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Background: Online retail sales has been growing steadily since the late twentieth century. Fashion, as a segment of the online marketplace, is the largest market in cyberspace and as new companies are combined with old ones who want to establish a presence online, competition is stifling. As more companies offer fashion in the online world consumers behavior evolves with this new reality and customer-perceived value shifts as the consumers values in their transactions shifts. In order to gain and maintain a strong consumer base companies need to know what the variables are that make up customer-perceived value in hopes of affecting it.

Purpose: The purpose of this research is to explain the relationship between values of utilitarian nature, those being; monetary savings, convenience, product variety, product information, and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail and to explain the relationship between values of hedonic nature, those being; adventure, gratification, best deal, idea, and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail.
**Methodology:** The research conducted here was an explanatory study to determine how different independent variables related to a single dependent variable. The study was deductive in nature and used a quantitative approach. Independent variables were studied with the use of a convenience sample and self-reporting survey posted online. Statistical analysis was conducted with data collected from 142 valid responses and through the use of validity and reliability methods the data was determined statistically meaningful and valid to test the hypothesis as accepted or rejected.

**Findings:** The findings of this study show that a new theoretical model was needed to better demonstrate the direct connection between variables that consumers identified as valuable to them in online fashion shopping, had with consumer-perceived value. By examining data collected through online survey it was determined that of the 8 variables, seen as valuable by research into consumer perceived value, 4 would be accepted as such. These 4 variables would become the basis for a new model that explained how consumers develop customer-perceived value.

**Conclusion:** The research explains the relationship the 8 variables selected by previous research for their effect on customer-perceived value. It also provides a model for future research activities or for development of marketing plans with exceptional efficiency and effectiveness in mind. In directly relating each variable to customer-perceived value on its own merit it was found that the variables respondents valued most were of the more practical or utilitarian in nature aside from one, adventure, which possessed the highest level of value of the 8 variables.
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1. Introduction

In this chapter the overall background of online retail will be introduced with its connection to customer-perceived value and a discussion of problems that arose in previous research regarding customer-perceived value and its foundation will be presented. At the end, the chapter will be concluded with the purpose of this research.

1.1 Background

Retail sales online has existed since the late twentieth century as Amazon, founded in 1994 (Amazon, 2018), and eBay, founded in 1995 (EBay, 2018). Those companies setting the tone for how online retail should look moving forward (OpenLearn, 2013). The sales platform has grown dramatically from those early beginnings to a 2.3 billion US dollar business worldwide in 2017 and it is estimated to double over the next four years (Statista, 2018). This increase can be partially attributed to the growing number of internet users (OpenLearn, 2013). As consumers adapt their behaviour to the online retail platform they change the way they shop and what they value from the online experience (OpenLearn, 2013). Once forced to visit a retailer’s physical location they now can weigh the pros and cons of visiting the retailer’s physical location or whether there is more benefit in making the purchase online. They now have the chance to maximize their available resources (Spenner and Freeman, 2012) with, as Percy (2017) points out, “technology-enabled shopping experiences giving them the simplicity, convenience and excitement they crave” (p. 1). As consumer behavior continues to evolve, the retailers that take part in online retail will need to evolve along with them to keep attractive in the consumers’ eyes (Percy, 2017).

To take advantage of the new reality, businesses complement physical stores with an online presence (Bricaud, 2015; Deck Commerce, 2017). This means that retailers who exclusively operate online are facing more competition and cannot focus purely on their products (Wu, Chen, Chen, and Cheng, 2014). A distinct lack of consumer interaction that used to take place in the physical retail environment needs to be replaced with more accessible consumer information to design a more personal shopping experience (Lee, and Dubinsky, 2017). Researchers have taken up the task of identifying the value building elements of online shopping (Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Rintamäki, Kanto, Kuusela and Spence, 2006). Basing the search for customer-perceived value on the traditional factors from retail in the real world (Chen and
By looking at utilitarian, the functional drive to consume, and hedonic, the emotional relationship in the act of shopping, categories of customer-perceived value, research has begun to define the core building blocks for customer-perceived value online (Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Overby and Lee, 2006; Percy, 2017; Chiu et al. 2014). In the hope of explaining the situation that online retail has created, researchers look to the concept of customer-perceived value as a gateway to new theoretical models that will offer a framework for deeper understanding into this phenomenon (Kumar and Kashyap, 2018).

1.2 Problem discussion

Customer-perceived value, or short CPV, has gained interest in the last several decades, due to the growth of new forms of retail as well as the need to understand elements such as repeat purchasing and brand loyalty (Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Eggert and Ulaga, 2002; Lam, Shankar, Erramilli and Murthy, 2004 and Ravald and Grönroos, 1996). The concept has been expanded by examining the contributing values of price versus quality and adopting a broader perceived benefit versus customer sacrifices in the consumption process (Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Rintamäki et al., 2006). This broader definition has led researchers to focus on very different aspects of CPV as they explore potential models that would give structure to future studies as well as frameworks for practitioners (Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Chiu, Wang, Fang and Huang, 2014; Ulaga and Chacour, 2001; Wu, et al., 2014).

CPV can influence and even define consumers purchasing decisions (Lin, 2012). The need for more detailed and situationally specific compositions for values of hedonic and utilitarian nature as well as clear explanations of those values effects on the consumer and their value building process, the more effective and efficient marketing efforts can be developed (Babin, Carr, Peck, and Carson, 2001; Ulaga and Chacour, 2001). The underlying goal, to minimize the perceptual gap between consumers and suppliers in order to clearly understand how consumers develop the perception of value toward not only products but the process of acquiring those products (Childers et al., 2001; Wu et al., 2014). Attempting to define CPV in online shopping, several exploratory studies with tentative models have emerged in an effort to explain the purchase process of consumers in this constantly developing marketplace (Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Chiu et al., 2014; Wu et al., 2014). These models provide a starting point for explanation of CPV, and once confirmed in varied situations, can be utilized by management practitioners (Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Chiu, Wang, Fang and Huang, 2014; Ulaga and Chacour, 2001). This relevance confirmation can
give way to new, more situationally based models as well as potentially identifying unique behaviours that may apply only to the act of online shopping (Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Childers et al., 2001). To begin that process rigorous testing must be performed to establish the most accurate and useful models for the subject matter (Bryman and Bell, 2015). Beginning with the two signature values identified as components of CVP, utilitarian and hedonic, a traditionalist starting point has been adopted by most researchers who have been looking into behaviors in online retail (Babin, Darden and Griffin, 1994; Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Childers et al., 2001; Overby and Lee, 2006).

Utilitarian value, the functional benefits that a consumer gets from a purchase, was originally used for the measurement of CPV exclusively but was found to be conceptualized in too broad a way and needed a narrower examination of defined variables in order to identify the precise contributors to utilitarian value (Zauner, Koller and Hatak, 2015). The result of this examination gave way to the more specific variables within the utilitarian value as monetary savings, convenience, product variety and product information being identified as contributors (Chandon, Wansink and Laurent, 2000; Chiu, Wang, Fang and Huang, 2014; Kesari and Atulkar, 2016; Moon, Khalid, Awan, Attiq, Rasool and Kiran, 2017; Mpinganjira, 2015; Parker and Wang, 2016; Pham, Tran, Misra, Maskeliūnas and Damaševičius, 2018; Rintamäki et al., 2006). As these variables have emerged they have been tested against CPV within the confines of utilitarian value (Childers et al., 2001). Meaning that a direct correlation to the knowledge of the researchers here, has not been performed. The need for such testing is clear in that there is no way of knowing to what degree these variables effect CPV and if there is a hierarchy of importance within the grouping.

The belief that utilitarian values, presumably alone, were the driving force in consumers behavior regarding online shopping, has led to tunnel vision as the confirmation of even a small group of hedonic values has led to arguments over the amount of influence those values wield (Childers et al., 2001; Dobre and Milovan-Ciuta, 2015; Kumar and Kashyap, 2018). Hedonic value is based on the overall feeling a customer has from an experience, which is subjective, abstract and more difficult to quantify compared to utilitarian value (Chiu et al., 2014; Kesari and Atulkar, 2016; Rintamäki et al., 2006). The renewed interest shown in the overlooked complementary factor of hedonic value is fueling new experimentation as some would argue that the hedonic values may be of equal importance as utilitarian (Chiu et al., 2014; Dobre and Milovan-Ciuta, 2015; Kesari and Atulkar, 2016). Classifying hedonic value into variables has challenged researchers with some classifications being confirmed by their peers and others being refuted even now (Chandon et al., 2000; Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982; Kesari and Atulkar, 2016; Rintamäki et
al., 2006). Working from Holbrook and Hirschman’s (1982) study, Arnold and Reynolds’ (2003) defined the values of hedonic nature as adventure, gratification, value or best deal, idea, role and social. Research that is specific to online shopping often utilize the initial four variables as being the most relevant to the study of this phenomena (Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Chiu et al., 2014). However, just as with the utilitarian values, they have only been tested against CPV within the confines of hedonic value and misses, to the best knowledge of the researchers, the direct measurement regarding its relationships.

Online fashion retail is the largest market worldwide as reported by Statista 2016. As a platform for the study of online shopping behaviour it offers a varied segment of consumer from different cultures, countries and financial backgrounds. On a global level with “the highest penetrated market for fashion on e-commerce [being] South Korea at over 35 percent, the UK [being] around 25 percent and the United States [being] 24 percent” (Beighton in Davey, 2018). However, oversaturation of the current online fashion market has businesses looking for the advantage they need to not only attract consumers to their platforms but to earn those customers loyalty (Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Childers et al., 2001). By identifying the building blocks of CPV a framework, through which a plan of action can be developed, can be established and future plans can utilize that framework to focus resources in the most effective and efficient way (Spender and Freeman, 2012; Percy, 2017). If business is to follow the recommendations that researchers have proposed in the discussion of CPV, it should be validated that the variables used to measure that concept are indeed accurate, beneficial and within the companies’ ability to influence through action. Therefore, the development of an accurate model that highlights which variables and to what effect they influence the CPV will provide more options to companies in their plans for consumer attraction and retention (Spender and Freeman, 2012; Percy, 2017).

1.3 Purpose

The purpose of this research is to explain the relationship between values of utilitarian nature, those being: monetary savings, convenience, product variety, product information, and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail and to explain the relationship between values of hedonic nature, those being: adventure, gratification, best deal, idea, and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail.
2. Literature Review

In the literature review the theoretical concepts of customer-perceived value as well as the sub-concepts of values of utilitarian and hedonic nature are presented. The values of utilitarian nature are monetary savings, convenience, product variety and product information. The values of hedonic nature are adventure, gratification, best deal and idea.

2.1 Customer-Perceived Value

Customer-perceived value (Chen and Dubinsky, 2003), or total customer value (Graf and Maas, 2008; Rintamäki et al., 2006), was originally seen as a trade-off between product price and the product’s quality (Bolton and Drew, 1991; Dodds and Monroe, 1985). However, over time, with the concept of customer-perceived value gaining more attention, researchers started to realize the complexity of this concept (Overby and Lee, 2006). Zeithaml’s (1988) definition of customer-perceived value, “the customer’s overall assessment of the utility of a product based on perceptions of what is received and what is given” (p.14), received acceptance in the research community by taking more than price and quality into account (Arslanagic-Kalajdzic and Zabkar, 2015; Boksberger and Melsen, 2011; Walker, Johnson and Leonard, 2006). Other researchers used the terms benefits and sacrifices instead whereof benefits can be seen as a counterpart to the original “what is received” (Zeithaml, 1988, p.14) and sacrifices as a counterpart to “what is given” (Zeithaml, 1988, p.14). Hence customer-perceived value being a trade-off between benefits and sacrifices (Babin et al., 1994; Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Overby and Lee, 2006; Ravald and Grönroos, 1996; Rintamäki et al., 2006; Woodruff, 1997) whereas customer-perceived value as an end-result can be seen as a consumer surplus. The consumer is gaining more overall benefits than he or she has to sacrifice (Anderson, Jain and Chintagunta, 1993; Arslanagic-Kalajdzic and Zabkar, 2015). This consumer surplus is subjective and situation specific (Arslanagic-Kalajdzic and Zabkar, 2015; Ravald and Grönroos, 1996). However, according to Arslanagic-Kalajdzic and Zabkar (2015) customer-perceived value “is formed over a period of time” (p.87) and in repeated situations. Consumers take alternative offerings from other retailers into account and weigh their experience with the perception of value they will gain by changing to another retailer Arslanagic-Kalajdzic and Zabkar, 2015). If the customer-perceived value from the past was high enough consumers are likely to repeat the purchase giving the retailer a competitive advantage (Arslanagic-Kalajdzic and Zabkar, 2015, Chiu et al., 2014 Ravald and
Grönroos, 1996). Overby and Lee (2006) divided this behaviour into preference and intention. When consumers received value through a purchase from a specific retailer they prefer this one over others and see this specific retailer as the first choice when purchasing more products. This is reflected in the consumers intentional behaviour. According to Overby and Lee (2006) consumers stay loyal to retailers that delivered value, hence they will keep shopping at that specific store and look at that stores offerings first when they need to purchase an item similar in nature to what they have purchased there in the past. Due to previously received value, consumers trust the retailer and are confident that they will receive value in the future. This, at the same time, improves their experience with the retailer (Chiu et al., 2014; Overby and Lee, 2006).

