arrive at a Web site's homepage. GVV's WWW user surveys showed that consumers are confused by and annoyed with long waits to download an e-tailer's homepage from Web ads (Graphics, Visualization, and Utilization Center, 1998). When downloading is delayed, potential customers are likely to drift to alternative e-tailers or give up online shopping, at least for that time (Weinberg, 2000).

Consumers are more affected by their perceived duration of *download waiting time* than by the actual waiting time (Dellaert and Kahn, 1999). That is, when the wait to download is shorter than expected, consumers' satisfaction with the service increases. Conversely, if the wait is longer than expected, consumers' satisfaction decreases.

Consumers are likely to feel disturbed by the wait when they are uncertain about the actual waiting duration (Weinberg, 2000). By providing *waiting time information* (e.g. time bar indicator at the bottom of the Web page), e-tailers might help consumers become more tolerant of the wait and more favorably disposed toward the site.

#### **Attitude toward online shopping**

*Attitude* is "a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor" (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993, p. 1). Attitude has a strong influence on consumers' buying intention (e.g. Ryan, 1982), the immediate precursor of actual behavior (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). Previous studies have observed a positive association between attitude and behavioral intention (e.g. Chang *et al.*, 1996; Chiou, 2000; Ryan, 1982; Shimp and Kavas, 1984; Taylor and Todd, 1995), including in an online shopping context (Shim *et al.*, 2001). Applied to the present study, attitude toward online purchasing is considered to be a function of the consumer's beliefs about an e-store's characteristics and the degree of subjective importance a consumer attaches to those attributes (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). Based on the foregoing prior work, then, an e-tailer's failure to foster a favorable attitude toward its Web site will likely lead consumers to eschew online purchases with that particular e-tailer.

## **Method**

### **Sample and data collection**

The data were collected in a classroom setting from a convenience sample of students at a large Midwestern university. In a study of consumers' behavioral intentions to use different retail formats (e.g. retail stores, catalog, Internet), Keen (1999) compared results between a student sample and mall shopper sample. The findings showed no difference between the two samples in predicting consumer decision-making on the Internet. Moreover, college students deserve e-retailer attention because of their significant numbers vis-à-vis the Internet. For instance, college students spend more than 20 hours per week on the Internet, and 81 percent of them have made purchases online. Furthermore, college students are considered brand loyal and are early adopters of new products (FuturePages, 2002). Shortly, this group will enter the mainstream of the online consumer group, which is characterized as being between 34 and 45 years old, highly educated, and well paid as compared to the general offline population. Thus, college students should be considered a key target market in the long-term success for many online businesses. For these reasons, the student sample used in the present investigation is seemingly appropriate for querying online consumers.

Among 252 questionnaire completed, approximately 75 percent of the respondents were female. The mean age was 20.9. About 62 percent

of the respondents reported their income level to be less than \$5,999. Approximately 72 percent of the respondents had purchased a product through the Internet.

## Measures

### *E-shopping attributes*

Prior to developing questionnaire items, qualitative research was conducted to generate important e-shopping attributes. In this procedure, 29 students were given open-ended questionnaires. These questions were generated from the work of Mathieson (1991). Specifically, they queried respondents about the advantages and disadvantages of making a purchase on the Internet, and their likes and dislikes about online shopping.

In the qualitative research, interviews with respondents revealed that merchandise variety (Table IV) incorporates brand selection (Table III). Therefore, in this study's final questionnaire, merchandise variety (a physical store feature) was included. Also, "ease of use", which was referred to in our literature review, was combined with "ease of ordering" (Table III), owing to their overlapping nature. A pretest was conducted to check clarity of measurement items in the final study questionnaire. Ambiguous sentences were revised.

Fishbein's expectancy-value measures have been used as a person's "evaluative implications of an underlying cognitive structure" (Fishbein and Middlestadt, 1995, p. 186). An expectancy-value measure is obtained by multiplying a person's behavioral belief that an object possesses a certain attribute ( $b_i$ ) by the degree of subjective importance the person attaches to the object's attribute ( $e_i$ ) (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). Applied to this study, the degree to which a respondent believed e-tailer Web sites possess a certain attribute ( $b_i$ ) was multiplied by the degree of subjective importance the respondent attached to

that e-store attribute ( $e_i$ ). Respondents were queried about 16 e-shopping attributes using seven-point scales. The scales of belief strength were anchored from "unlikely" (1) to "likely" (7). The scales of evaluation were anchored from "unimportant" (1) to "important" (7). An example of each is noted below:

- ( $b_i$ ) The e-tailer would provide me with high quality product information (unlikely/likely).
- ( $e_i$ ) For me, high quality product information in online buying is (unimportant/important).

### *Attitude toward behavior ( $A_B$ )*

Consistent with the work of Fishbein and Ajzen (1975), attitude toward online purchasing was measured by four different statements using seven-point semantic differential scales. Scales were anchored using four different terms: "dislike/like", "foolish/wise", "bad/good", and "unpleasant/pleasant". For example:

- ( $Y_1$ ) Making a purchase on the Internet is a (bad/good) idea.

## Data analysis

Data were analyzed using both factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Factor analysis attempts to identify hypothetical variables that explain the pattern of correlations within a set of observed variables. While exploratory factor analysis attempts to identify the minimum number of common factors that represent correlations among the observed variables before developing hypotheses, CFA provides self-validating information for a given hypothesis (Kim and Mueller, 1978). That is, the purpose of conducting CFA is to build a model "assumed to describe, explain, or account for the empirical data in terms of relatively few parameters" (Jöreskog and Sörbom, 1993, p. 22). CFA was employed to confirm the e-store attribute classifications obtained in the factor analysis. In addition to these, multiple regression analysis was conducted to investigate the underlying Web site dimensions obtained in the CFA on consumers' attitude toward online shopping.

## Results

### Exploratory factor analysis

The SPSS computer software extracted four factors from 16 observed variables (consumer evaluative perceptions of e-shopping attributes) using principal component analysis and Varimax

Table IV Beliefs about e-shopping attributes (qualitative research)

Advantages/disadvantages of online purchases	Number mentioning attributes ( $n = 29$ )	Percentage
Price	19	65.5
Security	19	65.5
Timely delivery	9	31.0
Quality guarantees	9	31.0
Difficulty of return and exchanges	7	24.1
Reliability of a retailer	7	24.1
Merchandise variety	6	20.7
Product information	5	17.2
Download/process time	5	17.2
Ease of use	4	13.8
Real-time customer service	3	10.3



rotation. Factor analysis revealed *four* underlying dimensions with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and a communality of 59.7 percent. The resulting factors generally emerged as expected for e-shopping characteristics, except for the promotion characteristic. Promotion loaded on factor 2 (i.e. interactivity characteristics). Factor loadings ranged from 0.347 to 0.876, which exceed the threshold value of 0.30 (Kim and Mueller, 1978). However, delivery, ease of ordering, and product display on Web pages were excluded in subsequent analyses because of their crossloading on factors 1 and 2. The final results of the exploratory factor analysis are presented in Table V.

### Confirmatory factor analysis

CFA was conducted to confirm the prespecified dimensions obtained in the foregoing exploratory factor analysis. In general, the results supported a measurement model that included *four* overriding characteristics ( $\chi^2_{20} = 21.43$ , RMSEA = 0.018, GFI = 0.980). Price, other customers' postings, promotions, and provision of waiting information were removed from the measurement model owing to reliabilities of less than 0.30 (Bettencourt and Brown, 1997; Table VI – only final results are shown). Other than these attributes, all standardized factor loadings were statistically significant ( $p < 0.001$ ). The validity of the measures was examined by the index of the proportion-of-variance extracted. All proportions in the index were higher than 0.50, which indicates that the overall amount of variance in e-shopping attributes was captured by the corresponding characteristics reported in Table VI (Hair *et al.*, 1998).

