Utilitarian and Hedonic Motivations: Its Influences on Search and Purchase Intention on Instagram
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Abstract

Instagram as one of the most active social media platform in Indonesia has made businesses to use it as one of their marketing strategies. Recognizing users’ motivation to be active in Instagram enables digital retailers to optimize this platform to market their products. The purpose of this study is to analyze the relationship among the shopping, utilitarian and hedonic motivation on consumers’ intention to search the information or to do shopping on Instagram. This study involved 128 Instagram users aged 17-45 years old. An online questionnaire was used as the data collection, then it was analyzed using SEM-PLS. The result shows that hedonic motivation does not motivate the consumers to search the information on Instagram. Moreover, utilitarian motivation and search information are not as a predictor of online purchasing. Considering the platform chosen is able to influence the information search intention and purchasing, thus this study paves the way on how an individual having interaction through social media, especially Instagram.
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1. Introduction

Social media has drawn attention to marketer as an effective communication media to interact with the consumers (Anderson, Knight, Pookulangara, & Josiam, 2014; Fatanti & Suyadnya, 2015). Low-cost expense and large scale are the main reasons behind this. One of fast-growing social media globally is Instagram, which enables its users to upload a photo or video as well as to share it on the other platform (Business Insider, 2010; Instagram, 2016; Wagner, 2015). Instagram is the first social network application designed for mobile device (Miles, 2013). Instagram has been a popular marketing media, not only because of the growing number of its users, but also because of its characteristics that emphasize visual content rather than text (Neher, 2013). Instagram, which at first, is used for entertainment and interaction, nowadays, it is also used for business’ needs (Alghamdi & Reilly, 2013; Miles, 2013).

Nowadays, Indonesia has become a country with Instagram users in the Asia Pacific with the monthly active user (MAU) is 1 billion per June 2018 (Bohang, 2017, 2018). Some popular brands (such as AirAsia, Intel, Lazada,
Traveloka, Coca-Cola Indonesia, etc.), government institution and even MSMEs have been using Instagram to engage with their customers. Therefore, social media becomes the greatest internet content accessed and having significant growth of MAU compared to other social media platform (APJII, 2016; Bohang, 2018; Sheldon & Bryant, 2016), Instagram can be an effective marketing tool for companies (Amornpashara, Rompho, & Phadoongsitthi, 2015). The interest in using the Internet to find information is a strong predictor of purchase intention in the Internet (Liu & Forsythe, 2010; Moe, 2003; Shim, Eastlick, Lotz, & Warrington, 2001). The motivation to search the information and to purchase are encouraged by utilitarian motivation and there are also caused by hedonic motivation (Babin, Darden, & Griffin, 1994). The extent to which the influence of those motivations is varied depending on the media or platform chosen (Liu & Forsythe, 2010). Therefore, it is vital for businesses to understand consumers’ motivation, in which it generates their intention to search and purchase through Instagram.

2. Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

Involving consumers in social media marketing needs to understand their shopping motivation (Anderson et al., 2014). It is because that shopping process is a set of behavior starting from the motivation behind the behavior which directs to purchase. In doing shopping, an individual’s motivation is not only based on the usefulness of the products or service purchased, but also the satisfaction feeling got during the process of searching and purchasing (Tauber, 1972). Motivation refers to the process that causes people to behave in certain ways and it emerges because there are needs that should be fulfilled (Solomon, 2018). A marketer always strives the best to meet a diverse consumers’ needs. However, individuals’ motivation to fulfill their needs is various, thereby the identification of consumers’ motivation is considered essential done by the marketers in order that the products or services offered are able to meet their needs precisely. In general, motivation is divided into utilitarian and hedonic motivation (Babin et al., 1994; Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982). Utilitarian is based on functional or tangible reason (for example, by doing online shopping, consumers are able to save time, so they do not need to go out from home when they need something they want). Whereas hedonic tends to be more pleasurable or intangible, in which the hedonist when buying something does not care the benefits will get. However, they see it from experience point of view in doing the online transaction (Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982; Holbrook & Hirschman, 1982; Solomon, 2018).

Janiszewski (1998) proposed that browsing various products on social media can be driven by goal-oriented or exploration-oriented. Goal-oriented consumers will try to find the information for the products they need. Conversely, exploration-oriented consumers will browse without a specific purpose or just do online windows shopping. Notwithstanding those actions, both orientations allow to enhance the consumers’ intention to make a purchase. The purchase intention of goal-oriented consumers will emerge after they find the product information they need. Meanwhile, consumers exploration-oriented consumers, their purchase intention is not planned or tends to be impulsive (Moe, 2003).

