

Standard Deviation (σ) is a measure of how close the responses from the respondents are centered on the mean score. Conventionally, the lower the σ the better. In this analysis, the σ values may be considered to be good. To find the proportion of the respondents in the different age group and their education status a cross tabulation was done

between age and education status and the results are presented in Table II. It was found that the respondents in the 15-25 age group have a U.G degree. This also indicates that but for the nine respondents in SSLC category, rest of the respondents will be above 17 years of age. The number of respondents in the other groups is much lesser.

TABLE II CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN AGE AND EDUCATION OF RESPONDENTS

Education Age		SSLC	HSC	U.G	P.G	Total
15-25	Count	9	6	142	30	187
	% within Age	4.8%	3.2%	75.9%	16.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	85.7%	89.9%	63.8%	84.6%
	% of Total	4.1%	2.7%	64.3%	13.6%	84.6%
26-35	Count	0	1	13	15	29
	% within Age	0.0%	3.4%	44.8%	51.7%	100.0%
	% within Education	0.0%	14.3%	8.2%	31.9%	13.1%
	% of Total	0.0%	0.5%	5.9%	6.8%	13.1%
36-45	Count	0	0	3	2	5
	% within Age	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	4.3%	2.3%
	% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.9%	2.3%
Total	Count	9	7	158	47	221
	% within Age	4.1%	3.2%	71.5%	21.3%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	4.1%	3.2%	71.5%	21.3%	100.0%

To investigate the marital status of the respondents based on the age group, a cross tabulation was carried out between the two and it can be observed that (Table III), almost all of the respondents in the 15-25 age group are unmarried. Further is could be observed that half of the women in 26-35 age group are also single. Single women may have a

large amount of disposable income which could influence their apparel buying behaviour. To investigate this phenomenon further, a cross tabulation between marital status and frequency of purchase of apparel was applied and the results are tabulated in Table IV.

TABLE III CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN AGE AND MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

Marital Status Age		Married	Single	Total
15-25	Count	6	181	187
	% within Age	3.2%	96.8%	100.0%
	% within Marital Status	24.0%	92.3%	84.6%
	% of Total	2.7%	81.9%	84.6%
26-35	Count	15	14	29
	% within Age	51.7%	48.3%	100.0%
	% within Marital Status	60.0%	7.1%	13.1%
	% of Total	6.8%	6.3%	13.1%
36-45	Count	4	1	5
	% within Age	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	% within Marital Status	16.0%	0.5%	2.3%
	% of Total	1.8%	0.5%	2.3%
Total	Count	25	196	221
	% within Age	11.3%	88.7%	100.0%
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	11.3%	88.7%	100.0%

Observing the results of the cross tabulation between marital status of the women apparel buyers and their frequency of purchase, it can be seen that almost equal proportion of the respondents make their apparel purchase in the stated frequency irrespective of their marital status. In other words, marital status of women does not affect their frequency of apparel purchase. In order to test this

hypothesis, i.e., to test if there is any significant difference in apparel purchase between the married and unmarried women, a chi square test is carried out and the results are presented in the last row of Table IV. The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between differing marital statuses of women in apparel purchase is considered for the test.

TABLE IV CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN MARITAL STATUS AND FREQUENCY OF PURCHASE

Frequency Of Purchase Marital Status		Half yearly	Monthly	Occasions	Quarterly	Total
Married	Count	5	8	2	10	25
	% within Marital Status	20.0%	32.0%	8.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Frequency of Purchase	15.2%	8.4%	9.5%	13.9%	11.3%
	% of Total	2.3%	3.6%	0.9%	4.5%	11.3%
Single	Count	28	87	19	62	196
	% within Marital Status	14.3%	44.4%	9.7%	31.6%	100.0%
	% within Frequency of Purchase	84.8%	91.6%	90.5%	86.1%	88.7%
	% of Total	12.7%	39.4%	8.6%	28.1%	88.7%
Total	Count	33	95	21	72	221
	% within Marital Status	14.9%	43.0%	9.5%	32.6%	100.0%
	% within Frequency of Purchase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	14.9%	43.0%	9.5%	32.6%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square Value: 1.820; Asymptotic Significance: 0.611						

Observing the results from the Chi square test shown in Table IV the asymptotic significance is greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$). Thus we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that marital status makes no significant difference in the frequency of apparel purchase among women.

V. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

As the main objective was to analyse the group differences within groups (Table I) on the chosen predictor variables, univariate GLM is used to analyse the same and the results of which are discussed below. The outcome of the Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (GLM and the related statistics) for the predictors considered for the study (except marital status, since there are fewer than three groups) is compiled

into a single table (Table V) so that only those predictors which have a significant and contingent impact on the overall shopping experience of apparels of respondents can be explained further.

Observing the results of GLM compiled in Table V, it can be seen that only the respondents groups based on factors Age and Occupation have a significant differences among themselves. On other factors, there is no significant difference on the opinion on overall shopping experience between the different groups of customers. The Levene's test which the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups is rejected for age and occupation and we interpret the ANOVA results accordingly.

TABLE V TESTS OF BETWEEN-SUBJECTS EFFECTS FOR PREDICTORS AND OVERALL SHOPPING EXPERIENCE OF APPARELS OF RESPONDENTS

Source	Mean Square	F	Sig. (p)	Partial η^2	Adjusted R^2	Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances	
						F	Sig. (p)
Age of respondents	14.267	34.771	.000	0.242	0.235	12.549	0.000
Education level	0.650	1.215	.305	0.017	0.003	1.479	0.221
Occupation	2.789	5.408	.005	0.047	0.039	15.461	0.000
Perceived store atmosphere	0.340	0.630	.596	0.009	-0.005	0.393	0.758
Perceived brand image	0.171	0.315	.867	0.006	-0.013	0.432	0.785
Frequency of purchase	0.530	1.857	.138	0.025	0.012	1.117	0.343

The results in Table V show that there could be a significant difference in the satisfaction on the overall shopping experience of apparels between the respondents in the age bands of 15-25 years, 26-35years and 36-45 years. Also it can be seen that there could be a significant difference between the Employed, Housewife and Students on their

opinion their overall shopping experience of apparels. In order to find out exactly where the difference occurs between the groups a post hoc test is carried out and the results of the post hoc tests are presented in Table VI, VII and VIII.

TABLE VI MULTIPLE COMPARISONS (POST HOC TEST) WITH OVERALL SHOPPING EXPERIENCE AND THE DIFFERENT AGE GROUP OF RESPONDENTS

Post hoc test used: LSD						
(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
15-25	15-25	-	-	-	-	-
	26-35	0.72*	0.128	.000	0.47	0.98
	36-45	1.87*	0.290	.000	1.30	2.44
26-35	15-25	-0.72*	0.128	.000	-0.98	-0.47
	26-35	-	-	-	-	-
	36-45	1.14*	0.310	.000	0.53	1.76
36-45	15-25	-1.87*	0.290	.000	-2.44	-1.30
	26-35	-1.14*	0.310	.000	-1.76	-0.53
	36-45	-	-	-	-	-
The error term is Mean Square (Error) = .410.						
* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.						

As stated earlier, to find exactly where the differences lie within the age group of respondents, a multiple comparisons (Post hoc test) of overall shopping experience within the different age group of respondents is done and the results are presented in Table VI. Observing the results in Table VI, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in the perception of overall shopping experience among all the age group of women who make apparel purchases.

This means that the young and older women belonging to different age groups exhibit a different satisfaction on their apparel purchase experience. The differences in the experience could be because the young women evaluate shops with a different set of criterion from the older women.

For example Tongren (1988) has compiled the shopping preferences of mature consumers and list the following factors such as their emphasis on enjoyment; liking for personalised style; have lower price consciousness; have higher fashion consciousness, have lower brand loyalty; go for less frequent shopping, and have an aversion to features designed especially for the elderly. Age was identified as an important dimension in fashion clothing (Auty and Elliott, 1998; O’Cass, 2000).

