

#9

Traditionally it has been held that consumer buying behavior can be classified by social class and stage in the family life cycle. Recently it has been suggested that these distinctions have been obscured by the leveling effects of social and economic changes. From data of an extensive empirical study of women's shopping behavior, the authors suggest that in many instances the earlier market segmentation concept may be outmoded.

Social Class and Life Cycle as Predictors of Shopping Behavior

This article is concerned with application of concepts of social class and life cycle to consumer shopping behavior for the purposes of segmenting the market. That these concepts help in understanding the consumer is generally accepted. As Martineau said,

"The friends we choose, the neighborhoods we live in, the way we spend and save our money, the educational plans we have for our children are determined in large degree along social class lines. A rich man is not just a poor man with more money. He probably has different ideals, different personality forces, different church membership, and many different notions of right and wrong, all largely stemming from social class differentials. With its disciplinary pressures of approval and disapproval, belonging versus ostracism, social class is a major factor shaping the individual's style of life" [16].

Thus for a marketing program to be effective, it must be designed to reach the social class that fits one's product or service. Similarly, life cycle has been used as an independent variable in analyzing housing needs and uses, income, finances, and the purchase of a standard package of items to be consumed at each stage in life [3].

However, recent changes in social and economic circumstances of consumers—such as increase in discretionary income, leisure time, opportunities for higher education, increasing social benefits, movements to suburbia—have raised some doubts about the effectiveness of social class and life cycle to explain consumer behavior. Several articles [6, 15, 19, 26, 27] in academic and professional journals indicate how people

supposedly of different classes tend to resemble each other in the market place. This was also reflected in the *Wall Street Journal*.

"It is no news that blue-collar pay is rising. It's not even particularly news that blue-collar workers have been raising their pay somewhat faster than white-collar workers. The extent to which these blue-collar increases have been creating what is in effect a new class blending traditional blue-collar and white-collar spending habits, social customs and ways of thinking, is perhaps not so well realized. But recently this has become the most striking of all blue-collar trends" [14, p. 1].

A similar trend has been noted about life cycle. As a J. C. Penney's executive said,

"The youth market is influenced by the population explosion, education which teaches reason rather than memorization, sweeping changes in social attitudes. Young people have a 'no depression complex,' a refreshing honesty and self-effacing humor. They also have a higher level of 'taste achievement' which they have acquired themselves. The youth market is witty, worldly, and has money to spend. This market has influence on all the other markets (parents, young adults, older people who respond to youth)" [7].

In summary, the traditional distinctions between the various social classes and stages in the family life cycle seem to be quickly diminishing. The main objective of this article is to report the findings of a study done to test the usefulness of social class and life cycle in understanding consumer behavior during changing socioeconomic conditions.¹ In presenting our findings, other

* Stuart U. Rich is professor of marketing, School of Business Administration, University of Oregon. Subhash C. Jain is assistant professor of marketing, School of Business Administration, University of Dayton.

¹ This study was done for a doctoral dissertation [10].

studies, and certain statements, and assertions will be referred to which our empirical findings support or refute.

METHOD

The data used in this study were originally collected by one of the authors for a comprehensive work in 1963 on shopping behavior of department store customers [22]. The data consisted of about 4,000 personal and telephone interviews in Cleveland and New York. For this article part of the data was reanalyzed, namely the results of 1,056 personal interviews with a probability sample representing all women 20 years of age and older residing in the Cleveland standard metropolitan statistical area. In collecting the original data, a random procedure divided this Cleveland area into 19 zones and selected a sample of places—one place in each zone. This random procedure was repeated and a second, independent sample was drawn, providing a replicated probability sample.²

The two major variables used here were social class and family life cycle. Social class was stratified by a multiple-item index, Warner's Index of Status Characteristics [28] widely used in social research.³ In this index Warner had four variables, source of income, occupation, dwelling area, and house type. This index was modified and source of income and house type were replaced with the amount of income and education of family head. Warner originally used source of income only because of the difficulty in obtaining income amount. It has been found that house type, which is mainly a reflection of house value is mainly dependent on occupation. If house type and occupation were used, occupation would have been weighed very heavily. Therefore, education—also an important determinant of social class—was substituted for house type.

To measure life cycle, the following breakdown was used: under 40 without children, under 40 with children, 40 and over without children, 40 and over with children. This gave a measure of the effects of age, married status, and children in the household—all important determinants of shopping behavior. Using 40 as the dividing point for age indicated whether there were preschool children in the household, another important factor influencing shopping habits [22].

