EFFECT OF SHOPPING MOTIVES AND STORE ATTRIBUTES ON SHOPPING ENJOYMENT

Egi Widya Nur Iqbal
Universitas Indonesia

Rizal Edy Halim♣
Universitas Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Young shoppers frequent the growing number of malls in Jakarta, Indonesia, as places for socializing and self-actualization. As an emerging age group, young shoppers are a vital market segment. This study divides young shoppers into segments, distinguished by levels of self-esteem, extraversion, and interpersonal communication. These characteristics can be further grouped into distinct segments: social butterflies, confident techies, and self-contained shoppers. This study examines the differences among the three groups, including shopping motives, store attributes important to young shoppers, and shopping enjoyment. The study found a significant difference between segment groups. The consumer typology of youth shoppers exists on several dimensions in the variable of shopping motives, store attribute, and shopping enjoyment. As a segment, social butterfly had the highest mean on several dimensions. This was followed by the confident techies' segment and self-contained shoppers segment, respectively. Based on the results, store management can offer each segment group different treatments in its marketing activities. The study also presents the most significant influencing dimensions of shopping enjoyment in order to explain youth shopping: anticipated utility, enhancement, and price orientation.

Keywords: Consumers Typology; Shopping Enjoyment; Shopping Motives; Young Shoppers.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since 2010, the number of malls or shopping centers in Jakarta, Indonesia, has rapidly increased. With more than 170 malls, Jakarta is one of the world's largest cities with the largest number of shopping malls. According to Cushman and Wakefield's Global Cities Retail Guide 2013–2014, retail space in Jakarta has reached approximately 4 million square meters. Changes in lifestyle due to globalization have fostered a consumption-orientated lifestyle among the urban youth. There is a wide range of products offered to consumers. Product information conveyed through advertising, promotions, or direct selling has become more varied and intense, supported by sophisticated technologies. Moreover, youth affluence, as reflected in rising income and expenses, has increased compared to levels in 2011. For example, in 2011, only 28% of Indonesian teenagers had an income of 3.5 million IDR. By 2013, that number had risen to 57% (Marketeers, 2013).

♣ Corresponding author: Department of Economics, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Indonesia, Depok 16424, West Java, Indonesia; e-mail: rizaledy@gmail.com

According to Consumer Survey Indonesia research, a mall visitor stays an average of 3.5 hours and spends approximately 194,500 IDR during each visit. This equates to 10,921,000 IDR per person per year. The amount of money spent varies dramatically based on age. Students spend an average of 160,000 IDR per visit compared with 337,000 IDR spent by the 36–40 year-old group. However, spending decreases to approximately 177,000 IDR for the over-40 group. Interestingly, only about 10% of mall visitors come alone. The remaining 90% go with friends (51%) or with family (39%). Clearly, malls no longer serve only as places to shop.

This study focuses on young shopper segmentation in Indonesia, based on an analysis of shopping enjoyment. The study's model is adapted from work conducted by Wong, Osman, Jamaluddin, & Yin-Fah, (2012). Their research determined the strongest predictors of shopping motives and store attributes that influence shopping enjoyment. The study also examined the differences in shopping motives, store attributes, and shopping enjoyment based on gender and race. Our slightly different parameters are based on Breazeale & Lueg (2011) and their three young shopper typologies. We apply these typologies to Jakarta's young shoppers using three variables: shopping motives, store attributes, and shopping enjoyment, which were also used in Wong et al.'s 2012 research.

These three variables can influence marketers' managerial decisions (Guha, Biswas, Grewal, Bhowmick, & Nordfält, 2018; Janakiraman, Lim, & Rishika, 2018; Wong et al., 2012). We then found internal predictors (shopping motives) and external predictors (store attributes) that estimate young shoppers' enjoyment, especially among Jakarta university students.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Self-Esteem

Self-esteem, which reflects confidence and satisfaction, influences consumer behavior (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991; Halim, 2017; Sutarso, Halim, Balqiah, & Tjiptoherijanto, 2017). For adults, self-esteem significantly influences symbolic consumption and high-involvement goods (Banister Margaret K Hogg, Christopher, Lowson, & Evans, 2004). It also predicts consumers' shopping behavior (Anonymous, 1995). According to one study focused on teenagers (Darley, 1999), intrinsic motivation (shopping enjoyment) is an important variable in determining search efforts and product perception. Studies of adults conducted by Reynolds (1974) and Berkowitz, Walton, & Walker Jr (1979) found that consumer self-esteem with in-home shopping channels was higher than that of a traditional store buyer. Rosa, Garbarino, & Maker, (2006) also found that self-esteem influenced shopping choices. Furthermore, according to Chebat, Sirgy, & St-James (2006), consumers' self-esteem also affects their perceptions of retailers in the mall.

2.2. Interpersonal Communication

Interpersonal communication is an open interaction about products in a social network (Halim & Zulkarnain, 2017; Moschis & Churchill, 1978). It also a significant factor in a teenager's consumer socialization. In consumer socialization studies, most of the interpersonal communication happens in the interactions between consumers and colleagues. Feick & Price (1987) found that market experts garner the most information about retailers (including shopping channels) as compared to

other consumer categories. This information gathering often occurs via interpersonal communication. Clark & Goldsmith (2005) suggested that self-esteem has a positive relationship with market experts (Feick & Price, 1987; Zhang, Phang, Wu, & Luo, 2017).