2.2 Values of Utilitarian Nature

2.2.1 Monetary Savings

Monetary savings are the customers’ savings in obtaining demanded products for a lower price than if they had shopped at a competitor (Chandon et al., 2000; Chiu et al., 2012; Kesari and Atulkar, 2016; Moon et al., 2017; Parker and Wang, 2016; Rintamäki et al., 2006; van Heerde, Gijsbrechts, and Pauwels, 2008). Consumers have a minimized perceived financial loss (Chandon et al., 2000; Rintamäki et al., 2006) and are given the benefit of saving money on future expenditures (Chiu et al., 2012; Moon et al., 2017). Monetary savings include overall low prices, sales promotions (Chiu et al., 2012) and discounted costs for quality products which creates competitive pricing in the market (Kesari and Atulkar, 2016). The price of previously purchased products in relation to the product’s quality is nevertheless of significance as well (Overby and Lee, 2006).

2.2.2 Convenience

The value of convenience is influenced by two factors, the effort and time consumers have to invest in order to make a purchase (Kesari and Atulkar, 2016; Mpinganjira, 2015; Pham et al., 2018; Rintamäki et al., 2006). The process of buying a product begins with the search for a retailer, the collection of information about a product and ends with the successful purchase of it (Kesari and Atulkar, 2016; Mpinganjira, 2015; Rintamäki et al., 2006). Seiders, Berry and Gresham (2000) separated convenience into four different kinds namely access convenience, the ease of reaching a retailer; search convenience, the ease of identifying and selecting essential products; possession convenience, the ease of obtaining desired products and transaction convenience, the ease of purchasing and returning products. Transaction
convenience can however not only be seen as an advantage for the retailer when fulfilled in the customers’ eyes (Seider, Berry and Gresham, 2000) but also as a disadvantage if not. A lack of transaction convenience can lower the consumers’ willingness to purchase a product even though the consumer is almost done with completing the purchase. According to Olivares, Lu, Musalem, and Schilkrut (2011) the length of a line at a checkout in a retail store negatively influences customers purchasing behavior. Furthermore, Mpinganjira (2015) and Pham et al. (2018) stress the importance of evaluation convenience which is based on the drive of quickly finding product information. Hence it is very similar in nature to Seiders, Berry and Gresham’s (2000) search convenience. This further acts in line with the outcome that consumers do not want to spend much time looking for products and product information (Kesari and Atulkar, 2016; Mpinganjira, 2015; Moon et al., 2017; Pham et al., 2018; Seiders, Berry and Gresham, 2000). Additionally, scholars found that consumers want to purchase products in flexible hours, whenever it fits them best (Chiu et al., 2012; Moon et al., 2017; Parker and Wang, 2016) and wherever they are (Chiu et al., 2012; Seiders et al., 2000).

2.2.3 Product Variety

Product variety refers to a large range of products (Chiu et al., 2014; Kesari and Atulkar, 2016; Scavarda, Reichhart, Hamacher and Holzweg, 2010) and broad product offerings (Chiu et al., 2014). In Chiu et al.’s (2014) words, the products offered by a retailer should be “reflecting both the breadth and depth of the offered products” (p. 92). Consumers should be offered a sufficient number of products to ensure they will find products that suit their needs and preferences (Chiu et al., 2014). This acts in accordance with Stäblein, Holweg and Miemczyk (2011) who found that a retailer’s product variety can be divided into three categories; fundamental, intermediate and peripheral variety. The first one, fundamental variety, refers to the broad range of product assortment, taking every item category into account. Enough differing products should be offered in order to fulfill differing market segments’ needs. Intermediate variety summarizes the variety within a product category. An overview of those different categories allows consumers to make decisions between alike products and eases the process of purchasing similar products out of one category. Lastly, peripheral variety, focuses on equivalent products that only differ from each other due to additional components such as colouring for instance. This allows customers to partly customize their product based on their desired features while gives the consumer more options in order to find a desired product (Stäblein et al., 2011).
2.2.4 Product Information

Product information is information about products and services offered (Moon et al., 2017). This information can consist of standard information, covering the general information about price, sizes, colours available etc. (Chiu et al., 2014; Moon et al., 2017) and rich or in other words quality information which goes into the details of product specifications (Chiu at al., 2014; Moon et al., 2017). Quality information can include a products’ features (Chiu et al., 2014; Moon et al., 2017) or valuable technical information for instance. Quality information however do not only refer to information published by the retailer but can refer to user generated reviews as well, which supply a wealth of hands on evaluations. Those often include the way a product performs along with a rating system which signifies the satisfaction a consumer has with that specific product (Chua and Banerjee, 2016). Nelson (1970) furthermore divided products based on the information given to consumers into search and experience products which has been acknowledged by several researchers since then (Pant, Hsieh, Lee and Shen, 2014). Search products are products where all important product details are given to the consumers, hence products for which the consumer simply needs to search for information from the retailer. Experience products on the other hand lack information and require the consumer to experience the product before knowing more about it (Nelson, 1970; Pant et al., 2014). According to Mpinganjira (2015) finding product information is closely related to search convenience with consumers looking for information to help them evaluate product options in the shortest amount of time possible. It is of importance that product information is relevant, accurate (Moon et al., 2017) and up-to-date (Chiu et al., 2014; Moon et al., 2017).

2.3 Values of Hedonic Nature

2.3.1 Adventure

The hedonic value of adventure refers to entertaining and simulating aspects contributing to customer value (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003; Chiu et al., 2014; Overby and Lee, 2006; Rintamäki et al., 2006). It is, according to Arnold and Reynolds (2003) also called entertaining due to its growing importance in retail sales. Chandon et al. (2000) highlight contests and free gifts as contributors to entertainment value. The overall atmosphere, without considering whether it is an offline or online retailer, is nevertheless important as well (Chandon et al., 2000; Kesari and Atulkar 2016; Rintamäki et al., 2006). Sensory stimulation (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003) such as music (Kesari and Atulkar, 2016), lighting and colour settings (Rintamäki et al., 2006) and or themed environments for instance lead consumers to enjoy pleasure.
Entertainment values are pursued passively (Rintamäki et al., 2006) and contributors serve to generate enjoyment (Kesari and Atulkar, 2016; Rinkamäki et al., 2006). They allow consumers to have a pleasant time (Rintamäki et al., 2006); treating themselves with the shopping experience (Chiu et al., 2014). Consumers might seek adventure when they are bored (Chiu et al., 2014) and according to Arnold and Reynolds (2003), these stimulations help consumers to add excitement to their day in letting them feel like they are in a different world.

2.3.2 Gratification

According to researchers such as Arnold and Reynolds (2003), Chiu et al. (2014) and Parker and Wang (2016) gratification shopping is shopping for stress relief, to reduce tension and to ameliorate the mood. Consumers shop to forget about their problems (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003) and about their stressful days (Chiu et al., 2014). Consumers have a drive of acting out pleasurable activities such as shopping as a help to relax and to relief stress (Babin et al., 1994; Kesari and Atulkar, 2016; Parker and Wang, 2016). Overby and Lee’s (2006) outcome acts in accordance with that, finding that consumers need to be absorbed in the shopping experience through the retailer; they should be able to follow their drive to escape from their daily routine with shopping. Babin et al. (1994) went one step further and identified shopping as an escape for consumers’ daily lives, in a therapeutic way, based on their findings that consumers tend to shop when they are depressed due to the knowledge that shopping cheers them up (Babin et al., 1994).

2.3.3 Best Deal

Best deal (Chiu et al., 2014, Moon et al., 2017) or value (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003) involves the search for savings in form of sales and discounts (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003; Chiu et al., 2014; Moon et al., 2017) which is very similar in nature to the utilitarian value of monetary savings mentioned in 2.2.1. The difference however is how the value is perceived. The utilitarian value of monetary savings delivers value in form of saving money per se (Rintamäki et al., 2006; Kesari and Atulkar, 2016) whereas the hedonic value, best deal, is the enjoyment of the process of hunting for and taking advantage of bargains (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003; Moon et al., 2017). According to Arnold and Reynolds (2003) consumers see the hedonic value of “hunting for bargains, looking for sales, and finding discounts or low prices, almost as if shopping is a challenge to be “conquered” or a game to be “won” (p. 81) resulting in a feeling of pride when succeeded (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003). Babin et al. (1994) found that consumers are eager to find a bargain and feel pleasure in doing so, which was supported by Chiu et al. (2014) who identified that
consumers feel happy and proud when finding a bargain. This supports Bicen and Madhavaram’s (2013) findings of consumers experiencing excitement when finding bargains.

2.3.4 Idea

Idea shopping refers to shopping in order to stay current regarding new products, innovations, fashion and trends (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003; Kesari and Atulkar, 2016; Parker and Wang, 2016). Consumers want to gather insights and new ideas of what to buy (Kesari and Atulkar, 2016; Parker and Wang, 2016). Consumers want to explore, touch and try different products (Kesari and Atulkar, 2016). Idea shopping is pursued actively through a wide variety of activities such as window shopping and browsing, (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003; Babin et al., 1994; Rintamäki, 2006) where consumers might even visit different departments to get a wider understanding of what trends or fashions are popular at the time (Rintamäki et al., 2006). Babin et al. (1994) furthermore identified consumers variety seeking attitude as a way of gathering ideas and staying updated which agrees with Rintamäki et al.’s (2006) findings.
3. Conceptual Framework

In this chapter, the conceptualization of the theoretical concepts will be presented with the corresponding hypotheses. Finally, the model to be utilized in this study, which is derived from the literature review and hypotheses conceptualization, will be presented.

3.1 Conceptualization; The Relationship between Values of Utilitarian Nature and Customer-Perceived Value

Utilitarian value, identified as having a positive relationship to customer-perceived value (Arslanagic-Kalajdzic and Zabkar, 2015; Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Rintamäki et al., 2006) was, in several research settings, identified to consist of monetary savings (Chandon et al., 2000; Chiu et al., 2014; Kesari and Atulkar, 2016, Moon et al., 2017; Overby and Lee, 2006; Parker and Wang, 2016; Rintamäki et al., 2006). Therefore, it is expected that monetary savings has a positive relationship with customer-perceived value directly, in online fashion retail as well. Meaning that when monetary savings in online fashion retail increases, customer-perceived value in online fashion retail increases. Therefore, this study puts forth the following hypothesis:

H1: There is a positive relationship between monetary savings and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail.

Utilitarian value, identified as having a positive relationship to customer-perceived value (Arslanagic-Kalajdzic and Zabkar, 2015; Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Rintamäki et al., 2006) was, in several research settings, identified to consist of convenience (Chiu et al., 2014; Kesari and Atulkar, 2016; Moon et al., 2017; Mpinganjira, 2015; Overby and Lee, 2006; Parker and Wang, 2016; Pham et al., 2018, Rintamäki et al., 2006). Therefore, it is expected that customer-perceived value is positively influenced by convenience directly, in online fashion retail as well. Meaning that an increase in convenience in online fashion retail results in an increase in customer-perceived value in online fashion retail. Therefore, this study puts forth the following hypothesis:

H2: There is a positive relationship between convenience and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail.
Utilitarian value, identified as having a positive relationship to customer-perceived value (Arslanagic-Kalajdzic and Zabkar, 2015; Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Rintamäki et al., 2006) consists of product variety (Babin et al., 1994; Chiu et al., 2014; Kesari and Atulkar, 2016). Therefore, it is expected that there is a positive relationship between product variety and customer-perceived value directly, in online fashion retail as well. Hence an increase in product variety in online fashion retail leads to an increase in customer-perceived value in online fashion retail. Therefore, this study puts forth the following hypothesis:

H3: There is a positive relationship between product variety and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail.

Utilitarian value, identified as having a positive relationship to customer-perceived value (Arslanagic-Kalajdzic and Zabkar, 2015; Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Rintamäki et al., 2006) was, in several research settings, identified to consist of product information (Chandon et al., 2000; Chiu et al., 2014; Kesari and Atulkar, 2016, Moon et al., 2017; Overby and Lee, 2006; Parker and Wang, 2016; Rintamäki et al., 2006). Therefore, it is expected that product information has a positive relationship with customer-perceived value directly, specifically in online fashion retail. Meaning that an increase in product information in online fashion retail results in an increase in customer-perceived value in online fashion retail. Therefore, this study puts forth the following hypothesis:

H4: There is a positive relationship between product information and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail.

3.2 Conceptualization of the Relationship between Values of Hedonic Nature and Customer-Perceived Value

Hedonic value, identified as having a positive relationship to customer-perceived value (Arslanagic-Kalajdzic and Zabkar, 2015; Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Rintamäki et al., 2006) was, in several research settings, identified to consist of adventure (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003; Babin et al., 1994; Chiu et al., 2014; Kesari and Atulkar, 2016; Overby and Lee, 2006, Rintamäki et al., 2006). Hence it is expected that there is a positive relationship between adventure and customer-perceived value directly, in online fashion
retail as well. Meaning that an increase in adventure in online fashion retail leads to an increase in the customer-perceived value in online fashion retail. Therefore, this study puts forth the following hypothesis:

H5: There is a positive relationship between adventure and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail.

