

UTILITARIAN VS. HEDONIC MOTIVATIONS IN CAR BUYING DECISIONS: INSIGHTS FROM DEHRADUN

¹Chloe Mia, ²Mas artine

^{*1}(MBA Student), Uttaranchal University

²Asst. Professor, Uttaranchal University

ABSTRACT

In this article the role of utilitarian values on consumer buying decision was studied with specific reference to cars. Therefore a sample of 120 was taken and the primary data was gathered through structured questionnaire. The data gathered from the respondents were put in the SPSS to analyze the various factors and dependability of the variables. Mean, Standard deviation and one way anova are used in this study. Data was studied across the two demographic variables (i.e. age and income) of the respondents. The study revealed that the utilitarian values have no relationship with age but it has relationship with the income of the respondents as income is a vital factor that influences the purchasing decision and consumer behaviour of an individual in Dehradun.

Keywords: *Utilitarian Values, Consumer buying behaviour, Customers perception, satisfaction, effectiveness of utilitarian values.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Consumer choices are driven by utilitarian and hedonistic considerations. Consumers who choose between new cars, for example, can worry about utilitarian features (for example, fuel consumption) and hedonistic attributes (eg sports design). The research suggests that these different considerations refer to separating the components of the evaluations and the attitudes of the products and allowing people to distinguish between the product based on their hedonistic or utilitarian relative nature (Batra and Ahtola 1990, Mano and Oliver, 1993) . In general, the consumption of hedonistic goods provide more experiential, fun, pleasure and excitement (designer clothes, sports cars, luxury watches, etc.), while utilitarian goods are mainly instrumental and functional (microwaves, minivans, personal computers, etc. .Hirschman and Holbrook 1982; Strahilevitz and Myers 1998).

Consumers often have to face this type of choice between hedonistic and utilitarian alternatives that are driven, at least in part, by emotional desires instead of cold cognitive deliberations. Therefore, these elections represent an important domain of consumer decision-making. However, much of the pioneering work in behavior decision theory has focused largely on the cognitive aspects of decision making without exploring the emotional dimensions (Kahneman 1991).

So far, the distinctions within and between both perspectives have coexisted without much integration because they came from different theoretical paradigms of consumer research and decision making. In this section we propose to evaluate and organize the various conceptualizations and review the empirical results that are rooted in these differences. Research methods such as ethnography and consumer neuroscience are shedding new light on how consumers make decisions

On the other hand, there is a utilitarian consumption that places greater emphasis on usefulness, functionality, functionality and compliance with basic needs. In general, they are utilitarian products that add ease to their daily life; For example, basic cars, refrigerator, telephone. The utilitarian needs are acquired without enigmas and have little emotional and sensory attachment.

Utilitarian means related to practical purposes or related to the idea that utility is more important than beauty. An example of a utilitarian decision is the purchase of a car that achieves good fuel efficiency rather than a larger and more comfortable car. A consumer behavior is the result of attitudes, motivations and values and can highlight Behavior of purchase and consumption. The analysis of the literature on consumer behavior suggests that consumer goods and consumer services and consumer behavior due to the two fundamental reasons

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Ravi Dhar Klaus Wertenbroch (1999), stated that the relative importance of hedonistic dimensions is greater when consumers decide which of the various elements to abandon (confiscation options) than when they decide which object to acquire (acquisition options). The resulting hypothesis that a hedonistic article is relatively preferred over the same article is used in the furniture choices that in acquisition elections was supported in two choice experiments. In a subsequent experiment, these results were extended to hypothetical choices in which the acquisition and confiscation conditions were created by manipulating the reference states of the initial attribute level rather than the property

Ravi Dhar and Klaus Wertenbroch (2000) have stated that the creator examines how the consumer's desire among hedonistic assets and utilitarian goods is influenced by the use of the nature of the chosen task. Based on the elaboration research, the authors propose that the relative relevance of the hedonistic dimensions is greater when the buyers determine which of the numerous contraptions to provide (lump sum options) with respect to when they identify which object to acquire (options for acquisition). The resulting hypothesis that a hedonic object is fantastically desirable in the same object used in the refinement options as in the acquisition options was supported by two desire experiments. In a subsequent experiment, these findings extended to hypothetical choices in which acquisition and confiscation prerequisites were created by manipulating preliminary reference states at the attribute level rather than at the property level.

