



GENDER COMPARISON IN ONLINE SHOPPING IN TERMS OF PRODUCT CLASSIFICATION AND SHOPPING MOTIVATIONS

Nihal SUTUTEMİZ¹, Metin SAYGILI^{2*}

¹ Assoc.Prof., Department of Management Information Systems, Sakarya Business School, Sakarya University, Sakarya, Turkey.

² Ph.D. Student, Department of Business, Graduate School of Business, Sakarya University, Sakarya, Turkey.

***Corresponding Author:**

Email: mtmsaygili@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study had two aims. The first was to determine whether the products purchased on-line by the consumers were in hedonic or utilitarian product category and whether these categories were related to gender or not, while the second aim was to determine the hedonic and utilitarian factors that drive consumers to online shopping, and whether these factors were related to gender or not. The study had several subsidiary aims such as defining the place of online shopping among the internet usage aims, describing the advantages of online shopping and most common problems of internet shopping in terms of gender. In this context, the universe of this positivist study comprised 18 year and older online shoppers. 481 consumers accepted to join the study on a voluntary basis with convenient sampling method and constituted the study sample. Study data was collected from the participants through online surveys. Findings showed that hedonic and utilitarian product preferences and shopping motivations were related to gender.

Keywords: Online Shopping, Utilitarian Product, Hedonic Product, Shopping Motivations

INTRODUCTION

Internet has entered our lives with information technologies which are an indispensable part of our lives, and caused remarkable changes particularly in daily economic activity fields. The proliferation of internet in various fields of economic life has enhanced the life quality of individuals, and significantly changed behaviours, habits and shopping styles of consumers. Today, changing life conditions have forced consumers to spend time more effectively. Increasing the role of men and women in working life has made time management more important than ever, motivating consumers to use practical shopping methods due to their wish and need to save time. On the other hand, business owners have had to analyse the situation well, and develop several shopping methods to respond to the needs and wishes of customers as a result of this time restriction. One of the methods introduced by the manufacturers and businesses is online (shopping over internet) shopping, which has recently turned into a very popular and preferred trend that changed shopping styles and habits of consumers. Having access to any service or products on online shopping sites, acquiring information on these services and products, and comparing prices all have strengthened the effects of online shopping on consumer behaviours. Rapid proliferation of Internet to become an indispensable part of our lives has given business owners opportunity to provide various

products and services with less cost and in shorter time according to the personal needs and demands of consumers (Enginkaya, 2006; Turan, 2008; Demirel, 2010; Izgi and Sahin, 2013). The advantages of online shopping including raising quality, comfort, trust and satisfaction of consumers as salespeople turned the route of their activities to internet-based systems after the disappearance of geographical borders by using the Internet and the adoption of the new aspects of market concept. From this perspective, since the day, it entered our lives, technology has initiated a great many changes in our habits including factors that encourage online shopping. Consumers prefer online shopping due to various motivations which in turn influence their shopping styles.

In this context, this study aimed to determine why the consumers do online shopping, emphasize the hedonic or utilitarian qualities of products they purchase online, and whether the products' qualities were related to gender or not. Another aim was to determine whether gender was related to the hedonic and utilitarian motivations¹ that drive consumers to online shopping, or not.

Conceptual Framework

Evaluating the advantages of the Internet technology in marketing and particularly retail sector with regards to rich product categories, easy access to product and price data, different shopping experience and comfort it provides has made it necessary to determine which technology each consumer type uses under various conditions (Grewal et al., 2004).

Online shopping is a new marketing and sales canal that provides a different shopping platform to consumers, and allows them to do shopping with less effort and window shopping, compare prices and counsel others in addition to its other significant advantages including easy and fast access to product and service information, more choices and opportunity to save money and time. Thanks to this canal, the consumers have been able to see the products, and evaluate their suitability for their needs, obtain price information, take part in product design processes, search for special offers, and receive the customer support after shopping (Korgaonkar and Wolin, 2002; Kircova, 2008; Armagan and Turan, 2014).

Qualities, characteristics, personal benefits, recognition level of new information technologies and demographic features of consumers influence online shopping behaviour as well as do other factors such as gender, age, income level, education level and online shopping habits (Burke, 2002; Dundar and Yoruk, 2009; Hasan, 2010).

Peterson et al. (1997) studied consumer behaviours in online shopping and concluded that books, videos, computer softwares etc. were more preferred than clothes, grocery and accessories, etc. In another study on purchasing intentions according to different product types, intentions to purchase music CDs or clothes differed from each other (Vijayasarathy and Jones, 2000).

Anderson (1997) and Horrigan and Raini (2002) in their studies suggested that books, CDs and travel packages have been the most preferred products in online shopping (Armagan and Turan, 2014). Other products preferred in online shopping have been computer hardwares

¹ As the subject of this study is consumer behaviour in online shopping, these concepts are intended for online platforms throughout the whole article.



and softwares, clothes and accessories, food and beverages, beauty and health products (Johnson, 1998; Teo, 2006).

Khan et al (2005) classified product preferences that guide shopping behaviours as the hedonic and utilitarian products. The hedonic products are the experiential consumption products that provide fun, pleasure and excitement. Flowers, design clothes, music, sports cars and luxury watches are in this category. The utilitarian products are the ones that have primary effects, and encourage people to purchase for the functional qualities. Microwave ovens, detergents, minibuses, home security systems or personal computers can be used to exemplify this category (Khan et al., 2005).

The findings of a study in Turkey on purchasing behaviours of Internet users (Usta, 2006) revealed that most preferred products have been computers and electronic devices, followed by books, sports equipment, hotel reservations, travel tickets and clothes. It also found out that more online shopping has been done by the people in bigger cities than the people in smaller towns, and men more than women. In another study (Ceylan, 2007), it was found out that the consumers were rather interested in hedonic qualities of clothes, food and electronic devices in online shopping.

