VALIDATION OF A HEDONIC SHOPPING MOTIVATION MODEL IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT

Dr Riané Cherylise Dalziel
North-West University (Vaal Triangle Campus), South Africa
Riane.Dalziel@nwu.ac.za

Prof Ayesha Lian Bevan-Dye
North-West University (Vaal Triangle Campus), South Africa
Ayesha.Bevandye@nwu.ac.za

─**Abstract**─

The purpose of this study was to validate hedonic shopping motivations as a five-factor model in the South African context. While utilitarian shopping motives are grounded in rational consumption behaviour, hedonic shopping motives refer to the emotional aspects of shopping, including pleasure, enjoyment and fun. These hedonic motives are widely viewed as important shopping drivers. Over the years several different models have been proposed for measuring hedonic shopping motives. In this study, the model developed by Arnold and Reynolds (2003) and tested by Cardoso and Pinto (2010) is validated in the South African context. The Cardoso and Pinto (2010) model comprises the five factors of pleasure and gratification shopping, social shopping, idea shopping, role shopping and value shopping. Following the descriptive research design approach, data were collected using a self-administered questionnaire from a convenience sample of 404 students registered at two selected higher education institutions (HEIs) in the Gauteng province. The captured data were analysed using Pearson's Product-Moment correlation, confirmatory factor analysis, internal-consistency reliability, composite reliability, construct validity and fit indices. According to the findings, hedonic shopping motivations is a five-factor model comprising pleasure and gratification shopping, social shopping, idea shopping, role shopping and value shopping. The model exhibits internal-consistency reliability, composite reliability and construct validity, in terms of nomological, convergent and discriminant validity. Furthermore, the goodness-of-fit indices produced by AMOS suggested a well-fitting model. This empirically-validated model provides a useful research instrument for measuring and explaining consumers' hedonic shopping motivations in the South African context.

1. INTRODUCTION

Shopping forms an important part of consumers' lives (Cardoso & Pinto, 2010) and has vital symbolic and recreational functions, as it entails more than merely obtaining food and other household items (Craig, Fischer & Lorenzo-Arribas, 2018). Consumers might engage in shopping to satisfy a need for a specific product or service, a need for attention seeking, a need to spend time socialising, or simply because they have free time (Arnold & Reynolds, 2003). Consumers' internal needs are the driving force behind the act of shopping (Jin & Kim, 2003). As such, shopping is not only about the consumption of products and services, but also about the experience of shopping (Jin & Kim, 2003; Prinsloo, 2017).

While utilitarian shopping motives are grounded in rational consumption behaviour (Davis, Smith & Lang, 2017), hedonic shopping motives refer to the emotional aspects of shopping, including pleasure, enjoyment and fun (Yim, Yoo, Sauer & Seo, 2014); therefore, hedonic shoppers will purchase products primarily for affective or sensory gratification purposes (Kempf, 1999). Hirschman and Holbrook (1982) and Hoyer, MacInnis and Pieters (2013) state that hedonic shopping is associated with the shopping experience and is regarded as being more personal and subjective. Furthermore, hedonic shopping motivations have proven to influence consumers' intention to search for products directly (To *et al*., 2007), as well as indirectly influence their purchase intention (Anderson *et al.*, 2014; To *et al.*, 2007). These hedonic motives are widely viewed as important shopping drivers and, therefore, retailers and marketers stand to gain from understanding of consumers' hedonic shopping motivations. This necessitates the validation of a hedonic shopping motivations model in the South African context.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In terms of hedonic shopping motivations, pleasure and gratification motivation represents a combination of gratification and adventure shopping. Gratification shopping refers to consumers engaging in the act of shopping in order to relieve stress, lighten a negative mood or as a special self-treat (Evans, Jamal & Foxall, 2009; Horváth & Adıgüzel, 2018). Shopping for adventure is described as a consumer seeking stimulation, excitement and adventure, or a shopping

experience that is different than normal (Arnold & Reynolds, 2003; Kang & Park-Poaps, 2010), triggered by different sights, sounds and smells (Kim, 2006).

Consumers who shop in order to collect information about new trends and fashion are engaging in idea shopping (Cardoso & Pinto, 2010). They use this type of shopping to update their knowledge regarding the development of new trends (Budisantoso, Bhati, Bradshaw & Tang, 2016). Idea shopping motivation is an indicator that consumers need structure, order and knowledge. Furthermore, they use this type of shopping to make use of external guidelines and information in order to make sense of themselves (Chiu, Wang, Fang & Huang, 2014).