Highlights of the differences in shopping behavior of women in various social classes and stages in the life cycle are described here. Chi-square tests were used to ascertain which of these differences were significant at the .05 level and to determine, for instance, whether social class affected women's interest in fashion and choice of shopping companions.

² For a step-by-step description of the research procedure used, including sample design, see "Technical Appendix on Research Methodology" [22].

³ For a full discussion of different methods of social stratification and how and why we used Warner's Index, see Chapter 2 [10].

FACTORS AFFECTING SHOPPING

Interest in Fashion

If traditional distinctions between the women in various social classes and stages of the life cycle are disappearing an indication would be expected in women's interest in fashion. Respondents' interest in fashion was measured from these five statements, each printed on a separate card and handed to the respondent. She was asked to state her preferences, which were noted by the interviewer.

1. I read the fashion news regularly and try to keep my wardrobe up to date with fashion trends.
2. I keep up to date on all fashion changes although I don't always attempt to dress according to these changes.
3. I check to see what is currently fashionable only when I need to buy some new clothes.
4. I don't pay much attention to fashion trends unless a major change takes place.
5. I am not at all interested in fashion trends.

In Table 1, the fashion interests of the women belonging to various social classes are compared. Fashion plays an important part in the lives of all women regardless of class. Except for the lower-lower class, in which a slightly higher percentage of women than in other classes showed no interest in fashion at all, very small percentages of women among all other classes found fashion uninteresting.

King made essentially the same point, emphasizing the broad appeal of fashion [13]. This finding supports Weiss's remark "Fashion today is the prerogative of a substantial majority of our population—men, women and children" [29, p. 104]. However, these findings do not entirely agree with the traditional research of Barber and Lobel who found that social class differences determined the definition of women's fashion [1]. Although this was true for knowing fashion changes, it did not apply to keeping the wardrobe up to date, which concerned all women.

The present survey also showed that women in different stages of the life cycle did not vary significantly in their fashion interests. For instance, 48 percent of women 40 or over with children either read the fashion news regularly or kept up to date on all fashion trends compared with 50 percent of women under 40 with children. Katz and Lazarsfeld, however, found that interest in fashion declined with the life cycle [12].

Table 2 summarizes the methods that women in various social classes used for following fashion trends. Except for watching television and listening to the radio, where the differences between social classes were not significant, the helpfulness of the various methods shown in keeping women up to date on fashion changes increased with social class level. The rate of increase varied, however, with different methods. For example, in the category "discussing fashion with others," there

Table 1
INTEREST IN WOMEN'S FASHIONS BY CLEVELAND WOMEN SHOPPERS, BY SOCIAL CLASS

Statement on degree of interest	Social class					
	L-L	U-L	L-M	U-M	L-U	U-U
Read news regularly and keep wardrobe up to date	14%	8%	9%	10%	19%	9%
Keep abreast of changes but not always follow	19	29	42	50	47	64
Check what is fashionable only if buy new clothes	15	22	15	17	17	9
Only pay attention to major fashion changes	22	23	19	14	14	18
Not at all interested in fashion trends	24	16	12	9	3	— ^b
Don't know	6	2	3	—	—	—
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases	132	346	265	206	36	11

^a In this and subsequent tables, *L* = lower, *M* = middle and *U* = upper.

^b In this and subsequent tables, a dash represents less than .5 percent.

was relatively little difference between the lower and middle classes. In "looking at newspaper ads," there was a sharp rise in helpfulness from the lower-lower class to the upper-lower class, but the difference is not particularly significant until the upper-upper class. In summary, the traditional view of greater fashion interest for higher social classes generally holds true for particular methods used to keep informed of fashion although the increase in interest is seldom in any direct proportion to the increase in social level.

Unlike social class, life cycle did not affect fashion interest. There were no significant differences in the methods used by women in various stages of the family life cycle for being informed of fashion changes.

Sources of Shopper Information

Newspaper ads are an important source of shoppers' information. The degree of helpfulness which women attributed to newspaper advertising was analyzed. Women in various social classes seemed to find newspaper ads helpful to about the same degree, except a slightly greater percentage of women in the lower-lower class found them somewhat more helpful.