2.3.   Extraversion

Mooradian & Swan (2006) discovered a link between dependence on interpersonal communication about products between friends and relatives and with cultural extraversion. Benet-Martínez & John (1998) defined extraversion as a personality dimension that influences activity, energy, and socialization. Costa & McCrae (1980) also linked extraversion with personal warmth, involvement with other people, and social participation. Lucas, Diener, Grob, Suh, & Shao (2000) considered extraversion as the strongest dimension of a five-factor model for consumer behavior. Although extraversion does not influence spatial behavior patterns, more extraverted consumers shop in more stores (Coshall & Potter, 1986). Students' tendency to consume compulsively is enhanced by extraversion (Mowen & Spears, 1999). Additionally, (Berkowitz et al., 1979) and Taylor, Coulter, & Coulter (1988) believe that mall shoppers have a special experience when they are with other buyers.

2.4.   Breazeale and Lueg's Consumer Typology

Labels (such as cool, geek, and hottie) are often used by teenagers to give themselves an identity and to impress their friends. Marketers need to capture and segment today's youth market because teenagers become future adult consumers. Breazeale & Lueg (2011) proposed a psychographic retail shopping typology of American teens' retail-channel preferences based on levels of self-esteem, extraversion, and interpersonal communication. The interpersonal communications are made between peer and relatives and the young shoppers in malls or on the Internet. This typology has three segments: social butterflies, confident techies, and self-contained shoppers. All segments are distinctive because they possess different levels of self-esteem, extraversion, and interpersonal communication.

2.4.1.   Social Butterflies

Teenagers categorized as social butterflies have the highest levels of extraversion and peer interpersonal communication (Breazeale & Lueg, 2011). They also possess the highest association for relative interpersonal communication at the mall (Toker-Yildiz, Trivedi, Choi, & Chang, 2017; Zhang et al., 2017). Additionally, these youth spend the most time and money in malls, and they anticipate future shopping behavior (shopping time and spending level). However, teenagers in this typology score the lowest in Internet behavior (shopping time, spending level, future shopping, and purchasing intentions). Teenagers in the social butterfly segment enjoy spending time and money in the mall. The extraversion that partially defines them also influences a brand's effect on them, which impacts their attitudes and purchase loyalty (Matzler, Bidmon, & Grabner-Kräuter, 2006). They also have a tendency to become market mavens (Brancaleone & Gountas, 2007).

2.4.2.   Confident Techies

Confident techies is another teenager consumer typology developed by Breazeale & Lueg (2011). Teenagers in this segment score the highest in self-esteem and in peer and relative Internet interpersonal communication. They also spend the most time on the Internet (shopping time, spending

level, future shopping, and purchasing intentions). They enjoy surfing the Internet and shopping online. They do not lack confidence but enjoy a greater sense of security online. Confident techies also provide opportunities for marketers because they are early adopters (Helm, 2007). They also tend to show more interpersonal communication behavior related to Internet consumption. Both of these characteristics make them an important segment for online retailers. For them, the Internet does not have the poor customer service or limited shopping options often found at traditional retail outlets. For confident techies, the Internet is a virtual mall where they can quickly pick the best retailers.

2.4.3.   *Self-Contained Shoppers*

Self-contained shoppers is another teenager consumer typology developed by Breazeale & Lueg (2011). Teenagers in this segment score the lowest in self-esteem and extraversion. The segment also scores low in peer and relative mall interpersonal communication. They spend the least amount of time and money shopping in malls. Self-contained shoppers give retailers different opportunities. Because they are less vocal about their consumption choices, these buyers are heavily affected by interpersonal communication with their colleagues or relatives. According to Sokol (2003), self-contained shoppers regard themselves as more individualistic than those in previous generations. This may result from their ability to customize their shopping options.

2.5.   **Shopping Motives**

According to Jin & Kim (2003), there are two broad categories of shopping motives: shopping for product acquisition and shopping for enjoyment. The product-acquisition motive occurs when a consumer goes to the store to acquire a product with a similar concept. This is a product-orientated, utilitarian, and extrinsic shopping motivation. Other consumers visit malls for pleasure, which is similar to hedonist experience or recreation. Shopping for enjoyment provides intrinsic and stimulating shopping motives (Guha et al., 2018; Kim & Jin, 2001).

Shopping motives refer to a consumer's internal state to fulfill needs (Kumar, Leszkiewicz, & Herbst, 2018; Westbrook & Black, 1985). Kaur & Singh (2007) suggest that while shopping motives vary, many are not related to the actual purchase of a product. Therefore, the shopping experience can be considered both a utilitarian effort focused on acquiring goods and services and a way to obtain hedonic rewards. Past studies have discovered various reasons behind a consumer's decision to shop. Some of the earliest research in this area was by Tauber (1972). Bloch, Ridgway, & Dawson (1994) identified six motives of shoppers in a mall: enjoying aesthetics; escaping from routines and boredom; exploring new products or stores; engaging with fun activities; finding new information about stores and their products; and gaining social interaction and affiliation. Roy Dholakia (1999) later proposed three dimensions of shopping motives: a utilitarian or product-orientated motive; a personal or hedonic motivation; and a social dimension, which refers to interactions with family members.

