

Cinjarevic, Merima; Tatic, Kasim; Petric, Srdjan

Article

See It, Like It, Buy It! Hedonic Shopping Motivations and Impulse Buying

Economic Review: Journal of Economics and Business

Provided in Cooperation with:

Faculty of Economics, University of Tuzla

Suggested Citation: Cinjarevic, Merima; Tatic, Kasim; Petric, Srdjan (2011) : See It, Like It, Buy It! Hedonic Shopping Motivations and Impulse Buying, Economic Review: Journal of Economics and Business, ISSN 2303-680X, University of Tuzla, Faculty of Economics, Tuzla, Vol. 09, Iss. 1, pp. 3-15

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/193794>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

SEE IT, LIKE IT, BUY IT!**HEDONIC SHOPPING MOTIVATIONS AND IMPULSE BUYING**Merima Činjurević¹, Kasim Tatić², Srđan Petrić³**ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this study is to examine the influence of six broad categories of hedonic shopping motivations (adventure, gratification, role, value, social, and idea shopping) and fashion consciousness on consumers' impulse buying behavior. The online questionnaire was created using LimeSurvey, a web-based questionnaire generator tool. An online questionnaire was directed to a sample of 500 individuals in Bosnia and Herzegovina, using non-probability convenience sampling method. A total of 224 participants completed the questionnaire, which corresponds to the response rate of 44.8 percent. The survey instrument used in this study was designed using scales that were already validated in the previous research. The results indicated that impulse buying behavior was significantly related to adventure, gratification, value and idea shopping motivations. Nevertheless, role shopping, social shopping and fashion consciousness were found not significantly related to impulse buying behavior. The findings of this study can help retailers to gain a useful insight into the shopping motivations that trigger impulse buying behavior. A focus on adventure, entertainment, excitement and sales may be an effective retailing strategy to stimulate impulse buying behavior. There are some of limitations in this study worthy of improvement and leads for future studies. A more random sampling method, sampling from different geographic locations and replication of this study in the context of other product

categories are necessary to ensure reliable generalizability.

Keywords: Consumer behavior, Impulse buying, Motivation, Hedonic

JEL classification: M300

1. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, shopping is seen as a recreational activity and an escape from daily life rather than a transactional activity used to fulfill material needs. Shopping has become much like a play in which the main character is played by the consumer indulging in the shopping experience (Saraneva and Sääksjärvi, 2008). Consumers often walk around stores browsing for hours just for the fun of it. In addition, some consumers view shopping as an escape mechanism to get their minds off their problems and as a way for relieving stress and alleviating negative mood (Jamal et al. 2006). For them, a stressful life or a bad day can easily be turned into a positive experience with the help of a new pair of shoes, or a handbag that goes with an outfit. Therefore, some researchers prefer to use emotional, sensual and belief-related concepts such as “psychological treatment” and “worship” in defining the fact of shopping.

Buying goods in order to boost emotional satisfaction is probably motivation that plays

¹ School of Economics and Business Sarajevo, merima.cinjarevic@efsa.unsa.ba

² School of Economics and Business Sarajevo, kasim.tatic@efsa.unsa.ba

³ MUP RH, Inspektorat Unutarnjih poslova, srdjan.petric@vu.t-com.hr

some role in most buying behavior, but it might be particularly important when people engage in non-planned, "spur of the moment" purchase. Such purchasing is called impulse purchasing, unplanned purchasing, or irrational purchasing. Similar to other types of self indulgent behavior such as alcohol consumption, impulse buying behavior at low to moderate levels can be an enjoyable pastime driven by the pursuit of hedonistic goals. However, high levels of these behaviors can be harmful and are potentially self-destructive (Silvera et al., 2008).

Dramatic increases in disposable income and credit card availability have created possibilities to make impulse buying a prevalent consumer behavior in retail environments (Dittmar and Drury, 2000). In the USA, impulse buying generated over \$4 billion in annual sales (Kacen and Lee, 2002) where about 40 percent of consumers consider themselves impulse shoppers (Park et al., 2006).

Previous studies on impulse buying focused on defining differences between impulse and non-impulse buying behavior (Cobb and Hoyer, 1986; Piron, 1991). Many researchers have provided theoretical frameworks for examining impulse buying related to psychological variables (e.g. personality, self-regulation), hedonic experiences (e.g. shopping enjoyment, emotional state, mood) and situational variables (e.g. available time, money) in a shopping context (Beatty and Ferrell, 1998; Burroughs, 1996; Rook and Fisher, 1995). Generally, impulse buying is found to satisfy hedonic or emotional needs for fun, social interaction, and gratification (Hausman, 2000; Piron, 1991) rather than utilitarian needs. This implies that consumer impulse buying while shopping can be encouraged by a hedonic consumption tendency and emotional factors (Park et al.

