

---

## THE EFFECT OF HEDONIC AND UTILITARIAN MOTIVES ON CONSUMER BEHAVIOR: A COMPARISON STUDY BETWEEN TURKISH AND SPANISH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

İbrahim Arısal<sup>a</sup> Yavuz Cömert<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Mustafa Kemal University, Hatay, 31060, Turkey, [arisal44@hotmail.com](mailto:arisal44@hotmail.com) (corresponding author)

<sup>b</sup>Inonu University, Malatya , 44280, Turkey, [yavuz.comert@inonu.edu.tr](mailto:yavuz.comert@inonu.edu.tr)

### ABSTRACT

**T**his article examines the influence of hedonic and utilitarian motives on consumer behavior and comparison of two cultures that have different systems on hedonic and utilitarian behaviors. The study has been conducted on randomly selected students from both Huelva University (Spain) and Mustafa Kemal University (Turkey). Moreover, the effects of various demographic variables on hedonic and utilitarian motives of countries have been searched. The data that are collected by using one of the quantitative research models, descriptive survey model have been analyzed by using ANOVA, independent groups T-Test. As a data collection tool, attitude scale for hedonic and utilitarian motives has been used. By collecting data from the participants as gender, age, income and demographic information like the place they live, whether hedonic and utilitarian motives have effects on those demographic variables have also been analyzed. At the end of the study, differences have been found between the students in Turkey and Spain on hedonic and utilitarian motives and those differences vary according to age, gender, the place students live, and their income. It was resulted that Turkish students' hedonic and utilitarian motivations are higher than Spanish students. This result shows a reverse portray upon the less developed countries' higher attitudes on those characteristics in consumption

**Keywords:** Hedonic Motives, Utilitarian Motives, Spanish and Turkish Consumer, Consumer Behavior.

## 1. Introduction

The etymology of the word "motivation" derives from a verb which is called as "movere" the meaning of which is "to move" in Latin (Wilkie, 1990). In literature it is revealed as a dynamic meaning on being ready to perform something. In a scientific definition, Jones (1955) has defined that: motivation is associated with how behavior gets started, is energized, maintained, directed and ended. Therefore, motivation is the basis of all consumer activities (McClelland 1987, 4). When a need arises, for the consumer, there are the two types of motivation.

Basically, rational (utilitarian) and emotional (hedonic) motivations are efficient in consumer buying decision. Previous researches have also supported the opinion that Consumer behavior is affected by hedonic and utilitarian motivations (Babin, Darden, Griffin, & Darden, 1994; Batra & Ahtola, 1990; Dhar & Wertenbroch, 2000; Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982; Jones, Reynolds, & Arnold, 2006). In the past, the researches on consumer behavior focused that consumers would make rational preferences; it was assumed that consumers have acted upon utilitarian motives and functional objectives. This traditional approach under the influence of the information processing view has been increasingly questioned by subsequent studies. Unregarded aspects in the traditional opinion are fantasies, feelings, and fun as is called the experiential view (Holbrook & Hirschman, 1982). Hence, besides utilitarian aspect of consumption as a work mentality, it has gained importance hedonic dimension of consumer behavior related to the multi-sensory, fantasy and emotive sights (Hirschman & Holbrook 1982, 92).

The study investigate whether there are differences in hedonic and utilitarian motives between the countries based on demographic variables. Especially, based on the suggestions of previous empirical studies, it was aimed to investigate the situation in terms of different cultures. In this respect, this research paper firstly represents the research hypotheses for Turkish and Spanish consumers about the issue, and then defines and uses the proper method and techniques that are used for data collection and analysis in which the results to be discussed. Finally, we will complete the discussion of the findings, stating the limitations of the performed study and suggesting the proposals for future research.

## 2. Review of Literature

The review of the existing literature on hedonic and utilitarian motives reveals that there was a limited research performed on the cross-cultural comparison study. Therefore, this study compares the levels of hedonic and utilitarian motives in Spain and Turkey.