2.6.   **Store Attributes**

According to Martineau (1958), store image combines a store's functional activities with its psychological attributes. Based on this study, consumers are more likely to shop at a store with a better

image. Erdem, Ben Oumlil, & Tuncalp (1999) highlighted store image as the most significant factor in identifying retail patronage. Kim & Jin (2001) stated that as store image has multiple dimensions in nature, it should be measured using several attributes. Pan & Zinkhan (2006) believed that physical attributes are the main ingredient of store atmosphere. The atmosphere of a shop is designed to encourage and influence consumers' emotional feelings. Store attributes such as displays, lighting, music, scents, colors, helpful employees, product demonstrations, or samples can trigger a shopper's positive in-store emotions (Solomon, 2007). Lindquist (1974) categorized store attributes into nine dimensions: merchandising, service, clientele, physical facility, convenience, promotion, store atmosphere, institutional factors, and past transactions. A positive relationship exists between in-store attributes and consumers' psychological states (Kim & Jin, 2001; Kumar et al., 2018; Sherman, Mathur, & Smith, 1997).

2.7. *Shopping Enjoyment*

Shopping enjoyment has been defined as an individual personality characteristic (Bellenger & Korgaonkar, 1980; Odekerken-Schröder, De Wulf, & Schumacher, 2003). According to Babin & Darden (1996), excitement is a combination of pleasure and arousal, which increases the likelihood of unintended purchases and hedonic shopping value. Shopping enjoyment is related to transitory emotional responses such as satisfaction, excitement, and dominance (Dawson, Bloch, & Ridgway, 1990; Koufaris, Kambil, & LaBarbera, 2001). It is considered the main factor in enticing consumers to visit malls (Lemon & Verhoef, 2016). According to Babin & Darden (1996), excitement can increase consumer satisfaction with a store, increase the amount of time spent in a store, and boost spending levels. Generally, consumers who enjoy shopping tend to spend more time shopping per visit. They also generally know what they want to buy in the future. Forsythe & Bailey (1996) found that this type of consumer is more likely to shop in groups and prefers to shop at department stores. Additionally, these shoppers look for stores offering attractive decor and an interesting shopping experience.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

3.1. *Population and Sampling*

The population of the study is a young customer in Indonesia, specifically in Jakarta. The analysis unit can be either an individual or group (Trochim & Donnelly, 2006). In this study, the unit of analysis is an individual or mall student customers. The sampling technique used is purposive sampling in order to ensure that the appropriate target fulfills the research objectives.

3.2. *Measurement and Data Collection*

This study used 17 items to measure shopping motives developed by Westbrook & Black (1985) and 19 items to analyze store attributes, adopted from Bellenger, Robertson, & Greenberg (1977). It also used six items developed to measure shopping enjoyment (Sandra M; Forsythe & Lesser, 1989). These research instruments were accompanied by 26 items developed by Breazeale & Lueg (2011). Questionnaires were first tested on 40 students, a small portion of the overall sample, to verify that the respondents understood all proposed statements, whether there were any writing errors or wrong choices of words, and whether any ambiguous statements existed (Malhotra, Birks,

& Wills, 2013). In addition, a wording test was administered to see if the questionnaire was understood thoroughly by respondents in the pretest process.

The final self-administered questionnaires were distributed directly online using Google Forms. A total of 358 questionnaires were distributed to an online student community in Jakarta, and 337 questionnaires were returned (response rate 94%) by students from 32 universities in Jakarta. Validity and reliability analysis was used to identify any instrument problems, ensuring all final constructs in the study are valid and reliable.

3.3.   Analysis

The study used a cluster analysis to classify the student customers based on their self-esteem, extraversion, and interpersonal communication. Multiple regressions using the stepwise method were performed to analyze the effect of internal and external predictors, namely the effects of shopping motives and store attributes on shopping enjoyment.

4.   RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

K-means cluster analysis defined the young shoppers' typology segment, and a one-way ANOVA analysis was used to test the three variables (shopping motives, store attributes, and shopping enjoyment) in each segment. Additionally, a Pearson correlation analysis was used to look for the dimension/antecedent from shopping motives and store attributes to find which had the highest correlation with shopping enjoyment. A multiple regression using the stepwise method was also conducted to find the strongest dimension that influenced shopping enjoyment. The final sample of 337 respondents consisted of females (56.97%) and males (43.03%), with an average age of 21 years old.

4.1.   Young Shoppers' Typology

A K-means cluster analysis was used for questions about self-esteem, extraversion, and interpersonal communication taken from the three segments developed by Breazeale & Lueg (2011): social butterflies, confident techies, and self-contained shoppers. In Table 1, the social butterfly group has the highest mean for indicators of self-esteem, extraversion, and mall interpersonal communication with peers and relatives. This illustrates that the social butterfly youth group loves to "hang out" as much as to shop in the mall. Moreover, this group tends to be more sociable compared to other groups. Next, the confident techies group has the highest mean on indicators of peers and relatives Internet interpersonal communication. This shows that this segment prefers to shop online. Finally, the self-contained shoppers group has the lowest mean on each indicator. This indicates that this group takes pleasure in solitary activities and does not really like to mingle with other people when shopping. This finding confirms that different groups of customers require different marketing responses in order to meet their needs and characteristics.