A study on the Internet activities showed that online shopping has been the third most popular activity, followed by sending e-mails and surfing on the Web (Li and Zhang, 2002). Studies revealed that people more engaged with Internet also do more online shopping and develop unique online shopping attitudes, and this new shopping platform has eliminated certain problems of traditional shopping such as store crowds and queues (Bellman et al., 1999; Wen et al., 2001). On the other hand, the online shopping platforms differ from the traditional shopping due their significant advantages such as offering a wide range of products for lower and reduced prices and being open 24 hours (Jarvenpaa et al., 2000; Mariotti and Sgobbi, 2001).

Despite all these advantages of online shopping, several factors sometimes hindered its implementation. One of these factors has been the security problem that occurs in credit card shopping simply defined as the fear of sharing identity information, followed by the problems such as the lack of personal tie with the products as the consumers had no chance to touch and try, and also hesitations about the real size of the products and delayed delivery (Kotler, 2002; Palumbo and Herbig, 1998; Thompson and Teo, 2002). One of the factors that has caused a negative attitude towards online shopping has been the low access speed arising from the computers, tablets, mobile phones or service providers (Kim and Lim, 2001).

According to the results of Information Technologies Household Usage Survey (2018) conducted by Turkish Statistical Institute (TUIK), Internet usage rate in 2018 April was 72.9 % among the individuals aged 16 to 74, and approximately eight of every ten houses (83.8 %) had Internet access. If the results were evaluated according to the Internet usage purposes; 84.1 % of Internet users used Internet in the last three months of 2018 for participating in social networks (creating user profile, posting messages or other contributions), followed by 78.1% watching video content from sharing services, 69.5 % for telephoning over the Internet / video calls (via webcam) over the Internet, 68.8 % seeking health-related information (e.g. injury, disease, nutrition, improving health, etc.) and % 67.8 % for finding information about goods or services. On the other hand, if the results of Information Technologies Household Usage Survey (2018) were evaluated in terms of online shopping, using the Internet for



ordering or purchasing goods or services for personal use has reached 29.3 % level. With this increased interest in online shopping, the first three products/services purchased by the Internet users for the twelve-month period between April 2018 and March 2018 became “clothes and sports equipment”, “travel tickets, rent a car etc”, “household goods (furniture, toys, domestic appliance)”, followed by food and daily needs (groceries), and books, magazines, newspapers (including e-books)”. Approximately one fifth of the individuals purchasing or ordering in this 12-month period reported that they had problems, the most common was being “wrong or damaged goods/services delivered” (49.1 %) and “the speed of delivery longer than what was indicated “(46.5 %).

Consumer Motivations

The consumption activity of purchasing goods and services to facilitate life has been defined as the utilitarian consumption. Offering tangible utilitarian to consumers could be considered as the basic point of the utilitarian consumption; consumption of basic needs has been also considered a utilitarian factor that drives people to do shopping. As this consumer category prefers products for their functional aspects, the utilitarianism might be said to motivate the shopping activity (Celik, 2009; Sengun and Karahan, 2013).

Consumers do not only purchase really practical and useful goods and services, but may also do shopping for joy (pleasure). According to this understanding defined as the hedonic shopping in literature, people tend to do shopping to experience adventure, catch opportunities, form an opinion, and follow the latest fashion, socialize and strengthen their social affairs and, also relax (Arnould and Reynolds, 2003).

Factors that motivate the consumers to the hedonic and utilitarian shopping have become the subjects of numerous studies (Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982; Babin et al., 1994; Spangenberg et al. 1997; Guido, 2006; Jones et al., 2006; Kim, 2006; Kop, 2008; Overby and Lee, 2006; Topaloglu, 2009; O'Brien, 2010; Koker and Maden, 2012) and these studies have revealed that people do not only tend to be smart while shopping but also the emotional structure of the individual is also effective; people are influenced by both hedonic and utilitarian factors, and consumers define some products as hedonic while others as utilitarian, since most products involve both motivation types to different extents (Westbrook and Black, 1985; Dhar and Wertenbroch, 2000; Altunisik and Callı, 2004; Unal and Ceylan, 2008; Yayla, 2010)

- ***Hedonic Shopping Motivations***

The idea of hedonic shopping was first dealt with and explained in Hirschman and Holbrook's (1982) seminary paper. As mentioned above, according to Hirschman and Holbrook (1982), consumers do not carry out shopping activity just for utilitarian, but they may also consider it as an opportunity to experience pleasure and fun.

Studies on factors that motivate consumers to hedonic shopping (Hirschmann and Holbrook, 1982; Batra and Ahtola, 1990; Sheth et al., 1991; Babin et al. 1994; Spangenberg and Voss, 1997; To et al. 2007; Childers et al., 2001) have revealed that consumers display hedonic shopping behaviour for various reasons. Arnould and Reynolds (2003) who carried out the most extensive study on this subject suggested that consumers did shopping for various reasons, and experienced very strong feelings during shopping activity. They developed a “hedonic shopping motivations” scale and revealed that consumers did shopping for six basic motivations. This study was based on “hedonic shopping motivations” developed by Arnould



and Reynolds for traditional shopping and hedonic shopping motivations which were classified by authors as adventure, gratification, role (to make others happy), value, social, and idea shopping (to follow the latest fashion) motivations (Arnould and Reynolds, 2003).