2006). An important issue aligned with hedonic consumption is determining product-specific impulse buying behavior. According to Jones et al. (2003), product-specific impulse buying is affected significantly by product involvement and it is an important factor supporting impulse buying tendencies.

The purpose of this study is to examine the influence of six broad categories of hedonic shopping motivations (adventure, gratification, role, value, social and idea shopping) and fashion consciousness on consumers' impulse buying behavior. For the purpose of this study, the product category of clothing was chosen for several reasons: (1) clothing is one of the most likely consumer goods to be purchased on impulse (Dittmar et al., 1995), (2) clothing is a product purchased and worn by consumers of both genders and all ages and (3) clothing is a product that primarily provides the consumer with utilitarian and/or hedonic value, and that hedonic value is a specifically important contributor of the customer's identification with the product purchased (Broback and Hyalmarson, 2006).

The significance of this study is two-fold i.e. it is important to both marketing and management experts because it provides an additional explanation of impulse buying behavior, especially in terms of hedonic shopping motivations and their impact on such behavior. Also, the findings of the present study can be useful for retailers who want to improve their understanding regarding impulse buying behavior.

The remainder of the paper is organized into five sections. Section two gives a brief literature review regarding the impulse buying behavior, hedonic shopping motivations and fashion consciousness. In section three, the data collection procedure along with measures applied in the current study

are described. Research findings are presented in section four. Conclusion and managerial implications are noted, and limitations and future direction are discussed in section five.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Impulse buying behavior

Consumer decision-making has been studied extensively. The basic assumption underlying this body of knowledge is that consumers' choices can be explained from a rational perspective, where a choice is made after carefully considering different options from a set of alternatives. However, in some cases, consumers violate these requirements of rationality. In such instances, choices are made without careful consideration of the available alternatives, with insufficient information about the product of interest, or without prior intent of purchase. One such instance is impulse buying.

Impulse buying behavior is a phenomenon that has captured researchers' interest fifty years ago. However, the scope on impulse buying has changed, quite substantially, in the last few years. Early studies on impulse buying were more concerned with the definitional issues distinguishing impulse buying from non-impulse buying and attempted to classify the types of impulse buying into one of several sub-categories (Bellenger et al. 1978; Kollat and Willet, 1967; Stern, 1962), rather than to understand impulse buying as a trait of consumer buying behavior. Therefore, this approach generated a theory that ignores the behavioral motivations of impulse buying for a large variety of products and, instead, focuses on a small number of relatively inexpensive products. Therefore, researchers began to re-focus attention on impulse buying behavior and to investigate the behavioral motivations of

impulse buying (Cobb and Hoyer, 1986; Hausman, 2000; Rook, 1987; Rook and Gardner, 1993; Rook and Fisher, 1995).

Rook and Hoch (1985) focused their attention on the cognitive and emotional responses which consumers may experience during an impulse purchase. The construction of the definition was resting on consumers' descriptions of thoughts and emotions experienced during impulse purchasing situations. They came up with five distinctive elements that draw the difference between impulsive and planned purchases: (1) feeling a sudden and spontaneous desire to act; (2) temporary loss of self-control; (3) psychological conflict and struggle; (4) reduced cognitive assessment and (5) spending regardless of the consequences (Rook and Hoch, 1985). Summarizing the five dimensions, Rook (1987, pp. 191) defined impulse buying as "buying where a consumer experiences a sudden, often very strong and permanent urge to immediately buy something".

Previous research analyzed many factors that influence impulsive buying. Antecedents of impulsive buying can be summarized into three general categories, namely product, individual and situational factors. Early research on impulsive buying is product-oriented and impulsive buying is widely discussed in terms of which products are or are not impulse items (e.g., Bellenger et al., 1978). Products characterized by low price, low marginal need for the item, mass distribution, self-service, mass advertising, prominent store display, short product life, small size and ease of storage tend to be more frequently purchased on impulse (D'Antoni Jr and Shenson, 1973). Individual factors include buying impulsiveness (e.g., Rook and Fisher 1995), in-store browsing (e.g., Bloch et al., 1986), shopping enjoyment (e.g., Beatty and

Ferrell, 1998), positive affect (e.g., Beatty and Ferrell, 1998), independent self-concept (Kacen and Lee 2002), and need for touch (Peck and Childers, 2006). Situational factor includes time available (e.g., Thompson et al. 1990) and money available (Beatty and Ferrell 1998). Additionally, Rook and Fisher (1995) suggest that individuals' normative evaluations (i.e., judgments about the appropriateness of engaging in impulse buying behavior) moderate the relationship between the impulse buying trait and impulsive buying behavior.