Another measure used to study the importance of newspaper ads was to analyze the regularity with which women in different social classes looked at newspaper ads. Here again, women of different status groups showed no significant differences in the regularity of their looking at newspaper ads. These results agreed with findings of a recent study reported in *Editor and Publisher*:

"The daily newspaper's coverage of the market place on the average day is nearly universal. Almost every household, 87%, gets a newspaper. . . . The mass exposure opportunity represented by this high

percentage of page opening is remarkably consistent for men and women of all ages, incomes, educational attainments and geographical locations" [25].

Carman has reported a similar finding about the importance of newspaper ads as a source of information for members of different social classes [2, p. 29].

Among women in the various stages of the family life cycle, those with children considered the newspaper ads more helpful. For instance, 88 percent of the women 40 and over with children found ads helpful compared with 73 percent of those without children. Among the women under 40 with and without children, the percentages were 81 and 70, respectively. Further analysis showed that women with children looked at newspaper ads more often than those without children. Age itself had little effect on either the regularity of looking at ads in newspapers or the helpfulness attributed to these ads.

This finding about life cycle differs from what Miller pointed out in 1954,

"The younger housewives are easier to educate to an awareness of product and brand; it is easier to get across to the younger housewives the reasons why they should try it or buy it; and the younger housewives are less fixed in their buying habits and brand loyalty, and will be more inclined to change their buying patterns in response to advertising" [17, p. 65].

Again we note that some of the traditional distinctions among the social classes and stages in the family life cycle may be disappearing.

Interpersonal Influences in Shopping

Interpersonal influences play an important part in shopping decisions. For practical application to market-

Table 2
METHODS HELPFUL TO CLEVELAND WOMEN ON FASHION TRENDS, BY SOCIAL CLASS

Method	Social Class					
	L-L	U-L	L-M	U-M	L-U	U-U
Going to fashion shows	5%	3%	7%	9%	22%	18%
Reading fashion magazines	14	13	11	23	36	27
Reading other magazines	17	18	26	31	28	46
Reading fashion articles in papers	22	34	46	45	56	64
Looking at newspaper ads	39	57	60	68	67	91
Going shopping	36	50	53	63	75	73
Discussing fashion with others	21	22	29	34	36	46
Observing what others wear	22	36	81	51	58	55
Watching television	32	28	25	26	25	46
Listening to the radio	2	5	5	2	8	—
Don't know	3	1	1	—	—	—
No interest in fashion	30	18	14	10	3	—
Total ^a	243%	285%	358%	362%	414%	466%
Number of cases	132	346	265	206	36	11

^a Total exceeds 100 percent because of multiple responses.

ing, it is necessary to know who these influencers are for each segment of the market. The traditional view has been that upper classes interacted more with members of the immediate family and put great emphasis on lineage. The middle class, though, was generally considered self-directing, had initiative, and was dependent on themselves and their friends more than on relatives. Like the upper classes, the lower classes depended on relatives and family members more often [8, p. 286]. Our findings differed in some respects from this view.

Tables 3 and 4 present data on the impact of interpersonal influences on shopping decisions under two categories, helpfulness attributed to discussing shopping with others and persons with whom respondents usually shopped. In both categories, women in various social classes showed no significant difference in the influence of friends on shopping. The husband was slightly more important as a shopping influence for the middle and upper classes than for the lower classes, and children were more likely to be taken on shopping trips by the middle and upper classes. However, mother and other family members were not mentioned to any large extent by the lower classes as traditional research would indicate.

Note also in Table 3 that the proportion of women who attributed no help to discussing shopping with others was not significantly different for the three classes. This does not agree with what Rainwater, Coleman, and Handel said, "the working class largely depended on word-of-mouth recommendation before making major purchases" [21, p. 210].

Shopping Enjoyment

Most women enjoyed shopping regardless of their social class. However, women in different social classes had varying reasons for enjoying shopping. Some rea-

sons—such as the recreational and social aspects of shopping, seeing new things and getting new ideas, and bargain hunting and comparing merchandise—were mentioned by all social classes without any significant difference. Another reason, namely acquiring new clothes or household things, was more enjoyable for the two lower classes. However, a pleasant store atmosphere, display, and excitement were specified as reasons for enjoying shopping by a greater proportion of the women in the upper-middle, lower-upper, and upper-upper classes. Stone and Form found that enjoyment in shopping was not a function of social status [24]. This was in accord with our general finding on shopping enjoyment although, as just noted, the reasons for enjoyment sometimes varied among social classes.