Table V Results of exploratory factor analysis

E-shopping attributes	Factor loadings			
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Product information	0.695			
Variety of merchandise	0.783			
Comparatively low price	0.579			
Customer support		0.539		
Personal choice helper		0.474		
Other customers' postings		0.815		
Promotions		0.439		
Good reputation			0.667	
Security			0.868	
Privacy			0.876	
Time to get to home pages				0.724
Time to download Web pages				0.837
Waiting information				0.657
Cronbach's $\alpha$	0.688	0.617	0.610	0.843

Notes: Extraction method: principal component analysis; rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser normalization

In essence, CFA identified four distinct dimensions of e-shopping attributes: merchandise, interactivity, reliability, and navigation characteristics. Merchandise consisted of product information ( $\lambda = 0.707$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and variety of merchandise ( $\lambda = 0.757$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ); interactivity, customer support ( $\lambda = 0.653$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and personal-choice helper ( $\lambda = 0.610$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ); reliability, an e-tailer's good reputation ( $\lambda = 0.883$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), security ( $\lambda = 0.633$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), and privacy ( $\lambda = 0.652$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ); and navigation, time to get to an e-tailer's homepage ( $\lambda = 0.878$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and time to download Web pages on the Web site ( $\lambda = 0.687$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). The e-shopping attributes confirmed in the final analysis were grouped into four different e-shopping characteristics.

### Multiple regression analysis

Table VII summarizes the results of multiple regression analysis. The VIF index showed no significant multicollinearity problem (Neter *et al.*, 1996). The four independent variables (i.e. merchandise, interactivity, reliability, and navigation) revealed in the CFA were regressed across consumers' attitude toward online shopping. The overall model is significant ( $R^2 = 0.17$ ,  $F_{4,247} = 13.01$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). The results indicate that consumers' attitude toward online purchasing is a function (positively) of merchandise ( $\beta = 0.25$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and reliability ( $\beta = 0.19$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) attributes. Interestingly, though, their attitude is not significantly related ( $p > 0.05$ ) to interactivity or navigation Web site dimensions.

### Discussion

The findings of this study present important e-shopping attributes that consumers consider in their e-tailer evaluations. For merchandising characteristics, consumers appear to focus on product information when they evaluate e-tailers. Previous research suggests that online shoppers seek detailed information about products and services rather than sensory attributes, such as visual cues (Degeratu *et al.*, 2000). This may be largely attributed to the nature of Internet shopping in which consumers cannot touch or see a product. Accordingly, consumers tend to rely on product information provided by e-tailer Web pages. This result is consistent with those obtained in previous studies (Lynch and Ariely, 2000; Ward and Lee, 2000). Also, online consumers appear to seek a variety of merchandise through online shopping; this finding is also consistent with consumers' reactions in physical retail stores and

Table VI Results of measurement model: confirmatory factor analysis

E-shopping attributes	Factor loadings	t-values	Total-item reliability <sup>a</sup>	Proportion of variance extracted
<i>Merchandise characteristics</i>			0.71	0.78
Product information	0.707	10.31	0.50	
Variety of merchandise	0.757	10.97	0.57	
<i>Interactivity characteristics</i>			0.57	0.70
Customer-support	0.653	8.71	0.43	
Personal choice-helper	0.610	8.25	0.38	
<i>Reliability characteristics</i>			0.84	0.76
Good reputation	0.883	12.65	0.78	
Security	0.633	9.18	0.40	
Privacy	0.652	9.50	0.43	
<i>Navigation characteristics</i>			0.76	0.81
Time to get to home pages	0.878	11.24	0.77	
Time to download Web pages	0.687	9.33	0.47	
<i>Indices of goodness-of-fit</i>				
Chi-square (df)	21.43 (20)			
RMSEA	0.018			
GFI	0.980			
AGFI	0.955			
NFI	0.972			

Note: <sup>a</sup>Italicized entries in this column represent overall reliability for each construct

Table VII Results of multiple regression analysis

	Mean	SD	Attitude	
			Standardized coefficients	t-value
Merchandise	30.59	9.71	0.254	3.737*
Interactivity	26.19	8.83	0.189	2.789*
Reliability	33.29	9.68	-0.004	-0.060
Navigation	29.69	9.17	0.078	1.112

$R^2 = 0.17$  ( $F_{4,247} = 13.01$ ,  $p < 0.001$ )

Notes:  $n = 252$ ; \*significant at the 0.01 level

in-home shopping (such as TV and paper catalogs). In addition, the findings of multiple regression analysis imply that the merchandise attribute is positively associated with respondents' attitude toward online purchase.

In the online shopping literature, the term "interactivity" has been used to refer to different e-store characteristics:

- (1) speed of interactivity between a person and related devices (i.e. computers, modems) (e.g. Alba *et al.*, 1997; Novak *et al.*, 2000); and
- (2) interactivity between a customer and e-tailers (e.g. Ghose and Dou, 1998).

In our study, interactivity was observed to be a service that customers can receive from the Internet, just as they can from a salesperson in a bricks and mortar store. Through online shopping, customers and retailers use different forms of communication. While the physical store provides customers with personal interaction via face-to-

face communication with sales associates, e-tailers provide a similar service through either personal interactivity (i.e. call center) or machine interactivity, such as customer support (i.e. downloading software, e-form inquiry, order tracking) and choice helpers. The findings of our study confirm that customer support and choice helpers are key interactivity dimensions of e-stores.

Reliability has emerged as a critical influence on consumers' purchase decisions in home-based shopping (McDonald, 1993). In online transactions, consumers are likely to release personal information as well as credit card information. Accordingly, they tend to be more careful than in traditional store shopping by examining e-tailer credibility prior to making a purchase. In determining an e-retailer's reliability, consumers appear to evaluate e-tailers' reputation, as well as security and privacy policies. Also, the result of multiple regression analysis reveals that reliability is a significant predictor of respondents' attitude toward online purchase.

In online shopping, customers tend to be sensitive to waiting time (Dellaert and Kahn, 1999). Despite its importance in predicting consumer behavior on the Internet, many researchers have not delineated navigation characteristics clearly. Instead, they have tended to employ a single term – "ease of browsing" – and included it under "convenience" dimensions (e.g. Shim *et al.*, 2001; Szymansky and Hise, 2000). The results of our factor analysis, however, reveal

that navigation dimensions constitute an independent construct, which is characterized by:

- time required to get to the e-tailer's homepage; and
- time required to download an e-tailer's Web page.

The findings obtained demonstrate that consumers' attitude toward online shopping is positively related to their perceptions of Web site merchandise and reliability attributes, but surprisingly unrelated to interactivity or navigation characteristics. Specifically, consumers develop a positive affect toward online shopping to the extent that they perceive a Web site to provide detailed product information and merchandise variety, as well as mechanisms that enhance feelings of trust in the e-tailer. Interestingly, though, consumers' affect is seemingly unrelated to their perceptions of an e-tailer's offering customer support and personal-choice helpers or Web site navigation speed. The latter two findings may be a function of the state of current Web sites. Adequate customer support and navigation speed are a necessary, but insufficient, condition for e-tailer success. Because of early Internet shoppers' complaints about poor Web site design, interactivity quality, and navigation speed (Dellaert and Kahn, 1999), perhaps e-tailers have made steadfast efforts to enhance these qualities. If so, online shoppers may have reduced their former concerns about these two attributes, thus vitiating the impact of these two attributes on online shopping attitudes.

### Managerial implications

Through Internet commercial sites, online marketers can collect a plethora of consumer information, such as age, gender, and zip code. Also, they can track consumers' interests and preferences. To parlay this data rich advantage of electronic commerce, online marketers should understand consumers' online shopping behavior so that they can develop effective marketing programs.