For clothing, fashion-oriented impulse buying refers to a person's awareness or perception of fashionability attributed to an innovative design or style (Park et al., 2006, pp. 435). That is, fashion-oriented impulse buying occurs when consumers see a new fashion product and buy it because they are motivated by the suggestion to buy new products (Han et al., 1991). Han et al (1991) found high evidence of fashion-oriented impulse buying for college students majoring in textiles and clothing compared to students in other majors. Their findings suggested that fashion-oriented impulse buying might be related more significantly to students with majors having high fashion involvement. Park et al. (2006) found that consumers' fashion-oriented impulse buying behavior can be predicted by the attitudinal component (e.g. fashion involvement) and emotional factors (e.g. satisfied, excited).

2.2. Hedonic shopping motivation

Shopping motivation can be defined as the "drivers of behavior that bring consumers to the marketplace to satisfy their internal needs" (Jin and Kim, 2003, pp. 399). According to Westbrook and Black (1995), shopping behavior evolves from three fundamental reasons: to acquire a product, to acquire both

a desired product and provide satisfaction with non-product-related needs, and to primarily attain goals not related to product acquisition. Generally, shopping motivations have been categorized into two aspects: utilitarian and hedonic (Nguyen et al., 2007). Utilitarian shopping motivations are task-oriented, rational, and cognitive with the intentions or desires to purchase a product efficiently and rationally highlighted (Kang and Park, 2010). Hedonism, on the other hand, is concerned with the fun and play of shopping arising from the experience itself, and not for the achievement of any specified end-goal. Typical dimensions of hedonism are "increased arousal, high involvement, perceived freedom, fantasy fulfillment, and escapism" (Babin et al. 1994, pp. 646), as well as festivity (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003), treat, and self-indulgence (Miller, 1998). As a result, "people buy so they can shop, and not shop so they can buy" (Langrehr 1991, pp. 428). Arnold and Reynolds (2003) stress that "hedonic shopping motives are similar to the task orientation of utilitarian shopping motives, only the task is concerned with hedonic fulfillment, such as experiencing fun, amusement, fantasy and sensory stimulation" (pp. 78). So whereas an utilitarian shopper, or a *Homo Economicus* (Teller et al. 2008, pp. 286), would try and get a good quality product at the least possible price, a hedonic shopper, or a *Homo Luden* (Teller et al. 2008, pp. 286), is more likely to purchase that product from a store that has a pleasant atmosphere and offers other avenues of entertainment (Babin and Attaway, 2000; Diep and Sweeney, 2008). Arnold and Reynolds (2003) identified and validated six broad categories of hedonic shopping motivations. These included adventure shopping (to seek stimulation, adventure, and feelings of being in a different world), social shopping (for enjoyment of shopping with friends and family, socializing while

shopping and bonding with others), gratification shopping (for stress relief, to alleviate a negative mood and as a special treat to oneself), idea shopping (for keeping up with trends and new fashions and to seek new products and innovations), role shopping (for getting enjoyment as a consequence of shopping for others) and value shopping (reflecting shopping for sales, looking for discounts, and hunting for bargain).

2.3. Fashion consciousness

Previous research reported strong association of consumers with fashion products (Goldsmith et al. 1991; Kaiser, 1990; Nam et al., 2007; Schrank and Gilmore, 1973). Extensive research by these researchers on fashion products (e.g., clothing and fashion accessories) has been done primarily due to their high visibility, importance in generating self-image, and impressions on others. Schrank and Gilmore (1973) defined fashion as a socially derived valuation of products and recognized it as one of the greatest forces in the present-day life. As another definition, fashion is “a form of collective behavior that is socially approved at a given time but is expected to change” (Summers et al., 1992). Sproles and Kendall (1986) listed eight basic characteristics of consumers’ decision-making styles based on their interests, one of them being fashion or novelty consciousness. Goldsmith et al. (1991) found that consumers’ purchase intentions are motivated by their inclination toward fashion products that express themselves. Considered as a symbol for self-expression or self-identity, fashion products usually act as a tool to impress others (Kaiser, 1990).