Life cycle did not have any effect on the enjoyment of shopping for clothing and household items. For instance, 38 percent of the women over 40 with children enjoyed shopping for such reasons as pleasant store atmosphere, displays, and excitement compared with 36 percent in this age group without children. For women under 40 without children, the percentages were 37 and 41, respectively.

Stone and Form claimed that younger women with children enjoyed shopping more than other women. In this study, neither age nor the presence of children in the family seemed to make any difference for women in their enjoyment of shopping.

Shopping Frequency

The frequency with which women shopped during the year was significantly associated with social class. For example, 38 percent of the women in the upper class and 34 percent in the middle class shopped 52 or more times a year compared with 24 percent in the lower class. These findings do not match those of Stone and

Table 3
DISCUSSION OF SHOPPING WITH OTHERS, CLEVELAND
WOMEN, BY SOCIAL CLASS

Consider it helpful with	Social class ^a		
	Lower	Middle	Upper
Friends	34%	37%	50%
Husband	13	18	24
Mother	5	5	6
Other family members	20	14	18
No one	36	39	32
Total ^b	108%	113%	130%
Number of cases	478	471	47

^a Significant differences were noted even when we divided the respondents into six social classes. However, to save space here in some instances only three classes are shown.

^b Total exceeds 100 percent because of multiple responses.

Form. According to them, women in either the upper or the middle class shopped less often than women in the lower or working class.

Younger women shopped more often than older women, but presence of children did not make any significant difference within the two age groups (Table 5). Stone and Form found the frequency of shopping trips mainly dependent on children in the family.

Importance of Shopping Quickly

The higher the social status of a woman, the more she considered it important to shop quickly. Thus 39 percent of upper class women regarded it important to always shop quickly though only 30 percent in the lower class and 34 percent in the middle class did. Only 10 percent of upper class women felt it was not important to shop quickly compared with 19 percent and 29 percent in the middle and lower classes, respectively. According to Stone and Form, however, the upper and lower classes spent more time shopping than did the middle class. Huff found that women of high social status spent the most time on an average shopping trip [9].

For life cycle, Stone and Form found that women in their forties felt most hurried, and women in their twenties were divided evenly between those who felt they had adequate time and those who did not. In their study age was found to be the determining factor of the importance of shopping quickly. In this study, women under and over 40 with children put more stress on quick shopping than those without children. These findings thus show different behavior patterns about the importance of shopping quickly.

Browsing

Tendency to browse without buying anything was more prominent among the upper-lower (41 percent), lower-middle (44 percent), and upper-middle (42 percent) classes. Yet women in the lower-lower, lower-

upper, and upper-upper classes mentioned it less often (Table 6). Stone and Form discovered that lower class women did more browsing than middle and upper class women, a finding obviously different from this study's.

Further, women under 40 with or without children, browsed more (24 percent and 22 percent, respectively) than women 40 and over (12 percent for those with and without children); but Stone and Form did not find the life cycle to have any relationship here. Again, traditional distinctions among the various social classes and stages in the family life cycle may be changing.

Downtown Shopping

Several authors have reported how the continued expansion of the shopping centers has challenged the traditional role of the downtown area [5, 11, 23]. In this study, the lower the social status, the greater the proportion of downtown shopping (Table 7). Sixty-eight percent of lower-lower class women were designated as high downtown shoppers, only 22 percent of the lower-upper class and 18 percent of the upper-upper class were considered to be so. This finding is different from that reported in *Workingman's Wife*, "A comparison between the shopping of middle class women and working class women shows the provinciality of the latter. Fewer working class than middle class women classify themselves as 'regular shoppers' in the central business districts" [21, p. 21]. Thus there is a change in downtown clientele. Once the upper class shopped downtown more often; now it may be the lower classes who patronize downtown more.

This also suggests that suburban shopping centers are becoming increasingly more important for the upper classes. This has been noted in *Women's Wear Daily*, "It is a mistake to promote just \$25 dresses in a suburban store. . . . We have found, from experience, that higher price clothes do sell in depth in the suburbs" [20, p. 40].

Cross tabulations by life cycle showed a tendency for young people to patronize shopping centers more than older people, as suggested by other findings.

