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Abstract
The present study explored whether levels of product presentation influenced differences in the 4Es and hedonic and utilitarian shopping value, contributing to research on retail Website features and experiential aspects of online shopping.
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Consumers increasingly expect engaging experiences as they go about the process of purchasing goods and services (Pine & Gilmore, 1999; Postrel, 2003), and this expectation is likely to extend to the online environment. Pine and Gilmore (1999) proposed that consumption experiences are enhanced by the 4Es (educational, entertainment, escapist, and esthetic experiences) and posited that a consumer environment should include all of the 4Es to fully engage the consumer and lead to the most desirable consumption experience. Research supports the influence of retail Website features on consumer experiences and their resulting effects on consumer attitude towards a product or online store (Fiore, Jin, & Kim, 2005a; Fiore, Kim, & Lee, 2005b). Offering enhanced visual images of apparel products on a Website, such as alternative views, image enlargements, and views of a product on a model, is important because product presentation has been found to facilitate positive consumer responses resulting from both hedonic (experiential) and utilitarian value (Fiore et al., 2005a; Fiore et al., 2005b).

Few studies have explored the impact of an experience economy strategy on consumers (Jeong, Fiore, Niehm, & Lorenz, 2009; Oh, Fiore, & Jeong, 2007), but no empirical research has simultaneously examined the effect of product presentation on the 4Es and hedonic and utilitarian shopping value derived from the consumption experience. Therefore, the present study explored whether levels of product presentation influenced differences in the 4Es and hedonic and utilitarian shopping value. Hence, this exploratory study contributes to research on retail Website features and experiential aspects of online shopping.

One hundred ninety-six usable responses from female students were obtained from 230 questionnaires completed at a large Midwestern university in the United States. The questionnaire contained multi-item measurement scales found to be valid, reliable, and unidimensional. The present study employed a two treatment between-subject experimental design to test the effects of product presentation on derived consumer experiences and value. Based on input from pretests, two stimulus Websites with different levels of product presentation (low and high experiential value) were developed as the experimental treatments. For the development of the low experiential value stimulus site, product information, simple product images, and pop-up enlarged images were taken from an actual Website (Respondents did not recognize the actual site.) For the development of the high experiential value stimulus site, the zoom feature and view on a model feature from the actual Website were added to the low experiential treatment.

The MANOVA results indicated that participants exposed to the high experiential value Website offering rich sensory information and lifestyle-oriented information (e.g., the zoom feature and view on a model feature) differed in their experiences (entertainment, educational, escapist, and esthetic) and perceived shopping value (hedonic and utilitarian) from participants...
exposed to simpler product presentation features (Wilks’ Lamda = 0.80, $F = 8.13, p < 0.001$). Consequently, univariate analysis of variance analysis showed a substantial main effect of product presentation on entertainment, educational, escapist, and esthetic experiences, and hedonic value ($F = 25.53, p < 0.001; F = 20.03, p < 0.001; F = 13.47, p < 0.001; F = 19.52, p < 0.001; F = 3.95, p < 0.001$, respectively), but there was no main effect of product presentation on utilitarian value (See Table1). The cell means, standard deviations, and sample sizes for each treatment of product presentation are presented in Table 2.

Findings of this study suggest that offering richer visual images led to enhanced consumer experiences and perceived shopping value for women’s casual apparel examined by female consumers between the ages of 18 to 25. Further studies may explore the moderating effects of differences in distribution channels, product categories, and target markets on the 4Es and shopping value.

Table 1. Tests of the effects of product presentation on the 4Es and hedonic and utilitarian shopping value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product presentation</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Means, standard deviations, and sample sizes for MANOVA test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High treatment ($N = 100$)</th>
<th>Low treatment ($N = 96$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>5.25 (1.11)</td>
<td>4.42 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>4.58 (1.16)</td>
<td>3.88 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapist</td>
<td>3.47 (1.34)</td>
<td>2.80 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esthetics</td>
<td>5.32 (1.03)</td>
<td>4.63 (1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonic value</td>
<td>4.11 (1.31)</td>
<td>3.74 (1.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian value</td>
<td>4.36 (1.21)</td>
<td>4.40 (1.26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F value is significant at p<0.05; **F value is significant at p<0.001

Standard deviations are reported in parentheses.
Measurement items were rated on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree).