Being motivated by the social aspect of shopping entails consumers shopping in order to socialise and bond with other consumers such as friends and family, or individuals with similar interests (Horváth & Adıgüzel, 2018; Jamal, Davies, Churdy & Al-Marri, 2006). Social shoppers also enjoy taking part in social activities while shopping (To, Liao & Lin, 2007). Furthermore, consumers use social shopping as a way to express themselves and to be amongst their peer group (Budisantoso et al., 2016). Taking part in social shopping reflects consumers' tendency to seek the approval and affection from individuals in these groups (Chiu et al., 2014).

Role shopping motivation is associated with consumers shopping for others with an end goal of finding the perfect gift (Arnold & Reynolds, 2003:). The consumer feels that he or she represents a specific role in society when shopping for someone else (Yang & Kim, 2012; Budisantoso et al., 2016). Included in these roles are being a good spouse or a good friend (Wagner & Rudolph, 2010). According to Chiu et al. (2014), consumers find it pleasurable and gain self-acceptance through playing a specific role when shopping for others.

Consumers motivated by value shopping shop in order to find sales and discounts and enjoy bargain hunting. They consider finding low prices a challenge that needs to be conquered (Kang & Park-Poaps, 2010). Value shopping can be described as bargain hunting, or shopping that gives consumers the pleasure of negotiating for discounts and the benefits they enjoy from purchasing products at lower prices (Wagner & Rudolph, 2010). This type of shopping indicates that consumers are competitive and that they seek success and supremacy, while being motivated to gain self-esteem and respect from other consumers (Chiu et al., 2014).

Shopping motivation has transpired as one of the pivotal concepts in consumer behaviour research (Wagner & Rudolph, 2010). Consumers' shopping motivations may differ from country to country, as well as from target market to target market due to cultural, economic and social differences (Ozen & Kodaz, 2012). Gaining an understanding of their shopping motivations will assist retailers and marketers in segmenting consumers accordingly, and enable them to target these segments effectively by focussing on these underlying shopping motivations (Kim, 2006; Wagner, 2007). This suggests that the use of generalised marketing strategies would be inadvisable in targeting different consumer segments (Cardoso & Pinto, 2010; Ozen & Kodaz, 2012). While pleasure and gratification shopping, idea shopping, social shopping, role shopping and value shopping have proven to be a valid measure of consumers' hedonic shopping motivations in other countries (Arnold & Reynolds, 2003; Cardoso & Pinto, 2010; Jamal *et al*., 2006; Kim, 2006; Ozen & Kodaz, 2012; To *et al*., 2007), there is a lack of evidence that this measurement model has been validated in the South African context.

3. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to validate hedonic shopping motivations as a five-factor model comprising pleasure and gratification shopping, idea shopping, social shopping, role shopping and value shopping amongst Generation Y students in the South African context. Generation Y university students were deemed an appropriate sample for various reasons. Generation Y (individuals born between 1986 and 2005) (Markert, 2004), accounted for an approximate 36 percent of the South African population in 2017 (Statistics South Africa, 2017) and, as such, represent a salient target segment for retailers. According to various authors (Bevan-Dye, 2012; Bevan-Dye & Surujlal, 2011; Prinsloo, 2017), the student portion of the Generation Y cohort is a particularly attractive target segment because pursuing a tertiary qualification generally results in a higher future earning potential, spending power, level of consumption and social status.

4. METHODOLOGY
3.1 Research design

In order to validate the hedonic shopping motivations in the South African context, this study followed a descriptive research design, with a single cross-sectional sample.

3.2 Sampling method and data collection

For model validation purposes, the study's target population was delineated to Generation Y students aged between 18 and 24 years, registered at public South African higher education institutions (HEIs). The sampling frame selected included the campuses of two HEIs in the country's Gauteng province. One of these HEIs is a university of technology and the other, a traditional university. Fieldworkers were used to distribute the questionnaire to a convenience sample of 600 students who volunteered to participate in the study.

3.3 Research instrument

The measurement instrument used to collect the data was a self-administered survey questionnaire that comprised section requesting demographic data and a section testing the validity of hedonic shopping motivations in the South African context using scales from published studies.