- **Utilitarian Shopping Motivations**

Utilitarian shopping has been considered as the principle of rational and effective consumer behaviour to realize a particular purpose and find solutions for problems, while utilitarian shopping motivations have been defined as the motivations that cause people to purchase “only the goods, services and information they need” according to their rational expectations (Babin et al., 1994; Odabasi and Baris, 2002; Hae-Sook, 2005; Solomon, 2006)

In utilitarian shopping, the consumers benefit from several utilities such as functional and objective qualities of the products, and display shopping and consumption behaviours with the effect of “quality, price and value factors”, acting with the idea of smart shopping and purchasing only what they need, and with the best price with no focus on pleasure, but only focusing on the economic aspects with the effect of these utilitarian factors. In this context, consumers have been motivated to purchase what they need in the shortest time and with the least effort and benefit from the freedom and controlling utilities of the Internet to do efficient and rational shopping according to their purposes (Chen et al., 2008; Kop, 2008; Dogrul, 2012).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The Aim of the Study

It has been remarkable that studies in literature have rather focused on the hedonic aspect of shopping, and the utilitarian aspect was not sufficiently dealt with. Studies (Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982; Arnould and Reynolds, 2003; Altunisik and Calli, 2004; Kim, 2006; Overby and Lee, 2006; Kop, 2008; Topaloglu, 2009; O’Brien, 2010; Dogrul, 2012) revealed that consumers behave with the effects of the hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations. Studies on the hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations carried out in this country and the world predominantly dealt with the product groups preferred the hedonic and utilitarian shopping, and the differences between these two preferences and unplanned shopping. However, there have been a limited number of studies on the factors that motivate the hedonic and utilitarian shopping. The role of these motivation factors in online shopping has particularly been neglected.

In this context, the main aim of this study was to assess the hedonic and utilitarian shopping factors in online shopping, and find out whether these factors have been related to gender in addition to specifying the product qualities in online shopping.

This study sought for the answers to the following questions:

1. Do men and women prefer different product groups in online shopping?
2. Do the hedonic and utilitarian qualities of product groups in online shopping seem different to men and women?
3. Are online shopping motivation factors related to gender?
4. Is gender related to the rank of online shopping among the internet usage purposes?
5. What are the advantages of online shopping according to different genders?



6. What are the most common problems that different genders encounter in online shopping?

The responses to these questions have been believed to be useful for both researchers in this field and businesses operating online.

Study Sample and Data Collection

The study universe comprised online shoppers at or above the age of 18. In this context, sampling was compulsory as the universe was too wide, and finding the accurate number was not possible. However, the lack of a sampling frame prevented using a probability based sampling method. Therefore, the study sample involved 481 participants who agreed to take part in the study on a voluntary basis with the convenient sampling method.

The survey content involved the internet usage purposes, the most common problems encountered in online shopping, the most purchased products on Internet, the hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations, and the demographic data of the participants. The hedonic shopping motivations were measured with 18 statements designed with the help of studies previously carried out by Hirschman and Holbrook (1982), Arnould and Reynolds (2003), Cardoso and Pinto (2010) and O'Brien (2010). On the other hand, the utilitarian shopping motivations were measured with 10 statements designed with the studies of Babin et al. (1994), Overby and Lee (2006), To et al. 2007, Kim (2006), Kop (2008), Cardoso and Pinto (2010). 5-point Likert scale (1: Strongly Disagree....5: Strongly Agree) was used for the measurements.

Surveys were subjected to the consistency analysis. After eliminating the responses of 21 participants who responded "No idea" to any of the survey questions, a total of 460 observations were accepted for the analysis. The findings have been presented in the following sections.



DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

This section has involved the statistical information on the data subjected to analysis in the study.

Demographic Features

Examining the demographic features of the participants who do online shopping and have taken part in the study revealed that 52 % were women and 48 % were men. The number of single participants was relatively higher than the married participants. More than half of the participants (51.7 %) had bachelor's degree or higher educational degree. 76.7 % were between the ages of 18 and 35, while 23.3 % were 36 or older. The monthly income of more than half of the participants (55.9 %) was 2000 TL or less. 31.6 % were students and 26.2 % were academicians. The number of civil servants and workers was similar and constituted together approximately one fifth of the study sample. The participants defined as "other" were predominantly computer programmers, engineers or bank clerks.

Internet Usage Purposes

The participants were asked to express for what purpose they usually used the Internet, and tick only 3 options.

According to the responses of the female participants on the Internet usage purposes, 20.4 % of them used Internet to access social media sites (Facebook, Twitter etc). It was followed by "doing research", "purchasing products or service", "sending-receiving e-mails",

“downloading or listening to music, videos”, “doing banking transactions” and “sending instant messages (Chat, Msn, Skype etc)” was the least popular response.

According to the responses of the male participants, their Internet usage purposes were ranked as “accessing social media sites”, “doing research”, “downloading or listening to music, videos”, “sending-receiving e-mails”, “doing banking transactions”, “purchasing products or services” and “reading newspapers and magazines”; while “sending instant messages (Chat, Msn, Skype etc)” was again the least popular response.

To assess the results in terms of men and women together; it was found out that 60 % of both men and women used the Internet to access the social media sites (Facebook, Twitter etc). “Purchasing product or service” was the second popular purpose for women, while it was much behind the list for men.

Advantages of Online Shopping

According to the findings based on the participants’ responses which were used to assess three most important advantages of online shopping, both male and female participants declared the most important advantages of online shopping as the convenient price, saving time, product range, convenience, and comfort. It has been remarkable that findings for men and women were similar. On the other hand, the women considered the easy return conditions as a more significant advantage, while the men found the consumer comments on products and services more significant than women did.

Most Common Problems in Online Shopping

According to the responses of the participants, the most common problems encountered in online shopping were identified. The most common problems women encountered were “delayed order”, “display of stock-out product”, and “the difficulty of product return and the order cancellation”. The problems that men encountered were the “financial security issues”, “the difficulty of product return and the order cancellation”, and “the misinformation”. “The difficulty of the product return and the order cancellation” was a problem encountered both by men and women. On the other hand, the financial security issue was one of the leading problems for men. Therefore, the financial security issue may be defined as a significant reason for men not to prefer online shopping. The financial security was a less serious problem for female participants. The delivery of the purchased products seemed to be a more significant problem for women.

