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Overview

If the tenant mix is indeed a significant determinant of mall patronage, consumers' preferences for specific tenants should be a paramount goal in mall design and promotion. In reality, however, shoppers themselves do not participate in designing shopping centers. Customer feedback can potentially play a significant role in guiding a host of strategic decisions, including specifying the ideal mix of stores in a mall, the recreational and culinary options available and even the center's physical decor and atmospherics.

The goal of this pilot project is to demonstrate the potential of online consumer research to assess shoppers' preferences for

*solomon@auburn.edu
the ideal shopping center configuration. To accomplish this objective, a new online methodology is employed to let consumers respond to and choose visual options as they configure their ideal mall. A national sample of over 200 consumers participated in the pilot. They chose from among 15 store categories as they populated the “skeleton” of a mall online and then selected actual retailers that would appear within each of these spaces. They also chose four anchor/department stores and four restaurant/food outlets to appear in a central food court. Results indicated that consumers exhibited clear preferences regarding the types of stores they would like to see in their ideal mall, which specific stores they favored and also where within the mall those stores should be found. For shopping center developers and retailers wishing to expand upon this initial pilot platform, the online technology developed for this project will provide insights to a range of strategic decisions ranging from the optimal mix of tenants to specific design issues.

Introduction

Competition for retail customers is fierce, and the mushrooming number of non-store options available to customers is fueling the fire. Why should shoppers put up with crowds at a mall when they can buy at home? If they do venture out, what drives their choice of one mall over another? Technological advances coupled with escalating time poverty represent a real threat to the American shopping center industry. Mall patronage is declining, even as the amount of retail mall space is growing dramatically (Wakefield and Baker, 1998). Some suggest that the appeal of malls is waning because too many malls look alike and shoppers simply aren’t being stimulated as they once were (Templin, 1967).

How can mall developers fight back? Many retailers are realizing that the key to tempting shoppers away from their computer monitors is the value-added of the bricks-and-mortar shopping experience. Shopping is more than the act of buying. A mall is more than a place to purchase things. Indeed, a mall can be thought of as a consumer habitat; a communal living space where large numbers of consumers interact with each other, accumulate experiences and spend disposable leisure time (Bloch, Ridgway and Dawson, 1994). That explains the success of such destinations as
The Forum Shops in Las Vegas, Ontario Mills and the West Edmonton Mall where shoppers can experience amenities including robotic Roman gladiators, high-tech arcades, a wildlife preserve and even gambling opportunities.

In addition to “retailtainment,” an important attribute of an attractive mall is the mix of stores a shopper will encounter there. Research supports the assertion that consumers’ decisions about where to shop are influenced by the mix of stores available at a mall (Print and Louvier, 1990; Gentry and Butts, 1978). Indeed, one study found that tenant variety was the strongest predictor of excitement in the mall shopping experience (Wakefield and Baker, 1998).

Just as many stores, whether The Gap or Neiman Marcus, have distinct “personalities” that cater to specific lifestyle profiles, the malls in which they are housed also make a lifestyle statement. This “mall personality” may be safe/Middle America, sophisticated/affluent, cutting-edge, unpredictable, etc. However, it is rare for a study to incorporate the subjective meanings of one mall versus another. Most mall-related consumer research focuses primarily upon the optimal geographical location for retail sites and largely ignores how the mall’s image may or may not attract the desired customer base.

And, much of this locational research is based upon sophisticated mathematical models incorporating such variables as the geodemographics of the location, physical land attributes, road accessibility and structure visibility. These are important questions, but they don’t address the specific lifestyle profile of stores that should be included within a mall or design features of the overall shopping center.

Consumer feedback can play a significant role in guiding a host of strategic decisions including specifying the ideal mix of stores in a mall, the recreational and culinary options available and even the center’s physical décor and atmospherics. However, it is rare for a developer to solicit consumer feedback when designing a shopping center. Given the important role the retail mix plays in determining the profile of a center, consumers’ preferences for specific tenants should be a paramount goal in mall design and promotion.

This pilot project will assess shoppers’ preferences for the ideal shopping center configuration. The implementation of a new online methodology to collect these data will demonstrate the potential value of such a research tool to the shopping center industry. This tool can assist developers in fine-tuning a center to ensure that its “personality” meets the expectations of its target customers.