The hedonic shopping motivations model developed by Arnold and Reynolds (2003) contained six factors, namely adventure, gratification, role, value, social, and idea hedonic shopping motivations. However, in a later study testing this model, Cardoso and Pinto (2010) found five factors, with adventure and gratification forming one factor, which they named the pleasure and gratification shopping motivation. In this study, the Cardoso and Pinto (2010) five-factor model was tested. The pleasure and gratification motivation factor comprises six observed variables, namely 'When I am in a down mood, I go shopping to make myself feel better', 'Shopping makes me feel like I am in my own universe', 'To me, shopping is a way to relieve stress', 'I find shopping stimulating', 'To me shopping is an adventure' and 'I go shopping when I want to treat myself to something special'. The idea shopping motivation factor consists of three observed variables, namely 'I go shopping to keep up with the new fashions', 'I go shopping to keep up with the trends' and 'I go shopping to see what new products are available'. The social shopping motivation factor includes four observed variables, namely 'I enjoy socialising with others when I shop', 'I go shopping with my friends to socialise', 'I go shopping with my family to socialise' and 'Shopping with others is a bonding experience'. The role shopping motivation factor has the four observed variables of 'I enjoy shopping for my friends', 'I enjoy shopping for my family', 'I like shopping for others because when they feel good, I feel good' and 'I enjoy shopping around to find the perfect gift for someone'. In the Arnold and Reynolds (2003) study and the Cardoso and Pinto (2010) study, friends and family were treated as one in the social and role

shopping motivation factors. However, in this study, each of these variables were split into two separate statements in order to mitigate any potential double-barrelled question error. The value shopping motivation factor consisted of three observed variables, namely 'I enjoy looking for discounts when I shop', 'I enjoy hunting for bargains when I shop' and 'Generally, I go shopping when stores are having sales'. A six-point Likert-type scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6), was used to record responses to the observed variables used to measure hedonic shopping motivations.

3.3 Ethical considerations

In the study, all responses were reported in aggregate and student participation was on a voluntary basis.

3.4 Data analysis

The data collected for this study was analysed using the IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS), Version 25 for Windows. Data analysis methods included Pearson's Product-Moment correlation analysis, collinearity diagnostics, reliability and validity analysis, and confirmatory factor analysis using the maximum likelihood method.

5. RESULTS

Of the 600 questionnaires distributed, 572 completed questionnaires were returned, of which 56 were from respondents that fell outside of the specified target population age parameters of 18 to 24. Following their removal, there were 516 questionnaires available for data analysis; that is, a response rate of 86 percent. In the sample there were participants from each of the seven age categories specified in the target population, together with participants from eight of the country's nine provinces. Concerning gender, 64 percent were female and 36 percent male, and 60 percent were registered at the traditional university and 39 at the university of technology. The racial spread in the sample is similar to the country's racial spread (Statistics South Africa, 2017), with 80 percent of the participants being Black/African, 11 percent White, 3.7 percent Indian/Asian and 3.3 percent Coloured. Table 1 outlines a description of the study's sample.

Table 1: Sample description

	Frequency	Percent (%)		Frequency	Percent (%)
Gender			**Province**		
Female	328	63.6	Eastern Cape	19	3.7
Male	188	36.4	Free State	49	9.5
Age			Gauteng	301	58.3
18	67	13.0	Kwazulu-Natal	18	3.5
19	106	20.5	Limpopo	65	12.6
20	134	26.0	Mpumalanga	22	4.3
21	104	20.2	North West	5	1.0
22	52	10.1	Northern Cape	31	6.0
23	41	7.9	Western Cape	0	0
24	12	2.3	Missing	6	1.2
Institution			**Race**		
Traditional	314	60.9	Black/African	423	82.0
Technology	202	39.1	Coloured	17	3.3
			Indian/Asian	19	3.7
			White	57	11.0

The first step undertaken in validating the Cardoso and Pinto's (2010) hedonic shopping motivations model was to assess its nomological validity and to check for any multi-collinearity issues. The nomological validity was assessed by constructing a matrix of Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficients, as presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Correlation matrix

	Pleasure and gratification shopping	Idea shopping	Social shopping	Role shopping
Pleasure and gratification shopping				
Idea shopping	.472*			
Social shopping	.410*	.375*		
Role shopping	.482*	.291*	.551*	
Value shopping	.270*	.273*	.196*	.277*
* $p \leq .01$ (2-tailed)				

As computed correlation coefficients outlined in Table 2 indicate statistically significant ($p \leq 0.01$) and positive relationships between each of the pairs of latent factors. As such, the nomological validity of the measurement theory is evident (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). In order to check for any evidence of multi-collinearity between these pairs of latent factors, collinearity diagnostics were run. The computed tolerance values, which ranged between 0.603 and 0.876, were all above the cut-off of 0.10 and the average variance inflation factor (VIF) of 1.47 was below the cut-off of 10; therefore, there were no multi-collinearity concerns (Pallant, 2013).