Most Purchased Products Online and Product Qualities

One of the aims of the study was to find out the most purchased products in online shopping, and the product range was based on the products in Nielsen’s (2008) study (<http://nz.nielsen.com>), the biggest market research company in the world. 28 products from Davis, Lang and Diego’s (2013) study were categorized and adapted to this study. The participants were asked to order their shopping items according to their significance level from 1 to 3.

The weighted scores calculated according to the importance order of the most purchased products showed that three most popular product categories were “clothes and shoes”, “books, magazines and stationery” and “banking services” among the women while the “technological products (computer, camera, mobile phone etc)”, “books, magazines and stationery” and “travel tickets (bus and plane) were the most purchased products by the men. “Film, music,



CD/DVD” product group was at the bottom of the list of the most purchased products by both men and women.

In order to assess the qualities of the product categories which were most purchased by the participants, they were asked to score these products from 1 to 7 (1: Lowest.....7: Highest) according to their hedonic and utilitarian qualities. The findings have been presented on Table 1 with the average values of the hedonic and utilitarian qualities as well as the gender comparison.

Table 1: Gender Comparison According to Qualities of Most Purchased Products in Online Shopping and Independent Samples t-test Results

Utilitarian Product Quality						Product Group	Hedonic Product Quality					
Gender	N	Mean	t	df	p		Gender	N	Mean	t	df	p
Female	238	5.98	5.02	458	.000	Books, magazines and stationery	Female	238	5.57	5.494	458	.000
Male	222	5.04					Male	222	4.59			
Female	238	5.15	6.028	458	.000	Event tickets (cinema, theatre etc)	Female	238	5.50	4.37	458	.000
Male	222	4.02					Male	222	4.62			
Female	238	4.40	6.235	458	.000	Cosmetics and personal care products	Female	238	4.66	5.155	458	.000
Male	222	3.28					Male	222	3.68			
Female	238	5.12	-.847	458	.398	Technological products (computer, mobile phone etc.)	Female	238	4.87	-1.296	458	.196
Male	222	5.26					Male	222	5.10			
Female	238	5.35	.160	458	.873	Banking Services	Female	238	4.20	-.520	458	.603
Male	222	5.32					Male	222	4.31			
Female	238	3.84	.951	458	.342	Souvenirs and ornaments	Female	238	4.21	3.017	458	.003
Male	222	3.67					Male	222	3.66			
Female	238	5.63	.956	458	.340	Travel tickets (bus and plane)	Female	238	5.01	3.088	458	.002
Male	222	5.47					Male	222	4.45			
Female	238	4.54	1.547	458	.123	Home appliances	Female	238	4.41	3.573	458	.000
Male	222	4.28					Male	222	3.80			
Female	238	4.13	.124	458	.902	Sports equipment	Female	238	4.29	-.091	458	.928
Male	222	4.11					Male	222	4.31			
Female	238	4.35	2.431	458	.015	Film, music CD/ DVD	Female	238	4.96	3.304	458	.001
Male	222	3.90					Male	222	4.35			
Female	238	5.15	5.197	458	.000	Clothes and shoes	Female	238	5.32	6.867	458	.000
Male	222	4.21					Male	222	4.08			
Female	238	3.92	5.022	458	.000	Jewelry (necklace, ring, bracelet etc)	Female	238	4.72	7.083	458	.000
Male	222	2.95					Male	222	3.31			
Female	238	4.38	5.241	458	.000	Accessories (bag, watch, glasses etc.)	Female	238	5.02	7.060	458	.000
Male	222	3.41					Male	222	3.68			

According to the mean values of the hedonic and utilitarian qualities of the most purchased product groups in online shopping, the mean score of the utilitarian quality of books, magazines and stationery, technological products (computer, camera, mobile phone etc), banking services, travel tickets (bus and plane) was higher than the hedonic products' quality, which made them “*utilitarian product*” for both men and women.

The mean score of the hedonic product quality of event tickets (cinema, theatre etc), cosmetics and personal care products, sports equipment, film, music CD/DVD, jewelry (necklace, ring, bracelet etc) and accessories (bag, watch, glasses etc) was higher than the utilitarian quality mean score of these products, which made them the “*hedonic product*” for both men and



women. According to the mean scores of clothes and shoes category; it was possible to define them as the “*hedonic product*” for women and the “*utilitarian product*” for men.

Independent Sample t-tests were carried out for each product group with regarding their hedonic and utilitarian aspects in order to determine whether the qualities of the most purchased products in online shopping differed according to gender. The findings showed that there was a statistically significant difference ($p < 0,05$) between genders in terms of their responses to both hedonic and utilitarian qualities of books, magazines, and stationery; event tickets (cinema, theatre etc), cosmetics and personal care products; film, music CD/DVD; shoes and clothes; jewellery (necklace, ring, bracelet etc) and accessories (bag, watch, glasses etc) product categories, and only the hedonic qualities of the souvenirs and ornaments; travel tickets (bus and plane) and home appliances product categories. On the other hand, product evaluation scores of women were higher than the scores of men in products that displayed significant difference between genders.

Exploratory Factor Analysis on Hedonic and Utilitarian Motivations

Internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach Alpha) was calculated for the items that constituted the scale of 18 statements of Hedonic Shopping Motivations and 10 statements of Utilitarian Shopping Motivations. It was detected that 1 statement in Utilitarian Shopping Motivation scale (*Surfing other online shops to end my shopping trip disappoints me*) did not represent the scale to the full extent. This statement was eliminated, and the internal consistency analysis was repeated. After finding no statement that did not represent the scales, the “principal components factor analysis” was done for the variables in the study model, and the findings represented on Table 2 and 3 were obtained.

Factor analysis KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) values for Hedonic and Utilitarian Shopping Motivations were found to be 0.862 and 0.876; respectively. These values were above the critical value 0.70 (Malhotra, 1996) and they revealed the sufficiency of the sample subjected to the factor analysis. “Anti-image” coefficients were also separately studied to detect the detrimental variables, and no reason was found to eliminate any statement. Taking factor loads into consideration, the authors excluded three statements related to Hedonic Shopping Motivations that practically had smaller than 0.50 factor load which were not separated into any factor (*It is important for me to end shopping as I planned*”, *I have economic gains with online shopping*”).