Goldsmith, Moore, & Beaudoin (1999) and O’Cass (2004) in their research have shown that women consider themselves innovative regarding fashion, and that the degree of innovation is related to age. Mature women customers are less likely than young consumers to adopt

new fashions (Ming Law, Zhang, & Leung (2004), although fashion involvement for all age group women tend to be triggered by a high motivation to be acceptable into a particular group considered important to them and to avoid the wrong cues sent to those in that group (Auty and Elliott, 1998).

Dwek (1998) observes that today’s teenagers have more money and have more economic clout than the consumer of previous generation. Also young girls pay more attention to style and will search for cheaper versions of the precise designer clothes on their minds (Child Wise Insights, 2003). For young girls, the irresistible compulsion to be accepted by their peers has driven a strong sense of brand affinity for these young girls (Lawrence, 2003).

Results presented in Table V also show that there is a significant difference between the Employed, Housewife and Students on their opinion their overall shopping experience of apparels. Here too in order to find exactly where the differences lie within the different occupation of the respondents, a post hoc test is done on perception of overall shopping experience and the results of the same is presented in Table VII.

Looking into the results it can be seen that there is significant difference on the perception of satisfaction on shopping experience between the students – house wives and students – employed but not significant difference between employed – house wives.

TABLE VII MULTIPLE COMPARISONS WITH OVERALL SHOPPING EXPERIENCE AND THE DIFFERENT OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENTS

Post hoc test used: LSD						
(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Employed	Employed	-	-	-	-	-
	Housewife	0.28	0.191	0.147	-0.10	0.65
	Student	-0.23*	0.113	0.042	-0.45	-0.01
Housewife	Employed	-0.28	0.191	0.147	-0.65	0.10
	Housewife	-	-	-	-	-
	Student	-0.51*	0.175	0.004	-0.85	-0.16
Student	Employed	0.23*	0.113	0.042	0.01	0.45
	Housewife	0.51*	0.175	0.004	0.16	0.85
	Student	-	-	-	-	-
The error term is Mean Square (Error) = .516.						
* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.						

While examining the results of the Table VII, it can be perceived that there is significant difference on the perception of overall shopping experience among employed women and students. Also the same phenomenon is observed between the students and house wives. However there is no significant difference on the overall shopping experience between house wives and employed women. Both these women groups have the same feelings.

Employed women’s apparel consumption patterns are different from non-employed women. Employed women place greater importance on timesaving, convenience, place greater emphasis on fashion, takes significant interest in dress’s pleasing qualities and its suitability for work, and spends more money on clothing (Jacob, Shipp, & Brown, 1989; Shim & Drake, 1988). Further, brand name is

perceived by employed women to be more important while purchasing apparel than non-employed women (Cassill, 1990). Professional women may be different from non-professional women. Many professional women consider their dress to be significantly affecting their success within their work place (Douglas, 1985). Cassill & Drake (1987) found that women’s employment alignment has a significant influence on their lifestyles and clothing selection norms.

One of the predictors considered apart from the above mentioned (Table V) was marital status. Since there are only two groups here (married and unmarried), an independent samples ‘t’ test is carried out to find if there is a significant difference on their overall shopping experience among those two groups, and the results are shown in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII INDEPENDENT SAMPLES TEST FOR MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	29.301	.000	-5.320	219	.000	-0.780	0.147	-1.070	-0.491
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	-3.394	25.853	.002	-0.780	0.230	-1.253	-0.308

Observing the results from the independent samples ‘t’ test exhibited in Table VIII, the asymptotic significance is less than 0.05 (p < 0.05) thus we reject the null hypothesis, accept the alternative and conclude that in fact there is a significant difference in the overall shopping experience among the married and unmarried women. This could be because of the fact that married women may be constrained by availability of time to make a relaxed shopping since they may have to rush back home to take care of their families, while unmarried women do not have this limitation

and spend a lot more time on their shopping and this could contribute to the feeling of better overall shopping experience among unmarried women and the opposite feeling among married women.