The current study explored consumers' evaluative criteria of an online retail outlet. The findings of this study are helpful for e-tailers as a general guideline for Web site design. In terms of merchandising and its positive relationship with consumers' attitude toward online purchasing, e-tailers should pay acute attention to the contents of their Web pages through which consumers reach purchase decisions without physically touching or seeing a product. In particular, online consumers appear to place emphasis on quality product information. Moreover, effective descriptions of the products on an e-tailer's Web site have been found to mitigate online consumers' price sensitivity (Shankar *et al.*, 1999). The findings of

the present work also highlight the importance online shoppers place on the variety of merchandise in an online outlet. By utilizing consumer profiles and sales tracks, e-tailers should be able to provide the variety of merchandise that meets their customers' needs and preferences.

Reliability of e-tailers was found to be a significant factor when customers evaluate a commercial site, as well as influencing consumers' online purchase attitude. Indeed, one consumer survey showed that about 88 percent of online consumers make a purchase through the Internet using credit cards. It also reported that about 60 percent of Internet users are concerned about their credit card number being stolen when using a commercial Web site (eMarketer, 2001e). Furthermore, privacy has emerged as a critical concern among online consumers. Although customers' personal information is a crucial asset for retailers, online shoppers appear to have fears about revealing their personal information on the Internet. To convince online customers that their personal information will not be violated, e-tailers should provide consumers with their privacy policies, as well as a guarantee that the information will not be misused (eMarketer, 2001a).

Although interactivity of e-tailers was found to be a significant factor when customers evaluate a commercial site, it was not discerned to influence consumers' online purchase attitude. This finding, however, does not imply that e-tailers should ignore interactivity issues. CFA results suggest that online customers desire the equivalent quality of service that might be provided in a physical store, such as two-way communication between shoppers and salespeople. As such, online shoppers apparently expect to experience a high degree of customer service from e-tailers in the forms of software downloading, e-form inquiry, order status tracking, customer comments, and feedback: so, such tools should be provided by e-stores.

Online customers appear to be sensitive to the waiting time required to download Web pages (Dellaert and Kahn, 1999; Weinberg, 2000), although it is not associated with their attitude toward online purchasing. Notwithstanding this result, CFA findings suggest that e-tailers still need to be circumspect about Web site waiting time given that it is an evaluative criteria of online shoppers. Waiting time on the Internet may vary because of several factors: the extent of sophistication of a Web page, the number of graphics on a Web page, and the number of people who log on to the Internet. Although e-tailers cannot control every factor that affects downloading time, they can design their Web pages to be time-efficient. This does not mean Web

designers should forego cutting-edge graphic technology. Rather, they should avoid extensive utilization of graphics and animations, as well as consider downloading time when they design e-tailer sites (Dellaert and Kahn, 1999). Consequently, e-tailers should consider how to provide customers with detailed product information and increased interactivity without annoying them with excessive downloading time.

### Limitations and future research

This study employed a student group to measure their attitudinal beliefs about online retail outlets. Although college students account for a major portion of online consumer groups, the sample may be biased toward those who are younger and more educated compared to the general consumer population. Also, 75 percent of the sample consisted of females and 19 percent had not made an online purchase: this situation may decrease representativeness. Accordingly, the results of the current work might not generalize to the general consumer population. Also, the study is geographically limited, because data were collected from a Midwestern university. Therefore, utilizing a random sampling of general consumers nationwide should help overcome these shortcomings.

In characterizing e-store image, previous researchers have not been lucid about which dimensions characterize interactivity. Novak *et al.* (2000) identify interactivity solely in terms of speed. They found that Web site design affects speed of interactivity between online consumers and the medium (i.e. computer, related device) in measuring customer experience on the Internet. However, in terms of the scales that measure interactivity – which is equivalent to *navigational characteristics* in our study – Novak *et al.*'s study had almost identical items as ours:

- (1) waiting time between a person's actions and the computer's response; and
- (2) Web page downloading time.

Thus, the term *interactivity* needs further research in order to clearly define this characteristic.

This study examined consumers' evaluative criteria for an e-tailer without specifying a product category. However, store characteristics that affect store image may differ across product types and store types (Klein, 1998; Tigert, 1983). For instance, Yoo and Donthu (2001) found different effects of each site quality (i.e. ease of use, aesthetic design, processing speed, security) on consumers' decision-making across different product categories (e.g. apparel, electronics, food and drink, music, etc.) Therefore, future research should seek to develop different sets of e-shopping attributes within a specific context. The resulting

characteristics of an online store as a predictor of online shopping behavior may vary depending on the product category – and even, perhaps, owing to the brand being sold (e.g. manufacturer/service principal's brand versus an e-tailer's own brand). Also, there might be other factors that influence shoppers' evaluations of an e-tailer, such as the level of their expertise or experience in online shopping; so, such variables should be examined in subsequent work.

### References

- Alba, J., Lynch, J., Weitz, B., Janiszewski, C., Lutz, R., Sawyer, A. and Wood, S. (1997), "Interactive home shopping: consumer, retailer, and manufacturer incentives to participate in electronic marketplaces", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 61, July, pp. 38-53.
- Bell, D.R., Ho, T.-H. and Tang, C.S. (1998), "Determining where to shop: fixed and variable costs of shopping", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 35, pp. 352-69.
- Bellman, S., Lohse, G.L. and Johnson, E.J. (1999), "Predictors of online buying behavior", *Communications of the ACM*, Vol. 42 No. 12, pp. 32-8.
- Benterud, T. and Stø, E. (1993), "TV-shopping in Scandinavia: consumer satisfaction, dissatisfaction and complaining behavior", *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, Vol. 6, pp. 196-203.
- Berry, L.L. (1969), "The components of department store image: a theoretical and empirical analysis", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 45 No. 1, pp. 3-20.
- Bettencourt, L.A. and Brown, S.W. (1997), "Contact employees: relationships among workplace fairness, job satisfaction and prosocial service behaviors", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 73 No. 1, pp. 39-61.
- Blattberg, R.C. and Deighton, J. (1991), "Interactive marketing: exploring the age of addressability", *Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 5-14.
- Chang, Y., Burns, L.D. and Noel, C.J. (1996), "Attitudinal versus normative influence in the purchase of brand-name casual apparel", *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 79-109.
- Chiou, J.-S. (2000), "Antecedents and moderators of behavioral intention: differences between US and Taiwanese students", *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, Vol. 126 No. 1, pp. 105-24.
- Consumer Reports Buying Guide (2000), "Catalog shopping", pp. 14-15.
- Degeratu, A., Rangaswamy, A. and Wu, J. (2000), "Consumer choice behavior in online and traditional supermarkets: the effects of brand name, price, and other search attributes", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 17, pp. 55-78.
- Dellaert, B. and Kahn, B.E. (1999), "How tolerable is Dealy? Consumers' evaluations of Internet Web sites after waiting", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 41-54.
- Donthu, N. (1999), "The Internet shopper", *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 39 No. 3, pp. 52-8.
- Eagly, A.H. and Chaiken, S. (1993), *The Psychology of Attitudes*, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, London.