Factor analysis was repeated after the elimination of the statements, and KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) values were found 0.862 and 0.851 for Hedonic and Utilitarian Shopping Motivations; respectively. At the end of the analysis, Hedonic Shopping Motivations were collected under 6 sub-factors (aspects) with 18 statements, and Utilitarian Shopping Motivations were collected under 1 factor with 7 statements. 6 aspects constituting Hedonic Motivations explained 75.578 % of the total variance, while 1 aspect constituting Utilitarian Shopping Motivations explained 54.9 %. Factor analysis findings have been presented on Tables 2 and 3. The reliability test (Cronbach alpha) results of each factor was above the critical value of 0.70 (Bland and Altman, 1997).

Table 2: Online Hedonic Shopping Motivations Factor Analysis Results

Factors	Factor Loads	Variance Explained%	Cronbach Alpha
<i>Factor 1: Adventure Shopping</i>		14.208	.890

I find shopping stimulating.	.869		
To me, shopping is an adventure	.861		
Shopping makes me feel like I am in my own universe.	.794		
<i>Factor 2: Idea Shopping</i>		14.058	.873
I go shopping to see what new products are available.	.829		
I go shopping to keep up with the trends	.812		
I go shopping to keep up with the new fashions.	.800		
<i>Factor 3: Role Shopping</i>		13.768	.859
I enjoy shopping for my friends and family.	.872		
I like shopping for others because when they feel good I feel good.	.855		
I enjoy shopping around to find the perfect gift for someone.	.798		
<i>Factor 4: Value Shopping</i>		13.647	.782
I enjoy looking for discounts when I shop.	.771		
For the most part, I go shopping when there are sales	.765		
I try to get the cheapest product when I shop.	.735		
I do shopping to take advantage of discount times.	.658		
<i>Factor 5: Social Shopping</i>		11.489	.791
Shopping with my friends and family is a bonding experience..	.818		
I enjoy socializing with others when I shop.	.817		
Shopping is a good opportunity to socialize..	.636		
<i>Factor 6: Gratification Shopping</i>		9.409	.868
To me, shopping is a way to relieve stress.	.843		
When I'm in a down mood, I go shopping to make me feel better.	.822		

Table 3: Online Utilitarian Shopping Motivations Factor Analysis Results

Factor	Factor Loads	Variance Explained%	Cronbach Alpha
<i>Factor 1: Utilitarian Shopping Motivations</i>		54.90	.863
I like to feel smart about my shopping trip.	.768		
It is important that I buy the product I really need my shopping trip.	.759		
On a particular shopping trip, it is important to find items I am looking for.	.751		
Online shopping is easier and more convenient than traditional shopping.	.746		
I save time with online shopping.	.730		
Shopping as I wish makes me feel good.	.723		
Online shopping provides me fast shopping opportunity.	.711		

Gender Comparison on Hedonic and Utilitarian Shopping Motivations

To determine whether the shopping motivations depended on gender, Independent Sample t-Tests were carried out and the findings were presented on Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4: Comparison of Sub-dimensions of Online Hedonic Shopping Motivations According to Gender- Independent Sample t-Test Results

Dimensions	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	df	p
Adventure Shopping	Female	238	3.2857	1.11107	3.773	458	.000
	Male	222	2.8844	1.17033			
Idea Shopping	Female	238	2.9398	1.19289	2.786	458	.006
	Male	222	2.6396	1.11224			



Role Shopping	Female	238	3.7619	1.03763	5.706	458	.000
	Male	222	3.2012	1.06951			
Value Shopping	Female	238	3.6124	.88155	3.095	458	.002
	Male	222	3.3502	.93501			
Social Shopping	Female	238	3.0602	1.07157	1.345	458	.179
	Male	222	2.9264	1.06032			
Gratification Shopping	Female	238	3.5168	1.22204	6.770	458	.000
	Male	222	2.7185	1.30723			

The findings showed that there was a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between genders in terms of their responses to every dimension of Online Hedonic Shopping Motivations except for Social Shopping and the mean scores of female responses in these dimensions was higher than the mean scores of men.

Table 5: Comparison of Sub-dimensions of Online Utilitarian Shopping Motivations According to Gender- Independent Sample t-Test Results

Dimension	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	df	p
Online Utilitarian Shopping Motivations	Female	238	4.0696	.71756	1,710	458	0.088
	Male	222	3.9447	.84819			

Findings on Table 5 showed that there was no statistically significant difference ($p > 0.05$) between genders in terms of their responses to Online Utilitarian Shopping Motivations.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

According to the findings of this study on the hedonic and utilitarian shopping concepts, and as a result of the factor analysis, online shopping motivations were collected under Online Hedonic Motivations with 18 statements and 6 sub-factors (dimensions), and under Utilitarian Shopping Motivations with 10 statements and 1 factor. "Hedonic shopping motivations scale" designed by Arnould and Reynolds (2003) for traditional shopping was well adapted to online shopping, and these results showed that the consumers experience adventure in online shopping and do not only meet their needs but also feel motivated with shopping activities that relax them, strengthen their social affairs and are approved and admired by others.