Hedonic value, identified as having a positive relationship to customer-perceived value (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003; Babin et al., 1994; Chiu et al., 2014; Kesari and Alturkar, 2016; Overby and Lee, 2006; Parker and Wang, 2016; Rintamäki et al., 2006) was, in several research settings, identified to consist of gratification (Arslanagic-Kalajdzic and Zabkar, 2015; Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Rintamäki et al., 2006). Therefore, it is expected that there is a positive relationship between gratification and customer-perceived value directly, in online fashion retail as well. This means that an increase in gratification in online fashion retail results in an increase in customer-perceived value in online fashion retail. Therefore, this study puts forth the following hypothesis:

H6: There is a positive relationship between gratification and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail.

Hedonic value, proven to have a positive relationship with customer-perceived value (Arslanagic-Kalajdzic and Zabkar, 2015; Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Rintamäki et al., 2006) was, in several differing settings, identified to consist of best deal (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003; Babin et al., 1994; Chiu et al., 2014; Moon et al., 2017). Hence it is expected that there is a positive relationship between best deal and customer-perceived value directly, in the online fashion retail context as well. This suggests that an increase in best deal in online fashion retail leads to an increase in hedonic value in online fashion retail. Therefore, this study puts forth the following hypothesis:

H7: There is a positive relationship between best deal and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail.

Hedonic value, proven to have a positive relationship with customer-perceived value (Arslanagic-Kalajdzic and Zabkar, 2015; Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Rintamäki et al., 2006) was, in several differing settings, identified to consist of idea value (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003; Babin et al., 1994; Chiu et al., 2014, Kesari and Atulkar, 2016; Parker and Wang, 2016; Rintamäki et al., 2016). Hence it is expected that
there is a positive relationship between idea and the customer-perceived value directly, as well as in online fashion retail. This suggests that when idea value in online fashion retail increases, customer-perceived value in online fashion retail increases as well. Therefore, this study puts forth the following hypothesis:

H8: There is a positive relationship between idea and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail.

3.3 Model for this research
4. Method

In this section, the research design will be examined as well as data collection strategies and methods used in this study. The reasoning behind the methodological choices made as well as the relevance of the subject matter will be looked at. Finally, the way validity and reliability were evaluated and ensured will be presented and discussed.

4.1 Research approach

Before any research can be conducted, researchers need to make active choices regarding their research approach, a reflection of the nature of the connection between theory and research. Whether researchers utilize an inductive approach in which observations lead to theory development or a deductive approach in which researchers derive hypotheses from theory which leads to observations and a finetuning of the theory, decides what direction the research is further going to take (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

4.1.1 Deductive Research

Deductive research is based on deduction (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Soiferman, 2010; Svensson, 2009; Zalaghi and Khazaei, 2016). Researchers start the research process with an idea, usually a scholarly – or practitioner-oriented problem or both, which is turned into objectives or a question (Svensson, 2009). Based on the objectives or question, literature is examined, and hypothesis are deduced (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Creswell and Plano Clark, 2011; Soiferman, 2010; Zalaghi and Khazaei, 2016). Following the research process of deductive research, the researchers operationalize their literary findings about that idea in question into measurable concepts in order to gather empirical data. With the help of the empirical data, the hypotheses are tested, confirmed or rejected and based on the outcome, the theory is revised. This linear process following several steps in a logical sequence enables researchers to finetune the knowledge and give theoretical and managerial implications and suggestions for further research (Svensson, 2009). It is nevertheless presumed that there is a clear theoretic premise before any testing or data collection is conducted (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2009). This is in contrasts to inductive research that is used to explore and identify theory through the research process (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Saunders et al., 2009).
As this study’s purpose was to examine customer-perceived value, a concept that has been studied extensively in the past, the researchers decided that using a deductive approach would be the most appropriate research approach. The large amount of previously conducted research allowed the researchers to utilize other researchers’ previous findings as giving the literary foundation for the study and the deduction of hypothesis to be tested and accepted or rejected.

4.1.2 Quantitative Research

The researchers’ decision of using a deductive research approach oftentimes leads them to the usage of a quantitative research design (Bhattacherjee, 2012; Bryman and Bell, 2015; Zalaghi and Khazaei, 2016). This is due to the fact that the quantitative research design, just as deductive research as a research approach, follows a linear process starting in the examination of literature which leads to the deduction of hypothesis, the data collection, and in the end to the acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis. Quantitative research is conducted objectively based on the believe that there is one reality which can be measured accurately with scientific methods (Onwuegbuzie and Leech, 2005; Soiferman, 2010). Quantitative research is used to examine topics that have been in researchers’ focus before and are studied thoroughly enough in order to be applied to a larger sample than previous qualitative research approaches in the exploratory state would have allowed. On the contrary to qualitative data, quantitative data focuses on gathering numerical data, allowing researchers to generalize results to apply them to the actual population in question. The focus lies on the quantity of respondents giving the same answer rather than analyzing unique responses (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Through the collection of a large amount of raw data, data analysis is conducted through statistical calculation and presentation of the identified results (Cutcliffe and McKenna, 1999; Soiferman, 2010; Zalaghi and Khazaei, 2016).

Quantitative research has been criticized in the past due to the risk of translation errors in the operationalization from the literature to viable concepts due to the lack of context. As those errors could result in misleading results and false acceptance or rejection of hypothesis it is therefore of utmost importance to ensure the correctness of the operationalization of the concepts with the help of validity and reliability analysis (Bryman and Bell, 2011). It is nevertheless important as well to ensure transparency derived through the disclosure of all important steps in the research process (Moravcsik, 2013) which goes hand in hand with the need of quantitative studies to be able to be replicated. Every quantitative study should be able to be executed repeatedly leading to the same results as the result should be representative (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Moravcsik, 2013).
As stated in 4.1.1, the researchers of this study decided to utilize a research approach allowing them to deduce hypothesis, from a literary foundation, as this study's purpose is to examine a concept that has been studied thoroughly in the past. Hence, with quantitative researches’ nature of using a linear structure starting in elaborating theory and deducing hypothesis it is the appropriate choice for examining the concept in question, namely customer-perceived value, in order to be tested in a larger sample size.

4.2 Research Design

The research design of a study is the framework that researchers use in order to narrow their choices for the collection and analysis of data in form of data collection methods, data collection instruments etc. (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009) Depending on the research design chosen, some options for the collection and analysis discontinue whereas others help researchers to stay focused. Each research design comes with certain strengths which reflects the researchers’ priorities when conducting the study (Bryman and Bell, 2011). For quantitative studies, researchers have to choose between descriptive or explanatory research designs (De Vaus, 2005). A descriptive research design is applied in order to answer the questions of “What is going on” (De Vaus, 2005, p.1) whereas the question “Why is it going on” (De Vaus, 2005, p.1) is to be answered in an explanatory research design. The research design of a study is however not only dependent upon the researchers’ autonomous choice but also about previous research and the extent of information that is given as a foundation. The why question i.e. can only be asked if there is already enough existing theory that answers the what question (De Vaus, 2005). Researchers have to ask themselves “given the research question (or theory), what type of evidence is needed to answer the question (or test the hypothesis) in a convincing way” (De Vaus, 2005, p.9).

As implied before, a descriptive research design is applied in studies built upon a fairly limited amount of research. Its purpose is to ascertain information about cases in order to describe them. Explanatory research, in contrast, takes the research process one step further and builds on the descriptive research. It sets different variables into relation with each other. These relations, or causal explanations, argue for effects that variables have on another, in a direct or indirect way (Bryman and Bell, 2011; De Vaus, 2005; Saunders et al., 2009).

Since the concepts of customer-perceived value as well as the concepts of utilitarian and hedonic value have been examined in the past it is, according to the researchers, the most appropriate to make use of the available information and conduct an explanatory study. This way the researchers can make use of previously found relationships namely the positive relationships between utilitarian value and customer-
perceived value and hedonic value and customer-perceived value and use those as a foundation in order to examine the relationships between the contributors of utilitarian and hedonic values and customer-perceived value.

4.3 Data Sources

After choosing the research approach and research design it is important to decide what kind of data the researchers need to collect in order to be able to answer their hypothesis in an effective manner (Adams, Raeside and White, 2007; Bryman and Bell, 2011; Hox and Boeije, 2005, Saunders et al., 2009). Given the options of using primary and secondary data as data sources, they have to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of each of them both to ensure that data collected is of high quality and of use to them (Adams et al., 2007; Bryman and Bell, 2011).

Primary data is data collected by the researchers themselves for the purpose of a specific study (Adams et al., 2007; Bryman and Bell, 2011; Hox and Boeije, 2005; Saunders et al., 2009). Researchers compile a framework of what they need to know i.e. a questionnaire and following it is applied to a sample chosen by the researchers, depending on the population they are studying. This means that the data has very high accuracy when it comes to answering the hypothesis compiled by the researchers (Bryman and Bell, 2011). The main problem with primary data collection is, however, that it is time-consuming as researchers need to ensure that they identify participants matching their criteria to be able to gather representative data. As opposed to this, secondary data, data that has already been collected for other purposes by other researchers or organizations, is simple to gather in a convenient, time saving, manner. Data of good quality is already available (Adams et al., 2007; Bryman and Bell, 2011; Hox and Boeije, 2005; Saunders et al., 2009), and the data is “in most cases resulting in samples that are as close to being representative as one is likely to achieve” (Bryman and Bell, 2011, p.314). However, even though the data is of high quality, the data was collected for the purpose to serve as evidence in other researchers’ or organizations’ studies hence it might not be sufficiently accurate for answering the researchers’ purpose (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Hox and Boeije, 2005; Saunders et al., 2009).

Considering the advantages and disadvantages of primary and secondary data, the researchers of this thesis decided to collect primary data. The process of gathering primary data is certainly more time consuming that using secondary data would, however, using primary data ensures that the data collected answers the purpose in the most accurate manner.
4.4 Data Collection Method

Due to previous choices in the research process, the researchers’ data collection methods to choose between are interviews, observations, and questionnaires (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Saunders et al, 2009). Interviews and observations are, as opposed to questionnaires, rather difficult to conduct due to many potential sources of error which can lead to problems regarding the validity, reliability and most importantly the generalizability of the results (Bryman and Bell, 2011; May, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). These sources of error can occur from both, the interviewer’s and the participant’s, side. Potential sources of error in interview settings might be caused due to delays in the information recording process leading to inaccurate data collection, misunderstandings between the interviewer and the participant, an existent social desirability bias etc., just to name a few (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

Questionnaires, on the other hand, are conducted with standardized questions, tested before the data collection begins, to ensure validity and reliability are achieved (Bryman and Bell, 2011; May, 2011). These standardized questions are furthermore designed in a way that ensures respondents can complete the questionnaire on their own, without the help of the researcher or an independent person, avoiding the potential misunderstanding and social desirability bias (Bryman and Bell, 2011). The absence of the interviewer furthermore saves time and in return, not needing to be present in a specific interview setting increases the convenience for respondents hence the response rate might increase as well (Bryman and Bell, 2011; May, 2011). One possible disadvantage with self-completion questionnaires is nevertheless the risk of respondents answering the questions in a different order than proposed. This could mean that the respondents see a tendency towards variables that are dependent on each other hence the respondents might feel the need of answering questions differently than if he had been obliged to answer the questions in a certain order proposed by the researcher in an interview setting for instance. However, this risk can be minimized with clearly presenting the questions and sorting them wisely, starting with easier fairly impersonal questions moving towards questions that crave to reflect behavior. This way, participants are less worried about what kind of answers are expected from them and the tendency towards skimming the questionnaire beforehand is decreasing (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

For this research, the self-completion questionnaire data collection method has been chosen due to the many advantages for the researchers such as the minimized risk of error in the data collection process and the convenience. Not only regarding time savings for the researchers but also for the respondents’ possibility to answer the questionnaire whenever they have time in order to gather as many responses as possible within the fairly short timeframe. In order to avoid being limited to a certain set of respondents
that have had the chance to get a printed version of the questionnaire, the researchers further decided to make use of Google Forms, an online tool to create and share questionnaires online (GSuite, 2018). Utilizing online data collection services enables a quicker and wider distribution of the questionnaire and results in quicker responses and a larger sample of data for a more accurate analysis (Schillewaert and Meulemeester, 2005). Although some would argue that web-based data collection is questionable due to the risk of the questionnaire being sent out to person not belonging to the target sample on grounds of the wide distribution, web-based data collection, as opposed to printed questionnaires, enables researchers to make use of safeguards. These can be in form of email validation or requirement mechanisms that force a respondent to answer questions such as control questions before they can proceed (Schillewaert and Meulemeester, 2005).

4.5 Data Collection Instrument

As stated before, the data in this study was chosen to be collected with the help of a self-completion questionnaire. Since these kinds of questionnaires are filled out by the respondents themselves without the guidance by the researchers and without having the ability to ask questions, it is essential to be aware of several aspects that need to be taken into consideration. These are the operationalization, the research design and lastly, the pre-test (Bryman and Bell, 2011) which are explained in the following sections.