Karina Adomaviciute (2013), stated that consumption processes in modern societies are becoming increasingly important. When the growing importance of consumption is realized, the idea of a certain consumer responsibility for the crises observed is now relevant. Despite the increasing number of publications on the subject of socially responsible consumption, however, the ethical aspect of socially responsible consumption does not receive enough attention, most publications focus on environmental consumption. Furthermore, little attention is paid to the analysis of the ethical side of socially responsible consumption on the individual side. The measurement of the relationship between the behavior of the utilitarian and hedonistic consumer and the socially responsible consumption can contribute to the knowledge of new characteristics, describing the socially responsible consumer. The article suggests a theoretical model, which helps to measure the relationship between the behavior of the hedonist and utilitarian consumer and the ethical side of socially responsible consumption.

MEI-Ching Huang (2016) stated that the control of temporal distance is already understood and discussed in the theory of levels. This research examines how temporal distance affects the consumer's preference for the hedonistic and utilitarian product by performing two experiments. It shows that the consumer with a shorter time distance prefers products with better utilitarian attributes than those with better hedonic attributes than those with the best utilitarian attributes in the most distant temporary purchases.

Strahilevitz and Myers (1998) Useful goods are those whose consumption is more cognitively guided, instrumental and goal-oriented, and performs a functional or practical task.

Komal Chopra 2014 stated that the result of the study indicates that the utilitarian motives were considered more important than the hedonic motive. However, the result shows that the reason for buying was independent of the purchase times.

III. OBJECTIVE AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The research objective is to know the effectiveness of utilitarian values across the age and income of the respondents while buying the car. To study the research objectives the descriptive research design is used. In this particular research quantitative approach has been used and the primary data was gathered through structured questionnaire. For the data accumulation, convenient sampling is used and 120 responses were collected and utilized for the study in concern. The sample was collected from the Dehradun city. The data gathered from the respondents were put in the SPSS to analyze the various factors and dependability of the variables. Mean, Standard deviation and one sample t test and one way anova are used in this study.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Utilitarian values are related to practical purposes or its is related to the idea that utility is more important than beauty for the consumers. Utilitarian consumption places greater emphasis on usefulness, functionality and

compliance with basic needs of the consumers. In general, they are utilitarian products that add ease to their daily life. Therefore from the respondents a question was raised to know while purchasing a car which all utilitarian factors affect the buying behaviour of the consumers.

Utilitarian factors values Frequencies

| | | Responses | | Percent of Cases |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|---------|------------------|
| | | N | Percent | |
| Utilitarian factor values | Fuel efficiency | 54 | 13.6% | 45.0% |
| | Compact size | 42 | 10.6% | 35.0% |
| | Low maintenance cost | 40 | 10.1% | 33.3% |
| | Safety features | 50 | 12.6% | 41.7% |
| | Interior space for luggage | 42 | 10.6% | 35.0% |
| | Performance | 24 | 6.0% | 20.0% |
| | Luxury | 26 | 6.5% | 21.7% |
| | Big size SUVs | 18 | 4.5% | 15.0% |
| | Bigger engines | 26 | 6.5% | 21.7% |
| | Best infotainment systems | 18 | 4.5% | 15.0% |
| | Leather interiors | 16 | 4.0% | 13.3% |
| | bigger brands | 14 | 3.5% | 11.7% |
| | Seating capacity | 28 | 7.0% | 23.3% |
| Total | | 398 | 100.0% | 331.7% |

As per the above table majority of the customers stated that for them fuel efficiency, Safety features, Compact size, Interior space for luggage and the Low maintenance cost are the utilitarian values that consumers considered while purchasing the car.

Utilitarian Values Effectiveness

The mean of different variables of effectiveness of utilitarian values has estimated. It includes 9 variables which are presented below in the table. The information about the mean of different variables of utilitarian values is presented in the table below.

| | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--|------|----------------|
| I prefer features like boot space, cabin space, utility in a car | 2.80 | .402 |
| The compact size affects my buying decision on buying car | 2.60 | .492 |
| I buy vehicle according to my daily use | 1.60 | .492 |
| The low maintenance cost of car influence my buying behaviour | 2.20 | .402 |
| Safety features available in cars affect my buying decision | 1.80 | 1.171 |
| The mileage performance is the important feature I consider while making purchase decision | 2.60 | .492 |
| Bigger engine is important as it affect my purchase decision of car. | 2.40 | .492 |
| I only prefer those cars which carry best infotainment systems | 2.20 | .402 |
| I prefer car for family purpose so seating capacity should be large. | 3.00 | .898 |

The table above shows the mean of different variables of effectiveness of utilitarian values. Utilitarian values has scored mean of 2.80 for the variable: I prefer features like boot space, cabin space, utility in a car.