The findings of the study showed that there was a significant difference between genders with regards to the mean scores of their responses to Adventure Shopping, Idea Shopping, Role Shopping, Value Shopping and Gratification Shopping sub-dimensions of Online Hedonic Shopping Motivations, and the mean scores of women at these sub-dimensions were higher than men. It was revealed that several studies in Turkish literature (Babacan 2001; Ozdemir and Yaman, 2007; Cakmak and Cakir, 2012; Aydin, 2013; Guler, 2013; Kirgiz, 2014; Dogan et al., 2014; Fettahlioglu et al., 2014) detected significant differences between genders in terms of the hedonic shopping motivations, and female consumers were more likely to do the hedonic shopping than men. The findings of this study overlapped with these previous studies. However, there was not a statistically significant difference between genders when findings were evaluated with regards to the Online Utilitarian Shopping Motivations. Knowing the reasons of consumers to do online shopping, and the hedonic and utilitarian motivation factors underlying these reasons has been important for businesses to reach the consumers, and specify what qualities their products and services must possess. Therefore, the businesses

operating in this field must well understand the reasons that motivate online shopping and the hedonic and utilitarian aspects of these reasons. Businesses will be able to see and meet consumers' needs if they become aware of their opinions and feelings when shopping and what motivates them to act in this way. Considering the utilitarian and hedonic qualities of the most preferred products in online shopping will also provide certain advantages for businesses if they work on female consumers whose product perceptions and shopping motivations have been stronger than men.

This study's findings showed that both men and women use Internet primarily to access social media sites. The second purpose of women was "to purchase products or services through Internet" while this aim was less significant for men, and it was at the lower ranks of their purpose list. A study done by Turkish Statistical Institute (TUIK) in 2018 supported the findings of this study as it also revealed that the social media profiling, sending messages and sharing visual content were among the primary internet usage purposes.

According to the mean scores of the hedonic and utilitarian qualities of each most purchased product in online shopping; books, magazines and stationery, technological products (computer, camera, mobile phone etc), banking services, travel tickets (bus and plane) and home appliances have been recognized as the "Utilitarian Products" by both men and women as the mean score of their utilitarian qualities was higher than the mean score of the hedonic qualities. However, according to the mean score of the hedonic qualities of each product category, event tickets (cinema, theatre etc), cosmetics and personal care products, sports equipment, film, music CD/DVD, jewellery (necklace, ring, bracelet etc) and accessories (bag, watch, glasses etc) have been recognized as "Hedonic Product" by both men and women as the mean score of their hedonic qualities was higher than mean the scores of the utilitarian qualities. Mean scores of clothes and shoes category showed that these products were considered as the "hedonic products" by women and "utilitarian products" by men.

When the mean scores of the hedonic and utilitarian qualities of each most purchased product category were compared according to the genders, there was a statistically significant difference between the genders in terms of both hedonic and utilitarian qualities of books, magazines and stationery, event tickets (cinema, theatre etc), cosmetics and personal care products, film, music CD/DVD, clothes and shoes, jewellery (necklace, ring, bracelet etc) and accessories (bag, watch, glasses etc) and only in hedonic values of souvenirs and ornaments, travel tickets (bus and plane) home appliances and women had a higher mean value than men in products that display statistically significant difference between genders. Ceylan's (2007) study revealed that consumers have been rather focused on the hedonic qualities of clothing, food and electronic goods product categories. In this context, the findings of our study differed from the findings of Ceylan's study.

If the most common problems encountered in online shopping were compared according to genders; the significant problems for women were "delayed delivery of order", "display of stock-out products" and "product return and the order cancellation", while men considered the "financial security issues", "product return and order cancellation" and "misinformation" as the most significant problems. Taking actions to eliminate the problems encountered by the male and female consumers might enhance the customer satisfaction of the companies remarkably.



The advantages of online shopping were found the same for both genders. These advantages have been listed as convenient price, time saving, product range, convenience and comfort. The convenient price was at the top of the list of advantages, which showed price sensitivity of the consumers. This finding might be the result of the fact that participants were predominantly from the middle or lower income group. Businesses take income factor into consideration at the market sectioning, and considering this sensitivity while determining online sales prices is in their interest.

Considering the point that there have been more international studies on hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations; this study has been expected to shed light on the future studies, as its findings would be suitable for determining hedonic and utilitarian online shopping motivations and studying the hedonic and utilitarian qualities of product groups in terms of demographic features of consumers.

Designing product qualities according to hedonic-utilitarian classification of most purchased products in online shopping by men and women would certainly provide new opportunities and advantages for businesses. Considering the changing shopping style and value attributed to shopping, the study of shopping motivations in terms of socio-demographic features would guide both practitioners and academicians on future studies of online shopping.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This article has been the extended version of the declaration named “Study of Gender Factor in Online Product Preferences and Shopping Motivations” presented in Osmaneli International Congress of Social Sciences.

References

- Altunisik, R. and Calli, L. (2004). Impulse Buying Shopping and Hedonic Consumption A Research on Behavioral Behaviors: Information Use in the Decision of Procurement, 3. National Information, Economics and Management Congress, Eskisehir, 25-26 November, 231-240.
- Anderson, C. (1997). Survey of Electronic Commerce: In Search of The Perfect Market The Economist, 343, 3-5.
- Armagan, E. A. and Turan, A. H. (2014). Internet Shopping: The Effect Of Demographic Factors And Individual Requirements: An Empirical Assesment, Ataturk University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 28 (3): 1-22.
- Arnould, M. J. and Reynolds, K. E. (2003). Hedonic Shopping Motivations, Journal of Retailing, 79(2):77-95.
- Aydin, A. E. (2013). A Research on Factors Effect The Hedonic and Utilitarian Value Attached to The Products, Unpublished Master Thesis, Mugla, Muga Sitki Kocman University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Babacan, M. (2001). Reflection on Hedonic Consumption and Special Days Shopping, 6. National Marketing Congress Proceedings Book, 97-106.