A case study was performed for the student profiles in these countries. There are several reasons on choosing young consumers who are located in Spain and Turkey, and using them as sample. Firstly, European Union member status of Spain and Turkey's political and economic aims on the possible membership status gave us a high interest on investigation.

Table 1. Basic Indicators of Spain and Turkey

	Population (Million)	Per Capita Income (\$ )	Life Expectancy (Year)	Women's Participation In Labor Force (%)	Household Final Consumption Expenditure (%)
Turkey	75,8	10.970	75	32	3,8
Spain	47,2	29.920	82	68	-2,0

Resource: (World Bank; IMF 2014)

Different social, economic and political structures are seen for Turkey and other developed countries in Europe, and these are also reflected on consumption practices of consumers who located in these countries. Both Turkey and Spain are economically, demographically and culturally different countries. Table 1 also shows that, on some indicators, Turkey is at lower level than Spain. In particular if it is considered that these indicators are reflected directly or indirectly in consumer behavior and this diversity will be seen more significant through motivations.

### *2.1. Development of Hypothesis*

When analyzing the literature and discussions on consumer behavior, Holbrook and Hirschman (1982) focused differently on consumer experience as a phenomenon. Consumer behavior was approached through fantasies, feelings, and fun beyond conventional approach. In consumer researches, the issues such as “symbolic meanings”, “hedonic responses”, aesthetic criteria (Holbrook & Hirschman, 1982) and “consumer passion” (Belk, Ger, & Askegaard, 2003) are increasingly important.

In Ger et al.’s (1993) study, how consumption desires change over two countries (Roman and Turkey) was investigated. In this study, it was found that both Romanians and Turkish had high consumption desires and also speedily increased consumer desires, confusions, and frustrations. Especially these desires and confusions were concentrated on goods and services that contain impact of Western or globalization in developing countries. Ger and colleagues (1993) uttered “They feel excluded from the world and want to belong. The way to close this gap is to consume as the more modern world does.” Similar to Khare's (2011) study on university students in India, it appears that the youths might appear to confirm Western values in terms of preferring branded products but “Indian cultural values still play a significant role in their lifestyle and brand meanings.” (Khare 2011, 374).

By considering the influence of culture on consumers' preference for hedonic/utilitarian motives, it may be convenient to investigate more different/distant parts of the World. For instance, Lim and Ang (2008) examined the effects of cultural conditioning on hedonic/utilitarian consumption between Shanghai (China) and Singapore. Their findings revealed that consumers in Shanghai were affected by utilitarian motives rather than hedonic, they paradoxically sighted that the utilitarian products are more complicated, more exciting and friendlier than hedonic products. On the other hand, no difference was realized among Singaporeans.

At present, how is virtually conditioned in terms of the influence of a country's culture on consumers' preference for hedonic/utilitarian motives has become an important question. For this respect, choosing a proper sampling pattern for different countries in a scientific comparison is vital to enrich the literature. Indeed, the economic ties, aims and different levels might be basic clues on this. Therefore, we are willing to compare a developing country and a western developed country under the influence of globalization in this research.

Based on these arguments hypotheses are anticipated that:

*H1: There is a significant difference between Turkish consumers and Spanish consumers in terms of hedonic motivation and utilitarian scores.*

*H1a: The effects of hedonic motives are more in Turkish consumers than Spanish consumers.*

*H1b: The effects of utilitarian motives are more in Turkish consumers than Spanish consumers.*

There are substantially demographic and economic differences between the two countries. Specially, the impact of demographics is also the focus of this study, so we include demographics in the analysis. When we look at the previous researches on the influence of demographic variables, Kim (2006) has examined the inner city consumers being located in the USA by examining their hedonic and utilitarian motivations behind shopping. Findings indicated that the inner city consumers were affected by higher hedonic motivations than the non-inner city consumers for shopping.