VI. CONCLUSION

Marketers need to find the right target audience to position their products. Hitting on the right demography and the right perceptual aspects will go a long way in their targeting

strategies. This study considered certain demographical aspects such as age of respondents, education level, occupation, frequency of purchase and perceptual aspects such as Perceived store atmosphere, Perceived brand image that may influence the overall shopping experience of women apparel buyers. It was found from the analysis that there could be a significant difference in the satisfaction among different age groups of women on the overall shopping experience of apparels buying and it was also found that there could be a significant difference on shopping experience among women in different professions. A post hoc test revealed that the difference in opinion lie in all the age bands considered namely 15-25 years, 26-35 years and 36-45 years. As far as the employment of respondents is concerned, there is significant difference on the perception of overall shopping experience among students compared to both employed women and house wives. However there is no significant difference between house wives and employed women. Both these women groups have the same feelings.

It was also found that there was no significant difference in the overall shopping experience of apparel among women based on their education level, perceived store atmosphere, perceived brand image, and frequency of purchase. Previous researches also have similar findings. Martin (1976) found no differences between younger and older consumers' shopping enjoyment and fashion interest. In a study on shopping perspectives of elderly consumers, Lumpkin, Greenberg, & Gold stucker (1985) found that elderly women who were socially active enjoyed shopping for clothing, tended to be fashion trendsetters, and showed strong interest in fashion. Several researchers have established that older women consumers use apparel shopping for social, leisure, and physical activities (Duncan, Travis, & McAuley, 1995; Kowinski, 1985; Lumpkin & Greenberg, 1982; Mason & Smith, 1974). Mason & Smith (1974) in their research have found that older consumers travelled with friends or relatives for shopping. Lumpkin & Greenberg (1982) had observed that elderly consumers enjoyed interacting with apparel store personnel. In a study among elderly on their shopping orientations, Lumpkin, Greenberg, & Gold stucker (1985) found that older elderly women consumers were recreational shoppers who were interested in spending time shopping and treated shopping as a social activity.

From the marketing perspective it can be suggested that apparel manufacturers and retailers could concentrate their monies on students who fall in the age group of 15-25 years. From the research it is clear that this demography has lot of autonomy in the apparel buying and in fact spends a lot of time and money on apparel. As previous research suggests, apparel purchase is a high involvement process for youngsters as dressing forms an important part of themselves as it improves their self-esteem helps them gain social appreciation (Creekmore, 1980). Youngsters are also brand consciousness, and fashion consciousness and go for recreational and hedonistic. They are also shopping

consciousness, price and value consciousness (Sprotles & Kendall, 1986). Thus concentrating the marketing on this segment will be more fruitful. The findings of this research can be strategically implemented into apparel marketing scheme by apparel manufacturers and retailers.