No significant differences on downtown shopping existed among the women in the various social classes living in the city. However, among the suburbanites, social class was inversely related to downtown shopping. For instance, among the city dwellers about 60 percent of the women in the two lower and two middle classes were ranked as high downtown shoppers. Yet, among the out-of-city residents 43 percent of lower-lower class women and 37 percent of upper-lower class were considered high in-town shoppers; only 32 percent in the lower-middle and 27 percent in the upper-middle class were high downtown shoppers. The percentages for the two upper classes further decreased to 22 percent and 18 percent, respectively.

In contrast, about 70 percent of the women in the two upper classes (living in the suburbs) were low

Table 4
PERSONS WITH WHOM CLEVELAND WOMEN USUALLY SHOP, BY SOCIAL CLASS

<i>Usually shop with</i>	<i>Social class</i>					
	<i>L-L</i>	<i>U-L</i>	<i>L-M</i>	<i>U-M</i>	<i>L-U</i>	<i>U-U</i>
Friends	32%	31%	26%	34%	39%	46%
Husband	20	25	32	35	33	9
Mother	5	7	9	9	3	—
Children	10	15	22	23	28	—
Other family members	21	23	16	10	8	18
No one in particular	26	20	17	22	17	36
Never shops with others	—	2	1	2	—	—
Total ^a	114%	123%	123%	135%	128%	109%
Number of cases	132	346	265	206	36	11

^a Total exceeds 100 percent because of multiple responses.

downtown shoppers though the same percentage was 29 percent for the lower-lower class and 40 percent for the upper-lower class. However, when the high and low categories were considered together and compared with the "none" group, downtown shopping by suburbanites increased in each higher social class.

In general, a greater proportion of higher class women shop downtown, but women in the lower classes appear to shop more intensively in the central business district.

Type of Store Preferred

As seen in Table 8, higher class women more often named the regular department store as their favorite. The department store maintained a broad image as a favorite store since 51 percent of the lower-lower class women and 60 percent of the upper-lower class designated it their favorite store. A greater percentage of lower-lower (14 percent) and upper-lower (11 percent) women favored the discount store than did women in either the middle or upper classes.

Several writers have emphasized that women in various social classes differ in the department stores they patronize and have different expectations about each store [4, 16, 18]. Therefore, the authors looked at the particular stores which women named as their favorites among the different regular department stores. Three department stores in Cleveland were mentioned far more often than others, and these were called a high fashion, a price appeal, or a broad appeal store.

As shown in Table 9, the high fashion store became more important for each higher class. But, the price appeal store was inversely related to social class. The broad appeal store was mentioned by the two middle classes more often. These findings generally agreed with what Martineau discovered:

"the blue collar individual, as his family income goes up, proceeds from cars to appliances to home ownership to apparel. He and his family are candidates for almost any store, and the most successful stores

which would traditionally appeal to them have held them by steadily trading up, both in merchandise, store facilities and their image. . . . The point again is that this person has changed. He is not the same guy. He has long since satisfied his needs and wants and now he is interested in satisfying his wishes" [15, p. 56].

The high preference of the lower class shoppers for the regular department stores is therefore not surprising.

The kind of department store women in the various social classes mentioned most often was also analyzed for the following kinds of merchandise: women's better dresses; house dresses and underwear; children's clothing; men's socks and shirts; furniture; large appliances; towels, sheets, blankets and spreads; and small electrical appliances and kitchen utensils. Here again the two upper classes specified the high fashion store as their favorite for the first five of these eight kinds of merchandise. Women in the two lower classes shopped at the price appeal store most of the time for all items.

Table 5
FREQUENCY OF SHOPPING TRIPS OF CLEVELAND WOMEN, BY LIFE CYCLE

<i>Times per year</i>	<i>Stage in life cycle</i>			
	<i>Under 40</i>		<i>40 and over</i>	
	<i>No child</i>	<i>Child</i>	<i>No child</i>	<i>Child</i>
52 or more	30%	30%	25%	31%
24 to 51	33	25	17	20
12 to 23	23	28	18	21
6 to 11	2	4	6	7
1 to 5	12	12	27	21
Less than once	—	—	2	—
Never	—	—	1	—
Don't know	—	1	4	—
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases	66	474	240	276