Table 1: Results of the K-Means Cluster Analysis

Indicator	Cluster		
	1	**2**	**3**
	Social Butterfly	**Self-Contained Shoppers**	**Confident Techies**
	Mean	**Mean**	**Mean**
Self -esteem	4.33*	3.41	3.88
Extraversion	4.47*	3.28	4.10
Peers Mall IC	3.92*	2.05	3.63
Relatives Mall IC	3.73*	2.29	3.64
Peers Internet IC	3.50	2.04	4.22*
Relatives Internet IC	2.73	1.94	3.94*
N	184	51	102

The findings complement previous studies of customer segmentation. Landmark & Sjøbakk (2017) looked at fashion retailers using RFID. Different customer segments need different attention. For instance, personnel running the fitting room area must identify their customers in real time and deliver shop stewardship, creating a more personalized retail experience. Kabadayi & Paksoy (2016) segmented Turkish consumers based on their motives for visiting shopping centers. These segments included serious consumers, recreational consumers, enthusiast consumers, and pragmatic consumers.

4.2. *Young Shoppers' Segments: Shopping Motives, Store Attribute Preferences, and Shopping Enjoyment*

Table 2 shows that the variables of shopping motives, anticipated utility dimensions (0.000), negotiation (0.000), affiliation (0.000), and power and authority (0.013) meet the criteria. Then, based on those four dimensions, it follows that there are mean differences in each segment by the group of young shoppers. However, the dimensions of role enactment (0.156), choice optimization (0.152), and stimulation (0.284) do not meet the criteria. Therefore, we conclude that there are no mean differences in each segment of the young shoppers' group based on these three dimensions. Group differences in the dimension of anticipated utility can be summarized as follows: social butterflies and confident techies > self-contained shoppers. Moreover, the order of the difference is similar to the other three dimensions: social butterflies and confident techies > self-contained shoppers.

Table 2: Youth Shoppers Segment Differences in the Dimension of Shopping Motives

Dimension	Youth Shoppers Group	Mean	F	Sig.	Differences
Anticipated Utility	*Social Butterfly*	*4.1105*	9.090	0.000	*Social Butterfly & Confident Techies > Self-Contained Shoppers*
	Self-Contained Shoppers	3.4837			
	Confident Techies	3.9477			
Role Enactment	*Social Butterfly*	4.7192	1.870	0.156	n/a
	Self-Contained Shoppers	4.4444			

Dimension	Youth Shoppers Group	Mean	F	Sig.	Differences
	Confident Techies	4.6405			
Negotiation	*Social Butterfly*	4.1603	10.037	0.000	*Social Butterfly & Confident Techies > Self-Contained Shoppers*
	Self-Contained Shoppers	3.3922			
	Confident Techies	4.0392			
Choice Optimization	*Social Butterfly*	4.7799	1.893	0.152	n/a
	Self-Contained Shoppers	4.4804			
	Confident Techies	4.8088			
Affiliation	*Social Butterfly*	4.3732	18.572	0.000	*Social Butterfly & Confident Techies > Self-Contained Shoppers*
	Self-Contained Shoppers	3.5033			
	Confident Techies	4.3889			
Power and Authority	*Social Butterfly*	3.3478	4.436	0.013	*Social Butterfly & Confident Techies > Self-Contained Shoppers*
	Self-Contained Shoppers	2.9020			
	Confident Techies	3.4608			
Stimulation	*Social Butterfly*	4.2853	1.265	0.284	n/a
	Self-Contained Shoppers	4.0686			
	Confident Techies	4.1961			

The differences are based on Tukey HSD Post Hoc tests

The mean difference is significant at sig $\leq$ 0.05

Table 3 shows that the variables of store attributes, quality of merchandise dimension (0.002), enhancement (0.020), and price orientation (0.000) meet the criteria. Therefore, it can be concluded that according to these three dimensions, a mean difference exists for each segment of the young shoppers' group. However, since the dimensions of mall/store quality (0.022) and convenience (0.005) do not meet the criteria, there is no mean difference in each segment of the young shoppers' group. Group differences in the quality of merchandise dimension can be summed up as follows: social butterflies > confident techies > self-contained shoppers. Furthermore, the order of the difference is similar to the enhancement dimension, whose group differences are social butterflies > confident techies > self-contained shoppers. In the dimension of price orientation, group differences can be ordered as follows: social butterflies and confident techies > self-contained shoppers. This result implies that the most relevant store attribute dimensions that differentiate the youth shopper groups are quality of merchandise dimension, enhancement, and price orientation. Of these three dimensions, the social butterfly is the group with the highest mean score as compared to confident techies and self-contained shoppers, respectively (Guha et al., 2018; Lemon & Verhoef, 2016; Toker-Yildiz et al., 2017).