- Babin, B. J., Darden, W. R. and Griffin, M. (1994). Work and/or Fun: Measuring Hedonic and Utilitarian Shopping Value, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20(4): 644-656.
- Batra, R. and Ahtola, O. T. (1990). Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Sources of Consumer Attitudes, *Marketing Letters*, 2(2):159-17.
- Bellman, S., Lohse, G. and Jhonson, E. (1999). Predictors of Online Buying Behavior, *Communication for the ACM*, 42(12), 32-38.
- Bland, J. M. and Altman, D. G. (1997). *Statistics Notes: Cronbach's Alpha*, *Bmj*, 314:572.
- Burke, R. R. (2002). Technology and Consumer Interface: What Consumers Want in the Physical and Virtual Store” *Journal of The Academy of Marketing Science*, 30 (5): 411-432.
- Cakmak, A. Ç. and Cakir, M. (2012). Hedonic Consumption Behaviours of the Young People Aged 12-18: A Research in the City Center of Kocaeli, *Journal of History, Culture and Art Research*, 1 (4): 171-189.
- Cardoso, P.R. and S.C. Pinto (2010). Hedonic and Utilitarian Shopping Motivations among Portuguese Young Adult Consumers, *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 38(7):538-558.
- Celik, S. (2009). *Hedonic and Benefit Consumption*, Istanbul, Derin Publications.
- Ceylan, C. (2007). *An Investigation on The Reasons of Hedonic Consumption*, Unpublished Master Thesis, Erzurum, Ataturk University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Chen, M. H., Lee, H. H., Tsai, K. M and Lin, L. S. W. (2008). Ceating Values for Online Shoppers. *International Conference on Business and Information*, South Korea, Seoul: Academy of Taiwan Information Systems Research, 7-9 July, 5.1: <http://ibacnet.org/bai2008> (02.09.2014).
- Childers, T. L., Carr, L. C., Peck, J. and Carson, S. (2001). Hedonic and Utilitarian Motivations for Online Retail Shopping Behavior, *Journal of Retailing*, 77:511-535.
- Davis, R., Lang, B. and Diego, J. S. (2014). How Gender Affects The Relationship Between Hedonic Shopping Motivation and Purchase Intentions?, *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 13(1): 18-30.
- Demirel, H. (2010). Views of University Students About Online Shopping, *Gazi University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 12 (3): 119-134.
- Dhar, R. and Wertenbroch, K. (2000). Consumer Choice between Hedonic and Utilitarian Goods, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 37(1):60-71.
- Dogan, H. G., Gurler, A. Z. and Agcadag, D. (2014). Evaluation of Effective Factor to Hedonic Consumption Habits (Tokat Province Case), *The Journal of International Social Research*, 7 (30): 69-77.
- Dogrul, U. (2012). The Effect of Utilitarian and Hedonic Motivations on Electronic Shopping Behavior, *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4 (1): 321-331.
- Dundar, S. and Yoruk, D. (2009). The Factors Affecting Consumers' Attitudes towards Online Shopping, *Economics, Business and Finance*, 24 (278): 92-109.
- Enginkaya, E. (2006). Electronics Retailing and Electronics Shopping, *Ege Academic Review*, 6 (1): 10-16.



- Fettahlioglu H. S., Yildiz A. and Birin C. (2014). Hedonic Consumption Behaviors: A Comparative Analysis of The Effects of Demographic Factors on Hedonic Shopping Behaviours of The Students At Kahramanmaraş Sutcu Imam University And Adiyaman University, *International Journal of Social Science*, 27: 307- 331.
- Grewal, D., Iyer, G. R. and Levy, M. (2004). Internet Retailing: Enablers, Limiters and Market Consequences, *Journal of Business Research*, 57:703-713.
- Guido, G. (2006). Shopping Motives, Big Five Factors, And The Hedonic/Utilitarian Shopping Value: An Integration and Factorial Study, *Innovative Marketing*, 2(2):57-67.
- Guler, B. (2013). Factors That Determine E-Customers' Hedonic Consumption Behaviors and A Survey, Unpublished Master Thesis, Istanbul: Galatasaray University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Hae-Sook, K. (2005). The Types of Clothing Shopping Value and The Classification of Consumer Group By Shopping Values, *Journal of Fashion Business*, 9(6):126-140.
- Hasan, B. (2010). Exploring Gender Differences in Online Shopping Attitude, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26:597-601.
- Hirschman, E. C. and Holbrook, M. B. (1982). Hedonic Consumption: Emerging Concepts, Methods and Propositions, *Journal of Marketing*, 46(2):92-101.
- Horrigan, J. B. and Raini, L. (2002). Getting Serious Online: Pew Internet and American Life Project, March 3. www.pewinternet.org (17.09.2014)
- Izgi, B. B. and Sahin, I. (2013). Electronic Retail Sector and Internet Shopping Consumer Behavior: The Case of Turkey, *Journal of Economics and Management Research*, 2 (1): 9-27.
- Jarvenpaa S., Peter, L. and Todd, A. (1996). Consumer Reactions to Electronic Shopping on the World Wide Web, *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 1(2):59-88.
- Jarvenpaa, S. L. and Todd, P. A. (1997). Is There a Future for Retailing on The Internet? In Robert A. Peterson (ed.) *Electronic Marketing and The Consumer*, 139-154.
- Jarvenpaa, S.L., Tractinsky, N. and Vitale, M. (2000). Consumer Trust in an Internet Store, *Information Technology and Management*, (1):45-77.
- Johnson, D. (1998). Who's on the Internet and Why. *Futurist*, 32(6):11-12.
- Jones, M. A., Reynolds, K. E. and Arnould, M. J. (2006). Hedonic and Utilitarian Shopping Value: Investigating Differential Effects on Retail Outcomes, *Journal of Business Research*, 59:974-981.
- Khan U., Dhar, R. and Wertenbroch, K. (2005). A Behavioral Decision Theory Perspective on Hedonic and Utilitarian Choice, S. Ratneshwar, ve D. G. Mick (ed.), *Inside Consumption Consumer Motives, Goals, and Desires*, 144-165.
- Kim, H. S. (2006). Using Hedonic and Utilitarian Shopping Motivations to Profile Inner City Consumers, *Journal of Shopping Center Research*, 13(1):57-79.
- Kim, S. Y. and Lim, Y. J. (2001). Consumers Perceived Importance of and Satisfaction with Internet Shopping, *Electronic Markets*, 11(3):148-154.
- Kircova, I. (2008). *Internet Marketing*, 4th Edition. Istanbul, Beta Publishing Distribution.
- Kirgiz, A. (2014). Hedonism A Consumer Disease of The Modern Age: Gender and Hedonic Shopping In Turkey, *Global Media Journal: TR Editon*, 4(8):200-212.