Table 6
BROWSING OF CLEVELAND WOMEN, BY SOCIAL CLASS

<i>Regularity of occurrence</i>	<i>Social Class</i>					
	<i>L-L</i>	<i>U-L</i>	<i>L-M</i>	<i>U-M</i>	<i>L-U</i>	<i>U-U</i>
Regularly or fairly often	29%	41%	44%	42%	22%	18%
Once in awhile	30	37	35	36	31	27
Never	40	21	20	22	44	55
Don't know	1	1	1	—	3	—
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases	132	346	265	206	36	11

Analysis of the favorite store of women in various stages of the life cycle showed that the regular department store ranked high among all women except that younger women with children showed somewhat less preference for it. Table 10 shows that 57 percent of the younger women with children and 65 percent of the younger women without children mentioned the regular department store as their favorite. Discount stores were preferred by the younger women a little more than by the older ones. No significant differences were revealed between the types of stores favored by women in various stages of the family life cycle for the eight kinds of merchandise individually.

CONCLUSION

Socioeconomic changes in income, education, leisure time, and movement to suburbia cut across traditional class lines and various stages in the life cycle. Some authors like Rainwater, Coleman, and Handel have found social class a significant factor in determining consumer behavior [21]. However recent writings seem to indicate that social class distinctions have been obscured by rising incomes and educational levels [14, 15].

Our empirical findings tend to support the second viewpoint. The random sampling procedure used assured every Cleveland woman 20 years of age or older

an equal chance of being selected, and interviewer bias was closely controlled. Hence we are able to generalize about shopping behavior in Cleveland. Admittedly, all findings cannot be applied to women in other cities. However in the original study, which included Cleveland and New York-northeastern New Jersey metropolitan areas, many patterns of shopping behavior for women in particular income or life cycle categories were almost identical in the two areas despite the contrasting patterns of size, geographical location, demography, and kinds of stores found in these two cities [22].

Spot checks made of Cleveland and New York women in the present study again produced similar results. For instance, among women under 40 with children in Cleveland, 30 percent shopped 52 or more times per year compared with 34 percent for this group in New York. For women 40 and over with children, the percentages were 31 and 30 for the two cities. On the importance of being able to shop quickly, 30 percent of the lower social class women in Cleveland felt this was always important, as did 34 percent of the middle class women and 39 percent of the upper class women. In New York these percentages were 29, 36, and 39, respectively. In other words, there seems to be evidence that many of the shopping behavior patterns of Cleveland women exist in other cities.

The findings thus question the usefulness of life cycle

Table 7
SHOPPING DONE DOWNTOWN BY CLEVELAND WOMEN, BY SOCIAL CLASS

<i>Proportion of downtown shopping^a</i>	<i>Social class</i>					
	<i>L-L</i>	<i>U-L</i>	<i>L-M</i>	<i>U-M</i>	<i>L-U</i>	<i>U-U</i>
High	68%	50%	42%	33%	22%	18%
Low	19	33	37	50	59	64
None	11	15	19	15	16	18
Don't know	2	2	2	2	3	—
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases	132	346	265	206	36	11

^a High downtown shoppers shop downtown half or more of the time; Low downtown shoppers, one-quarter or less of the time; None means women who do not shop downtown.

Table 8
KIND OF FAVORITE STORE OF CLEVELAND WOMEN, BY SOCIAL CLASS

Kind of store	Social class					
	L-L	U-L	L-M	U-M	L-U	U-U
Regular department	51%	60%	77%	83%	88%	91%
Discount department	14	11	6	2	—	9
Variety and junior department	2	6	6	5	—	—
Mail order	9	14	5	2	3	—
Medium to low specialty	2	2	1	—	6	—
Neighborhood	11	2	1	1	3	—
Others	11	5	4	7	—	—
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases	132	346	265	206	36	11

Table 9
KIND OF DEPARTMENT STORE FAVORED BY CLEVELAND WOMEN

Kind of department store	Social class					
	L-L	U-L	L-M	U-M	L-U	U-U
High fashion store	4%	7%	22%	34%	70%	67%
Price appeal store	74	63	36	24	19	18
Broad appeal store	22	30	42	42	11	15
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases	67	208	204	71	32	10

Table 10
KIND OF FAVORITE STORE OF CLEVELAND WOMEN, BY LIFE CYCLE

Kind of favorite store	Stage in life cycle			
	Under 40		40 and over	
	No child	Child	No child	Child
Department	65%	57%	83%	79%
Discount	9	13	2	2
Mail order	5	11	2	7
All others	21	19	13	12
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases	66	474	240	276

and social class concepts in understanding consumer behavior in view of recent changes in income, education, leisure time, movement to suburbia, and other factors. Students of marketing and store executives may need to reconsider how far these sociological concepts should be used for segmentation purposes and what their probable impact will be on marketing policies and programs.