Nam et al. (2007) defined fashion consciousness as “a person’s degree of involvement with the styles or fashion of clothing” (pp. 103). An individual does not

have to be either a fashion opinion leader or a fashion innovator to be considered fashion conscious. Rather, fashion consciousness is characterized by an interest in clothing and fashion, and in one’s appearance (Nam et al., 2007). Fashion conscious individuals seek excitement and pleasure, and want to keep themselves up-to-date with the latest fashion (Goldsmith et al., 1991). Regarding the shopping styles, fashion conscious consumers tend to shop at high-quality stores and be engaged in home shopping activities such as infomercial or mail order (Wan et al., 2001).

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Sample and data collection

The online questionnaire was created using LimeSurvey, a web-based questionnaire generator tool, hosted on the server of Sarajevo School of Economics and Business. An online questionnaire was directed to a sample of 500 individuals in Bosnia and Herzegovina, using convenience sampling method. Potential respondents received a URL address in the form of a hypertext link included in an e-mail message sent by the researchers. The e-mail invited the receivers to visit the web page to complete the questionnaire. A total of 224 participants completed the questionnaire, which corresponds to an impressively high response rate of 44.8 percent.

The sample statistics is shown in Table 1. The sample consisted of a slightly higher proportion of female consumers (56.7 percent) than male consumers (43.3 percent). As for the age distribution, more than half of the respondents were aged between 18 and 36. In addition, half of the respondents had an undergraduate degree. In terms of their marital status, 58.9 percent of the respondents were single and 41.1 percent were married.

Table 1. Sample characteristics

Factor	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	97	43.3
	Female	127	56.7
Age Group	18-25	100	44.6
	26-35	78	34.8
	36-45	33	14.7
	46 and above	13	5.9
Marital status	Single	132	58.9
	Married	92	41.1
Education	Secondary school	105	46.9
	Faculty	114	50.9
	Master's Degree	5	2.2
Monthly income	600 KM and below	64	28.6
	Between 601KM and 1000 KM	77	34.4
	Between 1001 KM and 1800 KM	59	26.3
	1801KM and above	24	10.7

Source: Author's own research

3.2. Research hypotheses

Starting from the theoretical bases, research topic, and established aims, as well as from the previous research results, the following hypotheses are formulated:

- **H1- H6:** Hedonic shopping motivations have a positive impact on impulse buying behavior. These motivations are: adventure shopping (H1), gratification shopping (H2), role shopping (H3), value shopping (H4) social shopping (H5) and idea shopping (H6).
- **H7:** Fashion consciousness has a positive effect on impulse buying behavior.

3.3. Measurement instrument

Based on the literature, the survey instrument was built, using scales that were already validated in previous research. Section A measured the consumers' impulse buying tendency using the 20-item IBTS - Impulse buying tendency scale, developed by Verplanken and Herabadi in 2001. According to the authors, individuals' impulse buying tendency consists of primarily two components, namely cognitive and affective

impulsivity. Consequently, the IBTS has two sub scales, each with ten items that measure cognitive and affective impulsivity. The IBTS has good internal reliability (Coefficient alpha of complete 20-item scale: 0.87 with individual subscale-cognitive: 0.82, affective: 0.80 as per Verplanken and Herabad, (2001)) and has been used in several studies (Silvera et al., 2008, Dawson and Kim, 2009). Section B measured the personality factors (hedonic shopping motivations and fashion consciousness). Hedonic shopping motivations were measured using the 18-item Hedonic Motivations scale (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003). As it has been discussed before, the authors have categorized hedonic motivations into six categories, namely adventure, gratification, role, value, social and idea shopping. A scale for each motivation included three items, each of which was scored on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). This scale has good internal reliability (Coefficient alpha of 0.87 as per Arnold and Reynolds 2003) and has been used in several studies (Kim and Forsythe, 2007, Nguyen et al., 2007). Fashion consciousness was measured using the five items of fashion consciousness –

novelty sub-scale from the Consumer Style Inventory (CSI) developed by Sproles and Kendall (1986). Section C comprised general demographic information of respondent such as gender, age, education, marital status, and income.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A statistical package for social science (SPSS) version 17.0 was used to analyze the data. First, reliability analysis was used to assess the reliability of measurement scales. Secondly, regression analysis was employed to

analyze the relationship between independent and dependent variables.