- Eastlick, M.A. (1989), "Shopping motives of the mail-catalog shopper", unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.
- Eastlick, M.A. and Feinberg, R.A. (1994), "Gender differences in mail-catalog patronage motives", *Journal of Direct Marketing*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 37-44.
- eMarketer (2001a), *ePrivacy & Security Report*, New York, NY.
- eMarketer (2001b), "Privacy fears online", available at: [www.emarketer.com](http://www.emarketer.com)
- eMarketer (2001c), "The great online privacy debate: Part 2", available at: [www.emarketer.com](http://www.emarketer.com)
- eMarketer (2001d), "Xmas e-tailing: more on-time deliveries, more dissatisfaction", available at: [www.emarketer.com](http://www.emarketer.com)
- eMarketer (2001e), "eConsumers get lots of credit", available at: [www.emarketer.com](http://www.emarketer.com)
- Ernst & Young (1998), "Internet shopping: an Ernst & Young special report", *Stores*, Suppl. 2, pp. 1-29.
- Fishbein, M. and Ajzen, I. (1975), *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Fishbein, M. and Middlestadt, S. (1995), "Noncognitive effects on attitude formation and change: fact or artifact?", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 181-202.
- Furger, R. (1996), "Shopping online: what you need to know", *PC World*, 14 June, pp. 320-1.
- FuturePages (2002), "Why is it important to reach college students?", available at: [www.futurepages.com/mk-demo.cfm](http://www.futurepages.com/mk-demo.cfm)
- Ghose, S. and Dou, W. (1998), "Interactive functions and their impacts on the appeal of Internet presence sites", *Journal of Advertising Research*, March/April, pp. 29-43.
- Graphics, Visualization, and Utilization Center (1998), "GVU's WWW user surveys", available at: [www.gvu.gatech.edu](http://www.gvu.gatech.edu)
- Gupta, S. and Chatterjee, R. (1997), "Consumer and corporate adoption of the World Wide Web as a commercial medium", in Peterson, R.A. (Ed.), *Electronic Marketing and the Consumer*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 123-38.
- Hair, J.F. Jr, Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L. and Black, W.C. (1998), *Multivariate Data Analysis*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Janssen, M. and Moraga, J.L. (2000), "Pricing, consumer search, and the size of Internet markets", working paper, available at: <http://ecommerce.mit.edu/papers>
- Jeffrey, D. (1999), "Study says 2 of 3 consumers still leery of Web purchasing", *Billboard*, Vol. 111 No. 36, p. 85.
- Jöreskog, K. and Sörbom, D. (1993), *LISREL 8: Structural Equation Modeling with the SIMPLIS Command Language*, SSI, Chicago, IL.
- Keen, C.N. (1999), "The attribute structure of Internet shopping: what is important and what tradeoffs are possible between Internet, retail, and catalog formats?", unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.
- Kim, J.-O. and Mueller, C.W. (1978), *Factor Analysis: Statistical Methods and Practical Issues*, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Klein, L.R. (1998), "Evaluating the potential of interactive media through a new lens: search versus experience goods", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 41 No. 3, pp. 195-204.
- Lindquist, J.D. (1974), "Meaning of image: a survey of empirical and hypothetical evidence", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 50 No. 4, pp. 29-38.
- Lohse, G.L. and Spiller, P. (1998), "Electronic shopping: how do customer interfaces produce sales on the Internet?", *Communications of the ACM*, Vol. 41 No. 7, pp. 81-7.
- Lynch, J.G. and Ariely, D. (2000), "Wine online: search cost affect competition on price, quality, and distribution", *Marketing Science*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 83-103.
- McDaniel, S.W. and Burnett, J.J. (1990), "Consumer religiosity and retail store evaluative criteria", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 101-12.
- McDonald, W.J. (1993), "Consumer preference structure analysis: a managerial tool for understanding apparel catalog market competition", *Journal of Direct Marketing*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 20-31.
- Mathieson, K. (1991), "Predicting user intentions: comparing the technology acceptance model with the theory of planned behavior", *Information Systems Research*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 173-91.
- Morrison, P.D. and Roberts, J.H. (1998), "Matching electronic distribution channels to product characteristics: the role of congruence in consideration set formation", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 41 No. 3, pp. 223-9.
- Neter, J., Wasserman, W., Natchsheim, C.J. and Kutner, M.H. (1996), *Applied Linear Statistical Models*, McGraw-Hill/Irwin, Chicago, IL.
- Novak, T.P., Hoffman, D.L. and Yung, Y.F. (2000), "Measuring the customer experience in online environment: a structural modeling approach", *Marketing Science*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 22-42.
- Ryan, M.J. (1982), "Behavioral intention formation: the interdependency of attitudinal and social influence variables", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 9, pp. 263-78.
- Seaver, B.L. and Simpson, E. (1995), "Mail order catalog design and consumer response behavior: experimentation and analysis", *Journal of Direct Marketing*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 8-20.
- Shankar, V., Rangaswamy, A. and Pusateri, M. (1999), "The online medium and customer price sensitivity", working paper, eBusiness Research Center (eBRC), Penn State University, University Park, PA.
- Sheehan, K.B. (1999), "An investigation of gender differences in online privacy concerns and resultant behavior", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 24-38.
- Sheth, J.N. (1983), "An Integrative theory of patronage preference and behavior", in Darden, W.R. and Lusch, R.F. (Eds), *Patronage Behavior and Retail Management*, North-Holland, New York, NY, pp. 9-28.
- Shim, S., Eastlick, M.A., Lotz, S.L. and Warrington, P. (2001), "An online prepurchase intentions model: the role of intention to search", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 77 No. 3, pp. 397-416.
- Shimp, T.A. and Kavas, A. (1984), "The theory of reasoned action applied to coupon usage", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 11, p. 1984.
- Spiller, P. and Lohse, G.L. (1998), "A classification of Internet retail stores", *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 29-56.
- Szymanski, D. and Hise, R.T. (2000), "E-satisfaction: an initial examination", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 76 No. 3, pp. 309-22.
- Taylor, S. and Todd, P.A. (1995), "Decomposition and crossover effects in the theory of planned behavior: a study of consumer adoption intentions", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 12, pp. 137-55.
- Tigert, D.J. (1983), "Pushing the hot buttons for a successful retailing strategy", in Darden, W.R. and Lusch, R.F. (Eds), *Patronage Behavior and Retail Management*, North-Holland, New York, NY, pp. 89-113.
- USA Today Magazine (1997), "Changing attitudes toward TV shopping", *USA Today Magazine*, Vol. 126 No. 2627, pp. 9-10.

- Ward, M.R. and Lee, M.J. (2000), "Internet shopping, consumer search and product branding", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 6-18.
- Weinberg, B.D. (2000), "Don't keep your Internet customers waiting too long at the (virtual) front door", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 30-8.
- Wilkie, W.L. (1994), *Consumer Behavior*, Wiley, New York, NY.
- Yoo, B. and Donthu, N. (2001), "Developing a scale to measure the perceived quality of an Internet shopping site (SITEQUAL)", *Journal of Electronic Commerce*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 31-45.

## Executive summary and implications for managers and executives

*This summary has been provided to allow managers and executives a rapid appreciation of the content of the article. Those with a particular interest in the topic covered may then read the article in toto to take advantage of the research undertaken and its results to get the full benefit of the material present.*

Growing numbers of customers are turning to the Internet to buy goods and services, yet many online retailers are either cutting back or going out of business entirely. If online retailers are to retain customers and attract new ones, they need to know the criteria consumers use when selecting and evaluating an e-tailer.

### Four main e-shopping characteristics

Lim identifies four main e-shopping characteristics:

- (1) *Merchandise* – the product information and variety of merchandise offered. Purchasers on the Web, unlike customers in a shop, decide whether or not to buy a product without physically touching or seeing it, and so need high quality product information and a decent variety of merchandise available for purchase.
- (2) *Interactivity* – the customer support and service that customers can receive from the Internet, just as they can from a salesperson in a brick and mortar store. E-tailers can provide such support and service through a call centre, or through special software that provides facilities such as choice-helpers and computerised order tracking.
- (3) *Reliability* – an e-tailer's good reputation, plus security and privacy. In online transactions, consumers are likely to have to release personal and credit card information. They therefore tend to be more careful than in traditional store shopping, by examining the e-tailer's credibility before making a purchase.

- (4) *Navigation characteristics* – the time taken to get to an e-tailer's homepage, and to download the e-tailer's Web pages.

### Importance of the merchandise and reliability variables

Lim's research among a sample of students at a large university in Midwestern USA reveals that consumers' attitude towards online purchasing is significantly affected by the merchandise and reliability variables, but not by the interactivity or navigation characteristics.