Involving actual consumers in this way reflects a trend in other industries toward user-centered design. The idea is to incorporate current...
knowledge of users in the early stages of design, confront users repeatedly
with early prototypes and re-design as often as necessary. This assures that
customer requirements actually do guide the development process—and
that mistakes can be avoided before it's too late. Right now this perspec-
tive is more likely to be found in the design of technical products (e.g.,
beta-testing of software), but there is no reason why such a consumer-
centric philosophy cannot be extended to involve shoppers in the con-
struction of a shopping environment.

■ The Promise of Online Research

Conventional wisdom pits the Internet and traditional retailing outlets
against each other, but insightful bricks-and-mortar merchants under-
stand that online technology can actually benefit them instead of merely
cannibalizing sales. Many equate the Internet strictly with e-commerce,
but this perspective ignores the potential of such online activities as
Web-based supply networks (Solomon and Stuart, 2001). The Web can
be used to heighten consumer involvement with stores and shopping—as
evidenced, for example, by General Growth Properties' Mallibu.com pro-
ject that provides mall and tenant information to prospective shoppers on
their computers before they physically visit the setting (http://

This pilot project highlights yet another domain where the Internet
offers synergy for shopping center practitioners—conducting consumer
research to maximize the fit between shoppers' expectations and strategic
decisions. We are at the beginning of a revolution where conventional
marketing research procedures are being replaced or supplemented by online
methodologies. Conversion from mail, telephone or direct interviewing
survey techniques to a Web-based format has several compelling advan-
tages. Response time can be minimized due to automation of response
protocols. It is easier to modify the research instrument or to create
multiple experimental versions of it, and the survey or experiment can be
conducted around the clock. The researcher has the capability of reaching
a larger and more diverse subject population. Since data collection is
automated and coding errors all but eliminated, data costs per respondent
are considerably lower.

These compelling advantages point to the need for shopping center
developers and other retailing practitioners to embrace new ways of learn-
ing about the habits, characteristics and preferences of their target mar-
ket—and even to involve end-consumers in decisions related to new
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product development, store image and design, responsiveness to various promotional options and so on. This pilot project is a vehicle to demon-
strate the feasibility of developing online procedures to achieve these goals.

How does the system work? At the core of the methodology used in this pilot is a Web-based interactive data collection tool. This is comprised of a browser-based software interface with an extensive database layer that handles storage and retrieval of visual images. One innovative feature of the software that generates the Web pages is that it is a form of dynamic html programming called html scripting. This means that the large num-
ber of Web pages that might be required by a specific research application are not individually created html files, but are instead interactively created online in response to the behavior of the respondent. The specific pages, then, do not actually “exist” until the time of application when the pro-
gram creates them “on the fly.” This programming innovation is signifi-
cant because it allows us to incorporate a lot of visuals into an application while largely avoiding the long download times that have plagued such approaches in the past.

The research protocol is administered to consumers on a client-server platform. The base system is designed to function on a remote server linked to the user’s machine through an Internet connection. In this configuration, all Web page components reside on the server and are assembled into web pages as needed and data are input to the server databases as a continuous tracking of respondent behavior at the browser. The research tools are embedded in a password entry application that routes the respondent to the appropriate version of the application. The password entry application also serves to associate the respondent to the appropriate data record in the database, thereby permitting the interlay-
ing of data necessary for repeated measurement protocols. Individual responses are aggregated into a database that stores these choices as a matrix. This permits simple tabulation of the most popular choices in each category as well as more complicated analyses that assess interde-
pendencies among choices, clustering of choices by respondent character-
tics, etc. More details regarding the initial development of this online methodology are provided in English and Solomon (2000).

- Method

Subjects

The online survey instrument was administered to a cross-sectional panel of Americans (with Internet access at home, work or a library). These
respondents are members of an online panel of over 300,000 American consumers maintained by Survey Sampling, Inc. A goal of the study was to include respondents of diverse ages, so invitations were sent to panel members as young as 15 and as old as 54. In return for participating, subjects are entered into a drawing administered by Survey Sampling to win cash prizes.

The Online Survey Instrument

Phase 1: Basic Demographics.
When a respondent logged on and entered his/her password, the person was taken to a screener page that collected data regarding gender, age, annual household income and marital status. Following this, the next page introduced the study:

FIGURE 1.