When analyzed the impact of gender in relation with the hedonic and utilitarian shopping in literature, many studies state that females are more likely to shop for hedonic reasons than males, considering females are more emotional than males characteristically. For instance, Arnold and Reynolds (2003) indicate that females highlight hedonic value more than males and have stronger hedonic shopping motivations. Avello et al.'s (2010) study has examined urban working women located in Spain in terms of time-style and the hedonic motivations. The study has emerged urban working women into three distinct groups as efficient, erratic and pragmatic. All of them want to have an experience but the nature of this experience is different among groups. For instance, in this study, the members of efficient groups (28.8 %) view that "They love going shopping and enjoy the experience. They feel completely at home when shopping." (Avello et al. 2010, 141). Babacan's (2001) study similarly emerged that female consumers had higher hedonic motivations for shopping than male consumers in Turkey. As seen in Turkey, Spain and other countries, it can be inferred from the findings of previous researches that women have an important role at the shopping and consumption decisions. For instance, seventy percent of purchases in shopping centers are made by women in Spain (Avello et al., 2010). Women consist of 54.5 % of daily shopping in Turkey (Turkstat, 2014).

As considered the impact of income level (Veblen, 1899), in "The theory of leisure class" noted that all communities, even in the poorest groups, haven't entirely given up the emotional and visible side of consumption, throughout history. Allard et al.'s (2009) research, which examined the relationship between income matters and shopping malls' hedonic and utilitarian orientations, they found that low-income customers have a propensity to be appealed by the hedonic dimension of shopping. Meanwhile, high-income customers are more attracted by the utilitarian dimension of shopping. Interestingly, low-income consumers are more sensitive to the hedonic dimension of the mall than the ones with high-income (Allard, Babin, & Chebat, 2009). Teller et al.'s (2008) study also found that hedonists are represented by earn lower individual incomes.

As viewed the influence of age, there are differences between young adult consumers and elderly consumers in terms of effect of hedonic and utilitarian motives. Drolet et al. (2007) found that "elderly consumers (age 65 plus) had more favorable attitudes toward affective rational ads, in contrast, young adult consumers (age 18–25) favored affective ads only for hedonic products". Kim's (2006) study also emerged similar findings that consumers over 35 years of age are regarded functional shoppers related the utilitarian shopping motivations. In contrast, a very small percentage of shoppers in the 18 to 25 year age group were economic shoppers (8%) (Kim, 2006). As one grows older, functional or economical shoppers related the utilitarian shopping motivations may occur.

Based on the literature, the following hypothesis is proposed:

*H2: Gender, age, income, occupation (rural/urban) and religion affect hedonic and utilitarian motivations at shopping.*

Specifically, the following hypotheses will be tested:

*H2a: Females have higher hedonic motivations than males.*

*H2b: Age will be positively related to utilitarian motivations*

*H2c: Income level will be positively related to utilitarian motivations*

*H2d: Urban students have higher hedonic motivations than rural students*

*H2e: The level of religious will be negatively related to hedonic motivations*

Hedonic and utilitarian motives are two distinct components for consumer behavior (Batra & Ahtola, 1990). While hedonic motives are related to emotional value through the experiences of fun, fantasy and playfulness, utilitarian motives and those are described as rational and concerned with functional values such as tangible qualities, performance, durability etc. (Babin et al., 1994; Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982). In this respect, many prior researchers also investigated to associate with utilitarian values and hedonic values in consumption behavior. On the first sight, it seems to have inversely a correlation between utilitarian and hedonic motivations. Hence, previous studies found a negative relation between hedonic and utilitarian value (Batra & Ahtola, 1990; Wang, Chen, Chang, & Zheng, 2000). However another study on consumers of two restaurants in Iranian, Hanzae and Khonsari's (2011) findings have emerged a strong and meaningful positive relation between hedonic and utilitarian value. Thus, based on previous researches, it may be inferred consumers are affected by both hedonic and utilitarian motivation, which have influence on their buying, and they may not be sharply different through two components, because of economically different research cases.