Age is utilized in the study because with an understanding that age is a critical factor that influences consumer behaviour. As people grow, their requirements change. Similar changes can be seen in their purchasing decisions. With age, needs changes. Age conveys changes in individuals' way of living their life, , their requirements and individual esteems are influenced. At the point when individuals are young, they spend more on their lifestyle needs from fun to fashion. As they grow old, their costs on these things contract. Their well being related costs may rise. This is why age becomes one of the basic statistic factors influencing customer behaviour and their purchasing choices. Similarly Income is a vital factor that influences the purchasing decision and consumer behaviour of an individual. The difference in product choice and purchasing decision can easily be recognized across different income levels.

Therefore age and income is taken into consideration to study the effectiveness of utilitarian values of car.

Mean of variables of Effectiveness of Utilitarian Values Across Age of Respondents

The mean of different variables is estimated across the age of the respondents. The information about the variables of effectiveness of utilitarian value across the age of the respondents is presented in the table below.

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean | | Minimum | Maximum |
|-------|-----|--------|----------------|------------|----------------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | | |
| 20-26 | 32 | 2.3542 | .24349 | .04304 | 2.2664 | 2.4420 | 2.00 | 2.78 |
| 27-32 | 38 | 2.3743 | .24291 | .03941 | 2.2944 | 2.4541 | 2.00 | 2.78 |
| 33-38 | 30 | 2.3111 | .28048 | .05121 | 2.2064 | 2.4158 | 2.00 | 2.78 |
| 39-45 | 20 | 2.3889 | .22368 | .05002 | 2.2842 | 2.4936 | 2.00 | 2.78 |
| Total | 120 | 2.3556 | .24849 | .02268 | 2.3106 | 2.4005 | 2.00 | 2.78 |

Table above shows the mean of variables of effectiveness of utilitarian values across the age of the respondents. Effectiveness of utilitarian values has scored mean 2.3542 for respondent's of 20-26 years; effectiveness of utilitarian values has scored mean 2.3743 for respondent's from age group of 27 to 32 years; effectiveness of utilitarian values has scored mean 2.3111 for respondent's from age group of 33 to 38 years; effectiveness of utilitarian values has scored mean 2.3889 for respondent's from age group of 39 to 45 years. From the above table it is seen that variables of effectiveness of utilitarian values has scored highest mean for respondents from age group of 39-45 years.

One way-ANOVA Analysis of Effectiveness of Utilitarian Values Across Age of Respondents

In this study One way-ANOVA is carried out to compare means of variables of effectiveness of utilitarian values of car across the age of respondents to determine whether there is any significant difference. The information about One way-ANOVA across age of respondents is presented in the table given below.

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| Between Groups | .095 | 3 | .032 | .506 | .679 |
| Within Groups | 7.253 | 116 | .063 | | |
| Total | 7.348 | 119 | | | |

The table above shows that the calculated value of F of different variables of effectiveness of utilitarian values of car across age of respondents is smaller than tabulated value of F i.e. 2.60 at ($v_1=3$ and $v_2=116$) degree of freedom and 5 percent level of significance hence there is no significant relationship between effectiveness of utilitarian values of car and age of respondents.

Mean of variables of Effectiveness of Utilitarian Values Across Income of Respondents

The mean of different variables is estimated across the age of the respondents. The information about the variables of effectiveness of utilitarian value across the income of the respondents is presented in the table below.