2.1 Utilitarian Motivation, Search Intention, Purchase Intention

Utilitarian motivation is consumers’ motivation in social media which is encouraged by a goal to search for product or services information that matches their needs (Janiszewski, 1998; Mikalef, Giannakos, & Pateli, 2012). Consumers with utilitarian motivation consider Instagram as an effective and worth it media to search for the products (Kim & Shim, 2002; Soebandhi & Sukoco, 2015). The prior studies confirm that utilitarian motivation is a dominant factor enhancing intention to search for information online and intention to make purchases (Mikalef, Giannakos, & Pateli, 2013; Mikalef et al., 2012; To, Liao, & Lin, 2007). If consumers consider that Instagram has more utilitarian and function values, their intention for buying products will be higher (To et al., 2007). However, the study conducted by Singh (2014) postulated that hedonic motivation is a stronger predictor than utilitarian motivation. To clarify those relationships, the researchers propose this hypothesis: 

H1: Utilitarian motivation has a positive impact on search intention on Instagram

H2: Utilitarian motivation has a positive impact on purchase intention on Instagram

2.2 Hedonic Motivation, Search Intention, Purchase Intention

Hedonic motivation is a shopping motivation by virtue of pleasure, fantasy, and happiness experienced during information searching (Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982). Enjoyment or happiness experienced is not only from the information of products they find but also from the searching process itself. In such a way, consumers with hedonic motivation will seek enjoyment from that process instead of its usage/benefits of the purchased product. The happier product-information searching perceived, the higher the intention to do more searching (To et al., 2007). Whereas, the influence of hedonic motivation on consumers’ intention to do online shopping is still debatable among
researchers. Babin et al. (1994) and Dabholkar (1996) argued that hedonic value and feeling of enjoyment are able to enhance consumers’ intention to purchase the products. While Bridges and Florsheim (2008) and To et al. (2007) asserted that enjoyment allows consumers to wonder the information (browsing), but it does not increase their intention to buy. Then, the hypothesis proposed is in the following:

H3: Hedonic motivation has a positive impact on search intention on Instagram.
H4: Hedonic motivation has a positive impact on purchase intention on Instagram.

2.3 Search Intention and Purchase Intention
Before purchasing the products, a consumer will try to look for the information related to the products as much as possible. Search intention refers to the extent to which Instagram users are involved in the process of product searching. Whereas purchase intention refers to consumers’ intention to buy the products they have seen before (Mikalef et al., 2013). If the information obtained is adequate, the consumers tend to buy the product (Shim et al., 2001). The impact of product browsing on users’ intention to purchase has been studied in various platforms (i.e. social media (Mikalef et al., 2013), Facebook (Anderson et al., 2014), website (Shim et al., 2001; Singh, 2014). Since Instagram has a distinctive characteristic comparing to other social media platforms, hence this study attempts to analyze further the relationship between search intention and purchase intention using Instagram. Thereby, the hypothesis proposed is stated below:

H5: Search intention has a positive impact on purchase intention on Instagram.

3. Research Method
The population of this study is Instagram users that have not been carried an online shopping at all. The data collection was done using an online questionnaire with a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree' to represent respondents’ response. The questionnaire items refer to the previous studies. A total of 27 items were used in this study with the number of samples using a 5:1 ratio (Joe F. Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). The questionnaire was divided into two parts. The first part was designed to identify the respondents’ profile and the second part contained the questions related to the construct being studied. There were 140 respondents’ data during the research period, but it was only 128 responds that meet the criteria, which were credible to be used for the next stage. Afterward, the data was processed using SEM-PLS as the analysis tool.

4. Result
Based on the result of descriptive statistic data collected, it is found that the female respondents, that is 60.16%, are greater in number compared to the male respondents. Half of the total respondents are aged 26-34 years old (50.78%). There is no significant difference in number between respondents with high school and undergraduate education (n = 54 and n = 51 respectively). Students and employees are the dominant respondents in this study. Of the 128 data analyzed, 67.97% (n = 87) respondents stated that Instagram is a social media they like to shop online. For the detail description, it can be seen in Table 1.

From the 27 items analyzed, there are 5 items with the loading factor value is below the required threshold so that it is omitted from the model (Joseph F. Hair, Hult, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2014). After redesigning the model, the composite reliability is in the range of 0.892 until 0.9078, which indicates a good reliability since it is far from the minimum threshold (0.70) (Joe F. Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2011). The validity of the construct is measured by calculating the value of cross loading factors, which all measurement items are claimed valid. Those results show that the measurement model constructed from the research instrument used in this study has been proven to be a good convergent validity and reliability. Regarding the discriminant validity, the criteria of Claes Fornell and Larcker (1981) also show a positive result for all constructs.
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Further analysis is done by calculating the coefficient of determination ($R^2$). It is the proportion of endogenous construct variation that can be explained by the structural relationship in the model. For the search intention construct, the coefficient of determination shows a fairly high number (0.335), as well as the purchase intention (0.3376). The result of Stone-Geisser testing is $R^2$ square evaluating predictive relevancy in the structural model (Chin, 1998), in which the expected result number is more than 0 (C. Fornell & Cha, 1994). Based on the testing, the result is more than 0 for all endogenous variables used in this study. Therefore, those aforementioned results indicate that the model in the hypothesis is said to be accepted. Table 2 presents the information about the model evaluation.