Hence, the following hypothesis is tested:

*H3: The hedonic motivation will be negatively associated with the utilitarian motivations.*

*H4: The hedonic motivation will be positively associated with the brand effect.*

### 3. Research Methodology

#### 3.1. Data collection

Existing scale is utilized in the questionnaire instrument in the research. The study was administered by delivering the questionnaire to respondents, random sampling techniques were used. The data for the study were collected from university students located in Hatay (Turkey) and Huelva (Spain). The survey instrument was firstly developed in Turkish and then translated from Turkish into Spanish by an expert on Spanish language. The students were requested to participate in the survey Samples of 371 Turkish and 167 Spanish university students were respectively surveyed during, the spring semester of 2013-2014. Data were collected by using survey technique on the main campus of Mustafa Kemal University (Turkey) and Huelva University (Spain)

#### 3.2. Measurement

This study uses the scale developed by Babin et al. (1994), Arnold and Reynolds (2003), and Wang et al. (2000) in order to understand whether Turkish and Spanish university students' hedonic/utilitarian motivations are changed by the lifestyle variables which influence their attitudes about consumption Then the questionnaires consisted a total of 29 items. "Hedonic" factors were measured on a twelve-item scale through the scales developed by Arnold and Reynolds (2003). Five-items were utilized from the scale by (Babin et al., 1994) was developed to measure "utilitarian" factor. Eight statements were formed to measure "Brand effect" on hedonic and utilitarian motivations. It was utilized from the scales developed by Wang and colleagues (2008). The rest of the items in the questionnaire were added to measure different factors (religion, social media etc.) on hedonic and utilitarian motivations. For instance, the religion, which included the items such as "I am a religious person", was also used. The last part included demographic variables such as gender, age, occupation, and income status. The respondents were asked to indicate their attitudes on a five-point Likert-type scale with 5 being "strongly agree" and 1 being "strongly disagree."

### 4. Findings and Results

#### 4.1. Characteristics of Sample

In total, 371 Turkish and 167 Spanish university students were surveyed. Table 2 provides Summary of Demographic Characteristics of Respondents in both countries.

Table 2. Summary of Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

		Turkey		Spain	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Gender	Female	222	60.7	87	52.7
	Male	144	39.3	77	46.7
Income	Very Low	11	3.1	5	3.0
	Low	26	7.3	15	9.1
	Middle	289	80.7	126	76.8
	High	18	5.0	18	11.0
	Very High	14	3.9	-	-
The Residence Of Respondents' Family	Rural	73	20.1	12	7.3
	Urban	290	79.9	152	92.1
Age	16-19	86	24	31	19
	20-23	239	66	88	54
	24-27	28	8	28	17
	27-30	5	1	8	5
	Above 31	2	1	8	5

As can be seen in Table 2, among the Turkish respondents, the female-to-male ratio (60.7; 39.3), and the Spanish respondents of whom 52.7 percent were female and 46.7 percent were male. The percentage of women was higher than man in both countries. The percentage of income segment was predominantly ranged middle class for both countries (Turkish: 80.7%; Spanish: 76.8%). The residence of respondents' family was largely inhabited in urban. (Turkish 79.9%; Spanish: 92.1%). The respondents intensely ranged in age between 20 and 23 years. The average age of all the respondents was found 21.7.

#### *4.2. Analysis*

The factor analysis was used for testing twenty-three variables to find the relationships among the different variables. It is required to test the Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) as a measure of sampling adequacy for the attitude variables, Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) was found as 0.833 that is high values of the Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) measure for sampling adequacy to indicate that conducting factor analysis on the data is adequate. The Bartlett Test for Sphericity (BTS) was 4494.234 and the level of significance is  $p=0.000$ . Accordingly, these results indicate that it is appropriate to make factor analysis for the data in the scale. The factors were extracted to analyze the scree plot graphs the eigenvalue against the factor number. As the scree plot graphs, from the third factor, it consisted that the line is almost flat. In this way, three factors were seen in an eigenvalue equal. These factors were labeled “hedonic” “utilitarian” and “brand effect”. Given these overall indicators, factor analysis was conducted with all twenty-five items. As shown in Table 3, all of the items had primary factor loadings greater than .33.