4.5.1 Operationalization and Measurement of Variables

In order to convert theoretical concepts into measurable variables in form of statements or questions that the respondents can understand and relate to their own activities, beliefs and behaviors (Bhattacherjee, 2012), researchers must dismantle the theoretical concepts in the operationalization. This process is of utmost importance as those measurable variables must not only be understandable to the respondents but must mirror the theoretical concepts as accurately as possible as well in order to measure what it is supposed to (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Mai, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). In failing to do so, the result of the study might be falsified (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). However, not only the content of the concepts is important. It needs to be ensured that those variables are measured in an appropriate manner as well. The distinct levels of measurement decide upon the way how data is treated and therefore, researchers need to decide upon measurement scales before data can be collected (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

Measurement scales are divided into scale, nominal and ordinal (IBM, n.d.; Kent Library, 2018). Scale is used in order to measure interval or ratio scales “where the data values indicate both the order of values
and the distance between values” (IBM, n.d.). In other words, scale is used for objective numerical measurements such as weight, salary etc. Nominal and ordinal measurement scales on the contrary belong both to categorical measurement and are used for “data with a limited number of distinct values or categories” (IBM, n.d.). Nominal variables are used if the data collected consists of independent categories such as gender and region whereas the ordinal level of measurement is used for intrinsic rankings, such as “attitude scores representing degree of satisfaction or confidence and preference rating scores” (IBM, n.d.). It is important to highlight that subjective evaluations such as attitude scores cannot be represented by an interval scale due to the inaccuracy in determining the exact distance between the values (IBM, n.d.; Kent Library, 2018).

After taking the distinct measurement characteristics into consideration the researchers decided to utilize nominal and ordinal scales in this study. The nominal scale was used to measure the control questions due to them consisting of a limited number of distinct and independent categories, namely the simple differentiation between the participants age of being younger or older than 18 years of age and yes or no answers regarding experience with online purchases in general as well as experience with online purchases explicitly within fashion retail. The main body of the survey on the other hand consist of statements regarding the independent and dependent variables that craved being answered based on the respondents’ attitude towards their fashion retail experience. Their attitude was measured with a five-point Likert scale with a ranking assigned as following:

1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = No Opinion; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly Agree

As questions about attitudes are subjective in nature, data must be treated as ordinal data.

The operationalization below illustrates how the theoretical concepts were carefully translated into statements of behaviour that the respondents could identify with as either a behaviour they perform or do not perform and to what degree. A closer examination of the statements is performed in 4.5.2, Questionnaire Design.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Concept</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Type of measure</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1: Monetary Savings</strong></td>
<td>The customers’ savings in obtaining demanded products for a lower price than if they had shopped at a competitor (Chandon, Wansink and Laurent, 2000; Chiu, Wang, Fang and Huang, 2014; Kesari and Atulkar, 2016; Moon et al., 2017; Rintamäki et al., 2006; van Heerde, Gijsbrechts, and Pauwels, 2008).</td>
<td>M1 (Q1)</td>
<td>Five Point Likert Scale</td>
<td>Overall Low Prices</td>
<td>I pay less for clothing items I purchase online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M2 (Q2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sales Promotion</td>
<td>I find sale items more often for items I purchase online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M3 (Q3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher quality Discounts</td>
<td>I buy high quality fashion online to save money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2: Convenience</strong></td>
<td>The effort and time consumers have to invest in order to make a purchase (Kesari and Atulkar, 2016; Mpinganjira, 2015; Pham, Tran, Misra, Maskeliūnas and Damaševičius, 2018; Rintamäki et al., 2006).</td>
<td>C1 (Q4)</td>
<td>Five Point Likert Scale</td>
<td>Access Convenience</td>
<td>I can shop for fashion online any time of the day I want.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C2 (Q5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Search Convenience</td>
<td>It is easy to find information about products I purchases online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C3 (Q6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transaction Convenience</td>
<td>I can shop from any location I want.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C4 (Q7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transaction Convenience</td>
<td>I like that I don’t have to wait in a line to pay when I shop online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3: Product Variety</strong></td>
<td>The range of products (Kesari and Atulkar, 2016) and broad product offerings (Chiu et al., 2014).</td>
<td>V1 (Q8)</td>
<td>Five Point Likert Scale</td>
<td>Fundamental Variety</td>
<td>I find a large selection of fashion products when shopping online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V2 (Q9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate Variety</td>
<td>I purchase a certain category of clothing, for instance sporting apparel or shoes online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V3 (Q10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peripheral Variety</td>
<td>I can find substitutes for fashion products that are out of stock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4: Product Information</strong></td>
<td>The information about products and/or services offered, published on a retailers’ website (Moon et al., 2017).</td>
<td>PI1 (Q11)</td>
<td>Five Point Likert Scale</td>
<td>Standard Information</td>
<td>I can examine fashion products more carefully online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PI2 (Q12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality Information</td>
<td>I find information on fashion online to be informative and detailed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PI3 (Q13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Search Information</td>
<td>It is easy to find basic information, size colour choice or fabric type, when shopping for fashion online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Concept</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Type of measure</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5: Adventure</strong></td>
<td>The entertainment and stimulus felt in the act of shopping (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003; Chiu et al., 2014; Overby and Lee, 2006; Rintamäki et al., 2006).</td>
<td>A1 (Q14)</td>
<td>Five Point Likert Scale</td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>I have fun shopping for fashion online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A2 (Q15)</td>
<td>1 = Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>I shop for fashion online when I am bored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A3 (Q16)</td>
<td>5 = Strongly agree</td>
<td>Transporting</td>
<td>I shop for fashion online to add excitement to my day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6: Gratification</strong></td>
<td>Shopping as a means to improve one’s mood, relieve stress or escape the daily grind of life (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003; Chiu et al., 2014).</td>
<td>G1 (Q17)</td>
<td>Five Point Likert Scale</td>
<td>Stress relief</td>
<td>I shop for fashion online to relieve stress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2 (Q18)</td>
<td>1 = Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Relaxation</td>
<td>I find shopping online for fashion relaxing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G3 (Q19)</td>
<td>5 = Strongly agree</td>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>I shop online for fashion to get my mind off of everyday life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H7: Best Deal</strong></td>
<td>Quest shopping or the hunt where the goal of finding the lowest price or greatest value for a product(s) (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003; Chiu et al., 2014; Moon, 2017).</td>
<td>BD1 (Q20)</td>
<td>Five Point Likert Scale</td>
<td>Bargain Hunting</td>
<td>I actively search for bargains when I shop online for fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2 (Q21)</td>
<td>1 = Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>I enjoy looking for sales and bargains for fashion online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD3 (Q22)</td>
<td>5 = Strongly agree</td>
<td>Conquering/Winning</td>
<td>I feel proud of myself if I find a bargain or a sale on something I want to buy online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H8: Idea</strong></td>
<td>The behavior of identifying trends or current styles that are popular through browsing or window-shopping (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003; Kesari and Atulkar, 2016).</td>
<td>I1 (Q23)</td>
<td>Five Point Likert Scale</td>
<td>Trend Identification</td>
<td>I can find the newest trends by shopping online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I2 (Q24)</td>
<td>1 = Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Keeping Current</td>
<td>I shop for new fashion trends online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I3 (Q25)</td>
<td>5 = Strongly agree</td>
<td>Variety Seeking</td>
<td>I look for new fashion trends online.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5.1.3 – Perceived Customer Value in Online Fashion Shopping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Concept</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Type of measure</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer-perceived Value in Online Fashion Shopping</td>
<td>A trade off, in the customers opinion, between the benefit(s) and sacrifice(s) a product provides to that consumer (Overby and Lee, 2006).</td>
<td>CPV1 (Q26)</td>
<td>Five Point Likert Scale</td>
<td>Cumulative CPV</td>
<td>I shop for fashion online because of the overall benefits for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CPV2 (Q27)</td>
<td>1 = Strongly disagree 5 = Strongly agree</td>
<td>Cumulative CPV</td>
<td>I will look online for the products I need if they are not available in the store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CPV3 (Q28)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative CPV</td>
<td>I believe shopping online for fashion improves my shopping experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CPV4 (Q29)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative CPV</td>
<td>I feel confident in my purchases of fashion online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CPV5 (Q30)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative CPV</td>
<td>I will keep shopping online for fashion in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.2 Questionnaire Design

According to Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009) there are several aspects that need to be taken into consideration when designing a questionnaire. One of them is the “careful design of individual questions” (p.362). The questions in quantitative studies tend to follow a close ended structure and need to be worded in a way that enables the participants to understand them clearly and directly (Dale, 2006). They should be worded in the easiest way possible to ensure they are understandable by all respondents, no matter the educational background (Awang, Afthanorhan and Mamat, 2016; Bryman and Bell, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). Demanding questions might lead respondents to leave the survey without completing it. Poorly worded or confusing questions on the other hand can lead to wrong answers hence a falsified result (Awang, Afthanorhan and Mamat, 2016; Dale, 2006; Saunders et al., 2009). The order in which the questions or statements are presented is nevertheless important as well. According to Bryman and Bell (2011) researchers should start asking for objective information first and become more subjective enabling respondents to feel comfortable in sharing more confidential information (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

An additional factor that is of importance in questionnaire design is, according to Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009) a clear layout. Self-completion questionnaires should consist of several building blocks differentiating between dissimilar categories of questions to give the respondents ease in navigation. In accordance to that, Bryman and Bell (2011) argue for the inclusion of a variety of print styles, specifically “different fonts, print sizes, bold, italics, and capitals” (p. 238) in order to keep the survey attractive in the respondents’ eyes. According to them, it is nevertheless important to stay consistent in the way how those print styles are used. They recommend using the same print style in the headings and in the questions e.g. as inconsistency, in other words changing the print style within the same kind of information, within the headings for instance, would be confusing (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

Based on the previous mentioned guidelines, the researchers examined the content of the questionnaire carefully and changed the way how several of the statements were worded in order to ease the understandability. The order of some of the items changed to avoid the risk of leading the respondents towards certain answers and, furthermore, it was ensured that the order of the items start with objective questions namely the control questions. The statements in the main survey body however start fairly objective as well and become more private while progressing in the questionnaire. One additional aspect the researchers took into consideration was the language. This research was conducted for an international audience, however, due to the research being based in Sweden, it was important to ensure
that language would not be a barrier for Swedish respondents. Therefore, the questionnaire was translated from English into Swedish following Sha and Lai’s (2016) well-structured, systematic approach for the translation process. This included; using a centralized professional translation service or a native speaker with a high competence in the audience language as well as the research language, a strict pre-testing regiment with close attention to clarity of statements/questions which includes one on one discussion of the survey items, and awareness of cultural norms and social understanding when constructing and presenting the final draft of the survey (Sha and Lai, 2016). These steps required additional time before the questionnaire could be pre-tested but inaccurate translation or no translation at all could be flawed causing unwanted or irrelevant responses to the survey items (Kleiner, Pan and Bouic, 2009; Sha and Lai, 2016).

After the questions have been examined and translated, the researchers ensured that the questionnaire is easy to navigate with a differentiation between control and main survey questions for instance. Differing print styles in form of print sizes and italic where included in order to keep the survey interesting in the participants’ eyes. The complete survey including the instructions and application of ethical consideration, which are discussed in 4.9, can be found in Appendix 1.

4.5.3 Pre-Test

Before the questionnaire can be distributed to the sample, it is important to pre-test it in order to ensure that questions and statements are clear and understandable for the sample audience (Bhattachrjee, 2012; Bryman and Bell, 2011; May, 2011). Due to the researchers’ involvement in the study they might understand statements differently or assume statements to be formulated in an easy manner even though they are not (May, 2011). It is during this phase in the research process of a quantitative study exclusively that the researcher has the ability to see the participants’ reaction when exposed to their survey and to ask questions or determine if something needs to be changed to ease the understanding of statements or clarify them. As this is the only possibility to solve ambiguities, correct biased statements or confusing word choices before the questionnaire is released it is extremely important to pay attention to every detail in order reduce potential error sources in the data collection process (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Bhattachrjee, 2012; May, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009; Sha and Lai, 2016). The most common way to pre-test a questionnaire is therefore to conduct interviews with one respondent or a small group of people in which the researcher primarily observes the participants’ reactions and secondly asks questions to identify whether questions are understood correctly. At the same time, the researcher is also able to observe if the survey length might affect the respondents hence if it might be unnecessarily long (Bhattachrjee, 2012; Bryman and Bell, 2015).
The pre-test was conducted one week prior to the estimated release date of the survey with a small group of participants of varied backgrounds and age/ gender makeup as this is the recommended way of ensuring the questionnaire is understood by everyone according to several researchers such as Bryman and Bell (2015), Dale (2006) and Glasow (2005). Hence, care was taken to ensure a diverse group, with strong Swedish and/or English skills as well as variable technical abilities, and shopping behaviors. The common variables for all participants were the minimum age requirement of being greater than 18, the caveat that they must have made at least one but preferably more purchases online and those purchases must include no less than one fashion purchase. These criteria were set in accordance to the criteria the respondents must fulfil in order for their response to be accepted as of use by the research. The questionnaire pre-test group was comprised of 3 females and 8 males. Pre-test group members were directed through the survey draft one question at a time and following Dale’s (2006) and Glasow’s (2005) suggestion, the participants were taking turns reading and explaining what they understood the statement to mean. With feedback from the group members the word fashion was added to the items to add clarity to the statements since it was unclear that every question was referring to experience with fashion retail specifically and several minor adjustments were made to content and wording such as the addition of the word overall to the statement indicating the total value the respondent acknowledges for the online shopping experience.