E-tailers therefore need to pay significant attention to the contents of their Web pages. Indeed, previous research has found that the more effective descriptions are of the products available through a Web site, the less sensitive to price the Web site's customers become. E-tailers can seek to ensure that they have the right variety of merchandise available by using consumer profiles and tracking the sales they make through the site.

E-tailers also need to ensure that they are perceived as reliable. One customer survey showed that about 88 percent of online customers make a purchase through the internet using credit cards, but 60 percent of Internet users are concerned about their credit card number being stolen when using a commercial Web site. Moreover, shoppers appear to have fears about revealing other personal information on the Internet. To help to allay these fears, e-tailers should spell out their privacy policies, and guarantee that the information customers provide will not be misused.

### The interactivity and navigation variables

The apparent unimportance of the interactivity and navigation variables does not imply that e-tailers should ignore these issues. The findings may result from the fact that modern Web sites tend to provide adequate customer support and navigation speeds, so customers may have come to accept them as "given". Nevertheless, e-tailers should ensure that their Web sites offer quality service through, for example, software downloading, e-form inquiry, order status tracking, customer feedback and so on. And e-tailers must be sure that their customers do not have to suffer long downloading times.

*(A précis of the article "Consumers' perceptions of e-shopping characteristics: an expectancy-value approach". Supplied by Marketing Consultants for Emerald.)*

## LAMPIRAN 1

### KUESIONER

#### ANALISIS *MERCHANDISE*, *INTERACTIVITY*, *RELIABILITY*, DAN *NAVIGATION* TERHADAP SIKAP KONSUMEN *E-SHOPPING* PADA FORUM JUAL BELI KASKUS

### PENGANTAR

Sebelumnya, penulis mengucapkan terima kasih atas kesediaan saudara/i untuk berpartisipasi dalam survei ini. Survei ini diadakan untuk mengumpulkan data-data valid yang terkait dalam penelitian yang diadakan oleh penulis untuk menyelesaikan tugas akhir skripsi S1 jurusan Manajemen Retail di Fakultas Bisnis Universitas Widya Mandala Surabaya.

Kuesioner ini terbagi dalam empat (4) bagian utama, yaitu (1) *Merchandise*, (2) *Interactivity*, (3) *Reliability*, dan (4) *Navigation* yang berhubungan dengan sikap konsumen *e-shopping* pada Forum Jual Beli (selanjutnya disebut FJB) Kaskus. Pada tiap bagian akan diberikan penjelasan atau definisi mengenai tiap bagian yang akan mempermudah saudara/i memberikan respon pada butir-butir pertanyaan yang terdapat dalam kuesioner ini.

### BAGIAN 1 - MERCHANDISE

#### *Definisi*

*Merchandise* adalah segala jenis barang dan jasa yang ditawarkan oleh penjual dalam FJB Kaskus untuk memenuhi kebutuhan pelanggannya. Untuk meyakinkan pembeli, penjual tidak hanya menyediakan barang dagangannya saja, namun juga memberikan informasi dengan lengkap, mudah dipahami, dan memberikan kesempatan untuk pembeli melakukan komparasi atau perbandingan.

#### *Instruksi*

Bubuhkan tanda silang (X) pada kolom jawaban yang saudara/i rasa mewakili pengalaman anda berbelanja di FJB Kaskus. Kaitkan jawaban anda dengan transaksi terakhir anda di FJB Kaskus.

LAMPIRAN 1 (lanjutan)

<b>N O</b>	<b>Pertanyaan</b>	<b>S T S</b>	<b>TS</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>SS</b>
1	Penjual memiliki informasi yang lengkap mengenai produk yang saudara/i cari.					
2	Informasi produk yang diberikan penjual mudah di pahami.					
3	Penjual menyajikan informasi produk disertai gambar atau foto yang jelas.					
4	Penjual menawarkan produk alternatif yang berkualitas.					
5	Penjual memiliki persediaan/stok atas produk alternatif tersebut.					

**BAGIAN 2 - INTERACTIVITY**

**Definisi**

*Interactivity* adalah segala usaha penjual FJB Kaskus untuk dapat berkomunikasi dengan saudara/i baik lewat lapak atau saluran komunikasi lain. Kemudahan menghubungi penjual juga dapat memberikan pengaruh yang baik untuk mempengaruhi keputusan pembelian.

**Instruksi**

Bubuhkan tanda silang (X) pada kolom jawaban yang saudara/i rasa mewakili pengalaman anda berbelanja di FJB Kaskus. Kaitkan jawaban anda dengan transaksi terakhir anda di FJB Kaskus.

<b>N O</b>	<b>Pertanyaan</b>	<b>S T S</b>	<b>TS</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>SS</b>
1	Penjual merespon dengan cepat setiap pertanyaan atau keluhan saudara/i.					
2	Penjual dapat dijangkau dengan berbagai mode komunikasi (cth: <i>SMS, Messenger, Email, Telepon, dll</i> ).					



LAMPIRAN 1 (lanjutan)

3	Mesin pencari ( <i>search engine</i> ) di FJB Kaskus memudahkan saudara/i mencari produk yang dibutuhkan.					
---	---	--	--	--	--	--

**BAGIAN 3 - RELIABILITY**

**Definisi**

*Reliability* adalah faktor *trust* atau kepercayaan yang dibentuk oleh penjual agar saudara/i merasa yakin bahwa bertransaksi dengan penjual FJB Kaskus aman dari penipuan dan penyalahgunaan

**Instruksi**

Bubuhkan tanda silang (X) pada kolom jawaban yang saudara/i rasa mewakili pengalaman anda berbelanja di FJB Kaskus. Kaitkan jawaban anda dengan transaksi terakhir anda di FJB Kaskus.

N O	Pertanyaan	S T S	TS	N	S	SS
1	" <i>Testimonial</i> " dari pelanggan lainnya dapat mempengaruhi niat saudara/i untuk bertransaksi dengan penjual tersebut.					
2	Jumlah " <i>cendol</i> " yang dimiliki penjual FJB Kaskus mempengaruhi niat saudara/i untuk bertransaksi dengan penjual tersebut.					
3	Saudara/i merasa nyaman atau mudah bertransaksi dengan penjual FJB Kaskus karena memiliki rekening di bank yang sama.					
4	Saudara/i dapat melacak posisi produk pesanan yang dibeli dari penjual tersebut.					
5	Setelah bertransaksi dengan penjual tersebut, muncul pengalaman tidak menyenangkan, seperti: SMS gelap, SMS tipuan, adanya surat					

LAMPIRAN 1 (lanjutan)

	tagihan palsu, dll.					
--	---------------------	--	--	--	--	--

**BAGIAN 4 - NAVIGATION**

**Definisi**

*Navigation* adalah faktor yang memudahkan saudara/i untuk menjelajahi FJB Kaskus, seperti adanya fitur *site map*, *index*, dan lain-lain.

**Instruksi**

Bubuhkan tanda silang (X) pada kolom jawaban yang saudara/i rasa mewakili pengalaman anda berbelanja di FJB Kaskus. Kaitkan jawaban anda dengan transaksi terakhir anda di FJB Kaskus.

<b>N O</b>	<b>Pertanyaan</b>	<b>S T S</b>	<b>TS</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>SS</b>
1	Mudah untuk mencari lapak dari penjual tersebut.					
2	Butuh waktu yang cukup lama untuk dapat menampilkan seluruh isi lapak dari penjual tersebut.					
3	Mudah menyimpan atau mengunduh ( <i>download</i> ) situs atau lapak penjual.					

**BAGIAN 5 – SIKAP KONSUMEN**

**Definisi**

Sikap konsumen merujuk pada sinyal positif yang dirasakan oleh konsumen mengenai suatu *e-tailer* yang akan memutuskan konsumen berbelanja atau tidak.