Following this, confirmatory factor analysis, using the maximum likelihood approach, was then undertaken, where the measurement model was specified as a five-factor model. As per conventions, the first loading on each of the latent factors was fixed at 1.0. This resulted in 210 distinct sample moments and 50 parameters to be estimated, equalling 160 degrees of freedom based on an over-identified model. An examination of the model indicated no problematic estimates such as Heywood cases or standardised loading estimates above 1.0 or below -1.0 (Hair *et al*., 2010). The reliability and construct validity of the latent factors were assessed by checking the Cronbach alpha values (*a*), the composite reliability (CR) values, the standardised loading estimates, the average variance extracted (AVE) values and the differences between the square root of the AVE values (√AVE) and the correlation coefficients. These estimates are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Measurement model estimates

Latent factors	Standardised loading estimates	Error variance estimates	a	CR	AVE	√AVE
Pleasure and gratification shopping	.743	.552	.876	.879	.50	.71
	.815	.664				
F1	.783	.613				
	.828	.685				
	.695	.484				
	.561	.315				
Idea shopping	.887	.787	.858	.868	.50	.71
F3	.916	.839				
	.669	.448				
Social shopping	.735	.540	.805	.810	.50	.71
F2	.828	.686				
	.630	.397				
	.672	.451				
Role shopping	.646	.417	.745	.748	.50	.71
F4	.633	.400				
	.692	.479				
	.639	.408				
Value shopping	.852	.725	0.805	.810	.50	.71
F5	.808	.652				
	.630	.397				
Correlations	F1↔F2:.426	F2↔F3:.404		F3↔F5:.313		
	F1↔F3:.485	F2↔F4:.672		F4↔F5:.378		
	F1↔F4:.588	F2↔F5:.253				
	F1↔F5:316.	F3↔F4:.335				

The estimates reported in Table 3 indicate that the relationship between each of the 20 observed variable and their respective five latent factor is statistically significant ($p \leq 0.01$). Both the Cronbach alpha values and CR values are above 0.70, which provides evidence of internal-consistency and composite reliability.

All of the standardised loading estimates and the computed AVE values are above 0.50, which indicates convergent validity. There is also evidence of discriminant validity given that the square root of the AVE exceeds the correlation coefficients associated with each respective latent factor. As such, this convergent and discriminant validity, along with the nomological validity established in Table 2 suggests construct validity (Hair *et al.*, 2010; Malhotra, 2010).

An inspection of the model fit indices, turned up a significant chi-square value of 499.791 with 160 degrees of freedom (df). However, this statistic is known to be sensitive to large sample size, so other indices were considered in assessing the model fit. A standardised root mean residual (SRMR) of 0.056, a root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) of 0.064, a goodness-of-fit index (GFI) of 0.910, an incremental fit index (IFI) of 0.929, a Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) of 0.915 and a comparative fit index (CFI) of 0.928 all suggest acceptable model fit (Malhotra, 2010).

5. CONCLUSION

The aim of this study was to validate the hedonic shopping motivations model proposed by Cardoso and Pinto (2010) in the South African context using Generation Y university students. Arnold and Reynolds (2003) warn that in the increasingly competitive and dynamic environment that constitutes the contemporary retail environment, retailers need to pay more attention to the 'entertainment aspect' of retailing, which necessitates understanding individuals' hedonic shopping motivations. While several taxonomies of shopping orientations appear in marketing and retail literature this study focused on the one proposed by Cardoso and Pinto (2010), which is based on the model developed by Arnold and Reynolds (2003). The findings of this study suggest that hedonic shopping motivations is a five-factor model comprising pleasure and gratification shopping, idea shopping, social shopping, role shopping and value shopping motivations. This empirically validated model exhibits internal-consistency reliability as well as composite reliability. In addition, evidence of convergent, discriminant and nomological validity were found, thereby suggesting construct validity. Moreover, the tested model produced acceptable model fit indices. As such, the results of this study suggest that this five-factor model is a valid measure of hedonic shopping motivations within the South African context. However, a convenience sample was used and therefore caution should be applied in generalising the results to the wider South African Generation Y cohort. Accordingly, future research can be conducted on the wider South African Generation Y population.

REFERENCES

Anderson, K. C., Knight, D. K., Pookulangara, S. & Josiam, B. (2014). Influence of hedonic and utilitarian motivations on retailer loyalty and purchase intention: a Facebook perspective. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 21(5), 773-779.

Arnold, M.J. & Reynolds, K.E. (2003). Hedonic shopping motivations. *Journal of retailing*, 79(2), 77-95.