4.6 Sampling

As implied in previous sections, sampling is the process in which researchers choose respondents from the population they need to investigate to gain insights about a certain concept. These respondents nevertheless have to be chosen wisely since the result of the study needs to be representative hence if the result is applied to the entire population in question the outcome has to be the same when faced with similar or the same conditions. The likelihood of this to occur increases with the quantity and accuracy of the chosen sample (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Martínez-Mesa, González-Chica, Bastos, Bonamigo, and Duquia, 2014).

The most accurate way of gathering a representative result is through probability sampling. In probability sampling, random sampling is applied which means that every person belonging to the population of interest has an equal chance of being selected to answer the questionnaire. Random sampling processes are however very time consuming due to the intense process of including every single person from a population to the sampling process. Time and resource constraints thus disable researchers to use random sampling. Instead, they have to make use of non-probability sampling,
sampling which is conducted non-randomly. Due to the sampling process being rather unrestrained meaning that some people have a higher chance of being included than others there is however a higher risk of sampling error in the data collection process. This is the difference in the outcome between the sample and what the outcome had been if the entire population had been taken into account.

There are nevertheless precautions researchers can take in order to minimize the sampling error such as asking the respondents control questions to ensure they belong to the sample (Bryman and Bell, 2011; May, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). This is especially important in the most common non-probability sampling method in quantitative research, the convenience sampling. Since the researchers simply choose participants based on their availability there is a fairly high likelihood that responses are gathered through acquaintances which increases the risk of gathering answers from the same group of people with similar attitudes about a certain topic (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). An increased risk nevertheless does not mean that members of the researchers’ own network cannot represent valuable respondents fulfilling the researchers’ criteria (Saunders et al., 2009).

4.6.1 Sampling Selection

With time constraints the only feasible way to gather a sufficient number of responses was to utilize convenience sampling. This meant that the researchers distributed the questionnaires to family members, friends and other acquaintances in the researchers’ networks. The purpose of this study is to explain the relationship between several values of utilitarian and hedonic nature and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail. Therefore, control variables were included in the questionnaire in order to ensure the respondents fit into the sample criteria, namely them having experience with shopping fashion online. Just as Dale (2006) and Martínez-Mesa et al. (2014) suggest, letting respondents confirm their experience with certain situations of importance in order to define that they fit into the sample, verifies the relevance of them being a part of the study and the respondents know that their answers are valued (Martínez-Mesa et al., 2014; Dale, 2006). Other aspects such as gender, nationality etc. were left out since the researchers did not want to limit the data to a certain set of attitudes. According to researchers such as Bhattacherjee (2012), Martínez-Mesa et al. (2014) and Saunders et al. (2009) a very generalized set of attributes leads to wider range of answers and most likely to a reduced sampling error.
4.6.2 Data Collection Procedure

After the sample has been defined it is important to set a goal of how many responses are needed in order to be able to gather a representative result. It is difficult, however, to accurately determine what a good sample size is (Martínez-Mesa et al., 2014).

According to Wilson van Voorhis and Morgan (2007) a common way to calculate the needed quantity of respondents is the following formula:

\[ N > 50 + 8m \]

in which \( N \) is equal to the sample size and \( m \) is equal to the number of independent variables studied. The result however, as indicated by the symbol \( > \) is only the absolute minimum of responses needed in order to gather an acceptable result. As mentioned before, the higher the quantity of respondents, the more valuable in terms of i.e. representativeness is the outcome (Wilen von Voorhis and Morgan, 2007).

When applying Wilson van Voorhis and Morgan’s (2007) formula to the data collection procedure in this study, containing of 8 independent variables hence \( m = 8 \), the formula looks like following:

\[ 114 > 50 + 8 \times 8 \]

The outcome of \( N = 114 \) determines that 114 is the minimum sample size accepted in this study with 8 independent variables. Since 114 is the acceptance limit the researchers set the goal of gathering at least 130 responses, in case that some respondents fall out due to them not fulfilling the criteria established to differentiate between people that do or do not belong to the population in question.

4.7 Data analysis method

4.7 Data Analysis

After data has been collected, researchers need to follow certain steps in order to analyze data, beginning with coding the data and transferring it into a data analysis tool in order to analyze it regarding its characteristics e.g. (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

4.7.1 Data Coding

As described in the previous chapter, data measurement scales in this research were set to be nominal for the control questions and ordinal for the statements in order to measure the respondents’ attitudes towards the dependent and independent variables determined by the researchers. In order for the data
to be analyzed, it was transferred into a data analysis tool called IBM SPSS Statistics, which originally was known as the Statistical Package for the Social Science (van den Berg, n.d.).

Control questions were transferred and coded CON1-3. The other items were coded using the defined item numbers written in the operationalization e.g. Monetary Savings coded as M1-M3 and Convenience coded as C1-C4. Every respondent, 142 in total after removing participants that did not fulfill the criteria of belonging to the selected sample, was assigned one number and the answers to all questionnaire items was added to each respondent respectively in order to keep the original answer pattern.

4.7.2 Littles MCAR Test

Initially, after data input to SPSS, missing variables had to be dealt with to provide the most meaningful hypothesis testing. However before using SPSS to replace the missing data through expectation-maximization the data points need to be shown as completely random in nature. By running Littles missing completely at random test, MCAR, the significance of the missing data can be established and thus demonstrate that the missing data is in fact random and not meaningful in the hypothesis testing phase.

After running the Little’s MCAR test a p-value of .051 was given meaning the result is non-significant, and we do not reject the null hypothesis. Therefor SPSS can be used to replace the missing data with expectation – maximization.

4.7.3 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics is a way of describing collected data in order to show researchers the characteristics of the observations. The characteristics are shown in form of the central tendency and the dispersion of the data. How the data is summarized specifically is nevertheless dependent upon the type of data that has been collected. If the data is of nominal nature, the central tendency is shown with the help of the mode. Cases are sorted into categories and the mode is basically the category with the highest frequency distribution, in other words the category that includes the highest quantity of cases. The dispersion of the data is shown through the frequency distributions for all categories. Measurements of the central tendency for data of ordinal nature are the mode, median and mean. The mode shows the numerical value that has been measured the most often within an observation. The median shows the mid-point value of a rank ordered distribution and the mean shows the average numerical value.
The most common way to measure the dispersion of the data is to measure the standard deviation which is “the average difference of each score to the mean” (Fisher and Marshall, 2008, p.95). Besides the standard deviation there are however other ways to measure the dispersion as well, namely the skewness and kurtosis. The skewness indicates an asymmetry of a distribution and is measured by the skew ranges (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham, 2006; Ho and Yu, 2015) which, for normal distributions, are recommended to be at ±1. (Hair et al., 2006). However, ± 2 is acceptable if reliability and validity tests perform within appropriate ranges. Ranges above 0 indicate a positive skewness hence some respondents have given very positive answers and ranges below 0 indicate a negative skewness which in turn means that some respondents answered extremely negative (Hair et al., 2006; Ho and Yu, 2015). In order for the data’s kurtosis to be acceptable it should lie at ±3 in order to show a normal distribution. If the data shows during the descriptive statistics analysis that it is not normally distributed hence skewed, researchers have the possibility to examine the data more carefully and delete outliers that caused the skewness within the distribution (Fisher and Marshall, 2008).

4.7.4 Regression Analysis

Regression analysis is the analysis of variables and their relationships with each other. Researchers use this analysis method in order to study the relationship between a dependent variable y and one or more independent variables x in regard to the existence of the relationship and its strength. The strength of the relationship is in both, simple linear regression, the analysis of a relationship between one dependent and one independent variable, and multiple linear regression, the analysis of the relationship between one dependent variable and several independent variables combined, shown in form of the coefficient of determination. It is denoted as r² in simple linear regression and as R² in multiple linear regression where all independent variables are taken into account simultaneously. Adjusted R² is the modification of R² and lets the researcher adjust the multiple linear regression analysis to the analysis of the relationship of several independent variables separately in combination with a dependent variable. r², R² and adjusted R² range from 0 to 1 in with 0 explaining that there is no linear relationship and 1 explaining that there is a perfect relationship where all variables are explained. The results of r², R² and adjusted R² read as the percentage of to what extend one dependent variables is explained by one or more independent variables. Hence, a result of R² or adjusted R² = 0.6 i.e. means that 60% of the relationship between the dependent and independent variables are explained by the model tested (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

Additionally, the standard error should be taken into account. This is the standard deviation of the sampling distribution and shows the average distance data has to the regression line. In sampling, it
is most commonly shown as Sest which is the estimation of the standard error. The smaller the standard error, the more accurate is the prediction shown in the regression. Optimally the standard error is 0 which means that the mean of the data collected, as found in a perfect data distribution, matches the regression line (Bryman and Bell, 2011, Fisher and Marshall, 2009).

In order to determine if a hypothesis should be accepted or rejected, it is not enough to analyse data in regard to its coefficient of determination and the standard error. Researchers also have to analyse the outcome regarding its significance in order to ensure the relationship found holds true when applied to a different situation. In order to test the hypothesis for its significance, t-test is used for simple linear regression and the ANOVA F-test for multiple linear regression. The outcome of the t-test and ANOVA F-test are shown as the p-value, which, depending on the confidence level set beforehand, have to lie within a given range in order to be accepted. The most common way is to set the confidence level at 99% or 95% which is respectively shown with a significance in form of a p-value of 0.01 or 0.05. This in turn means that the p-value, if the confidence was set to be 99% has to be <0.01 whereas the p-value has to be <0.05 when the confidence level is set to be 95% (Bryman and Bell, 2011, Fisher and Marshall, 2009). For this research, the confidence level was set to be at 95% meaning that there is a 5% chance of accepting a false hypothesis or in return a 5% chance of rejecting a true hypothesis. Setting the confidence level of 95% means for this research that the p-value of the ANOVA F-test has to lie <0.05 in order for hypotheses to be accepted.

Following and lastly, researchers should analyse the standardized regression coefficient when analysing relationships. This is most commonly labelled as beta (β) and it measures the change in the dependent variable caused by a 1-unit change in the independent variable. Hence it measures the impact the independent variable has on the dependent variable. The standardized regression coefficient can be positive as well as negative, showing either a positive or a negative impact on the dependent variable. The closer to 1 the better, as it indicates a strong change in the dependent variable caused by the independent variable. A beta of 0.8 for example indicates that a 1-unit increase in the independent variable leads to a 0.8-unit increase in the dependent variable. It is however important to keep in mind that the predictability is dependent upon the tested significance in the previous step. If the confidence level is not compiled with, the relationship prediction is not accurate (Bryman and Bell, 2011, Fisher and Marshall, 2009).
4.8 Quality Criteria

In quantitative research, concepts are operationalized into defined variables and following, numbers are assigned to observations based on those variables. In order to ensure these numbers measure what they are supposed to and that they are measured accurately, quality criteria measures are needed (Etchegaray and Fischer, 2010; Kimberlin and Winterstein, 2008). The most common way to measure the quality of collected data is to test their validity and reliability as those are the key indicators for the quality of a measurement (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Etchegaray and Fischer, 2010; Kimberlin and Winterstein, 2008).

Validity measures the extent to which the questions measure what they intended to measure and how that acts in accordance with the interpretation of the results. This is assessed with the help of content, construct and criterion validity analysis. Reliability on the other hand measures the accuracy of the construct (Kimberlin and Winterstein, 2008) hence to what extent the result obtained is consistent (Etchegaray and Fischer, 2010). Reliability is tested in regard to stability of the construct, internal consistency and interrater reliability (Kimberlin and Winterstein, 2008). “Although reliability and validity are analytically distinguishable, they are related because validity presumes reliability. This means that if your measure is not reliable, it cannot be valid” (Bryman and Bell, 2015, p.172).

4.8.1 Content validity

Content validity means that a survey’s measure reflects the content of the concept in question (Bryman and Bell, 2015). Content validity mirrors “how well the items developed to operationalize a construct provide an adequate and representative sample of all the items that might measure the construct of interest” (Kimberlin and Winterstein, 2008, p.2279). All items need to be relevant in order to answer the hypothesis (Etchegaray and Fischer, 2010). However, as opposed to construct validity for instance, where researchers have the possibility to use statistical analysis to measure the validity, it is not possible to measure content validity. Content validity can only be assessed through knowledge of experts in the field of study. Hence, in order to determine that researchers operationalized their concepts adequately, researchers need experts to judge their content validity (Etchegaray and Fischer, 2010; Kimberlin and Winterstein, 2008).

For this paper, content validity has been accessed with the help of experts in the field. Michaela Sandell, the tutor of the research group, has been reviewing the questionnaire in a pre-test in order to find issues in the conceptualization. Åsa Devine, the examiner of this paper, has partly been reviewing
the questionnaire and pointed out the importance of accurately deriving questions to measure the construct from previous theory in order to provide academia and practitioners with representative data. Therefore, the conceptualization has critically been examined and all inconsistencies found have been eliminated to the best knowledge of the researchers.