REFERENCES

- [1] Apeageyi, P. R. (2011). The impact of image on emerging consumers of fashion. *International Journal of Management Cases*, 13(4), 242-251. doi:10.5848/apbj.2011.00133
- [2] Assael, H. (1993). Marketing principles & Strategy. In *Marketing principles & strategy*, 2nd ed., p. 316. Fort Worth, TX: Dryden Press.
- [3] Auty, S., & Elliott, R. (1998). Fashion involvement, self-monitoring and the meaning of brands. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 7(2), 109-123. doi:10.1108/10610429810216874
- [4] Avendus Capital Private Limited. (2017). Women's apparel landscape in India. Retrieved from https://www.avendus.com/encrypted_pdf_path/img_5b0bf9c3491886.60428112_Women-Apparel-Report_VFinal.pdf
- [5] Bakewell, C., & Mitchell, V. (2003). Generation Y female consumer decision-making styles. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 31(2), 95-106. doi:10.1108/09590550310461994
- [6] Blasor, L. (2004). Puerto Rico and the new challenges of marketing. *Caribbean Business*, 32(45), W2.
- [7] Browne, B. A., & Kaldenberg, D. O. (1997). Conceptualizing self-monitoring: links to materialism and product involvement. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 14(1), 31-44. doi:10.1108/07363769710155848
- [8] Cassidy, T. D., & Bennett, H. R. (2012). The Rise of Vintage Fashion and the Vintage Consumer. *Fashion Practice*, 4(2), 239-261. doi:10.2752/175693812x13403765252424
- [9] Cassill, N. (1990). Employment Orientation of Women as a Market Segmentation Variable for Apparel. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 9(1), 59-64. doi:10.1177/0887302x9000900108
- [10] Cassill, N., & Drake, M. F. (1987). Employment Orientation's Influence on Lifestyle and Evaluative Criteria for Apparel. *Home Economics Research Journal*, 16(1), 23-35. doi:10.1177/1077727x8701600103
- [11] Cervellon, M., Carey, L., & Harms, T. (2012). Something old, something used. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 40(12), 956-974. doi:10.1108/09590551211274946
- [12] Child Wise Insights. (2003, Feb 5). Children's Purchasing Habits. Retrieved from <http://www.childwise.co.uk/purchasing.htm>
- [13] Chirag Shah. (2016). Indian branded apparel - A thematic report. Retrieved from Credit Lyonnais Securities Asia (CLSA) Retrieved from: <https://www.clsa.com/idea/indian-branded-apparel/>
- [14] Creekmore, A. M. (1980). Clothing and Personal Attractiveness of Adolescents Related to Conformity, to Clothing Mode, Peer Acceptance, and Leadership Potential. *Home Economics Research Journal*, 8(3), 203-215. doi:10.1177/1077727x8000800306
- [15] Cristache, M. (2013). The 'vintage community' in Bucharest: consumers and collectors. In Anu Kannike & Patrick Lavolette (Eds.), *Things in Culture, Culture in Things* (pp. 158-171). Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/38167942/The_vintage_community_in_Bucharest_consumers_and_collectors
- [16] De Kervenoael, R., Canning, C., Palmer, M., & Hallsworth, A. (2011). Challenging market conventions. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 15(4), 464-485. doi:10.1108/13612021111169951
- [17] Dilip Kumar Jha. (2018). Domestic apparel market to grow by 12% on robust demand, says CMAL. Retrieved from Business Standard News website: https://www.business-standard.com/article/companies/domestic-apparel-market-to-grow-by-12-on-robust-demand-cmai-118071600951_1.html
- [18] Douglas, S. P. (1985). The Female Clothes Horse: From Aesthetics or Tactics?. In M. R. Solomon (Ed.), *The Psychology of fashion*, 387-402. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- [19] Duncan, H. H., Travis, S. S., & McAuley, W. J. (1995). An Emergent Theoretical Model for Interventions Encouraging Physical Activity