**Instruksi**

Bubuhkan tanda silang (X) pada kolom jawaban yang saudara/i rasa mewakili pengalaman anda berbelanja di FJB Kaskus. Kaitkan jawaban anda dengan transaksi terakhir anda di FJB Kaskus.

LAMPIRAN 1 (lanjutan)

<b>NO</b>	<b>Pertanyaan</b>	<b>S T S</b>	<b>TS</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>SS</b>
1	Saudara/i memilih belanja <i>online</i> di FJB Kaskus karena hampir seluruh barang dan jasa yang dibutuhkan tersedia.					
2	Saudara/i memilih belanja <i>online</i> di FJB Kaskus karena tingkat kepraktisannya lebih baik daripada berbelanja tradisional.					
3	Saudara/i memilih belanja <i>online</i> di FJB Kaskus karena memiliki keamanan transaksi yang baik.					

## LAMPIRAN 2

*Data Entry SPSS variabel X1 – X2 (N=100)*

N	X1.1	X1.2	X1.3	X1.4	X1.5	X2.1	X2.2	X2.3
1	4	4	4	1	1	4	4	4
2	4	4	3	5	3	4	4	4
3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4
4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4
5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
6	5	5	5	3	4	4	4	5
7	4	5	5	4	3	4	5	5
8	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	4
9	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	3
10	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	4
11	4	4	4	4	2	4	5	4
12	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4
13	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
14	5	5	4	4	3	5	5	5
15	5	5	5	2	4	5	5	5
16	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4
17	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
18	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
19	5	4	4	3	3	5	5	4
20	4	4	4	4	3	4	5	4
21	4	5	5	4	4	5	4	5
22	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
23	4	3	4	4	4	4	5	3
24	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4
25	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5
26	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	5
27	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	4
28	4	4	4	2	2	3	5	4
29	4	3	5	4	5	4	5	3
30	4	3	4	4	5	5	5	3
31	4	4	4	3	3	5	5	4
32	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5
33	5	5	5	3	3	5	3	5
34	4	4	4	2	3	4	4	4
35	4	4	5	3	2	4	5	4
36	4	5	5	4	5	5	4	5

## LAMPIRAN 2 (lanjutan)

37	4	4	5	3	3	5	4	4
38	3	3	3	3	2	4	5	3
39	5	5	5	3	4	5	5	5
40	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	4
41	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3
42	4	4	4	3	4	5	4	4
43	3	4	5	3	5	4	5	4
44	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
45	4	4	5	2	2	3	5	4
46	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
47	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
48	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4
49	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4
50	5	5	4	4	3	4	4	5
51	4	4	4	3	2	5	4	4
52	5	5	5	3	3	4	4	5
53	4	3	4	2	2	4	4	3
54	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5
55	5	5	5	2	2	5	4	5
56	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5
57	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4
58	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	3
59	4	4	4	2	2	3	3	4
60	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3
61	4	4	3	2	2	4	3	4
62	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
63	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	5
64	4	3	4	3	2	4	4	3
65	4	4	5	4	5	4	5	4
66	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4
67	5	4	4	3	3	5	4	4
68	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3
69	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	3
70	4	4	4	2	2	3	4	4
71	3	3	3	2	2	4	3	3
72	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4
73	4	3	4	4	4	5	4	3
74	5	3	4	5	4	4	4	3
75	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	4

## LAMPIRAN 2 (lanjutan)

76	5	4	5	2	2	4	3	4
77	5	5	5	3	3	5	5	5
78	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	5
79	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	3
80	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
81	2	3	3	4	4	5	4	3
82	4	4	3	2	2	4	4	4
83	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	3
84	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	5
85	5	4	5	2	2	4	4	4
86	4	4	4	2	2	4	4	4
87	3	4	3	2	2	4	4	4
88	4	4	3	2	2	4	4	4
89	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4
90	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	4
91	4	5	5	2	2	5	4	5
92	4	4	3	2	2	3	3	4
93	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	2
94	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2
95	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3
96	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	5
97	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	4
98	4	3	3	4	4	5	4	3
99	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5
100	4	3	4	4	4	5	4	3

### LAMPIRAN 3

*Data Entry SPSS variabel X3 – X4 (N=100)*

N	X3.1	X3.2	X3.3	X3.4	X3.5	X4.1	X4.2	X4.3
1	5	3	4	2	3	5	4	4
2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
3	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	4
4	5	3	3	4	4	5	4	4
5	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3
6	5	3	4	5	4	5	3	5
7	4	2	4	4	3	4	3	5
8	5	4	5	5	4	5	4	5
9	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3
10	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4
11	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	4
12	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	4
13	5	3	4	4	4	5	4	4
14	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4
15	4	3	5	5	4	4	3	5
16	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4
17	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	5
18	3	3	4	5	3	3	5	5
19	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4
20	3	3	5	4	3	3	4	4
21	4	3	4	5	3	4	5	5
22	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
23	2	2	4	4	3	2	4	4
24	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4
25	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
26	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	5
27	4	3	4	5	3	4	5	5
28	5	3	3	5	3	5	4	4
29	3	3	4	4	4	3	5	5
30	5	3	4	4	4	5	4	4
31	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4
32	3	3	5	5	4	3	5	5
33	3	3	2	4	3	3	5	5
34	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
35	5	4	2	5	4	5	5	5
36	5	2	4	5	4	5	5	5
37	4	3	3	4	3	4	5	5

## LAMPIRAN 3 (lanjutan)

38	5	3	2	4	3	5	3	3
39	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	5
40	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	3
41	5	5	4	3	4	5	3	3
42	2	2	4	4	3	2	4	4
43	3	3	4	5	3	3	5	5
44	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5
45	5	4	5	3	4	5	3	5
46	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
47	5	3	2	5	4	5	5	5
48	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
49	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	4
50	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4
51	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4
52	4	4	3	4	4	4	5	5
53	4	2	3	4	3	4	4	4
54	4	3	4	4	4	4	5	5
55	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	5
56	2	4	3	5	3	2	4	4
57	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	3
58	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	2
59	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4
60	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4
61	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
62	3	3	3	4	3	3	5	5
63	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	5
64	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4
65	4	4	3	4	4	4	5	5
66	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	4
67	5	3	5	5	4	5	4	4
68	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
69	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	4
70	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	4
71	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	3
72	5	5	5	2	4	5	3	4
73	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	4
74	4	3	4	5	4	4	4	4
75	5	3	3	5	4	5	5	5
76	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	5



LAMPIRAN 3 (lanjutan)

77	3	2	4	5	3	3	5	5
78	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	5
79	3	2	4	4	3	3	3	3
80	2	3	4	4	3	2	4	4
81	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
82	4	4	5	5	4	4	3	3
83	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	4
84	3	3	5	4	3	3	5	5
85	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	5
86	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
87	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3
88	2	2	4	4	3	2	3	3
89	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3
90	4	3	5	5	4	4	4	4
91	5	3	4	4	4	5	5	5
92	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3
93	2	2	4	4	3	2	3	3
94	2	3	4	3	3	2	2	2
95	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	4
96	3	3	5	5	3	3	5	5
97	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	4
98	2	2	4	4	3	2	3	3
99	3	3	5	4	3	3	4	5
100	5	3	4	4	4	5	4	4