Table 1. Demographic profile of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 – 25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 34</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Higs School</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College student</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferable social media for online shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>67.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Value of AVE, Composite Reliability, and $R^2$ square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Motiv</td>
<td>0.6239</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonic Motiv</td>
<td>0.6642</td>
<td>0.9078</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Intention</td>
<td>0.5858</td>
<td>0.8759</td>
<td>0.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intention</td>
<td>0.5844</td>
<td>0.9077</td>
<td>0.3376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After ensuring that the structural model used has been met the suggested criteria, the hypothesis testing is done to get the significance value of each path. Based on the hypothesis testing, it is obtained that $H_1$ and $H_4$ are supported significantly. While $H_2$, $H_3$ and $H_5$ are not supported (critical t-values 1.96; sig. level = 5%). The analysis result is presented in Table 3.

5. Discussion and Conclusion
This study is aimed to analyze the utilitarian and the hedonic motivation towards search intention in doing online shopping, which afterward, those motivations will influence the consumers’ intention to purchase using Instagram. To actualize this purpose, quantitative analysis is employed in the data that is collected from 128 Instagram users. The result, from the five hypotheses, show that utilitarian motivation and search intention do not enhance consumers’ intention to do online shopping using Instagram and hedonic motivation does not motivate an individual to search the product information in Instagram.
Based on the hypotheses testing in Table 3, it is known that an individual’s intention to search information through Instagram is only affected by the utilitarian motivation (H1 supported). It means that consumers think that browsing through Instagram is able to meet their goals in looking for information needed, but this information searching is not able to give experience and pleasure, even though the consumers can explore the information in Instagram (H3 not supported). This result is in contrast to the previous studies claiming that both motivations are able to motivate an individual to search for products. (Blake, Neuendorf, & Valdiserri, 2005; Janiszewski, 1998; Mikalef et al., 2013; Soebandhi & Sukoco, 2015; To et al., 2007). Liu and Forsythe (2010) suggested that the utilitarian and hedonic motivations also depend on the media chosen. Those studies used different platform with the context of this study so that the results obtained are different.

Table 3. The Result of Path Coefficient and Hypothesis Testing

| Hypothesis | Original Sample Mean (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | Standard Error (STERR) | T Statistics (|O/STERR|) | Result |
|------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------|
| H1 Utilitarian Motiv -> Search Intention | 0.5418 | 0.5489 | 0.0721 | 0.0721 | 7.5171 | Supported |
| H2 Utilitarian Motiv -> Purchase Intention | 0.0924 | 0.0868 | 0.091 | 0.091 | 1.0154 | Not Supported |
| H3 Hedonic Motiv -> Search Intention | 0.088 | 0.0902 | 0.0867 | 0.0867 | 1.0143 | Not Supported |
| H4 Hedonic Motiv -> Purchase Intention | 0.5187 | 0.5195 | 0.079 | 0.079 | 6.5627 | Supported |
| H5 Search Intention -> Purchase Intention | 0.058 | 0.0609 | 0.1006 | 0.1006 | 0.5763 | Not Supported |

Related to consumers’ intention to purchase on Instagram, this study shows that consumers’ intention to purchase is affected by hedonic motivation, not by utilitarian motivation (H2 not supported, H4 supported). This result is contrary to the previous studies, that is, the utilitarian motivation becomes the main driven to make a purchase since the consumers with this motivation have goals to fulfill (Babin et al., 1994; Mikalef et al., 2013; Singh, 2014; To et al., 2007). According to those writers, hedonic motivation does not influence individuals to purchase using social media platform because an individual having hedonic motivation tends to buy in an offline shop. Those studies also explain that hedonic motivation does not show a direct impact on purchase intention. It might happen since Instagram is able to make its users feel enjoyment. When they feel enjoy, they will be highly possible to have unplanned impulsive shopping intention. (Moe, 2003; To et al., 2007).

Lastly, this study shows that the intention to search using Instagram does not encourage their intention to purchase (H3 not supported). This surprising result is in contrast with the previous studies that generally claim about the relation of those variables (Mikalef et al., 2013; Soebandhi & Sukoco, 2015; To et al., 2007). This insignificant result may be caused by the risk perception perceived to buy in a social media platform, such as Instagram (Beneke, Greene, Lok, & Mallett, 2012). Instagram is only used for searching information, while for purchasing, consumers more fond of buying in an offline store.

6. Implication
This study has a contribution to an online marketing field by proposing and validating the empirical research model about how individuals interact with the online interface through a social media platform. The findings also demonstrate that in making a purchase, the consumers tend to have hedonic orientation. This notion is important for the marketers in order to target the consumers by offering fun and enjoyable experience during the browsing and shopping on Instagram. The appealing appearance of Instagram pages and combining a fun stimuli can make the consumers spend more time on the company’s Instagram page (Menon & Kahn, 2002).

7. Limitations and Future Research
This study also has a limitation that is possible to be updated for next researches. A greater amount of respondents or more specific respondents for certain type of products are suggested as the notion for further study in order to get a more detail description of online behavior.
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