- (Mall Walking) Among Older Adults. *Journal of Applied Gerontology*, 14(1), 64-77. doi:10.1177/073346489501400105
- [20] Dwek, R. (1998). Child's play? *Marketing Business*, 12-15.
- [21] Elliott, R. (1994). Exploring the symbolic meaning of brands. *British Journal of Management*, 5, S13-S19.
- [22] Fashion United. (2016). Fashion Industry Statistics India, Fashion United Business Intelligence. Retrieved from <https://fashionunited.in/fashion-industry-statistics-india>
- [23] Fernandez, P. R., & Lean, M. L. (2009). Impact of Branding on Gen Y's Choice of Clothing. In *International Conference on Economics, Business Management and Marketing*, 73-77. Singapore.
- [24] Goldsmith, R. E., Moore, M. A., & Beaudoin, P. (1999). Fashion innovativeness and self-concept: a replication. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 8(1), 7-18. doi:10.1108/10610429910257904
- [25] Guiot, D., & Roux, D. (2010). A Second-hand Shoppers' Motivation Scale: Antecedents, Consequences, and Implications for Retailers. *Journal of Retailing*, 86(4), 355-371. doi:10.1016/j.jretai.2010.08.002
- [26] IMAGES Business of Fashion. (2018, Feb. 12). An overview of the women's wear market in India. Retrieved from <https://www.india-retailing.com/2018/02/09/fashion/womens-wear-market-india/>
- [27] Indian Brand Equity Foundation (IBEF). (2019, Mar. 8). Textile Industry and Market Growth in India. Retrieved from <https://www.ibef.org/industry/textiles.aspx>
- [28] Indian Retail Industry 2017-2018 drift. (2018, Feb. 2). Retrieved from Connect Media website: <http://www.connectmedia.online/indian-retail-industry-2017-2018-drift/>
- [29] Jacobs, E., Shipp, S., & Brown, G. (1989). Families of working wives spending more on services and nondurables. *Monthly Labor Review*, 112(2), 15-23. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41843252>
- [30] Keane, J., & Willem teVelde, D. (2008). The role of textile and clothing industries in growth and development strategies, Investment and Growth Programme. Retrieved from Overseas Development Institute website: <https://www.odl.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/3361.pdf>
- [31] Kowinski, W. S. (1985). *The Malling of America: An Inside Look at the Great Consumer Paradise*. New York, NY: William Morrow.
- [32] Krishna, C. V. (2011). Determinants of Consumer Buying Behaviour: An Empirical Study of Private Label Brands in Apparel Retail. *Vilakshan: The XIMB Journal of Management*, 8(2), 43-56.
- [33] Lahiri, I., & Samanta, P. K. (2010). Factors Influencing Purchase of Apparels from Organized Retail Outlets. *The IUP Journal of Marketing Management*, 9(1), 73-87.
- [34] Lawrence, D. (2003). The role of characters in kids marketing. *Young Consumers*, 4(3), 43-48. doi:10.1108/17473610310813898
- [35] Lumpkin, J. R., & Greenberg, B. A. (1982). Apparel shopping patterns of the elderly consumer. *Journal of Retailing*, 58(4), 68-89.
- [36] Lumpkin, J. R., Greenberg, B. A., & Goldstucker, J. L. (1985). Shopping orientation segmentation of the elderly consumer. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Sciences*, 61(2), 75-105.
- [37] Madan Sabnavis, Darshini Kansara, & Mradul Mishra. (2017). Indian Retail Industry - Structure and Prospects. Retrieved from CARE Ratings website: <http://www.careratings.com/upload/NewsFiles/SplAnalysis/Indian%20Retail%20Industry%20-%20June%202017.pdf>
- [38] Mandhachitara, R., & Piamphongsant, T. (2016). Professional Women's Fashionable Clothing Decisions in Bangkok and New York City. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 28(2), 135-149. doi:10.1080/08961530.2015.1116039
- [39] Martin, Jr., C. R. (1976). A Trans generational Comparison - The Elderly Fashion Consumer. In B. B. Anderson (Ed.), *NA - Advances in Consumer Research*, 453-456. Retrieved from <http://www.acrweb.org/volumes/9215/volumes/v03/NA-03>
- [40] Mason, J. B., & Smith, B. E. (1974). An Exploratory Note on the Shopping Behavior of the Low Income Senior Citizen. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 8(2), 204-210. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6606.1974.tb00542.x
- [41] McCracken, G., & Roth, V. (1989). Does clothing have a code? Empirical findings and theoretical implications in the study of clothing as a means of communication. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 6(1), 13-33.