Table 3: Youth Shoppers Segment Differences in the Dimension of Store Attribute

Dimension	Youth Shoppers Group	Mean	F	Sig.	Differences
Mall/Store Quality	*Social Butterfly*	5.4092	2.955	0.053	n/a
	Self-Contained Shoppers	5.1513			

Variable	Youth Shoppers Group	Mean	F	Sig.	Differences
	Confident Techies	5.3235			
Quality of Merchandise	*Social Butterfly*	5.0761			*Social Butterfly > Confident Techies > Self-Contained Shoppers*
	Self-Contained Shoppers	4.6422	6.328	0.002	
	Confident Techies	4.9142			
Convenience	*Social Butterfly*	4.8225			*n/a*
	Self-Contained Shoppers	4.5817	2.059	0.129	
	Confident Techies	5.4092			
Enhancement	*Social Butterfly*	5.1513			*Social Butterfly > Confident Techies > Self-Contained Shoppers*
	Self-Contained Shoppers	5.3235	3.945	0.020	
	Confident Techies	5.0761			
Price Orientation	*Social Butterfly*	4.6422			*Social Butterfly & Confident Techies > Self-Contained Shoppers*
	Self-Contained Shoppers	4.9142	7.982	0.000	
	Confident Techies	4.3889			

The differences is based on Games-Howell Post Hoc tests

The mean difference is significant at sig ≤ 0.05

The shopping enjoyment variable in Table 4 meets the criteria because it has a significance value of 0.000. Therefore, it can be inferred that a mean difference exists in each segment of the young shoppers' group regarding shopping enjoyment. This group difference can be summed up as follows: social butterflies and confident techies > self-contained shoppers. Therefore, we can conclude that all dimensions in the social butterfly group have the highest mean score, followed by confident techies and self-contained shoppers, who show the lowest mean score. For the shopping enjoyment dimension, (i.e.,., mall/store quality), the social butterfly group also showed the highest mean score as compared to the confident techies and self-contained shoppers (Guha et al., 2018; Kumar et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2017),

Table 4: Youth Shoppers Segment Differences in the Dimension of Shopping Enjoyment

Variable	Youth Shoppers Group	Mean	F	Sig.	Differences
Mall/Store Quality	*Social Butterfly*	4.2255			*Social Butterfly & Confident Techies > Self-Contained Shoppers*
	Self-Contained Shoppers	3.2320	14.609	0.000	
	Confident Techies	3.9526			

The differences is based on Tukey HSD Post Hoc tests

The mean difference is significant at sig ≤0,05

4.3. The Relationship Between Shopping Motives and Store Attributes with Shopping Enjoyment

Table 5 has two dimensions (negotiation and role enactment), with no correlation to the shopping enjoyment dependent variable. Meanwhile, 10 dimensions correlate to the shopping enjoyment

dependent variable. Arranged from strongest to weakest, the order is as follows: anticipated utility (0.458**), quality of merchandise (0.345**), price orientation (0.295**), enhancement (.264**), affiliation (0.256**), power and authority (0.221**), stimulation (0.175*), mall/store quality (0.170**), choice optimization (0.161**), and convenience (0.131*). These findings are consistent with those of Dawson et al., (1990) and Lotz, Eastlick, & Shim (1999), which showed that a positive relationship exists between shopping motives and shopping enjoyment. Furthermore, positive relationships were found in-store attributes and consumers' subjective psychological states, which are enjoyment and interest (Kim & Jin, 2001; Sherman et al., 1997).

Table 5: Relationship of Shopping Motives and Store Attributes with Shopping Enjoyment

Variable	Dimension	Pearson Correlations	Sig.
Shopping Motives	*Anticipated Utility*	0.453**	0.000
	Role Enactment	0.073	0.183
	Negotiation	0.075	0.167
	Choice Optimization	0.161**	0.003
	Affiliation	0.256**	0.000
	Power and Authority	0.220**	0.000
	Stimulation	0.175**	0.001
Store Attributes	*Mall/Store Quality*	0.170**	0.002
	Quality of Merchandise	0.344**	0.000
	Convenience	0.131*	0.016
	Enhancement	0.264**	0.000
	Price Orientation	0.295**	0.000

** *Pearson Correlations* is significant at the level 0.01

* *Pearson Correlations* is significant at the level 0.05

4.4.　　　*Multiple Regression with Stepwise Method*

Model 3 in Table 6 is the final model on this regression. Here the three dimensions have a significance level below 0.05, which means that all three dimensions influence their dependent variables, with the following significance level: anticipated utility (0.000), enhancement (0.001), and price orientation (0.002). The t-values of the three dimensions are anticipated utility (8.215), enhancement (3.487), and price orientation (3.168). The t-value is below 1.650 (t−1.650 > value), which is a critical value of hypothesis testing limit in one direction for a confidence level of 95% and a significance level of 0.05 or with the degree of freedom of 324 (df = n-k−1 or df = 337-12-1).

Table 6: Summary of the Stepwise Method of Multiple Regression for Shopping Enjoyment

Model	Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Unstandardized Coefficient Beta	Standardized Coefficient Beta	t-value	Sig.	Result
1	*Shopping Enjoyment*	(Constant)	2.367E-17		0.000	1.000	
		Anticipated Utility	0.453	0.453	9.306	0.000	Significant
2	*Shopping Enjoyment*	(Constant)	1.285E-18		0.000	1.000	
		Anticipated Utility	0.427	0.427	8.922	0.000	Significant
		Enhancement	0.210	0.210	4.398	0.000	Significant
3	*Shopping Enjoyment*	(Constant)	1.285E-18		0.000	1.000	
		Anticipated Utility	0.396	0.396	8.215	0.000	Significant
		Enhancement	0.170	0.170	3.487	0.001	Significant
		Price Orientation	0.158	0.158	3.168	0.002	Significant