LAMPIRAN 4

*Data Entry SPSS variabel Y (N=100)*

<b>N</b>	<b>Y1</b>	<b>Y2</b>	<b>Y3</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y1</b>	<b>Y2</b>	<b>Y3</b>
<b>1</b>	3	3	3	<b>51</b>	3	4	4
<b>2</b>	4	3	3	<b>52</b>	4	4	4
<b>3</b>	4	4	4	<b>53</b>	3	4	3
<b>4</b>	4	4	4	<b>54</b>	5	4	4
<b>5</b>	3	3	3	<b>55</b>	4	4	4
<b>6</b>	4	4	4	<b>56</b>	5	5	3
<b>7</b>	4	4	3	<b>57</b>	4	3	3
<b>8</b>	4	4	4	<b>58</b>	3	3	3
<b>9</b>	3	4	3	<b>59</b>	3	3	3
<b>10</b>	4	4	3	<b>60</b>	4	3	3
<b>11</b>	4	5	4	<b>61</b>	3	4	3
<b>12</b>	4	3	4	<b>62</b>	5	4	3
<b>13</b>	4	4	4	<b>63</b>	5	4	4
<b>14</b>	4	4	3	<b>64</b>	3	4	3
<b>15</b>	4	4	4	<b>65</b>	4	4	4
<b>16</b>	4	4	3	<b>66</b>	4	3	3
<b>17</b>	5	5	4	<b>67</b>	4	4	4
<b>18</b>	5	4	3	<b>68</b>	4	3	4
<b>19</b>	4	4	4	<b>69</b>	4	3	3
<b>20</b>	4	4	3	<b>70</b>	3	3	3
<b>21</b>	4	4	3	<b>71</b>	3	3	3
<b>22</b>	5	4	5	<b>72</b>	4	4	4
<b>23</b>	4	4	3	<b>73</b>	4	4	4
<b>24</b>	4	4	5	<b>74</b>	3	4	4
<b>25</b>	5	5	5	<b>75</b>	4	4	4
<b>26</b>	4	4	4	<b>76</b>	4	4	3
<b>27</b>	5	4	3	<b>77</b>	4	4	3
<b>28</b>	3	4	3	<b>78</b>	4	4	4
<b>29</b>	4	5	4	<b>79</b>	3	3	3
<b>30</b>	4	4	4	<b>80</b>	4	3	3
<b>31</b>	4	4	3	<b>81</b>	3	4	3
<b>32</b>	5	4	4	<b>82</b>	3	4	4
<b>33</b>	4	4	3	<b>83</b>	4	3	3
<b>34</b>	3	4	4	<b>84</b>	4	4	3
<b>35</b>	4	4	4	<b>85</b>	4	3	3
<b>36</b>	5	5	4	<b>86</b>	3	4	4
<b>37</b>	4	4	3	<b>87</b>	3	4	3

LAMPIRAN 4 (lanjutan)

<b>38</b>	3	4	3	<b>88</b>	3	4	3
<b>39</b>	4	4	4	<b>89</b>	4	3	4
<b>40</b>	4	3	4	<b>90</b>	4	4	4
<b>41</b>	3	4	4	<b>91</b>	4	3	4
<b>42</b>	4	4	3	<b>92</b>	3	3	3
<b>43</b>	4	4	3	<b>93</b>	2	3	3
<b>44</b>	5	4	4	<b>94</b>	2	3	3
<b>45</b>	3	4	4	<b>95</b>	4	3	3
<b>46</b>	5	5	5	<b>96</b>	4	4	3
<b>47</b>	5	4	4	<b>97</b>	5	4	4
<b>48</b>	4	4	4	<b>98</b>	4	4	3
<b>49</b>	4	4	4	<b>99</b>	5	3	3
<b>50</b>	4	4	4	<b>100</b>	4	4	4

## LAMPIRAN 5

### Statistik Deskriptif

#### Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
X1.1	4,19	,662	100
X1.2	4,04	,777	100
X1.3	4,16	,788	100
X1.4	3,51	1,020	100
X1.5	3,48	1,078	100
X2.1	4,19	,677	100
X2.2	4,16	,748	100
X2.3	4,04	,777	100
X3.1	3,86	,932	100
X3.2	3,45	,892	100
X3.3	4,03	,758	100
X3.4	4,17	,667	100
X3.5	3,52	,455	100
X4.1	3,86	,932	100
X4.2	4,04	,751	100
X4.3	4,16	,788	100
Y1	3,87	,650	100
Y2	3,71	,449	100
Y3	3,52	,455	100

#### X1.1

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	2	2,0	2,0	2,0
	3	8,0	8,0	10,0
Valid	4	59,0	59,0	69,0
	5	31,0	31,0	100,0
Total	100	100,0	100,0	

#### X1.2

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	2	2,0	2,0	2,0
	3	22,0	22,0	24,0
Valid	4	46,0	46,0	70,0
	5	30,0	30,0	100,0
Total	100	100,0	100,0	

LAMPIRAN 5 (lanjutan)

**X1.3**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	2,0	2,0	2,0
	3	18	18,0	20,0
	4	42	42,0	62,0
	5	38	38,0	100,0
	Total	100	100,0	100,0

**X1.4**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	1,0	1,0
	2	20	20,0	21,0
	3	22	22,0	43,0
	4	41	41,0	84,0
	5	16	16,0	100,0
	Total	100	100,0	100,0

**X1.5**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	1,0	1,0
	2	24	24,0	25,0
	3	19	19,0	44,0
	4	38	38,0	82,0
	5	18	18,0	100,0
	Total	100	100,0	100,0

**X2.1**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3	15	15,0	15,0
	4	51	51,0	66,0
	5	34	34,0	100,0
	Total	100	100,0	100,0

LAMPIRAN 5 (lanjutan)

**X2.2**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 2	1	1,0	1,0	1,0
3	18	18,0	18,0	19,0
4	45	45,0	45,0	64,0
5	36	36,0	36,0	100,0
Total	100	100,0	100,0	

**X2.3**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 2	2	2,0	2,0	2,0
3	22	22,0	22,0	24,0
4	46	46,0	46,0	70,0
5	30	30,0	30,0	100,0
Total	100	100,0	100,0	

**X3.1**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 2	8	8,0	8,0	8,0
3	27	27,0	27,0	35,0
4	36	36,0	36,0	71,0
5	29	29,0	29,0	100,0
Total	100	100,0	100,0	

**X3.2**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	1	1,0	1,0	1,0
2	10	10,0	10,0	11,0
3	46	46,0	46,0	57,0
4	29	29,0	29,0	86,0
5	14	14,0	14,0	100,0
Total	100	100,0	100,0	

LAMPIRAN 5 (lanjutan)

**X3.3**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	2	4	4,0	4,0
	3	15	15,0	19,0
Valid	4	55	55,0	74,0
	5	26	26,0	100,0
Total	100	100,0	100,0	

**X3.4**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	2	2	2,0	2,0
	3	9	9,0	11,0
Valid	4	59	59,0	70,0
	5	30	30,0	100,0
Total	100	100,0	100,0	

**X3.5**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	3	3	3,0	3,0
	3	5	5,0	8,0
	3	5	5,0	13,0
	3	17	17,0	30,0
	3	20	20,0	50,0
	4	21	21,0	71,0
Valid	4	14	14,0	85,0
	4	6	6,0	91,0
	4	4	4,0	95,0
	4	1	1,0	96,0
	5	2	2,0	98,0
	5	2	2,0	100,0
Total	100	100,0	100,0	

LAMPIRAN 5 (lanjutan)

**X4.1**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 2	8	8,0	8,0	8,0
3	27	27,0	27,0	35,0
4	36	36,0	36,0	71,0
5	29	29,0	29,0	100,0
Total	100	100,0	100,0	

**X4.2**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 2	1	1,0	1,0	1,0
3	23	23,0	23,0	24,0
4	47	47,0	47,0	71,0
5	29	29,0	29,0	100,0
Total	100	100,0	100,0	

**X4.3**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 2	2	2,0	2,0	2,0
3	18	18,0	18,0	20,0
4	42	42,0	42,0	62,0
5	38	38,0	38,0	100,0
Total	100	100,0	100,0	