To determine the reliability of measurement scales, item analysis and the internal consistency were estimated. Internal consistencies of the total scores for each scale were assessed through Cronbach's Alpha coefficients. The reliabilities for all three measurement scales are calculated and presented in Table 2. As it is shown, all reliabilities are adequate since the Cronbach's Alpha value for each scale is higher than prescribed 0.7.

Table 2. Reliability analysis

Scale	Number of items	Cronbach Alpha	Mean score	SD
Hedonic shopping motivation	18	0.727	2.89	0.448
Impulse buying tendency scale	20	0.863	3.20	0.715
Fashion consciousness	5	0.773	3.14	0.755

Source: Author's own research and calculation

Standard regression was conducted to examine the influence of six broad categories of hedonic shopping motivations and fashion consciousness on consumers' impulse buying behavior. The independent variables in the regression model were the fashion consciousness and six dimensions of hedonic shopping motivations, namely, (1) adventure, (2) gratification, (3) role, (4) value, (5) social and (6) idea shopping. Before performing regression analysis, a series of analytical procedures are conducted to ensure that gathered empirical data meet conditions and prerequisites for performing the regression analysis. More specifically, the following factors could adversely affect validity of the results: (1) distribution of individual variables that deviates from the normal distribution; (2) variables display a bivariate or multivariate multicollinearity; (3) existence of heterosce-

dasticity among variables. In order to examine the univariate normal distribution of individual variables, we have calculated a skewness index and a kurtosis index for every single variable. The results have shown that both indices are within acceptable limits (absolute values are below 3 for the skewness index and below 10 for the kurtosis index), i.e. there is a normal distribution for all variables in the model. Given that it is possible for the high correlation between two variables to imply the bivariate collinearity, we have used a correlation matrix for all variables as to determine the collinearity among them. The results of the correlation analysis have led to a conclusion that there is no unacceptable level of the bivariate collinearity among the variables as values of all correlation coefficients are below 0.588 (Table 3).

Table 3. Pearson's correlation of impulse buying behavior, hedonic shopping motivations and fashion consciousness

		ADV	GRA	ROL	VAL	SOC	IDE	FC
IBB	Pearson Correlation	0.588**	0.513**	0.104	0.490**	0.100	0.324**	0.364**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.121	0.000	0.134	0.000	0.000
	N	224	224	224	224	224	224	224

Note: ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
 IBB- Impulse Buying Behavior; ADV - Adventure Shopping; GRA - Gratification Shopping; ROL- Role Shopping; VAL - Value Shopping; SOC- Social Shopping; IDE- Idea Shopping; FC – Fashion Consciousness.

Source: Author's own research and calculation

Variance inflation factor (VIF) was analyzed in order to examine the multicollinearity for more than two variables, i.e. in case when three or more variables have high correlation coefficient. The findings of the VIF test (Table 4) show that all observed variables are within the acceptable limits. The VIF test has helped us determine that the collinearity level among analyzed variables is acceptable (the VIF test benchmarks at 10, so values above this figure are indicative of significant multicollinearity).

The homoscedasticity of individual variable pairs, wherein the defined model presumed to be in a direct causal relationship, were subject to the Levene's test of homogeneity of variances. This test has proven to be insignificant ($p > 0.05$) related to all examined variable pairs, hence this makes us conclude that the hypothesis of homoscedasticity of certain relations cannot be dismissed, meaning that the relation between tested variables is homoscedastic.

Table 4. Results of VIF test

Model	Variables	Collinearity Statistics	
		Tolerance	VIF
IBB	Adventure Shopping	0.661	1.512
	Gratification Shopping	0.738	1.355
	Role Shopping	0.901	1.108
	Value Shopping	0.673	1.487
	Social Shopping	0.898	1.114
	Idea Shopping	0.905	1.105
	Fashion Consciousness	0.758	1.319

Source: Author's research and calculation

As we have ascertained that the collected empirical data meets the primary presumptions for performing regression analysis, we were able to approach the next stage in the process. The summarized results of regression analysis are presented in Table 5. The results

indicate that about 49.7 percent ($R^2 = 0.497$) of the variance in impulse buying behavior can be explained by the fashion consciousness and hedonic shopping motivations (Table 5).