Phase 2: Store Category Selections.
Upon completion of this page, the respondent was taken to the first step of the data collection procedure. A schematic was presented of a basic
cross-shaped mall configuration consisting of four axes, each bounded by an anchor store with a food court in the middle. This layout provides for four retail stores in each of the four quadrants of the virtual mall. (Figure 2)

FIGURE 2.

Respondents were asked to designate the type of store they would like to see at each of these 16 locations. The instructions explained that a choice should be made for each of these; the other spaces (clearly marked in different colors) would always be allocated either to department stores or food outlets/restaurants. When the respondent clicked on each of the 16 available squares a pull-down menu appeared with a list of 15 store categories and he/she selected the desired store category with a click of the mouse. The categories included were:

- Accessories (e.g., Claire’s Boutique, Coach)
- Cards/gifts/books/music (e.g., Barnes & Noble, Spencer Gifts)
- Children’s fashions (e.g., Kids “R” Us, Osh Kosh B’Gosh)
- Electronics (e.g., Radio Shack, Circuit City)
Entertainment (e.g., General Cinema, LEGO Imagination Center)
Health/beauty (e.g., Bath and Body Works, Sephora)
Housewares (e.g., Williams-Sonoma, Crate & Barrel)
Jewelry/watches (e.g., Bailey Banks & Biddle, Watch Station)
Men's fashions (e.g., Structure, Hugo Boss)
Men's and women's fashions (e.g., Banana Republic, Old Navy)
Shoes (e.g., Foot Locker, Nine West)
Specialty stores (e.g., Sharper Image, The Museum Company)
Sporting goods/activewear (e.g., Champs, Patagonia)
Toys (e.g., FAO Schwarz, KB Toys)
Women's fashions (e.g., bebe, Talbots)

The pulldown store category menu is shown in Figure 3.

This procedure was repeated until all 16 squares were designated with a category. The instructions explained that the respondent could revise any of these choices as much as desired. Completion of this selection task brought the respondent to the next phase of the study.

Phase 3: Store Selections.

After the respondent had configured the virtual mall in terms of the types of stores that should be located in each space, s/he was asked to select a specific retailer within each category. Choices were made for all categories, including department stores (e.g., Sears, Nordstrom) and restaurants/food outlets (e.g., Starbucks, Applebees).

**Figure 3.**
By clicking on a square, a pull-down menu listed a set of retailers within a given category. This was not intended to be an exhaustive list of stores, but rather a reasonably representative one consisting primarily of nationally known names that would be familiar to respondents regardless of their geographic area. Once the respondent clicked on a specific store, its logo appeared in the square. As in the prior phase, the respondent could change any of these selections if desired. A sample is shown in Figure 4.

At the end of this task, the respondent had configured the complete virtual mall, resulting in a schematic like the example shown in Figure 5.

**Phase 4: Demographics and Psychographics.**

At the end of the survey additional demographic measures assessing income, education, household size and place of residence were included. Other items assessed frequency of visits to a shopping mall and the average amount of time spent per visit. In addition, a nine-item scale assessing shopping involvement was adapted from a scale developed by Lumpkin (1985). Subsequent refinements of this initial procedure will be possible to classify respondents’ preferences in terms of such variables as region of the country, age, income, reason for visiting the mall (e.g., task-oriented versus recreational) and so on.

**Figure 4.**
Results

Sample Demographics

This section will provide a brief overview of the sample. Data tables are provided in Appendix I.

Gender, Race, Age and Family Size

A total of 233 subjects responded to the invitation to participate, of which 169 (73%) were female. Approximately half (49%) of the sample is married, but a little over a third (36%) are single and the remainder (15%) are divorced or separated. About 75% are Caucasian and another 20% are African-American. Roughly 60% of the sample is between the prime segment ages of 25-44, but other age categories also are represented. However, due to the relatively low response rate of consumers 45 and older, these respondents will not be included in the analyses. Although a relatively small number of respondents below the age of 18 participated, for exploratory purposes these data will be included due to the potential value of gaining some initial insights regarding response patterns of this pivotal demographic. Thus a total of 216 respondents was included in subsequent analyses. Table 1 summarizes how the sample was distributed in terms of age.
TABLE 1. BREAKDOWN OF THE SAMPLE BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 2, the sample was widely distributed in terms of household size. While a quarter of the sample lived alone or with one other person, for example, fully 13% reported eight or more people living in the home. Three-quarters had five or fewer people in the home.