Table 3. The Factor Loading Matrix for the Measure

Items	Hedonic	Utilitarian	Brand effect
I find shopping stimulating	.734		
When I'm in a down mood, I go shopping to make me feel better	.729		
I go shopping when I want to treat myself to something special	.710		
To me, shopping is an adventure	.693		
I enjoy shopping for my friends and family	.692		
I enjoy shopping around to find the gift for someone	.639		
I go shopping to see what new products are available	.618		
I go shopping to keep up with the trends and the new fashions	.584		
I enjoy socializing with others when I shop	.450		
I go shopping to experience new things that have not been tried by other people before.	.424		
I enjoy looking for discounts when I shop	.408		
I would like to try different brands rather than always use the same brand.	.347		
If I use the products of a famous brand, I gain self-confidence		.749	
To buy branded products, I can pay more		.709	
I'd like to see the branded products' logo on me		.685	
It is worth buying a foreign brand product although it is more expensive than a domestic brand product.		.684	
I'd like to share the branded products I bought on social media		.622	
I like better a foreign branded product than a domestic branded product		.542	
It is more likely for me to buy branded product after I watched the ads		.493	
The most of branded products I use, I think, is fun		.481	
While shopping, I found just the item(s) I was looking for			.739
During shopping, I only buy the things that I have planned			.699
I enjoy for bargains when I shop			.444
After shopping, I can regret for things that I bought			.368

Note. Factor loadings < .3 are suppressed

Primarily, for these factors, it is necessary to find that Cronbach's alpha coefficients of which is proper to test reliability technique for Likert-type scales. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient normally ranges between 0 and 1. "The closer Cronbach's alpha coefficient is to 1.0 the greater the internal consistency of the items in the scale"(Gliem & Gliem, 2003). The first factor was labeled as Hedonic. This Hedonic factor contained twelve items, relating to the effect of hedonic motivation on consumer behavior. The Cronbach's alpha for Hedonic factor accounts for 0.847, the second factor was labeled as "utilitarian", contained five items. The Cronbach's alpha for utilitarian factor accounts for 0.602. The last factor was termed as "brand effect". This factor contained eight items, relating to the effect of brand on hedonic and utilitarian motivation in consumer behavior. The Cronbach's alpha for brand effect factor accounts for 0,790. As viewed in all of the measure, The Cronbach's alpha coefficient is 0,831 for twenty-five items.

### 4.3. Results

In order to test H1, which postulated that there is a significantly different, the mean scores of hedonic and utilitarian motivations between Turkish and Spanish university students were compared.

Table 4. Independent Group T-Test and Descriptive Statistics for Hedonic and Utilitarian Factor

	Turkey			Spain			t	p
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N		
Hedonic	38.59	10.65	371	32.59	9.139	167	0.075	.000*
Utilitarian	14.96	4.097	371	11.48	3.040	167	0.262	.000*

\*p<0.01

Table 4 demonstrates that the presentations of t-test results are statistically significant differences between Turkish consumers and Spanish consumers in terms of hedonic and utilitarian factors. We found a significant support for H1. There are statistically significant differences between Turkish and Spanish university students in both Hedonic and utilitarian motivations scores. Results show that Turkish had higher both hedonic (M = 38.59, SD = 10.65, n = 371, p < .001) and utilitarian (M = 14.96, SD = 4.097 n = 371, p < .001) scores. That's why Turkish students tend to have a higher both hedonic and utilitarian motivations than Spanish do. In this manner, H1(a) which postulated Turkish promoted hedonic, rather than utilitarian motivations. As reported in Table 4, mean scores of Turkish respondents reported higher hedonic motivations than Spanish respondents, (MTurkey = 38.59, MSpain = 32.59, p < .001). We found support for H1(a). However, H1(b) suggested that Turkish participants promoted utilitarian rather than hedonic motivations. As viewed in Table 4 for H1b, contrary to the hypothesis, Turkish respondents reported higher utilitarian motivations than Spanish (MTurkey = 14.96, MSpain = 11.48, p < .001). Hence, H1(a) is strongly supported but H1(b) is not supported.