From Table 6, we conclude that anticipated utility, enhancement, and price orientation have a positive and significant influence on shopping enjoyment. The dimensions with the strongest influence, respectively, are anticipated utility (8.215), enhancement (3.487), and price orientation (3.168). In the above Table, anticipated utility has a 0.396 beta value, indicating that for every 1 unit increase in anticipated utility, the average shopping enjoyment standard deviation will increase by 0.396. The dimension of enhancement has a 0.170 beta value, indicating that for every 1-unit increase in enhancement, the average shopping enjoyment standard deviation will increase by 0.170. Similarly, price orientation has a 0.158 beta value, indicating that for every 1 unit increase in price orientation, the average shopping enjoyment standard deviation will increase by 0.158. Therefore, we conclude that the anticipated utility has created a stronger contribution than enhancement and price orientation in explaining the shopping enjoyment variable (Guha et al., 2018; Kumar et al., 2018).

5. CONCLUSIONS

Among young shoppers, social butterflies have the highest mean for self-esteem, extraversion, and mall interpersonal communication. They are followed by the confident techies segment, which has the highest mean for Internet interpersonal communication. This segment also has the second highest mean for self-esteem, extraversion, and mall interpersonal communication among young shoppers. The self-contained shoppers segment has the lowest mean for all four segment-determining factors.

The social butterfly segment prefers to spend time and money in the mall. This group's level of self-esteem, extraversion, and interpersonal communication in the mall are all high. Social butterflies choose the mall as the place to socialize and to have their shopping activities. Confident techies are happy to spend their time and money on the Internet. They have a relatively low level of interpersonal communication, so prefer online shopping. On the other hand, self-contained shoppers as a group are more individualistic and less likely to be vocal about consumption. This segment might be more influenced by interpersonal communication with colleagues or relatives. As

young shoppers, this segment has the lowest mean for self-esteem, extraversion, mall interpersonal communication, and Internet interpersonal communication.

Significant differences exist among segments of young shoppers. These areas include shopping motives, store attributes, and shopping enjoyment. Social butterflies show the highest mean on several dimensions in the variables of shopping motives, store attributes, and shopping enjoyment. This is followed by confident techies and self-contained shoppers. The results suggest that the higher the mean level of a group's self-esteem, extraversion, mall interpersonal communication, and Internet interpersonal communication, the higher the mean level of several dimensions in the variables of shopping motives, store attributes, and shopping enjoyment.

Not all dimensions/antecedents of independent variables have a meaningful relationship with the dependent variable. Young shopper enjoyment relates to anticipated utility, affiliation, power and authority, stimulation, and choice optimization. These are associated with their shopping motives and the dimension/antecedent quality of merchandise, price orientation, enhancement, mall/store quality, and convenience. These, in turn, are associated with store attribute preferences found in the mall. On the other hand, dimension/antecedent negotiation and role enactment do not have any relationship with shopping enjoyment.

Dimensions/antecedents with the strongest influence are anticipated utility from the shopping motives variable, followed by enhancement and price orientation from the store attribute variable. These results differ from a previous study by Wong et al. (2012), which asserted that predicting young shoppers' enjoyment derives from "anticipated utility" and "enhancement." However, the results of our study show that in Jakarta, price orientation is also a predictor of young shoppers' enjoyment. In other words, young Indonesian shoppers are "price sensitive." For buyers, a discount, in addition to anticipated utility and enhancement, can influence shopping enjoyment.

Future studies should use probabilistic sampling to identify young shoppers' enjoyment, providing better results that represent the entire population. We also suggest measuring external variables such as communications in schools and universities, current issues, and cross-cultural factors that might affect the selection of a shopping channel. Preferably, each segment group will have the same population, so results can be compared accurately.

Store attributes measured in this study need to be defined more broadly to include more physical aspects. In order to understand the similarities and differences between buyers among various formats, we suggest including retail formats such as department stores, discount stores, and non-traditional formats (e.g., online shopping venues). We also recommend research into combined retail formats. Consumer shopping enjoyment might vary by product category, so we encourage studies that examine a particular product category rather than a general one. We hope these limitations can be addressed in future studies.

REFERENCES

Anonymous. (1995). Compulsive shopping: The call of the mall. *Psychology Today*, *28*(1), 8. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/214241733?accountid=25704 LA - English

Babin, B. J., & Darden, W. R. (1996). Good and bad shopping vibes: Spending and patronage satisfaction. *Journal of Business Research*, *35*(3), 201–206. https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(95)00125-5

Banister Margaret K Hogg, E. N., Christopher, M., Lowson, R., & Evans, M. (2004). Negative symbolic consumption and consumers' drive for self-esteem: The case of the fashion industry. *European Journal of Marketing*, *38*(7), 850–868. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/03090560410539285%5Cnhttp://%5Cnhttp://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000000575

Bellenger, N. D., & Korgaonkar, P. (1980). Profiling the recreational shopper. *Journal of Retailing*, *56*(3), 77–92.

Bellenger, N. D., Robertson, D. H., & Greenberg, B. A. (1977). Shopping center patronage motives. *Journal of Retailing*, *53*(2), 77–91.