4.8.2 Construct validity

As opposed to content validity, construct validity is assessed after all data needed for the research has been gathered. It measures the extent of the relationship between two variables to which extent the relationship between those variables holds true. In other words, to what extent correlation exists that fits the presumed pattern derived from past research (Kimberlin and Winterstein, 2008). Kimberlin and Winterstein (2008) explain construct validity with an apparent example within health. “A measure of quality of life would be expected to result in lower scores for chronically ill patients than for healthy college students” (Kimberlin and Winterstein, 2008, p.2279).

The correlation in construct validity is measured with the help of correlation analysis. In correlation analysis, the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient, or short correlation coefficient, is estimated and designated as being $r$. The correlation coefficient $r$ “ranges between -1 and +1 and quantifies the direction and strength of the linear association between the two variables” (Boston University School of Public Health, 2013). If the range is between -1 and -0.1 the relationship is negative whereas $r$ being between 0.1 and 1 indicates a positive relationship. The higher the magnitude of the correlation coefficient the stronger is the relationship between the two variables measured. If $r$ is close to zero hence between -0.1 and 0.1, there is no relationship between those two variables (Boston University School of Public Health, 2013).

4.8.3 Criterion validity

“Criterion-related validity is the degree of correspondence between a test measure and one or more external referents (criteria), usually measured by their correlation” (Drost, 2011, p.116). Depending on the time the external referent, the criterion, is apart from the measure, researchers have to differentiate between predictive and concurrent validity (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Drost, 2011). Researchers talk about predictive validity if the criterion lies in the future hence if criterion validity is used in order to predict a certain outcome (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Drost, 2011; Kimberlin and Winterstein, 2008). Drost (2011) for instance uses the example of using student’s GMAT scores as the test measure to predict the student’s probability of successfully finishing their MBA programs.
Concurrent validity on the other hand is assessed through the analysis of the correlation of a test measure and a criterion simultaneously to the study. Researchers test a criterion that they know is somehow different to the concept in question but has relevance and a correlation to it (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Drost, 2011; Kimberlin and Winterstein, 2008). Bryman and Bell (2015) for instance use the example of a job satisfaction measure as the test measure and the analysis of the correlation to the criterion absenteeism, in other words to how often people do not show up to work. It is assumable that satisfied employees are less often absent that unsatisfied employees hence if there is a correlation between the test measure and the criterion the concurrent validity is assessed (Bryman and Bell, 2015).

For this study, hypothesis testing has been used in order to analyze the criterion validity. The independent variables have been tested separately together with the concept of customer-perceived value in order to determine the correlation to be able to compare the outcome to researchers’ past findings. All eight of the eight hypotheses have been tested and shown to have a positive relationship to customer-perceived value when tested separately hence the hypothesis in this paper act in accordance with previous research. This means that criterion validity is given.

4.8.4 Reliability

In general, it can be said that all data collected through measuring instruments “is composed of both the “true” score, which is unknown, and “error” in the measurement process (Kimberlin and Winterstein, 2008, p.2277). The true score would have been measured if the data collection had been perfectly accurate. This however, is very rarely the case. In research, different research methods and approaches lead to a different degree of error in the researcher’s data collection which is due to the different degree to which subjectivity is involved e.g. Reliability is therefore needed to be measured in order to develop the data collection measuring instruments through reducing the error. This improves the quality of data collection (Kimberlin and Winterstein, 2008).

Reliability can be assessed in diverse ways, taking different aspects of reliability into consideration. These are stability of the measurements, interrater reliability and internal consistency. The reliability of the stability of the measurement is also called the test-retest reliability which is derived from its procedure. Respondents are asked to answer the same survey for instance twice, at two different points in time. For using the approach researchers need to take into consideration that there need to be a fairly long amount of time between asking for responses the first and the second time since respondents should not be influenced by their answers given to the survey questions the first time (Kimberlin and Winterstein, 2008). Interrater reliability, or interobserver agreement, focusses on the required
objectivity in circumstances where the risk of subjectivity is high for instance if the researcher has to be an observer of a situation and needs to judge or give a rating to the situation that takes place. It needs to be ensures that a different person taking on the researcher’s task would judge in the same way or give the exact same rating as the researcher. The most common way to assess reliability is however through internal consistency. Internal consistency is given if items that measure the same variable have a correlation hence if it is indicated that items derived from the same concept are triggering the respondents to give similar responses to those items. Internal consistency is assessed with the help of Cronbach’s alpha (Kimberlin and Winterstein, 2008; Vaske, Beaman and Sponarski, 2017). “Cronbach’s alpha is a function of the average intercorrelations of items and the number of items in the scale” (Kimberlin and Winterstein, 2008, p.2277). The outcome ranges from 0 to 1 whereof 0 means the items are not correlated hence the items are not reliable and 1 means the items are highly correlated (Vaske et al., 2017). Ideally, Cronbach’s alpha should lie above 0.65 (Vaske et al., 2017).

According to Streiner (2003), Cronbach’s alpha however, “measures not only the homogeneity of the items, but also the homogeneity of what is being assessed” (p.102) and therefore he argues that Cronbach’s alpha should lie below 0.9 since values above “most likely indicate unnecessary redundancy rather than a desirable level of internal consistency” (Streiner, 2003, p.103).

Due to the survey’s nature of being treated objectively by the researchers and time constraints, that made it impossible to send out the same survey to the respondents twice with a period of time in between, the researchers for this study decided to make use of Cronbach’s alpha in order to determine the reliability of the measuring instruments.

4.9 Ethical and Societal Considerations

When conducting research, ethical and societal considerations play a vital role and need to be implemented in form of ethical guidelines, protecting the respondents from harmful behavior (Adams et al., 2007; Bryman and Bell, 2011; May, 2011). Those guidelines have to be kept in mind throughout the whole research process, determining whether actions are right or wrong (Bryman and Bell, 2011; May, 2011). Beginning in the designing of a questionnaire and ending in formulating the result of a study (Aggarwal, Vaidyanathan and Castleberry, 2011; Bryman and Bell, 2011; May, 2011). This is especially important in the social science as marketing research has being criticized for oftentimes being too incautious in ethics. Due to the fast pace of the wide distribution of a questionnaire for instance it is of utmost important to be greatly aware of ethical and societal concerns that could arise.
due to potential differences in culture and the level of understanding (Aggarwal, Vaidyanathan and Castleberry, 2011; Carrigan, Marinova and Szmigin, 2005).

According to the Center for Innovation in Research and Teaching there are four basic principles that must be considered when conducting research (Cirt.gcu.edu, 2018). Those are:

- Respect for persons – Respect the autonomy, decision-making and dignity of participants.
- Beneficence – Minimizing the risks (physically, psychologically and socially) and maximizing the benefits to research participants.
- Justice – Participants should be selected from groups of people whom the research may benefit.
- Respect for communities – Protect and respect the values and interests of the community as a whole and protect the community from harm.

Following these principles will not guarantee a complete avoidance of ethical issues but being aware and making every effort to adhere to them can minimize unwanted situations in the research process (Cirt.gcu.edu, 2018). In order to avoid harmful situation in this study, the researchers have included ethical and societal guidelines to illuminate or at the very least minimize those potentially harmful situations to their best knowledge.

Following the Center for Innovation in Research and Teaching’s (2018) principles, the researchers firstly ensured that the sample was chosen due to the relevance in the context of the study and its potential prospective benefits. Since this study’s purpose is to find out what hedonic and utilitarian values have a positive relationship to customer-perceived value in order to improve the application in the online retail context, consumers with online retail experience contribute to the result in the best possible way. With an application of the result in the real-life settings they might benefit from advantages arising due to their input.

Secondly and thirdly, the researchers ensured that respect for persons is given and that the benefits for the researchers are maximized at the same time as potential harm for the respondents is minimized. As those go hand in hand, it is difficult to differentiate between them and the researcher’s actions are presented without a clear categorization. In order to respect the persons and keep the benefit maximization present, one control variable was included asking for the participants’ age; whether it is under or over 18. By excluding respondents who are under-age and may need a guardian to release
information (Ageofconsent.net, 2018) the research is safeguarded from a potentially compromising situation (Martínez-Mesa et al., 2014; Dale, 2006). All participants were informed about the purpose of the study and for what environment the study is conducted. This acts in accordance with researchers such Aggarwal, et al. (2011), May, 2011; Saunders et al. (2009) and Williams and Aitken (2011) as well who argue that informed consent is of utmost importance. They furthermore say that respondents need to know that their data is safe (Aggarwal, et al., 2011; May, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009; Williams and Aitken, 2011) and in respect to that, the researchers ensured that the respondents got to know that the data is only gathered for this study and not going to be shared with third parties for marketing purposes e.g. This was especially important since the purpose of the study is to examine the relationship between utilitarian and hedonic values and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail, which, potentially could have led respondents to see a risk of such. Only questions relevant for the study were asked. Since the study's purpose is of quantitative nature and not gender specific it was not asked for the name and neither for the gender of the participants. Additionally, the respondents also got to know that they do not need to answer questions they do not feel comfortable with. This needed to be ensured due to the nature of the study, in which several behavioral questions had to be addressed with content that could invoke a trigger for unwanted behaviors such as addiction and financial instability. The researchers minimized the risk by wording the statements in the least triggering manner possible. However, some respondents might be more sensitive than others (Labott, Johnson, Fendrich and Feeny, 2013).

The forth principle the Center for Innovation in Research and Teaching (2018) names, the respect for communities, was taken into consideration as well. As this study includes questions towards several aspects that, if practiced too extensively – shopping in order to relief stress for instance, can lead to harm for the persons themselves and the society, the researchers kept the option open to, depending on the result of the study, suggest counteractions to reduce the risk for these behaviors to become rampant.
5. Results

In the results section the data collected through sampling via Google Forms will be examined. A discussion about descriptive statistics derived from the data as well as quality criteria via Cronbach’s alpha coefficient and the determination of validity testing through correlation analysis. Finally, the analysis of regression will be presented and discussed and the hypothesis testing which forms the basis for results of this study.

5.1 Descriptive Statistics

Once missing values in the data was predicted by SPSS the descriptive statistics were for control variables were analyzed to evaluate the response relevance of the data. It was shown that, of the 151 total respondents 142 were valid and completed the survey presented. This gave a 94% validity rate for respondents with the remaining 6% divided among the 3 control criteria as shown in table 5.1 below.

The respondents were asked first, in order to avoid potential ethical dilemmas, if they were over the age of consent most common worldwide which is 18 years of age. There were 149 of 151 respondents who filled this criterion. Of the remaining 149 there were 148 who had made at least one purchase from an online source and 142 had completed an online purchase of some fashion item. The 142 respondents were then taken to the full survey for response to the 29 statements using a Likert 5-point scale.

| Table 5.2.1 Control variable outcomes |
|-----------------|--------|--------|
| Age             | Frequency | Percent |
| >18             | 149     | 98.7   |
| < 18            | 2       | 1.3    |
| Online Purchases General |       |        |
| Yes             | 148     | 99.3   |
| No              | 1       | .7     |
| Online Purchases Fashion |      |        |
| Yes             | 142     | 95.9   |
| No              | 6       | 4.1    |
Descriptive statistics were analyzed through SPSS to illustrate the mean, minimum, maximum, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis. All variables, dependent and independent, ranged in the 5-point Likert scale utilized in the survey. Stress relief had the lowest mean at 1.89 this was a part of the hedonic value category of gratification. The category of gratification had the lowest set of mean values for the overall study. The category with the highest overall mean values was convenience of which the highest mean was for possession convenience at 4.58. Other mean values throughout the study fell between 2.0 and 4.49 respectfully. It is of note that the mean values for the hedonic natured values were commonly lower than those considered utilitarian in nature. Standard deviation among the variables was between the ranges 0.666 for possession convenience and 1.5 for stimulation. Skewness is widely varied and a strong skew to the left is seen in some data sets in that the skewness range is between -1.632 and 1.186. Skew ranges for normal distribution are recommended at ±1 however ± 2 is acceptable if reliability and validity tests perform within appropriate ranges. Kurtosis is flatter than a normal distribution in most data sets. Acceptable kurtosis should fall ±3 and the data does fall within this range.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Low Prices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>-.288</td>
<td>-.569</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Promotion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>-.688</td>
<td>-.529</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher quality Discounts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.840</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Convenience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>-1.485</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Convenience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>-.531</td>
<td>-.580</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction Convenience (a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>-1.632</td>
<td>2.467</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction Convenience (b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td>-.815</td>
<td>-.347</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Variety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>-1.396</td>
<td>1.942</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Variety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>-.363</td>
<td>-.862</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral Variety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>-.247</td>
<td>-.490</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>-.800</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>-.206</td>
<td>-.434</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>-.972</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>-.580</td>
<td>-.341</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>-1.363</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>-.655</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress relief</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.177</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>-1.036</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>-.337</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargain Hunting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.211</td>
<td>-.656</td>
<td>-.512</td>
<td>4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>-.532</td>
<td>-.756</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conquering/Winning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.274</td>
<td>-.659</td>
<td>-.641</td>
<td>4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend Identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>-.563</td>
<td>-.461</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping Current</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>-.978</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety Seeking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>-1.246</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative CPV 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>-.724</td>
<td>-.215</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative CPV 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative CPV 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.292</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>-1.051</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative CPV 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.171</td>
<td>-.434</td>
<td>-.594</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative CPV 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>-1.458</td>
<td>1.983</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n 142  CPV = Customer-perceived Value
5.2 Quality Criteria (Cronbach’s alpha coefficient)