TABLE 2. SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income, Occupation and Education

A little more than 40% of the sample reported total annual household incomes of $50,000 or more. Table 3 provides the income distribution for the sample. Slightly less than half the sample is employed in professional or managerial positions, while another 13% are homemakers. Table 4 gives an occupational breakdown. About one-third had a college degree or an advanced degree. Educational levels are provided in Table 5.

Geographic Variables

One-quarter of the sample lives in the Midwest, followed by 22% who live in the Southwest. A summary is provided in Table 6. As shown in Table 7, a little over one-third (37%) report living in a town with a population
### Table 3. Total Annual Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25,000</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000-29,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-39,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000-49,999</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-59,999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000-69,999</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70,000-79,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,000-89,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90,000-99,999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000-124,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125,000-149,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000 and over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Occupational Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional/technical</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager/administrator</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales worker</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical worker</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft worker</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine operator/laborer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/private household worker</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5. Breakdown by Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eighth grade</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college/technical school</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree (four years)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some postgraduate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 7. POPULATION SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 50,000</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-249,999</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000-499,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000-999,999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1,000,000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of less than 50,000 and another 37% report living in a town with a population of between 50,000 and 250,000.

### Specific Store Choices

Chart 1 provides a summary of the top three store choices within each of the three broad store categories included in the instrument. Additional analyses segmented these selections by gender, age, and shopping orientation (where the shopping involvement was subjected to a median split and two groups were created—one below the median and one above). In cases where one or more of these variables resulted in a different choice pattern (as determined by a significant $X^2$ statistic), that difference will also be reported with a $\sqrt{}$. Data tables are in Appendix I.

### Retail Stores by Category

Of the 15 store types, the Accessories category was selected most often followed by Specialty Shops and Women's Fashions. Table 8 provides the choice frequencies across all categories.
**Spatial Contingencies**

Exploratory analyses were conducted to determine if certain types of stores were more often selected to be next to department stores or adjacent to the food court. The analysis revealed a significant effect, indicating that respondents do in fact have distinct and differential preferences regarding where certain types of stores should be located. Chart I gives a summary of this analysis. It provides an overview of these preferences by charting the most frequently selected stores from data tables 9-25 in appendix I.
TABLE 8. STORE CATEGORY CHOICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessories</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Shops</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Fashions</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cards/Colo/Books/Music</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toys &amp; Hobbies</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics and Video</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry and Watches</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Beauty</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Goods and Activewear</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Fashions</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's and Women's Fashions</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Fashions</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home and Garden/Furnishings</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

giving the number of times a store position (i.e., adjacent to either an anchor or the food court) would be selected by chance (expected count) versus the actual rate of selection.

For example, one would expect by chance for Accessories stores to be placed adjacent to an anchor store 194.5 times but in fact they are placed in this position 203 times. In contrast, while this category could also be expected by chance to be placed adjacent to the food court 194.5 times, in fact they only appear in this position 184 times. On the other hand, respondents would prefer to see entertainment stores closer to the food court and farther away from the anchor stores.

**Conclusions**

The choice of a shopping mall is in essence a lifestyle decision for many consumers. While physical location is very important, all things being equal, a consumer will patronize a mall that provides the optimal assortment of stores, recreational activities and, in some cases, even the right mix of customers. This pilot study demonstrates the feasibility of using an online methodology that will facilitate the collection of this feedback from a representative sample of shoppers. Findings from subsequent studies can be used to guide marketing decisions and to identify gaps between the experiences, retailers and services that shoppers are now encountering and their ideal mall visits. The basic software and the consumer samples
## CHART II. PREFERRED STORE POSITIONS BY RETAIL CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store Position</th>
<th>Adjacent to Anchor</th>
<th>Adjacent to Food Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessories</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>194.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes/Gifts/Books/Music</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>113.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Fashions</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics and Video</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>105.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>105.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Beauty</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>105.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewares &amp; Home Furnishings</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry and Watches</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's &amp; Women's Fashions</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Fashions</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Shops</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Goods/Equipment</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toys &amp; Hobbies</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Fashions</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

included in subsequent studies can easily be modified to understand better, for example, how the ideal retailer mix might vary across consumer groups or geographical regions.