- Koker, N. E. and Maden, D. (2012). Perceptions of the Consumer on Product Based Innovation in the Context of Hedonic and Utilitarian Consumption: An Empirical Research, *Journal of Business Research-Turk*, 4 (2): 94-121.
- Kop, A. E. (2008). A Practise about Hedonic and Utilitarian Consumption in Consumer Behavior, Unpublished Master Thesis, Istanbul, Marmara University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Korgaonkar, P. and Wolin, L. D. (2002). Web Usage, Advertising And Shopping: Relationship Patterns, *Internet Research*, 12(2):191-204.
- Kotler, P. (2002). *Guru Talking*, Istanbul, Capital Publications.
- Li, N. and Zhang, P. (2002). Consumer Online Shopping Attitudes and Behavior: An Assessment of Research, *Eight Americas Conference on Information Systems*, 74:508-517.
- Malhotra, N. K. (1996), *Marketing Research. An Applied Orientation*, Second Edition. New Jersey, Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Mariotti, S. and Sgobbi, F. (2001). Alternative Paths for The Growth of E-Commerce, *Futures*, 33:109-125.
- Nielsen, A. (2008). Trends in Online Shopping a Global Nielsen Consumer Report, February.
- O' Brien, H. L. (2010). The Influence of Hedonic and Utilitarian Motivations on User Engagement: The Case of Online Shopping Experiences, *Interacting With Computers: Special Issue on User Experience*, 22(5):344-352.
- Odabasi, Y. and G. Baris. (2002). *Consumer Behavior*, Istanbul, MediaCat Kitapları.
- Overby, J. W. and Lee, E. J. (2006). The Effects of Utilitarian and Hedonic Online Shopping Value on Consumer Preference and Intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 59: 1160–1166.
- Ozdemir, S. ve Yaman, F. (2007). A Research on the Differentiation of Hedonic Shopping by Gender, *Eskisehir Osmangazi University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 2 (2): 81- 91.
- Palumbo, F. and Herbig, P. (1998). International Marketing Tool, The Internet. *Intustrial Managements Data Systems*, 98(6):253-261.
- Peterson, R. A., Balasubramanian, S. and Bronnenberg, B. J. (1997). Exploring The Implications Of The Internetfor Consumer Marketing, *Journal of The Academy of Marketing Science*, 25:329-348.
- Sengun, H.I. and Karahan, M. (2013). Hedonic Consumption Habits And The Causes That Consumer's Motivating Such Habits, *University of Dicle Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 2 (4): 13-26.
- Sheth, J. N., Newman, B. I. and Gross, B. L. (1991). *Consumption Values and Market Choices: Theory and Applications*, Cincinnati, Ohio, South-Western Publishing Co.
- Solomon, M. R. (2006). *Consumer Behavior Buying, Having and Being*, 7th Edition, New Jersey: Prentice Hall International Editions.
- Spangenberg, E. R., Voss, K. E. and Crowley, A. E. (1997). Measuring The Hedonic And Utilitarian Dimensions of Attitude: A Generally Applicable Scale, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 24:235 241.



- Teo, T. S. H. (2006). To Buy or Not To Buy Online: Adopters And Non-Adopters of Online Shopping In Singapore, *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 25(6): 497-509.
- Thompson, S. and Teo, H. (2002). Attitudes toward Online Shopping and The Internet Behaviour, *Information Technology*, 21(4):259-271.
- To, P. L., Liao, C. and Lin, T. H. (2007). Shopping Motivations on Internet: A Study Based on Utilitarian and Hedonic Value, *Technovation*, 27:774-787.
- Topaloglu, C. (2009). Shopping Motivations which Affect The Consumer Behaviour: An Application on Online Shopping, Unpublished Master Thesis, Kocaeli, Gebze Institute of Technology, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Turan, H. (2008). Factors Effecting Online Shopping Behaviors: A Model Suggestion with Extended Technology Acceptance Model, *Academic Informatics 2008 Conference Proceedings*, Jan 30-Feb 1, 723-731, Canakkale, Turkey.
- Turkish Statistical Institute (TUIK) (2018). Household Information Technology Use Research. Newsletter, Issue: 27819, 08 August. <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=24862> (20.10.2018).
- Unal, S. and Ceylan, C. (2008). Reasons to Reach Consumers Hedonic Shopping: A Comparative Study in Istanbul and Erzurum Provinces, *Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 22 (2): 265-283.
- Usta, R. (2006). A Research on The Consumers' Demographic Characteristics And Buying Behaviour on Internet, *Third Sector Social Economic Review* 41(3):1-13.
- Vijayasarathy, L. R. and Jones, J. M. (2000). Intentions to Shop Using Internet Catalogues: Exploring The Effects of Product Types, Shopping Orientations, and Attitudes Toward Computers. *Electronic Markets*, 10(1):29-38.
- Wen, H. J., Chen, H.-G. and Hwang, H.-G.,(2001). E-Commerce Web Site Design Strategies and Models, *Information Management & Computer Security*, 9(1): 5-12.
- Westbrook, A. R. and Black, W. C. (1985). A Motivation-Based Shoppen Typology, *Journal of Retailing*, 61(1):78-103.
- Yayla, K. (2010). New Approaches of Internet Marketing: Impacts of Online Social Networks to Purchase Behavior of University Students, Unpublished Master Thesis, Manisa, Celal Bayar University, Institute of Social Sciences.