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean | | Minimum | Maximum |
|-----------------|-----|--------|----------------|------------|----------------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | | |
| less than 25000 | 38 | 2.4211 | .27236 | .04418 | 2.3315 | 2.5106 | 2.00 | 2.78 |
| 25001-35000 | 28 | 2.2937 | .19414 | .03669 | 2.2184 | 2.3689 | 2.00 | 2.78 |
| 35001-45000 | 18 | 2.3580 | .26828 | .06324 | 2.2246 | 2.4914 | 2.00 | 2.78 |
| 45001-55000 | 20 | 2.2444 | .24343 | .05443 | 2.1305 | 2.3584 | 2.00 | 2.78 |
| above 55001 | 16 | 2.4444 | .19876 | .04969 | 2.3385 | 2.5504 | 2.33 | 2.78 |
| Total | 120 | 2.3556 | .24849 | .02268 | 2.3106 | 2.4005 | 2.00 | 2.78 |

Table above shows the mean of variables of effectiveness of utilitarian values across the income of the respondents. Effectiveness of utilitarian values has scored mean 2.4211 for respondent's of less than 25000; effectiveness of utilitarian values has scored mean 2.2937 for respondent's from 25001-35000 income; effectiveness of utilitarian values has scored mean 2.3580 for respondent's from 35001-45000 income; effectiveness of utilitarian values has scored mean 2.2444 for respondent's from 45001-55000 income; effectiveness of utilitarian values has scored mean 2.4444 for respondent's from above 55001 income. From the above table it is seen that variables of effectiveness of utilitarian values has scored highest mean for respondents from income group of above 55001.

One way-ANOVA Analysis of Effectiveness of Utilitarian Values Across Income of Respondents

In this study One way-ANOVA is carried out to compare means of variables of effectiveness of utilitarian values of car across the income of respondents to determine whether there is any significant difference. The information about One way-ANOVA across income of respondents is presented in the table given below.

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Between Groups | .644 | 4 | .161 | 2.761 | .031 |
| Within Groups | 6.704 | 115 | .058 | | |
| Total | 7.348 | 119 | | | |

The table above shows that the calculated value of F of different variables of effectiveness of utilitarian values of car across monthly income of respondents is bigger than tabulated value of F i.e. 2.37 at ($v_1=4$ and $v_2=115$) degree of freedom and 5 percent level of significance hence there is significant relationship between effectiveness of utilitarian values of car and income of respondents.

V. CONCLUSION

In measuring the consequences of actions, Utilitarianism is one of the factors that relies upon the intrinsic value. The utilitarian needs are acquired without enigmas and have little emotional and sensory attachment. Utilitarian means related to practical purposes or related to the idea that utility is more important than beauty. An example of a utilitarian decision is the purchase of a car that achieves good fuel efficiency rather than a larger and more comfortable car. A consumer behavior is the result of attitudes, motivations and values and can highlight behavior of purchase and consumption. Therefore when the utilitarian values which are offered in car was studied across the two demographic variables it was found that the utilitarian values have no relationship with age but it has relationship

with the income of the respondents as income is a vital factor that influences the purchasing decision and consumer behaviour of an individual.

REFERENCES

1. Batra, Rajeev and Olli T. Ahlota (1990) *measuring the hedonic and utilitarian source of consumer attitude*, *Marketing letters*, 2(2), 159-70.
2. Hirschman, E.C. and Holbrook, M.B. (1982) "Hedonic Consumption: Emerging Concepts, Methods, and Propositions," *Journal of Marketing* 46 (Summer): 92-101.
3. Kahneman, D. 1991) "Judgment and Decision-Making a personal view," *psychological Science*, 2 (May): 142-145.
4. Karina Adomaviciute (2013), "Relationship Between Utilitarian And Hedonic Consumer Behavior And Socially Responsible Consumption" *Economics And Management*: 2013. 18 (4) Issn 2029-9338 (Online)
5. Komal Chopra (2014), "Study of Relationship Between Utilitarian and Hedonic Motives and Temporal Perspective at Retail Malls" *International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology*, Volume 2, Issue III, March 2014
6. MEI-CHING HUANG, PEI HSUN WU, CHIA HSUN LIN *hedonic and utilitaarian products; The Influence of Temporal Distance upon Consumers Choice*. June 2016 Vol. 5 Issue.2
7. Ravi dhar and Klaus wertenbroch (August 1999), "Consumer choice between hedonic and utilitarian goods", *Forthcoming in the Journal of Marketing Research*.
8. Ravi dhar and Klaus wertenbroch (February 2000), "Consumer choice between hedonic and utilitarian goods", *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol.37, issue 1 2000, <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.37.1.60.18718>
9. Strahilevitz, Michal A., and George F. Loewenstein (1998), "The Effect of Ownership History on the Valuation of Objects," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25 (December), 276-289.