This study provides insights to shopping center practitioners for a range of strategic decisions ranging from the optimal mix of tenants to specific design issues. The database structure permits an analysis of spatial contingencies that would expand upon the initial steps attempted in this pilot. This approach would be helpful in determining the optimal layout of store types among different consumer segments. For example, recreational shoppers might prefer to have a mixture of store categories scal-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail Category</th>
<th>Store Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Anchor</td>
<td>Adjacent to Food Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>104.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>113.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>105.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>107.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>110.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>111.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>112.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>113.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.0</td>
<td>114.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.0</td>
<td>115.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>116.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>117.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>118.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.0</td>
<td>119.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.0</td>
<td>120.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>121.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*modified to understand night vary across consumer
center practitioners for an optimal mix of venues to
tin an analysis of spatial
ting steps attempted in this
ning the optimal layout
* For example, rec

---

THE VIRTUAL MALL USING THE INTERNET TO CONFIGURE THE IDEAL SHOPPING

tered around the mall to encourage browsing, while goal-oriented shoppers might prefer to have all stores within a category grouped together to facilitate comparison shopping and efficient purchasing. Or, the developer might want to cluster by age; youth-oriented stores might be put into one quadrant and isolated from other parts of the mall.

Yet another interesting avenue of research would be to track the clickstream of choices, i.e., to monitor each respondent’s progression through the schematic. For example, do people tend to start at the top (north) quadrant and work their way around in a clockwise direction or in some other pattern? Does this differ by respondent group? Does this pattern parallel the route a shopper would take in navigating a physical mall?