Table 5. Results of regression analysis

Model	Standardized coefficients	Standardized error	t-value	p-value
Impulse Buying Behavior (R²)	(0.497) 0.361	0.049	6.082	0.000
Adventure Shopping	0.241	0.053	4.286	0.000
Gratification Shopping	0.018	0.046	0.364	0.716
Role Shopping	0.196	0.056	3.331	0.001
Value Shopping	-0.076	0.049	-1.492	0.137
Social Shopping	0.132	0.051	2.602	0.010
Idea Shopping	0.078	0.052	1.408	0.161
Fashion Consciousness				

Source: Author's research and calculation

The strongest predictor for impulse buying behavior is adventure shopping ($\beta = 0.361$; $p < 0.01$; t -value = 6.082), followed by gratification shopping ($\beta = 0.241$; $p < 0.01$; t -value = 4.286), value shopping ($\beta = 0.196$; $p < 0.01$; t -value = 3.331) and idea shopping ($\beta = 0.132$; $p < 0.01$; t -value = 2.601). Therefore, the hypotheses *H1: Adventure shopping has a positive impact on impulse buying behavior*; *H2: Gratification shopping has a positive impact on impulse buying behavior*, *H4: Value shopping has a positive impact on impulse buying behavior*; and *H6: Idea shopping has a positive impact on impulse buying behavior*, are completely supported. These findings indicate that the consumers who perceive shopping as a means to seek stimulation and adventure, to feel better or give a special treat to one-self, to get the best deal in the market in terms of bargains and special offers or to keep up with latest fashion trends and technological innovations will be more likely to engage in impulse buying behavior. Nevertheless, role and social shopping were found not significantly related to impulse buying behavior. Therefore, hypotheses *H3: Role shopping has a positive impact on impulse buying behavior* and *H5: Social shopping has a positive impact on impulse buying behavior*, are rejected. For the *H7*, the relationship between fashion consciousness and impulse buying behavior, a non-significant positive coefficient was found. This result is not in line with the findings from

rejected. The possible explanation is that the role shopping is done by a consumer primarily for others i.e. when a consumer gets fulfillment by shopping for his or her relatives or friends. In such situations, the consumer may take the "shopping as work" orientation, in which the task of matching the gift with recipients' tastes and characteristics must be accomplished. Therefore, consumer is seeking utilitarian shopping value to a far greater degree than hedonic shopping value (Babin et al., 2007). Contrary to our expectations, a negative, although statistically insignificant relationship between social shopping and impulse buying behavior is observed ($\beta = -0.076$; $p > 0.05$; t -value = -1.492). Since social shopping refers to the situation where shopping is done along with friends or family members, the primary goal is to socialize with others rather than buying a product. For these consumers, shopping as an opportunity to bond with others and the process rather than the product becomes more significant (Drep and Sweeney, 2008). Besides, the possible explanation is that consumers' buying impulsiveness may be moderated by the presence of other people and judgments about the appropriateness of engaging in impulse buying.

previous studies that showed fashion consciousness to be a significant predictor of impulse buying behavior (Park et al., 2006; Phau and Lo, 2004). Several studies have

suggested the possible connections between fashion consciousness and hedonic shopping motivations. In these studies, fashion consciousness consumers were found to be more involved in fashion, enjoy shopping more, and be less cost-conscious and practical. On the other hand, fashion consciousness has been found to correlate with awareness of alternatives that indicate cognitive complexity (Lennon and Davis, 1987), and high level of shopping planning. In addition, fashion consciousness consumers are motivated by the need to express themselves, their personalities and their value systems in the purchases they make. These consumers usually buy branded products of high quality and style and like to purchase from their specified shops or boutiques.

5. CONCLUSION

The present study has been aimed to investigate the influence of fashion consciousness and hedonic shopping motivations on impulse buying behavior. As hypothesized, we found that adventure, gratification, value and idea shopping have a direct positive effect on impulse buying behavior. These findings suggest that motivations driven by adventure-seeking and desires for new ideas, self-gratification, bargaining and searching for sales explain underlying reasons why consumers are willing to engage in impulse purchases. Role shopping and social shopping were found not significantly related to impulse buying behavior. Contrary to our expectations, results of regression analysis did not confirm a positive link between fashion consciousness and impulse buying behavior.

The results of this study also offer implications for retailers on understanding and encouraging impulse buying in their stores. First, retailers need to focus as much on adventure, entertainment and excitement as

they do on getting the right merchandise mix and pricing. Appropriate lighting, music and aromas enhance mood and emotion, which may trigger consumers' buying impulse intent. Second, in-store displays and pro-motions, including advertising of sales are effective in-store communications. Third, retailers can increase consumers' urge to buy by removing barriers. By stressing the non-economic rewards of impulse buying in advertising efforts, retailers can make impulse purchases more risk free through convenient return policies, or they can enhance impulse purchase enablers such as extending credit and store hours.