REFERENCES

1. Bernard Barber and Lyle S. Lobel, "Fashion in Women's Clothes and the American Social System," *Social Forces*, 31 (December 1952), 124-31.
2. James M. Carman, *The Application of Social Class in Market Segmentation*, Berkeley, Calif.: University of California, 1965.
3. Lincoln Clark, ed., *The Life Cycle and Consumer Behavior*, Vol. 2, New York: New York University Press, 1955.
4. Richard P. Coleman, "The Significance of Social Stratification in Selling," in Martin L. Bell, ed., *Marketing: A Maturing Discipline*, Chicago: American Marketing Association, December 1960, 177.
5. Thomas Lea Davidson, *Some Effects of the Growth of Planned and Controlled Shopping Centers on Small Retailers*, Washington, D. C.: Small Business Administration, 1960.
6. Editors of *Fortune*, *Market for the Sixties*, New York: Harper and Row, 1960.
7. "Experts Set Youth Market Guidelines," *Women's Wear Daily*, 113 (October 18, 1966), 19.
8. August B. Hollingshead, "Class Differences in Family Stability," in Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset, eds., *Class, Status and Power*, New York: The Free Press, 1965.
9. David L. Huff, "Geographical Aspects of Consumer Behavior," *University of Washington Business Review*, 18 (June 1959), 27-35.
10. Subhash Jain, "A Critical Analysis of Life Cycle and Social Class Concepts in Understanding Consumer Shopping Behavior," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1966.
11. C. T. Johanssen, *The Shopping Center Versus Downtown*, Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1955.
12. Elihu Katz and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, *Personal Influence*, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955, 263-8.
13. Charles W. King, "Fashion Adoption: A Rebuttal to the Trickle Down Theory," *Proceedings*, Summer Conference, American Marketing Association, June 1964, 108-25.

- 01.4
PN 4700
E 2⁺
14. Frederick C. Klein, "Rising Pay Lifts More Blue Collar Men into a New Affluent Class," *The Wall Street Journal*, 165 (April 5, 1965).
 15. Pierre Martineau, "Customer Shopping Center Habits Change Retailing," *Editor & Publisher*, 96 (October 26, 1963), 16, 56.
 16. *Motivation in Advertising*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1957, 166-7.
 17. Donald L. Miller, "The Life Cycle and the Importance of Advertising," in Lincoln Clark, ed., *The Life Cycle and Consumer Behavior*, Vol. 2, New York: New York University Press, 1955.
 18. Vance Packard, *The Status Seekers*, New York: Pocket Books, Inc., 1961, 113.
 19. Peter G. Peterson, "Conventional Wisdom and the Sixties," *Journal of Marketing*, 26 (April 1962), 63-5.
 20. Trudy Prokop, "Jack Weiss: No Gambler, But a Man of Decision," *Women's Wear Daily*, 113 (November 28, 1966), 40.
 21. Lee Rainwater, Richard Coleman, and Gerald Handel, *Workingman's Wife*, New York: MacFadden-Bartell Corp., 1962.
 22. Stuart U. Rich, *Shopping Behavior of Department Store Customers*, Boston, Mass.: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1963.
 23. George Sternlieb, *The Future of the Downtown Department Store*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1962.
 24. Gregory P. Stone and William H. Form, *The Local Community Clothing Market: A Study of the Social and Social Psychological Contexts of Shopping*, East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University, 1957, 20.
 25. "Survey Proves High Exposure for Ads on Newspaper Pages," *Editor & Publisher*, 97 (October 3, 1964), 17-8.
 26. Thayer C. Taylor, "Selling Where the Money Is," *Sales Management*, 91 (October 18, 1963), 37-41, 122, 124, 126.
 27. —, "The I AM ME Consumer," *Business Week*, (December 23, 1961), 38-39.
 28. Lloyd W. Warner, M. Meeker, and K. Eells, *Social Class in America*, Chicago: Social Research, Inc., 1949.
 29. Edward B. Weiss, "The Revolution in Fashion Distribution," *Advertising Age*, 34 (June 24, 1963), 104-5.

Copyright of *Journal of Marketing Research* (JMR) is the property of American Marketing Association and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.