In addition to the basic task of selecting from among a set of retailers, the shopping center developer could also probe for preferences regarding physical design issues and store atmospheres. Our methodology is conducive to a wide range of pertinent issues, especially those involving the use of visuals, whether in the form of photos, sketches, or even imagery supplied by the users to convey their desires. The development of online research methodologies that are directly relevant to the shopping center industry has the potential to maximize productivity and to enable available a vehicle that can provide timely feedback on a wide range of marketing and merchandising questions.
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### TABLE 9. DEPARTMENT STORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JC Penney</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sears</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wal-Mart</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohl's</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macy's</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillard's</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordstrom</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomingdale's</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neiman Marcus</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neiman</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord &amp; Taylor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saks Fifth Ave.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stein Mart</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barneys NY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belk</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proffitts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Each respondent had four opportunities to select a department store. To determine the percentage of the sample that selected a name among all four choices, divide the percent by 4. For example, 3.3% for Lord & Taylor was chosen by about 8% of the respondents in exactly at least one of the department store's columns.
### TABLE 10. FOOD OUTLET CHOICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outlet</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applebees</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starbucks Coffee</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald’s</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chick-fil-A</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Queen</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burger King</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arby's</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimp</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Are’s Pretzels</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CiC’s Pizza</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCFY</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennigan’s</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinnabon</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Tuesday</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooters</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Cafe Bar and Grill</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chil’s</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.F. Chang’s China Bistro</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Steak &amp; Potato Company</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Roma’s</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Express</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benihana</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggen-Dias</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain D’s</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretzel Time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godiva Chocolaté</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Fields</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marble Slab Creamery</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Factory</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great American Cookie Co.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alamo Grill</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budda Express</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambria Coffee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullfalo’s Southwest Cafe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Wraps</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshness Yogurt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church’s Chicken</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frutani</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Schwartz</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froogy Bites</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindt Chocolate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iama’s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Each respondent had four opportunities to select a food outlet or restaurant. To determine the percentage of the sample that selected a particular outlet or restaurant, multiply the percent by 4. For example, Applebees was chosen by about 31% of the respondents to occupy at least one of the food outlet quadrants.
### TABLE 11. ACCESSORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claire's Boutique</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allerthoughts</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The icing</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storyheads.com</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 12. CARDS/GIFTS/BOOKS/MUSIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnes &amp; Noble</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallmark</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer Gifts</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borders</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldenbooks</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinn Goody</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yankee Candles</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things Remembered</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookstone</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood Video</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Dalton</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Kinkade Gallery</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Avery's Collectibles</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Luggage and Gifts</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 13. CHILDREN'S FASHIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Navy</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outfitters B&amp;G</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids: R Us</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Kids</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Children's Place</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Place</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Limited Too</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymboree</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Gap</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Snoopy Shop</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Other]</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 14. ELECTRONICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circuit City</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Shack</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics Boutique</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancoast Motion Picture Company</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fry's</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Pro</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bose</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verizon Wireless</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf Camera &amp; Video</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jberg &amp; Olufsen</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Mays</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 15. ENTERTAINMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Cinema</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Records</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regal Cinemas-Imax 3-D</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGO Imagination Center</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharehouse Music</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Entertainment</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Play</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSNBC</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinermark</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASCAR Silicon Motor Speedway</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Other]</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vans Skatepark</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Car</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 16. HEALTH/BEAUTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bath and Body Works</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Body Shop</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNC</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis Salon</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avita Cremophore Short</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckerd</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Secret</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Norman</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crabtree &amp; Evelyn</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sephora</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Cuts</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origins</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfumania</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. A. Nails</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Nails</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail Trix</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 17. HOUSEWARES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bed Bath &amp; Beyond</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot &amp; Tin Depot</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linens 'N Things</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IKEA</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crate &amp; Barrel</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottery Barn</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowe's</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The White Barn Candle Co.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Virgin Allen Interiors</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La-Z-Boy</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration Hardware</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverty's Furniture</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illuminations</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kordland</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay Company</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 18. JEWELRY/WATCHES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kay Jewelers</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zales Jewelers</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany &amp; Co.</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossil</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildberg Diamonds</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch World</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vist-Fix Jewelry Repair</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitefield Co. Jewelers</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey Banks &amp; Biddle</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon's Jewelers</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeds Jewelers</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison Jewelers</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham Jewelers</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch Station</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks &amp; Morgan Jewelers</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 19. MEN'S FASHIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men's Wearhouse</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugle Boy</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artinian Exchange</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duck Head</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo Boss</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Rags</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luehrmann's</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiati</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell's Formal Wear</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desmond's Formal Wear</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 20. MEN’S AND WOMEN’S FASHIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Navy</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Coat Factory</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie Bauer</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abercrombie and Fitch</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levis</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Eagle</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banana Republic</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Hilfiger</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.L. Bean</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benetton</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gapstores</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Crew</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Outfitters</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Dog</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guess</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Topic</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeropostale</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land’s End</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polo Ralph Lauren</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson’s Leather</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Buckle</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground Station</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zumiez</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timberland</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Fog</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.e.m.o.</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Sunwear</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 21. SHOES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payless ShoeSource</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot Locker</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famous Footwear</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSW Shoe Warehouse</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine West</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timberland</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vans</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nike</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journeys</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backport Shoes</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalizer</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish Line</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Cole</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Athlete’s Foot</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Walking Company</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footaction USA</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston &amp; Murphy</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hush Puppies Shoes</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sendle Ride</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Madden</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerosoles</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam &amp; Libby</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 22. SPECIALTY STORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dollar Tree</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Disney Store</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier 1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Channel Store</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SnagIt Image</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Museum Company</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeds 'N'Sticks</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena/Crafters</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCPenney</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-A-Bear Workshop</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Inc.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Picture People</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vans Skatepark Pro</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EyeMasters</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 56</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Parcel Service</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotline Inc.</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunglass Hut</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reis Baggage</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People's Store</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Postal Service</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Shavers &amp; Knives</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Cuts</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FedEx</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyeglass Emporium</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 23. SPORTING GOODS/ACTIVEWEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change Sports</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass Pro Shops</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champion</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymboree/Trading</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Face</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patagonia</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Sport</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harley Sports</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Sport &amp; Sport</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 24. TOYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toys &quot;R&quot; Us</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Schwartz</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kid's Toy</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babies &quot;R&quot; Us</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Day of Braille</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria's Secret</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Corner</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Limited</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick's of Hollywood</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress Barn</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lerner New York</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Russe</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Taylor</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet Seal</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consigno Casals</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherhood Maternity</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Claiborne</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August Max Woman</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bebe</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petite Sophisticate</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything But Water</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbots</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucalyptus</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-T-F-Shop</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher &amp; Banks</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Ashley</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiden B.</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Jill</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>