In order to answer H2, the impact of gender, age, income, occupation and religion (independent variables) on hedonic and utilitarian motivations (dependent variable) were determined by using independent samples t-test, one-way Anova and the Tukey HSD. H2(a) and H2(d) were assessed by using t-test, H2(b), H2(c) and H2(e) were determined by using one-way Anova and the Tukey HSD.

Table 5. Independent Group T-Test for Hedonic and Utilitarian Factor by Gender

		Turkey					Spain				
		Mean	SD	N	t	p	Mean	SD	N	t	p
Hedonic	Female	41.68	9.045	222	-7.397	.000*	36.10	8.565	88	5.723	.000*
	Male	33.78	11.26	144			28.61	8.182	77		
Utilitarian	Female	14.39	4.099	222	3.420	.001*	11,06	3,138	88	-1.963	.51
	Male	15.86	3.980	144			11,97	2,883	77		

\*p<0.001

To test H2a which predicted females have higher hedonic motivations than males. The results are reported in Table 5. Based on the results, female respondents tended to be more hedonic motivations than male respondents in both countries (Turkey Mhedonic=41.68,  $t = -7.397$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ; Spain Mhedonic=36.1,  $t=5.723$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ). Hence, H2a was supported in either country. Furthermore, based on the results of utilitarian factor, males have higher utilitarian motivations than females in only Turkish sample (Mutilatiran=15.86,  $t = 3.420$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ). This case was not found in the Spanish sample

Table 6. Results of Independent T-Test and Anova for Hedonic and Utilitarian Factor by Age, Income Religion and Residence

	Turkey								Spain							
	Age		Income		Religious		Residence		Age		Income		Religious		Residence	
	F	p	F	p	F	p	t	p	F	p	F	p	F	p	t	p
Hedonic	0.275	.005*	480	.321	.329	.681	-2.291	.023*	8.983	.018*	0.244	.333	.367	.246	.274	.713
Utilitarian	0.318	.042*	.087	.011*	.000	.487	.311	.756	3.054	.653	0.297	.190	.600	.829	-2.059	.059

\* $p < 0.05$

As for testing the others hypothesis of H2, the results are reported in Table 6. Based on results of either country, when independent variables were analyzed, we found differences among them in term of hedonic and utilitarian motivations. As for age, significant differences were also found in terms of hedonic factor in both countries. For the hedonic aspect, age groups 20-23, 23-27 and 16-19 were found to be significantly different. Also based on this difference, respondents in the age group 16-19 have higher hedonic scores as compared to other age groups. In other words, their hedonic motivation decreases as respondent's age increases. Hence, it supported the H2(b) which suggested that the age negatively affects hedonic motivations. In terms of income level, a significant relationship between income level and utilitarian factor was found in Turkey. Regarding this relationship, utilitarian scores of respondents with lower income levels were found to be higher than respondents with higher income levels. However, this is not the case in the Spanish sample. Hence, the results failed to support the H2(c). H2(d), which postulated that urban students have higher hedonic motivations than rural students was tested. As shown in Table 4, between residential environment and hedonic aspects were found to be significantly correlation in Turkey. Mean scores of respondents with urban were assessed higher than those of respondents with rural. H2d was supported for the Turkish sample. Lastly, as for the level of religious, hedonic and utilitarian aspects, there weren't found a significantly different in the two countries. Thus H2(e) wasn't supported.

H3 and H4 hypothesized that hedonic motivates should be associated with the utilitarian motivates and brand effects. H3 and H4 were tested by using The Pearson correlation coefficients among the variables.