**Y1**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 2	2	2,0	2,0	2,0
3	1	1,0	1,0	3,0
3	3	3,0	3,0	6,0
3	7	7,0	7,0	13,0
3	8	8,0	8,0	21,0
3	5	5,0	5,0	26,0
4	11	11,0	11,0	37,0
4	19	19,0	19,0	56,0



LAMPIRAN 5 (lanjutan)

4	8	8,0	8,0	64,0
4	10	10,0	10,0	74,0
4	10	10,0	10,0	84,0
5	4	4,0	4,0	88,0
5	3	3,0	3,0	91,0
5	9	9,0	9,0	100,0
Total	100	100,0	100,0	

Y2

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	3	1,0	1,0	1,0
	3	8,0	8,0	9,0
	3	7,0	7,0	16,0
	3	9,0	9,0	25,0
	4	16,0	16,0	41,0
	4	19,0	19,0	60,0
	4	8,0	8,0	68,0
Valid	4	15,0	15,0	83,0
	4	3,0	3,0	86,0
	4	7,0	7,0	93,0
	5	4,0	4,0	97,0
	5	1,0	1,0	98,0
	5	1,0	1,0	99,0
	5	1,0	1,0	100,0
Total	100	100,0	100,0	

Y3

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	3	3,0	3,0	3,0
	3	5,0	5,0	8,0
	3	5,0	5,0	13,0
	3	17,0	17,0	30,0
Valid	3	20,0	20,0	50,0
	4	21,0	21,0	71,0
	4	14,0	14,0	85,0
	4	6,0	6,0	91,0

LAMPIRAN 5 (lanjutan)

4	4	4,0	4,0	95,0
4	1	1,0	1,0	96,0
5	2	2,0	2,0	98,0
5	2	2,0	2,0	100,0
Total	100	100,0	100,0	

## LAMPIRAN 6

### Uji Validitas dan Reliabilitas

#### Correlations

		X1.1	X1.2	X1.3	X1.4	X1.5	X1
X1.1	Pearson Correlation	1	,652**	,580**	,334**	,310**	,714**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,001	,002	,000
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100
X1.2	Pearson Correlation	,652**	1	,682**	,216*	,242*	,692**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000	,031	,015	,000
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100
X1.3	Pearson Correlation	,580**	,682**	1	,262**	,361**	,732**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000		,008	,000	,000
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100
X1.4	Pearson Correlation	,334**	,216*	,262**	1	,786**	,764**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,001	,031	,008		,000	,000
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100
X1.5	Pearson Correlation	,310**	,242*	,361**	,786**	1	,794**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,002	,015	,000	,000		,000
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100
X1	Pearson Correlation	,714**	,692**	,732**	,764**	,794**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

#### Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
,785	,799	5

LAMPIRAN 6 (lanjutan)

**Correlations**

		X2.1	X2.2	X2.3	X2
X2.1	Pearson Correlation	1	,378**	,427**	,752**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000
	N	100	100	100	100
X2.2	Pearson Correlation	,378**	1	,423**	,776**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000	,000
	N	100	100	100	100
X2.3	Pearson Correlation	,427**	,423**	1	,806**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000		,000
	N	100	100	100	100
X2	Pearson Correlation	,752**	,776**	,806**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	
	N	100	100	100	100

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
,674	,675	3

LAMPIRAN 6 (lanjutan)

**Correlations**

		X3.1	X3.2	X3.3	X3.4	X3.5	X3
X3.1	Pearson Correlation	1	,465**	,092	,136	,637**	,713**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,364	,177	,000	,000
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100
X3.2	Pearson Correlation	,465**	1	,323**	,040	,693**	,759**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,001	,694	,000	,000
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100
X3.3	Pearson Correlation	,092	,323**	1	,169	,528**	,589**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,364	,001		,092	,000	,000
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100
X3.4	Pearson Correlation	,136	,040	,169	1	,442**	,460**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,177	,694	,092		,000	,000
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100
X3.5	Pearson Correlation	,637**	,693**	,528**	,442**	1	,937**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100
X3	Pearson Correlation	,713**	,759**	,589**	,460**	,937**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
,681	,731	5

LAMPIRAN 6 (lanjutan)

**Correlations**

	X4.1	X4.2	X4.3	X4
Pearson Correlation	1	,224 <sup>*</sup>	,320 <sup>**</sup>	,696 <sup>**</sup>
X4.1 Sig. (2-tailed)		,025	,001	,000
N	100	100	100	100
Pearson Correlation	,224 <sup>*</sup>	1	,791 <sup>**</sup>	,815 <sup>**</sup>
X4.2 Sig. (2-tailed)	,025		,000	,000
N	100	100	100	100
Pearson Correlation	,320 <sup>**</sup>	,791 <sup>**</sup>	1	,865 <sup>**</sup>
X4.3 Sig. (2-tailed)	,001	,000		,000
N	100	100	100	100
Pearson Correlation	,696 <sup>**</sup>	,815 <sup>**</sup>	,865 <sup>**</sup>	1
X4 Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	
N	100	100	100	100

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
,684	,707	3

LAMPIRAN 6 (lanjutan)

**Correlations**

	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y
Pearson Correlation	1	,586**	,380**	,871**
Y1 Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000
N	100	100	100	100
Pearson Correlation	,586**	1	,386**	,806**
Y2 Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000	,000
N	100	100	100	100
Pearson Correlation	,380**	,386**	1	,702**
Y3 Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000		,000
N	100	100	100	100
Pearson Correlation	,871**	,806**	,702**	1
Y Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	
N	100	100	100	100

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
,698	,711	3

## LAMPIRAN 7

### Analisis Regresi Linier Berganda

**Variables Entered/Removed<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	X4, X3, X2, X1 <sup>b</sup>		Enter

a. Dependent Variable: Y

b. All requested variables entered.

**Model Summary<sup>a</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	,947 <sup>a</sup>	,896	,892	,410	1,892

a. Predictors: (Constant), X4, X3, X2, X1

b. Dependent Variable: Y

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	137,797	4	34,449	204,578	,000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	15,997	95	,168		
	Total	153,794	99			

a. Dependent Variable: Y

b. Predictors: (Constant), X4, X3, X2, X1

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	1,490	,371		4,021	,000					
X1	,215	,020	,555	10,492	,000	,860	,733	,347	,391	2,556
X2	,146	,037	,201	3,970	,000	,754	,377	,131	,426	2,347
X3	,192	,021	,389	9,215	,000	,682	,687	,305	,516	1,624
X4	-,002	,034	-,003	-,052	,950	,739	-,005	-,002	,300	2,633

a. Dependent Variable: Y

**Collinearity Diagnostics<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Variance Proportions				
				(Constant)	X1	X2	X3	X4
1	1	4,960	1,000	,00	,00	,00	,00	,00
	2	,017	17,192	,22	,21	,04	,15	,02
	3	,012	20,591	,31	,02	,08	,19	,28
	4	,006	28,576	,02	,65	,23	,30	,40
	5	,005	30,996	,44	,12	,64	,36	,29

a. Dependent Variable: Y



## LAMPIRAN 7 (lanjutan)

**Residuals Statistics<sup>a</sup>**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	7,78	13,83	11,10	1,180	100
Std. Predicted Value	-2,808	2,313	,000	1,000	100
Standard Error of Predicted Value	,047	,150	,089	,022	100
Adjusted Predicted Value	7,69	13,75	11,10	1,180	100
Residual	-1,250	1,190	,000	,402	100
Std. Residual	-3,047	2,899	,000	,980	100
Stud. Residual	-3,116	2,980	,002	1,009	100
Deleted Residual	-1,307	1,273	,001	,427	100
Stud. Deleted Residual	-3,271	3,113	,003	1,026	100
Mahal. Distance	,310	12,243	3,960	2,416	100
Cook's Distance	,000	,149	,012	,026	100
Centered Leverage Value	,003	,124	,040	,024	100

a. Dependent Variable: Y

**Scatterplot**

**Dependent Variable: Y**