As with all research projects, the findings of the present study are characterized by limitations that restrict the extent to which they can be reliably generalized. First, our analysis was restricted to one product category (e.g. clothing) and was based on convenience sampling method from a single region. Furthermore, concentration on the single dependent variable (i.e. impulse buying behavior) creates one additional limitation. Impulse buying behavior is a complex concept involving different meanings such as pure, reminder, suggestion, and planned impulse buying. Thus, further research efforts can be contributed by investigating various types of impulse buying. Third, future researchers should also consider the effect of other consumer characteristics and situational variables such as personality, status consumption tendencies, shopping enjoyment, loyalty, time available, and money available on impulse buying behavior.

REFERENCES

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

2. Babin, B.J., Darden, W.R. & Griffin, M. (1994) Work and/or fun: Measuring hedonic and utilitarian shopping value. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20 (4), pp.644-656.
3. Babin. B.J. & Attaway, J.S. (2000) Atmospheric affect as a tool for creating value and gaining share of customer. *Journal of Business Research*, 49(2), pp. 91-99.
4. Babin, B.J., Gonzalez, C. & Watts, C. (2007) Does Santa have a great job? Gift shopping value and satisfaction. *Psychology & Marketing*, 24(10), pp. 895-917.
5. Beatty, S.E. & Ferrell, M.E. (1998) Impulse buying: Modeling its precursors. *Journal of Retailing*, 74 (2), pp. 169-191.
6. Bellenger, D.N., Robertson, D.H. & Hirschman, E.C (1978) Impulse buying varies by product. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 18 (December), pp.15-18.
7. Bloch, P.H., Ridgway, N.M. & Dawson, S.A. (1994) The Shopping mall as consumer habitat. *Journal of Retailing*, 70(1), pp. 23-42.
8. Broback, A. & Hjalmarson, H. (2006) Product-or-store-induced mood and its influence on product evaluations and identification with the product: The case of clothing. *European Advances in Consumer Research*. 7, pp. 170-175.
9. Burroughs, J.E. (1996) Product symbolism, self meaning and holistic matching: the role of information processing in impulsive buying. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 23, pp. 463-469.
10. Cobb, C.J. & Hoyer, W.D. (1986) Planned versus impulse purchase behavior. *Journal of Retailing*, 62 (4), pp. 384-409.
11. D'Antoni, J.S. JR. & Shenson, H. L. (1973), Impulse buying revisited: A behavioral typology. *Journal of Retailing*, 49(1), pp. 63-76.
12. Diep, V.C. & Sweeney, J.C. (2008) Shopping trip value: Do stores and products matter? *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 15 (5), pp. 399-409.
13. Dittmar, H., Beattie, J. & Friese, S. (1995) Gender identity and material symbols: Objects and decision considerations in impulse purchases. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 16, pp. 491-511.
14. Dittmar, H. & Drury, J. (2000) Self-image – is it in the bag? A qualitative comparison between “ordinary” and “excessive” consumers. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 21 (2), pp. 109- 142
15. Goldsmith, R.E., Heitmeyer, J.R. & Freiden, J.B. (1991) Social values and fashion leadership, *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 10(1), pp. 37-45.
16. Han, Y.K., Morgan, G.A., Kotsiopoulos, A. & Kang-Park, J. (1991) Impulse buying behaviour of apparel purchasers. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 9 (3), pp. 15-21.
17. Hausman, A. (2000) A multi-method investigation of consumer motivations in impulse buying behavior. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 17 (15), pp. 403-419.
18. Jamal, A., Davies, F., Chudry, F. & Al-Marri, M. (2006) Profiling consumers: A study of Qatari consumers' shopping