Bevan-Dye, A.L. (2012). Relationship between self-esteem and Facebook usage amongst black Generation Y students," *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, December (Supplement), 33-49.

Bevan-Dye, A.L. & Surujlal, J. (2011). Attitudes towards materialism in sport and materialism tendencies amongst Black Generation Y students. *African journal for physical, health education, recreation and dance (*Supplement). 1(1), 43-55.

Budisantoso, T., Bhati, A., Bradshaw, A., & Tang, C. M. (2016). Hedonic shopping motivation: does it really matter? In *Development of Tourism and the Hospitality Industry in Southeast Asia* (pp. 51-64). Springer, Singapore.

Cardoso, P.R. & Pinto, S.C. (2010). Hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations among Portuguese young adult consumers. *International journal of retail & distribution management*, 38(7), 538-558.

Chiu, C. M., Wang, E. T., Fang, Y. H., & Huang, H. Y. (2014). Understanding customers' repeat purchase intentions in B2C e-commerce: the roles of utilitarian value, hedonic value and perceived risk. *Information Systems Journal*, *24*(1), 85-114.

Craig, T. P., Fischer, A., & Lorenzo-Arribas, A. (2018). Shopping versus nature? An exploratory study of everyday experiences. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 9.

Evans, M., Jamal, A. & Foxall, G. (2009). *Consumer behaviour*. 2nd ed. Chichester: Wiley.

Davis, R., Smith, S. D., & Lang, B. U. (2017). A comparison of online and offline gender and goal directed shopping online. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *38*, 118-125.

Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J. & Anderson, R.E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: a global perspective*. 7th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice-Hall.

Hirschman, E.C. & Holbrook, M.B. 1982. Hedonic consumption: emerging concepts, methods and propositions. *Journal of marketing,* 46(3), 92-101.

Horváth, C. & Adıgüzel, F. (2018). Shopping enjoyment to the extreme: Hedonic shopping motivations and compulsive buying in developed and emerging markets. *Journal of Business Research*, *86*, 300-310.

Hoyer, W.D., MacInnis D.J. & Pieters, R. (2013). *Consumer behavior.* 6th ed. Mason, OH: South-Western Cengage Learning.

Jamal, A., Davies, F., Churdy, F. & Al-Marri, M. (2006). Profiling consumers: a study of Qatari consumers' shopping motivations. *Journal of retailing and consumer services,* 13(1), 67-80.

Jin, B. & Kim, J. (2003). A typology of Korean discount shoppers: shopping motives, store attributes, and outcomes. *International journal of service industry management,* 14(4), 396-419.

Kang, J. & Park-Poaps, H. (2010). Hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations of fashion leadership. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 14(2), 312-328.

Kempf, D.S. (1999). Attitude formation from product trial: distinct roles of cognition and affect for hedonic and functional products. *Psychology & marketing,* 16(1), 35-50.

Kim, S. (2006). Using hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations to profile inner city consumers. *Journal of shopping centre research,* 13(1), 57-79.

Malhotra, N.K. (2010). *Marketing research. An applied orientation*. 6th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice-Hall.

Markert, J. (2004). Demographics of age: generational and cohort confusion. *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 26(2), 12-25.

Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS survival manual*. 5h ed. London: Open University Press.

Prinsloo, D.A. (2017). Retail trends in a very dynamic South African market. https://www.urbanstudies.co.za/retail-trends-in-a-very-dynamic-south-african-market/ Accessed 2018/06/18.

Ozen, H. & Kodaz, N. (2012). Utilitarian or hedonic? A cross cultural study in online shopping. *Organisations and markets in emerging economies,* 3(2), 80-90.

Statistics South Africa. (2017). Mid-year population estimates: 2017. Key indicators, Statistical release P0302, 31 July 2017. http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0302/P03022017.pdf Accessed 2018/06/12.

To, P., Liao, C. & Lin, T. (2007). Shopping motivations on internet: a study based on utilitarian and hedonic value. *Technovation,* 27(12), 774-787.

Wagner, T. (2007). Shopping motivation revised: a means-end chain analytical perspective. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management, 35*(7), 569-582.

Wagner, T. & Rudolph, T. 2010. Towards a hierarchical theory of shopping motivation. *Journal of retailing and consumer services*, 17(5), 415-429.

Yang, K., & Kim, H. Y. (2012). Mobile shopping motivation: an application of multiple discriminant analysis. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 40(10), 778-789.

Yim, M. Y. C., Yoo, S. C., Sauer, P. L. & Seo, J. H. (2014). Hedonic shopping motivation and co-shopper influence on utilitarian grocery shopping in superstores. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 42(5), 528-544.