Cronbach’s alpha was consistently above the .6 minimum for acceptable hypothesis testing with all but 2 variables exceeding the .7 minimum for meaningful analysis of a hypothesis. The highest alpha in the variable set was gratification at .880 which means the strength of association is very good. The lowest alpha coefficient was .660 for monetary savings which is not optimal but has a moderate strength of association and is acceptable for the research objectives in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Savings</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratification</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Deal</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer-perceived Value</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables were then tested for validity by analyzing correlation. Table 5.3b shows that correlations are significant at one of two values with items marked with * are significant at .01. The Pearson’s correlation value for all variables is positive. There are four correlations with values less than 0.250 which indicates a weaker correlation however the validity is not in question due to this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Monetary Savings</th>
<th>Convenience</th>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Adventure</th>
<th>Gratification</th>
<th>Best Deal</th>
<th>Idea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Savings</td>
<td>.260*</td>
<td>.257*</td>
<td>.264*</td>
<td>.493*</td>
<td>.379*</td>
<td>.351*</td>
<td>.459*</td>
<td>.329*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.469*</td>
<td>.585*</td>
<td>.379*</td>
<td>.379*</td>
<td>.248*</td>
<td>.343*</td>
<td>.343*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>.257*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.493*</td>
<td>.369*</td>
<td>.379*</td>
<td>.239*</td>
<td>.249*</td>
<td>.329*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>.337*</td>
<td>.397*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.493*</td>
<td>.369*</td>
<td>.284*</td>
<td>.227*</td>
<td>.407*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>.364*</td>
<td>.397*</td>
<td>.379*</td>
<td>.369*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.753*</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratification</td>
<td>.351*</td>
<td>.248*</td>
<td>.239*</td>
<td>.284*</td>
<td>.753*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Deal</td>
<td>.459*</td>
<td>.343*</td>
<td>.249*</td>
<td>.227*</td>
<td>.520*</td>
<td>.357*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>.329*</td>
<td>.343*</td>
<td>.329*</td>
<td>.407*</td>
<td>.672*</td>
<td>.575*</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 142; **Correlation is significant at .01 level
5.3 Hypotheses Testing

In order to better understand the behavior of the variables each one was calculated in a linear regression with the dependent variable. These values would be used to give a deeper understanding into the effect each variable has with the dependent variable of CVP. All beta (ß) values showed a positive influence on the intercept with a significance of p<0.001 however the significance of the intercept did vary slightly with convenience and variety. Variety still presented a valid significance, but convenience gave a 0.057 which could be deemed as questionable according to statistical standards of a 0.05 acceptable significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Sig. Value Independent</th>
<th>Sig. Value Intercept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Savings</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratification</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Deal</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beta significant at *p< 0.001

To determine the model significance a multiple linear regression analysis was employed. This would also be used to determine relationship status between the X and Y variables, provide the b-value, beta (ß), standard error of estimates and adjusted r².

The beta value (ß) for hypothesis H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, and H7 showed a positive relationship with the intercept, CPV. However, H6 and H8 returned negative results and were rejected on those grounds. Additionally, H1 and H7 returned result that did not meet the required sig. value (p) < 0.05 and were therefor also rejected. H2 returned a result of 0.052 which under the circumstances of the research goals is arguably acceptable and will be further discussed in the conclusion.

To determine the significance of the model the ANOVA table was analyzed. Which returned a result of p < 0.0005. This means that there is strong evidence against the null-hypothesis (H₀) that there is no relationship between CPV and the variables being tested. Discussion for the reasoning in using this method will be discussed in the following chapter.
### Table 5.3.2 Multiple Linear Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis Test</th>
<th>Exp. Sign</th>
<th>Beta (β)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1: There is a positive relationship between monetary Savings and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail. (Q1-3)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: There is a positive relationship between convenience and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail. (Q4-7)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: There is a positive relationship between product variety and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail. (Q8-10)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: There is a positive relationship between product information and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail. (Q11-13)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: There is a positive relationship between adventure and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail. (Q14-16)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: There is a positive relationship between gratification and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail. (Q 17 – 19)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7: There is a positive relationship between best deal and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail. (Q20 – 22)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8: There is a positive relationship between idea and customer-perceived value in online fashion retail. (Q 23 – 25)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance for model from ANOVA**

- F-value: 22.59
- Degrees of Freedom (df): 8
- Std. Error of the Estimates: .546
- Adjusted R²: .576
- 0.000* p < 0.005
6. Discussion and Conclusion

In this section the results will be discussed and explained as well as the conclusion of the study.

6.1 Discussion

The theoretical model put forth in this study was determined to be of significance as the result of the ANOVA F test being \( p < 0.005 \). This means that rather than testing the significance of the model through regression, the null-hypothesis was used, as accepted or rejected, to determine the model validity (Salehi et al., 2018). In this case there is strong evidence against the null-hypothesis, \( H_0 \), that the variables being examined have no positive effect on CPV in online fashion shopping. Additionally, the connection between CPV and the variables being studied show a slightly stronger that average connection as shown by the \( R^2 \) value of 0.576, which shows that 57.6% of CPV in online fashion shopping can be attributed to the variables being studied. This method of validation for the model was used in lieu of the regression value as it produced a significance of 0.770 which is well over the desired \( p < 0.005 \). There are several ways to explain this outcome. Due to the nature of the sample being derived from convenience rather than a truly random sample, the lack of difference from 0 for the regression can lead to insignificant results. Another potential explanation could be the cultural differences in the respondents. With a strong sample from the United States, Sweden, and Germany the potential for difference of opinion for the variables being tested is very strong. The development will be discussed further in the limitations section of the study.

Of the eight-hypothesis presented here to explain CPV in online fashion shopping, four were accepted. Convenience (H2), product variety (H3), product information (H4) and adventure (H5) all showed positive relationships with the CPV of online fashion shopping at a level of acceptable significance. Although it is shown that H2, convenience, had a significance of .052 the examination of the of the items were shown to have a mean value of 4.30 on the Likert scale. As this was the highest value of any variable it was decided that the .002 difference was acceptable as the respondents showed the strong tie that convenience and CPV in online fashion shopping afforded them. Of the other four hypothesis, monetary savings (H1), and best deal (H7) had negative relationships with CPV whereas gratification (H6), and idea (H8) had no significant effect on CPV and thus were rejected.

The mean value for the four accepted hypotheses was 3.62 which is .62 over the median value of 3. This indicates that the four hypothesis categories of, convenience, product variety, product
information, and adventure hold positive influence with CPV. The four rejected hypotheses held a mean value of 3 which could indicate that these variables hold little if any significance to consumers in their establishment of value for online fashion shopping. Contrary to previous research into the relationship between online shopping in a general sense, this result implies that all of the variables that encompass the utilitarian and hedonic values may not have effect on CPV as previously stated (Childers et al., 2001; Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Wu et al., 2014). This will be discussed further in the following chapters.

6.1.1 Monetary Savings

Statistical significance for monetary savings was not shown in this study. With a significance level of .847 the result is to reject the hypothesis H1. That is not to say that the null hypothesis is accepted, it may be that the sample size was not sufficient to provide significance or the questions that were used to determine results were misinterpreted by the respondents. The confidence interval, showing a range of -.113 to .137 tells us that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected, that does not necessarily mean that the H1 is rejected in its entirety, it only identifies that it is a possibility that the null hypothesis of 0 positive effect is potentially accepted.

Due to the surprising result of monetary savings it was determined that a simple linear regression would be calculated in order to address the pure relationship between monetary savings and CPV without outside influence from additional variables. Not only did monetary savings show a positive effect on CPV but the significance value of p < 0.001 was met. This could be a result of the direct connection from the intercept to the variable as the remaining seven variables would have no impact on the outcome in this case. For this reason, it is hard to discount monetary savings completely as a positive influence on CPV. It is a possibility that given a larger sample size or stronger correlation between the variables, the result of H1 could have been more statistically significance in the multiple linear results.

6.1.2 Convenience

It is no surprise that the different types of convenience, as defined by scholars, gave overwhelming positive results for the subject of online fashion shopping. The single point of contention when discussing the testing of convenience in CPV is the narrow margin of significance with .052 being the end result. Perhaps being a sign of things to come as technology continues to offer simpler, faster and more efficient systems to find and purchase the products consumers need (Chiu et al., 2012; Moon et
al., 2017; Parker and Wang, 2016; Seiders et al., 2000). When that happens the concept of convenience will deliver little to the building of value but will contribute greatly to the destruction of it when an online retailer fails to meet the standards of what consumers expect as a base requirement of online fashion shopping (Seider, Berry and Gresham, 2000).

In the simple linear regression convenience maintained its result of a positive and significant contribution to CPV. Although the effect was a much greater one due to the focused effect of testing one independent variable against one dependent one. Not to imply that this discount the effect of other variables which showed a change from negative effect or lack of significance. More so this shows that on an independent relationship void of outside variables the outcome would be a magnified one in comparison to the multiple test.

6.1.3 Product Variety

The connection between product variety and CPV was not a strong one showing a beta of 0.24. The significance of the relationship was p<.005 and that gives a very solid effect albeit a small one. The breadth and depth of products that an online fashion retailer can offer dwarfs the selection one finds in a mall space or a downtown boutique. It is possible that respondents, in acknowledging the relationship did not value it in a meaningful way. Thus, the ability to find the products a consumer needs is taken for granted and the value of it is not considered.

The simple linear regression for product variety, at .563 beta and a sig. value of p < 0.001., showed a strong relationship between product variety and CPV. The stronger results here confirm that the relationship between variety, the ability to select a product based on personal taste, and CPV as a particularly well-suited variable of online fashion shopping. The weakening occurs when the variable is combined with other variables for the CPV which could indicate that product variety is only valuable when it is examined in independent comparison with CPV.

6.1.4 Product Information

Product information was found to have a positive relationship with CPV. Although the relationship was weaker than expected at .208, as were most of the positive correlated variables, the significance was strong at p < .01. As the concept of product information is closely tied to search convenience it is logical to deduce that the positive relationship with CPV would be similar to convenience (Mpinganjira, 2015). The weakness of the relationship could be due to the overall nature of information
in relation to the internet as it is common to search for information from not only the product supplier but outside sources related to the product explicitly.

The lack of first-hand experience with the product could affect the results of the product information category. As, with fashion in general, to actually evaluate a product one must experience it (Nelson, 1970; Pant et al., 2016). There is a natural desire for the consumer to try on or evaluate a fashion product first hand before committing to the purchase. This would be of particular significance with high end or luxury items. However, with many fashion outlets offering free returns or delayed payment options that enable the consumer to try before they buy, the potential for this anomaly to affect the results has been minimized. As well as the large resource of user generated evaluations or rating systems provided by fashion providers or independent of them (Chua and Banerjee, 2016). Respondents gave a more commonly neutral response, as seen by the mode of 3 for the statement “I can examine fashion products more carefully online.” Which would indicate that the need to examine products first hand is of no consequence or has been adequately addressed by product providers.

6.1.5 Adventure

The relationship between adventure and CPV produced the highest beta at 0.355 and a solid significance of $p < 0.001$. This indicates that the respondents enjoyed their fashion shopping experience online and confirms the hypothesis as being accepted. This implies that fashion online sales promote an entertaining and enjoyable experience, fulfilling the growing importance for entertailing (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003).

It is difficult to say exactly which element of online fashion shopping is truly influencing the consumers idea of fun. The concept is very subjective in nature. It could be considered that the activity is providing a transportive element that fulfils the consumers need to escape or that the imagery employed helps the consumer see themselves in a different situation such as on vacation. It is therefore difficult to determine the precise activity that respondents thought of when ranking the statements of adventure.

6.1.6 Gratification

The outcome for gratification was that it had a negative relationship with CPV. This would cause the Hypothesis H6 to be rejected. However, further examination can provide clarification for the result of the hypothesis. Looking at the significance we can, as was the case with monetary savings, see that the variable does not meet the level of significance that would be necessary to accept the hypothesis,
although the negative result already accomplishes the rejection of H6 that in this case. The confidence level also shows, as the difference between -0.159 and 0.096, that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected due to the case where 0 is included in the confidence interval. However, it is also important to note that with the confidence interval being on opposite sides of 0, both negative and positive numbers, the significance would have failed to meet the necessary 0.05 regardless of the null hypothesis result.

As with the previous variables, a separate simple regression was calculated to demonstrate the potential relationship of gratification to CPV. With a beta of +0.414 and significance of p < 0.001 it can be shown that as an individual factor in CPV gratification shows a substantial influence on CPV and only becomes rejected when tested with the additional variables.

Examining the item results for this variable it can be seen that there is a strong disagreement with the idea that online fashion shopping provides relaxation of escapism. The respondents selected the value of 1, indicating disagreement with the statements, for all three conditions. Potentially the respondents may have found the opposite to be the case in that there is a level of uncertainty when purchasing products online. You can’t be sure what you will get until you get it.