- motivations. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 13, pp. 67 – 80.
19. Jin, B. & Kim, J.O. (2003) A typology of Korean discount shoppers: shopping motives, store attributes, and outcomes. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 14(4), pp. 396-419.
 20. Jones, M.A., Reynolds, K.E., Weun, S. & Beatty, S.E. (2003) The-product-specific nature of impulse buying tendency. *Journal of Business Research*, 56 (7), pp. 505-511.
 21. Kacen, J.J. & Lee, J.A. (2002) The Influence of culture on consumer impulse buying behavior. *Journal of Consumer Impulse Buying Behavior*, 12 (2), pp. 163-176.
 22. Kaiser, S. (1990). *The social psychology of clothing: Symbolic appearance in context*, 2nd edition, New York: Macmillan.
 23. Kang, J. & Park-Poaps, H. (2010) Hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations of fashion leadership, *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 14 (2), pp. 312-328.
 24. Kim, J., & Forythe, S. (2007) Hedonic usage of product virtualization technologies in online apparel shopping. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 35 (6), pp. 502-514.
 25. Kollat, D.T. & Willett, R.P. (1967) Customer impulse purchasing behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 4 (February), pp. 21-31.
 26. Langrehr, F.W. (1991) Retail shopping mall semiotics and hedonic consumption. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 18(1), pp. 428-433.
 27. Lennon, S.J. & Davis, L.L. (1987) Individual differences in fashion orientation and cognitive complexity. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 64, pp. 327-330.
 28. Miller D. (1998). *Theory of Shopping*, Polity, Cambridge.
 29. Nam, J., Hamlin, R., Gam, H. J., Kang, J. H., Kim, J., Kumphai, P., Starr, C., & Richards, L. (2007) The fashion-consciousness behaviors of mature female consumers. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 31(1), pp. 102-108.
 30. Nguyyen. T.T. M., Nguyen, T. D. & Barrett, N.J. (2007) Hedonic shopping motivations, supermarket attributes, and shopper loyalty in transitional markets. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 19 (3), pp. 227-239.
 31. Park, E.J., Kim, E.Y. & Forney, J.C. (2006) A Structural model of fashion-oriented impulse buying behavior. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 10 (4) pp. 433-446.
 32. Peck, J. & Childers, T.L. (2006) If I touch it I have to have it: Individual and environmental influences on impulse purchasing. *Journal of Business Research*, 59, pp. 765-769.
 33. Phau, I. & Lo, C.C. (2004) Profiling fashion innovators: A study of self-concept, impulse buying and Internet purchase intent. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 8 (4), pp. 399-411.
 34. Piron, F. (1991) Defining impulse purchasing. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 18, pp. 509-513.
 35. Rook, D.W. & Hoch, S.J, (1985) *Consuming Impulses*, in Horfman, R.H. & Solomon,

- M.R. (ed), *Advances in Consumer Research*, 12 (1), Association in Consumer Research, pp. 23- 27.
36. Rook, D.W. (1987) The buying impulse. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14, pp. 189-199.
37. Rook, D.W. & Gardner, M.P. (1993) In the mood: impulse buying's affective antecedents. *Research in Consumer Behavior*, 6, pp. 1-26.
38. Rook, D.W. & Fisher, R.J. (1995) Normative influences on impulsive buying behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 22 (3), pp. 305-413.
39. Saraneva, A. & Sääksjärvi, M. (2008) Young compulsive buyers and the emotional roller-coaster in shopping. *Young Consumers: Insight and Ideas for Responsible Marketers*, 9 (2), pp.75 - 89.
40. Schrank, H.L. & Gilmore, D.L. (1973) Correlates of fashion leadership: Implications for fashion process theory. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 14(Autumn), pp. 534-543.
41. Silvera. D.H., Lavack, A.M. & Kropp, D. (2008) Impulse buying: the role of affect, social influence, and subjective wellbeing. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 25 (1), pp.23 - 33.
42. Sproles, G.B. & Kendall, E.L. (1986) A methodology for profiling consumers' decision-making styles. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 20 (2), pp. 267-279.
43. Stern, H. (1962) The Significance of Impulse Buying Today. *Journal of Marketing*, 26 (April), pp. 59-62.
44. Summers, T.A., Belleau, B.D. & Wozniak, P.J. (1992) Fashion and shopping perceptions, demographics, and store patronage. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 11, 83-92.
45. Teller, C., Reutteret, T. & Schnedlitz, P. (2008) Hedonic and utilitarian shopper types in evolved and created retail agglomerations. *International Review of Retail, Distribution & Consumer Research*, 18, 283-309.
46. Thompson, C.J., Locander, W.B. & Pollio, H. R. (1990) The lived meaning of free choice: An existential-phenomenological description of everyday consumer experiences of contemporary married women. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17 (December), pp. 346-361.
47. Verplanken, B. & Herabadi, A. (2001) Individual differences in impulse buying tendency: Feeling and no Thinking. *European Journal of Personality*, 15, Special Issue on Personality and Economic Behavior, pp. S71-S83.
48. Wan, F., Youn, S. & Fang, T. (2001) Passionate surfers in image-driven consumer culture: Fashion- conscious, appearance-savvy people and their way of life. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 18, pp. 266-274.
49. Westbrook, R.A. & Black, W.C. (1985) A motivation-based shopper typology. *Journal of Retailing*, 61(1), pp. 78-103.