Table 7. Correlation Matrix and Descriptive by the Pearson Correlation

	Hedonic		Utilitarian		Brand effect	
	r	p	r	p	r	p
Hedonic	-	-				
Utilitarian	0.107	0.013*	-	-		
Brand effect	0.383	0.000**	0.120	0.006*	-	-

\*p<0.005 \*\*p<0.001

The results are reported in Table 7. As for H3, Pearson correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between hedonic factor and utilitarian factor. There was a positive correlation between the two variables ( $r = 0.107$ ,  $p = 0.013$ ). But there was a low strength of correlation between hedonic factor and utilitarian factor. The results were obtained contrary to the research hypothesis (H3). Lastly, as for H4 which proposed hedonic motivation will be positively associated with brand effect, it determined that the correlation among the two variables (see Table 7). There was a positive correlation between the two variables ( $r = 0.383$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) and a middle strength of correlation between hedonic factor and brand effect. Thus H4 was supported.

## 5. Conclusions and Discussions

The study analyzed whether there are differences in hedonic and utilitarian motives between turkey and Spain based on demographic variables. When two countries are compared, they are seen as economically and culturally different. Especially, in terms of consumption experiences, there are similarities and differences between the countries which are a developing country and a western developed country and how these experiences of them change over two country types. The aim of selecting sample of our study as university students was in order to exemplify a potential market for companies and their attitude on regarding shopping that could be useful for marketers. Currently, the aim of shopping for a consumer changes from conventional to experiments progressively (Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982). The reasons of this change need to seek consumers' perception. While young consumers look forward to being understood by market's actor, the researchers would focus on the motivations underlying consumer behavior. Especially, it is important to understand how influence of motivations change in terms of different cultures. Thus, we examined in Turkey and Spain as sample. Based on past studies, these motivations are mainly divided two dimensions as hedonic and utilitarian motivation in this study. Primarily, the results of this study demonstrate that Turkish students have a higher both hedonic and utilitarian motivations than Spanish do. Based on Ger and colleagues (1993) suggestions, such difference can be expressed that consumers in Turkey as an economically developing country tend to have more consumption desires than consumers in Spain as a developed country. Regarding the demographic variables, as the results is assessed in terms of gender. Females have found to be affected from more hedonic motivations than males in both Turkey and Spain. This result supports earlier studies (Babacan, 2001). As for age, especially the 16-19 age group tend to be affected from more hedonic motivations as compared to other age groups in both samples. As respondent's age increases, hedonic motivation decreases that it can also be deduced from the findings. For Turkish sample, significantly differences were found in terms of income level and residence. Respondents with lower income levels were affected from more from utilitarian motivation than respondents with higher income levels. Results also support that urban students have higher hedonic motivations than rural students.

But this case did not occur in the Spanish sample. The reason why it can be inferred that urban/rural distinction in Turkey is seen more noticeable disparity than in Spain. The religion level has not been changed hedonic and utilitarian motivations significantly different in both countries. This study did not find a relationship between the religion level and hedonic/utilitarian motivation in both countries. If future researchers focus more on this issue by improving more detailed measures, the results may be more significant. Lastly, contrary to what is to known situation, there is a positive relationship between hedonic and utilitarian motivation which were obtained from the findings of all measure. Hanzaee and Khonsari's (2011) study has also shown the same results. Similar to Lim and Ang's (2008) study, the results indicate that although utilitarian motivations depend on functional benefits, consumer for utilitarian products can also demand for hedonic utility like excitement and sincerity. Thus marketing director should present utilitarian products with hedonic utility to improve their pleasure and esthetic aspects (Lim & Ang, 2008). Furthermore, this research demonstrated that there is a positive relationship between hedonic motivation and brand effect. This case can evaluate that consumer being affected by hedonic motivations were more sensitive about choosing branded products.

#### **6. Limitations and Future Research**

The study was conducted only on university students from two different countries. This case is limitations of the research as sample. If Future studies expand the scope of the study, a comparison among different countries, regions or older consumer can be conducted. Therefore, further research with expanded sample can understand influence of hedonic and utilitarian motives in culturally distinct market segmentations. This may present an important perspective for marketing manager and retails.