6.1.7 Best Deal

As with monetary savings, best deal fails to pass the 0.05 significance level needed to accept the hypothesis. The significance level of 0.112 is not quite as dramatic as the 0.847 result but the effect is the same. Meaning that H7 is rejected due to insignificant results. It could be possible that the close relation that best deal has with monetary savings has contributed to the results. As both variables speak to a search for increased value for the purchase being made (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003; Chiu et al., 2014; Moon et al., 2017). Although there is a difference between the two as the practical element of monetary savings is not comparable to the emotional reward of best deal. However, it is a hard distinction to make when the average consumer is looked at as the separation between a purely logical benefit and a purely emotional one does not exist.

Had the variable met the significance level the effect would have been weak in comparison to the other accepted hypothesis however the hypothesis would have been accepted never the less. Examining the confidence interval, we can see that the range -0.022 to 0.206, includes 0 as well as having numbers on both sides of 0. Meaning that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected nor, can a significant level be established. However, as was the case previously, in the simple regression the variable performed adequately and would have met the criteria for acceptance of the hypothesis.
By examining the mode, it was discovered that two modes exist in the descriptive statistics for items related to best deal. Bargain hunting produces a mode of 4 (a) and 5 as does conquering / winning. The selection of 4 (a) being the smaller for the selections. This is a bimodal result and means that both 4 and five were selected equally by the respondents. Although this split with 4 and 5 being the results of the mode, examining the mean value shows that a less than 4 average is the result. This implies that the respondents had a large division in the selected responses to the statements and this could have been the culprit for the insignificance result for best deal. A larger sample size or more statements, relative to the variable, could have potentially given a more statistically significant result.

6.1.8 Idea

Idea, which was tested through the hypothesis H8, the behaviour of identifying trends or current styles was rejected on two counts in the multiple regression analysis (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003; Kesari and Atulkar, 2016). It produced a negative beta of -0.014 which denotes that idea has a negative relationship with CPV. The significance, which is 0.863 also rejects the hypothesis due to not meeting the 0.05 threshold for significance. This could stem from a lack in concern for trends from the respondent sample. Looking at the individual items it is observed that although they responded that they were aware of trends and the availability of them online, the search or specific buying habit, focusing on trends, did not score well on the survey results. This conflict of outcomes with the ability to identify trends ranking a mode of 5 but the active search and purchase of trend items a mode of 1 is evidence that although the consumers are aware it does not motivate them to buy and therefor does not provide any value building attribute to them.

This result is only true when looking at idea in the multi regression calculation. In the simple regression, as all other variables, the idea variable can show influence at a significant level to CPV.

6.2 Conclusions

Customer-perceived value has been a contested model in many aspects. In the way it relates to the customers true perception of value as well as what elements that value is built upon. A variety of models from a variety of studies have tried to pinpoint the way, both practically and theoretically, business should focus their efforts in order to keep up with the evolving customer behaviour and stay attractive to the consumer (Percy, 2017). The research community has come a long way from the definition “the customer's overall assessment of the utility of a product based on perceptions of what
is received and what is given” (Zeithaml, 1988, p.14). No longer a strict trade-off between the utility of what is given and then received, the concept has grown in an attempt to make it more representative of true customer-perceived value.

This study, with a focus on online fashion retail, was tasked with the objective to explain the variables that have been shown to define customer-perceived value in real world sales. By examining the relationship between the independent variables and CPV on a level playing field, a direct connection, in varied degrees of effect, could be established. CPV became the testing ground, rather than routing the variables through the utilitarian and hedonic values. Essentially taking direct route from the independent variable to CPV and removing the potential support that a weak variable may have in being grouped with one or more strong variables. In this way a more precise model with an effect level for each of the variables would be tested. The original model, presented as 3.3 in the conceptual framework, gave the flat and equal relationship for each of the most accepted variables in the study of customer-perceived value (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003; Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Chiu et al., 2012; Kesari and Atulkar, 2016; Moon et al., 2017; Overby and Lee, 2006; Rintamäki et al., 2006). These values would then be put into the context of online fashion shopping as a specific theatre for the study to perform in.

The testing of these variables would determine the level of contribution as each value, on its own merit, was examined as it competed with the other values. It was expected that all variables, based on previous research results, would have a positive effect on CPV but to varied degrees. What instead happened was a weeding out the weak and keeping the strong. The result, as shown below is a more streamlined and focused set of variables that give real contribution to CPV in their own right without the caveat of being combined with other potentially misused concepts that do not truly affect CPV in a meaningful and positive way.
Model 6.2 1 Value Building Variables for Online Fashion Shopping

Customer Perceived Value in Online Fashion Retail

- Adventure: $H_5 \beta 0.355$
- Product Variety: $H_3 \beta 0.240$
- Product Information: $H_4 \beta 0.208$
- Convenience: $H_2 \beta 0.147$
7. Research implications

This section will present the implications of the end results and conclusion of this study. It will explain how and why this study is of value and the potential of use in a marketing setting.

7.1 Theoretical Implications

Previous research into CVP has long been based on the relationship of utilitarian and hedonic values as they contribute to the concept (Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Rintamäki et al., 2006). However, the cumulative testing of each component that make up those values from an equal level of contribution had not been conducted within the online fashion shopping segment. The potential for the relationship, between CPV and the independent variables to conflict and even negate themselves when examined in a new framework was not initially considered. The derived model that was developed to conduct the study was theoretically sound in its construction. However, the outcome would show that nothing is truly certain when customer behavior is being examined.

Seeing the behavior of the independent variables as they performed in the simple regression tests, the assumption was that given the original purpose, examining the relationships and reporting the levels of influence toward CPV, a logical outcome would be that which was expected once the variables were tested in multiple regression testing. When the data analysis showed that the variables acted very differently than was expected the end result of the study changed. A new model was required to better explain the actual situation presented here. Giving way to a narrowed but more relevant model to describe the outcome of the situation being observed within the confines of online fashion shopping. This new theoretical model is a descriptor, giving form to the specific situation facing consumer behaviour in modern times with the influence and continued advancement of technology and all of the implications that come with that ongoing advancement.

7.2 Managerial Implications

Having a model to clarify what elements of online fashion shopping contribute to customer previewed value is way for marketing managers to focus efforts, and funds, to the most efficient and relevant activities for the company. With online fashion being the largest market in the online shopping world it is of great importance to have as specific and detailed a model as possible (Statista, 2018). It is also of value to see what possible elements of online fashion shopping are not contributing to the overall effective marketing and promotional efforts.
Through this study and the subsequent model, a marketing plan can begin formation in ways that are relevant and meaningful to the company as well as offer a framework for creative marketing schemes to be built from. Knowing that adventure is a strong contributor to CPV will give management a base to build upon and then fit other elements into.

Additionally, examine the variables that are insignificant or even provided negative relationships with CPV does not discount them as valuable. Management in all areas of the online fashion industry can learn from these results and utilize them in an effort to increase the value and improve the cohesion they present among the independent variables. Establishing an equilibrium where CPV is a more balanced and potentially more valuable concept for the company to fulfil. For instance, combining the element of adventure to that of gratification in the context of online fashion shopping in order to create a new level of value for the consumer. Therefore, customizing the consumers experience and working to improve the level of contribution a weak or insignificant variable has.
8. Limitations and Future Research

In this chapter the limitations of the study will be presented followed by suggestions for future research.

8.1 Limitations

Due to resource constraints, some aspects of this study were subject to limitations that may have had an effect on the final results. Most notably were sampling concerns. As this study performed with a non-probability convenience sample of respondents which does not offer statistical reliability due to potential sampling errors (Martínez-Mesa et al., 2014). A more expansive and diverse population sample that would be representative of the entire population, as every member of the sample would be a potential respondent, then sampling errors would be at the very least minimized.

Another potential effect of the sampling procedure was a potential for insignificant results in the model when running the multiple regression tests. Because the sample is not truly random it is not subject to the laws of probability will not behave properly when estimating statistics (Figueroedo Filho et al., 2013). As the statistical significance for the model presented in the conceptualization produced insignificant results in the multiple regression it could be from the non-random sampling. It was decided to use the ANOVA F test to show significance for the model due to this behavior but that is not an optimal condition to meet when conducting quantitative research.

Another difficulty faced in the sample population selection was a cultural one. By pulling respondents from different countries a potential for cultural differentiation as well as language difficulties may have contributed to the resulting data. This could cause statements to be misunderstood and answered in a way that researchers do not intend. Although steps were taken to avoid this by translating the survey into two primary languages, it is unknown if that was an adequate measure. When using a widely accessible medium, such as internet, it can be difficult to gauge if respondents understand the wording of a statement or question.
8.2 Future research

The model presented here is a potential source of research for several situations within the marketing discipline. By re-testing the material in this study with a truly random sampling or with a larger sample size. These options would provide a more statistically accurate validation of the model or could lead to a deeper insight into the phenomena of CPV. Additionally, the model could be tested in other segments of online shopping such as literature or home fashions. By testing the model in different markets, a more definitive result will be achieved, and more relevant model will develop. As an addition to a change of context, further testing to ensure the model is generalizable and therefor suited to a wider selection of situations such as gender specific or age variations.

As the study performed here, a focused study on online fashion shopping, lacks the component of comparison between the physical activity of real world shopping it could reveal a unique take on the different variables and their relation to situations that are similar yet wildly different.

Finally, there could be interest in studying the individual independent variables in context of CPV. To determine exactly which ones show the greatest contribution to CPV, or if other combinations would yield different results should some variables be omitted.
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Appendix 1

Questionnaire

Perceived Customer Value
online purchasing of Fashion shopping

The following statements are specific to your feelings toward shopping for fashion online. They are ranked from 1 to 5 with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree.

Följande påståenden är specifika för hur du känner mot att handla mode på internet. Frågorna har svarsalternativ graderade från 1 till 5, där 1 är lägsta betyg och 5 är högsta betyg.

Are you over 18 years of age? Yes No

Have you ever made a purchase from an online store? Yes No

Have you ever purchased a fashion item (clothing, accessories, shoes or jewelry) from an online store? Yes No

If the respondent answers no to any of the above questions they are thanked for their time and the survey is closed. Items are presented in English as well as Swedish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I pay less for clothing items I purchase online.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag betalar mindre för kläder som jag köper online.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find sale items more often for items I purchase online.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag hittar oftare reor på artiklar när jag köper online.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I buy high quality fashion online to save money.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag köper högkvalitativt mode online för att spara pengar.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can shop for fashion online any time of the day I want.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag kan handla mode online helst när som helst på dygnet.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to find information about products I purchase online.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det är lätt att hitta information om produkter jag köper online.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can shop for fashion from any location where I can connect to the internet.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag kan köpa mode överallt där jag kan ansluta till internet.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like that I don't have to wait in a line to pay when I shop online.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag gillar att jag inte behöver stå i kö för att betala när jag handlar online.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find a large selection of fashion products when shopping online.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag hittar ett stort urval av modeprodukter när jag handlar online.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I purchase a certain category of clothing, for instance sporting apparel or shoes, online.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag köper en viss kategori av kläder, till exempel sportkläder eller skor, online.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can find substitutes for fashion products that are out of stock online.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag kan hitta ersättare för modeprodukter som inte finns på lager online.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can examine fashion products more carefully online.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag kan undersöka modeprodukter mer noggrant online.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find information on fashion online to be informative and detailed.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag tycker att informationen om mode är informativ och detaljerad online.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to find basic information, such as size colour and material, when shopping for fashion online.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det är lätt att hitta grundläggande information, till exempel storlek, färg och material, när jag handlar för mode online.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have fun shopping for fashion online.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag har kul när jag köper mode på nätet.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I shop for fashion online when I am bored.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag köper mode på nätet när jag är uttråkad.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I shop for fashion online to add excitement to my day.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag köper mode på nätet för att lägga till lite spänning till min vardag.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I shop for fashion online to relieve stress.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag köper mode på nätet för att lindra stress.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Item</td>
<td>Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find shopping online for fashion relaxing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag tycker att det är avslappnande att köpa mode på nätet.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I shop online for fashion to get my mind off of everyday life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag handlar mode på nätet för att distrahera mig från vardagsproblem.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I actively search for bargains when I shop online for fashion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag söker aktivt efter fynd när jag handlar mode online.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy looking for sales and bargains for fashion online.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag gillar att leta efter reor och fynd av mode på nätet.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel proud of myself if I find a bargain or a sale on something I want to buy online.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag känner mig stolt över mig själv om jag hittar ett fynd eller en rea på något jag vill köpa online.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can find the newest trends online.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag kan hitta de senaste trendprodukterna online.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I shop for new fashion trends online.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag köper produkter inom nya modetrender online.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look for new fashion trends online.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag letar efter nya modetrender online.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I shop for fashion online because of the overall benefits for me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag handlar mode online på grund av de övergripande fördelarna för mig.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will look online for the products I need if they are not available in the store.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag kommer att leta online efter de produkter jag behöver om de inte är tillgängliga i butiken.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe shopping online for fashion improves my shopping experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag tror att det förbättrar min shoppingupplevelse om jag köper mina modeprodukter online.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident in my purchases of fashion online.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag känner mig säker på köp av mode online.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for participating in this Survey.

None of the responses you have given will be shared, saved or used to identify you in any way. The purpose of this survey is strictly for educational purpose and has no commercial value or relevance. We thank you for your time in helping us with this study.

*Tack för att du deltog i denna undersökning.


*added after pre-testing discussion