- [42] Meyers-Levy, J., & Sternthal, B. (1991). Gender Differences in the Use of Message Cues and Judgments. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28(1), 84-96. doi:10.2307/3172728
- [43] Ming Law, K., Zhang, Z., & Leung, C. (2004). Fashion change and fashion consumption: The chaotic perspective. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 8(4), 362-374. doi:10.1108/13612020410559966
- [44] Minghuang, H., Yiching, C., Shushen, T., & Nienying, C. (2012). An Investigation of the Antecedents and Consequence of Desire -An Example of the Boutique Clothing. *Marketing Review*, 8(2), 2258-250.
- [45] Mitchell, V., & Walsh, G. (2004). Gender differences in German consumer decision-making styles. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 3(4), 331-346. doi:10.1002/cb.146
- [46] Mittal, P., & Aggarwal, S. (2012). Consumer perception towards branded garments: A study of Jaipur. *International Journal of Research in Finance and Marketing*, 2(2), 566-583. Retrieved from <http://euroasiapub.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/44-11.pdf>
- [47] Nam, J., Hamlin, R., Gam, H. J., Kang, J. H., Kim, J., Kumphai, P., Richards, L. (2007). The fashion-conscious behaviours of mature female consumers. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 31(1). doi:10.1111/j.1470-6431.2006.00497.x
- [48] O'Cass, A. (2000). An assessment of consumers product, purchase decision, advertising and consumption involvement in fashion clothing. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 21(5), 545-576. doi:10.1016/s0167-4870(00)00018-0
- [49] O'Cass, A. (2004). Fashion clothing consumption: antecedents and consequences of fashion clothing involvement. *European Journal of Marketing*, 38(7), 869-882. doi:10.1108/03090560410539294
- [50] Primedia Business. (2004, Mar. 14). Live from PROMO Expo: Event marketing warms women, Gen Y. Retrieved from Primedia Business Magazines and Media, Inc website: http://promomagazine.com/news/breakingnews/expo_event_mktg_women/index.html
- [51] Radha Krishna, G., & Shylajan, C. S. (2007). Determinants of Habitual Buying Behavior: A Study on Branded Apparel. *The ICFAI Journal of Marketing Management*, 6(3), 6-21.
- [52] Rajput, N., Kesharwani, S., & Khanna, A. (2012). Consumers' Attitude towards Branded Apparels: Gender Perspective. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 4(2), 111-120. doi:10.5539/ijms.v4n2p111
- [53] Shieh, K., & Cheng, M. (2007). An empirical study of experiential value and lifestyles and their effects on satisfaction in adolescents: an example using online gaming. *Adolescence*, 52(165), 199-216.
- [54] Shim, S., & Drake, M. F. (1988). Apparel Selection by Employed Women: A Typology of Information Search Patterns. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 6(2), 1-9. doi:10.1177/0887302x8800600201
- [55] Shuler, L. (2004). Experiential marketing survey: new consumer research. Retrieved from Jack Morton Worldwide: Global Brand Experience Agency website: <http://www.jackmorton.com/>
- [56] Sprotles, G. B., & Kendall, E. L. (1986). A Methodology for Profiling Consumers' Decision-Making Styles. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 20(2), 267-279. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6606.1986.tb00382.x
- [57] Stith, M. T., & Goldsmith, R. E. (1989). Race, sex, and fashion innovativeness: A replication. *Psychology and Marketing*, 6(4), 249-262. doi:10.1002/mar.4220060403
- [58] Suneera Tandon & Mihir Dalal (2014, Feb.14). Apparel brands see 50% growth in women's western wear. Retrieved from Live Mint website: <https://www.livemint.com/Industry/FhE2TWrxvqAZ9RYAlljgM/Apparel-brands-see-50-growth-in-womens-western-wear.html>
- [59] Tigert, D. J., King, C. W., & Ring, L. (1980). Fashion Involvement: a Cross-Cultural Comparative Analysis. In Jerry C. Olson & Ann Abor (Eds.), *NA - Advances in Consumer Research*, 17-21. Association for Consumer Research.
- [60] Tongren, H. N. (1988). Determinant Behavior Characteristics of Older Consumers. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 22(1), 136-157. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6606.1988.tb00217.x
- [61] Verma, A.P. & Tiwari, K. (2011). A Study on Consumer's Perception about Branded Clothing Store and Merchandise Levis Stores and Koutons Store in India (Project Work).