Benet-Martínez, V., & John, O. P. (1998). Los Cinco Grandes Across Cultures and Ethnic Groups: Multitrait Multimethod Analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*(3), 729–750. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.75.3.729

Berkowitz, E. N., Walton, J. R., & Walker Jr, O. C. (1979). In-Home Shoppers: The Market for Innovative Distribution Systems. *Journal of Retailing*, *55*(2), 15. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=4667445&site=ehost-live

Blascovich, J., & Tomaka, J. (1991). Measures of Self-Esteem. *Robinson, J. P., P. R. Shaver and L. S. Wrightsman (Ed.). Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes Series, Vol. 1. Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes. Xiv+753p. Academic Press, Inc.: San Diego, California, USA; London, England, U*, 115–160. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-590241-0.50008-3

Bloch, P. H., Ridgway, N. M., & Dawson, S. A. (1994). The shopping mall as consumer habitat. *Journal of Retailing*, *70*(1), 23–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4359(94)90026-4

Brancaleone, V., & Gountas, J. (2007). Personality characteristics of market mavens. In *Advances in Consumer Research* (Vol. 34, pp. 522–527). https://doi.org/Conference Paper

Breazeale, M., & Lueg, J. E. (2011). Retail shopping typology of American teens. *Journal of Business Research*, *64*(6), 565–571. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2010.06.007

Chebat, J. C., Sirgy, M. J., & St-James, V. (2006). Upscale image transfer from malls to stores: A self-image congruence explanation. *Journal of Business Research*, *59*(12), 1288–1296. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.09.007

Clark, R. A., & Goldsmith, R. E. (2005). Market mavens: Psychological influences. *Psychology and Marketing*, *22*(4), 289–312. https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20060

Coshall, J. T., & Potter, R. B. (1986). The relation of personality factors to urban consumer cognition. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *126*(4), 539–544.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1980). Influence of extraversion and neuroticism on subjective well-being: Happy and unhappy people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,

38(4), 668–678. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.38.4.668

Darley, W. K. (1999). The relationship of antecedents of search and self-esteem to adolescent search effort and perceived product knowledge. *Psychology and Marketing*, *16*(5), 409–427. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6793(199908)16:5<409::AID-MAR3>3.0.CO;2-8

Dawson, S., Bloch, P. H., & Ridgway, N. M. (1990). Shopping Motives, Emotional States, and Retail Outcomes. *Journal of Retailing*, *66*(4), 408. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=4667693&site=ehost-live

Erdem, O., Ben Oumlil, A., & Tuncalp, S. (1999). Consumer values and the importance of store attributes. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, *27*(4), 137–144. https://doi.org/10.1108/09590559910268435

Feick, L. F., & Price, L. L. (1987). The market maven: A diffuser of marketplace information. *Journal of Marketing*, *51*(1), 83. https://doi.org/10.2307/1251146

Forsythe, S. M., & Bailey, A. W. (1996). Shopping enjoyment, perceived time poverty, and time spent shopping. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, *14*(3), 185–191. https://doi.org/10.1177/0887302X9601400303

Forsythe, S. M., & Lesser, J. A. (1989). Antecedents and consequences of the intrinsic motivation to shop. *Psychological Reports*, *64*, 1183–1191.

Guha, A., Biswas, A., Grewal, D., Bhowmick, S., & Nordfält, J. (2018). An empirical analysis of the joint effects of shoppers' goals and attribute display on shoppers' evaluations. *Journal of Marketing*, *82*(3), 142–156. https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.16.0247

Halim, R. E. (2017). The impact of trust-distrust toward quality of life: The case of poor and non-poor household in Indonesia. *European Research Studies Journal*, *20*(3). Retrieved from http://www.ersj.eu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=876

Halim, R. E., & Zulkarnain, E. A. U. (2017). The effect of consumer affinity and country image toward willingness to buy. *Journal of Distribution Science*, *15*(4). https://doi.org/10.15722/jds.15.4.201704.15

Helm, C. (2007). From tech-led to brand-led—has the internet portal business grown up? *Journal of Brand Management*, *14*(5), 368–379. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.bm.2550077

Janakiraman, R., Lim, J. H., & Rishika, R. (2018). The effect of a data breach announcement on customer behavior: Evidence from a multichannel retailer. *Journal of Marketing*, *82*(2), 85–105. https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.16.0124

Jin, B., & Kim, J. (2003). A typology of Korean discount shoppers: Shopping motives, store attributes, and outcomes. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, *14*(4), 396–419. https://doi.org/10.1108/09564230310489240

Kabadayi, S., & Paksoy, B. (2016). A segmentation of Turkish consumers based on their motives to visit shopping centres. *International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, *26*(4), 456–476. https://doi.org/10.1080/09593969.2016.1157513

Kaur, P., & Singh, R. (2007). Uncovering retail shopping motives of Indian youth. *Young Consumers*, *8*(2), 128–138. https://doi.org/10.1108/17473610710757491

Kim, J. O., & Jin, B. (2001). The mediating role of excitement in costumer satisfaction and repatronage intention of discount store shopper in Korea. *Journal of Shopping Center Research*, *8*(2), 117–138.