## References

1. Arnold, Mark J, and Kristy E Reynolds. 2003. "Hedonic and Utilitarian Motives." *Journal of Retailing* 79: 77–95. doi:10.1016/S0022-4359(03)00007-1.
2. Avello, Maria, Diana Gavilán, Francis Blasco, and Carmen Abril. 2010. "Hedonic Buying Motivation and Time- Style." *The International Journal of Management and Business* 1 (1): 128–49.
3. Babacan, Muazzez. 2001. "Hedonic Consumption and Effects on Special Days' Shopping." In 6. National Marketing Congress. Erzurum.
4. Babin, Barry J, William R Darden, Mitch Griffin, and R Darden. 1994. "Work And/or Fun : Shopping Measuring Value Hedonic and Utilitarian." *Journal of Consumer Research* 20 (4): 644–56. doi:0093-5301.
5. Batra, Rajeev, and Olli T Ahtola. 1990. "Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Sources of Consumer Attitudes." *Marketing Letters* 2 (2): 159–70.
6. Belk, Russell W., Güliz Ger, and Søren Askegaard. 2003. "The Fire of Desire: A Multisited Inquiry into Consumer Passion." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30 (3): 326–51.
7. Dhar, Ravi, and Klaus Wertenbroch. 2000. "Consumer Choice Between Hedonic and Utilitarian Goods." *Journal of Marketing Research* 37 (1): 60–71. doi:10.1509/jmkr.37.1.60.18718.
8. Ger, Güliz, Russell W. Belk, and Dana-Nicoleta Lascu. 1993. "The Development of Consumer Desire in Marketizing and Developing Economies: The Cases of Romania and Turkey." *Advances in Consumer Research* 20: 102–7. <http://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/7421/volumes/v20/NA-20>.
9. Gliem, Joseph a, and Rosemary R Gliem. 2003. "Calculating, Interpreting, and Reporting Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Likert-Type Scales,." 2003 Midwest Research to Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education, no. 1992: 82–88. doi:10.1109/PROC.1975.9792.
10. Hanzae, Kambiz Heidarzadeh, and Yahya Khonsari. 2011. "A Review Of The Role Of Hedonic And Utilitarian Values On Customer ' S Satisfaction And Behavioral Intentions ( A Case Study ; Customers of Fasham Restaurants )." *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business* 1 (May): 34–45.
11. Hirschman, Elizabeth C, and Morris B Holbrook. 1982. "Hedonic Consumption: Emerging Concepts, Methods and Propositions." In *Journal of Marketing*, 46:92–101. doi:10.2307/1251707.
12. Holbrook, Morris B., and Elizabeth C. Hirschman. 1982. "The Experiential Aspects of Consumption: Consumer Fantasies, Feelings, and Fun." *Journal of Consumer Research* 9 (2): 132. doi:10.1086/208906.
13. Jones, M, K Reynolds, and M Arnold. 2006. "Hedonic and Utilitarian Shopping Value: Investigating Differential Effects on Retail Outcomes." *Journal of Business Research* 59 (9): 974–81. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.03.006.
14. Khare, Arpita. 2011. "Impact of Indian Cultural Values and Lifestyles on Meaning of Branded Products: Study on University Students in India." *Journal of International Consumer Marketing* 23 (5): 365–79. doi:10.1080/08961530.2011.602953.

15. Lim, Elison Ai Ching, and Swee Hoon Ang. 2008. "Hedonic vs. Utilitarian Consumption: A Cross-Cultural Perspective Based on Cultural Conditioning☆." *Journal of Business Research* 61 (3): 225–32. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2007.06.004.
16. McClelland, David C. 1987. *Human Motivation*. 2. ed. Newyork: Cambridge University Press.
17. Turkstat. 2014. "Women in Statistics, 2014." <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=18619>.
18. Wang, Cheng-Lu, Zhen-Xiong Chen, Allan K. K. Chang, and Zong-Cheng Zheng. 2000. "The Influence of Hedonic Values on Consumer Behaviors: An Empirical Investigation in China." *Journal of Global Marketing* 14 (1): 169–86. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J042v14n01\\_09](http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J042v14n01_09).
19. Wilkie, William L. 1990. *Consumer Behavior*. 2nd ed. New York: NY: John Wiley.