Koufaris, M., Kambil, A., & LaBarbera, P. A. (2001). Consumer behavior in Web-based

commerce: An empirical study. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, *6*(2), 115–138. https://doi.org/10.1080/10864415.2001.11044233

Kumar, V., Leszkiewicz, A., & Herbst, A. (2018). Are you back for good or still shopping around ? Investigating customers ' repeat churn behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *LV*(April), 208–225. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.16.0623

Landmark, A. D., & Sjøbakk, B. (2017). Tracking customer behaviour in fashion retail using RFID. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, *45*(7–8), 844–858. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-10-2016-0174

Lemon, K. N., & Verhoef, P. C. (2016). Understanding customer experience throughout the customer journey. *Journal of Marketing*, *80*(6), 69–96. https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.15.0420

Lindquist, J. D. (1974). Meaning of image. *Journal of Retailing*, *50*(4), 29. https://doi.org/Article

Lotz, S. L., Eastlick, M. A., & Shim, S. (1999). *Modelling Participation in Entertainment and Shopping Activities in Malls Utilizing the Flow Paradigm*. Seoul: Paper Presented at Yonsei University.

Lucas, R. E., Diener, E., Grob, A., Suh, E. M., & Shao, L. (2000). Cross-cultural evidence for the fundamental features of extraversion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*(3), 452–468. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.3.452

Malhotra, N. K., Birks, D. F., & Wills, P. (2013). *Marketing Research : An Applied Approach*. *Marketing Research*.

Martineau, P. (1958). The personality of the retail store. *Harvard Business Review*, *36*(1), 47–55.

Matzler, K., Bidmon, S., & Grabner-Kräuter, S. (2006). Individual determinants of brand affect: The role of the personality traits of extraversion and openness to experience. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, *15*(7), 427–434. https://doi.org/10.1108/10610420610712801

Mooradian, T. A., & Swan, K. S. (2006). Personality-and-culture: The case of national extraversion and word-of-mouth. *Journal of Business Research*, *59*(6), 778–785. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.01.015

Moschis, G. P., & Churchill, G. A. (1978). Consumer socialization: A theoretical and empirical analysis. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *15*(4), 599. https://doi.org/10.2307/3150629

Mowen, J. C., & Spears, N. (1999). Understanding compulsive buying among college students: A hierarchical approach. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *8*(4), 407–430. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp0804_03

Odekerken-Schröder, G., De Wulf, K., & Schumacher, P. (2003). Strengthening outcomes of retailer-consumer relationships. The dual impact of relationship marketing tactics and consumer personality. *Journal of Business Research*. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(01)00219-3

Pan, Y., & Zinkhan, G. M. (2006). Determinants of retail patronage: A meta-analytical perspective. *Journal of Retailing*, *82*(3), 229–243. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2005.11.008

Reynolds, F. D. (1974). An analysis of catalog buying behavior. *The Journal of Marketing*, *38*(3), 47–51. https://doi.org/10.2307/1249849

Rosa, J. A., Garbarino, E. C., & Maker, A. J. (2006). Keeping the body in mind: The influence of body esteem and body boundary aberration on consumer beliefs and purchase intentions. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *16*(1), 79–91. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp1601_10

Roy Dholakia, R. (1999). Going shopping: Key determinants of shopping behaviors and motivations. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, *27*(4), 154–165. https://doi.org/10.1108/09590559910268499

Sherman, E., Mathur, A., & Smith, R. B. (1997). Store environment and consumer purchase behavior: Mediating role of consumer emotions. *Psychology*, *14*, 361–378. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6793(199707)14:4<361::AID-MAR4>3.0.CO;2-7

Sokol, D. (2003). Piercing the gen Y myths. *Shopping Center World*, 27–30.

Solomon, M. R. (2007). *Consumer Behavior: A European Perspective Enhanced Media Edition Rack*. Financial Times Management. London: Finacial Time Prentice Hall.

Sutarso, Y., Halim, R. E., Balqiah, T. E., & Tjiptoherijanto, P. (2017). The role of co-creation activities, trust and gender on higher education marketing performance. *European Research Studies Journal*, *20*(3). Retrieved from http://www.ersj.eu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=880

Tauber, E. M. (1972). Why Do People Shop? *Journal of Marketing*, *36*(4), 46. https://doi.org/10.2307/1250426

Taylor, R. D., Coulter, R., & Coulter, M. (1988). Television home network shoppers versus conventional shoppers: demographic and psychograpich differences. *Journal of Midwest Marketing*, *3*, 63–73.

Toker-Yildiz, K., Trivedi, M., Choi, J., & Chang, S. R. (2017). Social interactions and monetary incentives in driving consumer repeat behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *54*(3), 364–380. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.13.0482

Trochim, W., & Donnelly, J. P. (2006). *The Research Methods Knowledge Base*. *WebRef* (Vol. 3rd). Retrieved from http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/

Westbrook, R. A., & Black, W. C. (1985). A motivation-based shopper typology. *Journal of Retailing*, *61*(1), 78–103. https://doi.org/10.1257/0002828041464551

Wong, Y. T., Osman, S., Jamaluddin, A., & Yin-Fah, B. C. (2012). Shopping motives, store attributes and shopping enjoyment among Malaysian youth. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *19*(2), 240–248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2012.01.005

Zhang, C., Phang, C. W., Wu, Q., & Luo, X. (2017). Nonlinear effects of social connections and interactions on individual goal attainment and spending: Evidences from online gaming markets. *Journal of Marketing*, *81*(6), 132–155. https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.16.0038