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ABSTRACT

This research examines the efficacy of hedonic shopping value in predicting tourists’ satisfaction and word of mouth communication. The data were collected through face-to-face interviews of 506 tourists of whom 383 respondents indicated that they had shopped and made a purchase during their holidays in Turkey. A total of 345 completed interviews were used for analysis. Findings suggest that hedonic shopping value is strongly linked to tourists’ satisfaction and word of mouth. Theoretical and practical implications are discussed within the context of retailing industry in a maturing tourist destination.
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INTRODUCTION

Shopping is recognized as part of the tourism experience of a traveler but has not been considered as one of the major push factors in travel decision-making models (e.g., Litrell, Paige, and Song, 2004; Yu and Litrell, 2005) even though shopping is the top ranked leisure activity of US travelers and overseas tourists to the United States (Hong & Littrell, 2003). Tourists spend more money on shopping than on accommodation and food combined. General destination-choice studies have either identified shopping opportunities as part of the overall attractiveness of a destination or as an auxiliary leisure activity travelers are engaged in while doing other things as well, but never a separate, prime motive for travelers.

Tourism researchers have long recognized that shopping is a core contributor to tourists’ satisfaction with a destination (Dwyer, Mellor, Livaic, Edwards, and Kim, 2004; Gallarza and Saura, 2006; Yuksel and Yuksel, 2007; Croes, Shani, and Walls, 2010). While tourism researchers like Hernandez-Lobato et al. (2006) identify the affective component of the tourist’s evaluation as being more influential than the cognitive component in terms of creating satisfaction and loyalty, they do not specifically examine the affective aspect of shopping.

Research is needed to better understand and evaluate the role of hedonic shopping value (enjoyment of the shopping experience) as conceptualized by Babin, Darden and Griffin (1994) and to explore relationships between shopping value and additional outcome variables in the context of a tourist destination.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Hedonic shopping value

Hedonic value is a measure of the fun, excitement, and enjoyment associated with shopping (Babin et al., 1994). Extant research suggests that hedonic shopping value is influential in the formation of satisfaction, loyalty and word-of-mouth communication among consumers. Reynolds and Beatty (1999) investigated the role of hedonic shopping value in the context of shopper-salesperson relationships and shopper-retailer relationships, demonstrating that hedonic value influences satisfaction with both the salesperson and the retailer and that in turn, influences loyalty.

Surprisingly, investigation into the role of hedonic shopping value in the context of tourism is rare, if existing at all, in the English literature. Aside from the work of Littrell (1990), Yu and Littrell (2005), specific contributions of hedonic shopping value within the tourist shopping experience is not investigated. Extant research in the general consumer behavior and retailing area provides support for linking hedonic shopping value to satisfaction (Babin et al., 2005; Overby and Lee, 2006). Extensions of the model in tourism by Kim (2008) and Yuksel (2007) provide compelling evidence that tourist shoppers’ affective involvement and emotion can predict satisfaction. Therefore, the following hypothesis is constructed:

H1. Hedonic shopping value will positively influence tourist satisfaction.

Loyalty
Shopping research demonstrates a link between satisfaction and loyalty (Reynolds and Arnold, 2000). In the context of tourism research, the relationship between satisfaction and loyalty is well established. Moreover, the results of a study by Jones et al. (2006) suggest a direct relationship between hedonic shopping value and loyalty in retailing and the findings of several studies in tourism demonstrate that a shopper’s emotions (pleasure, arousal, enjoyment) play a strong role in the formation of loyalty (Hernandez-Lobato et al., 2006; Mechinda et al., 2008). Therefore, the following two hypotheses are constructed:

**H2.** Satisfaction will positively influence loyalty.

**H3.** Hedonic shopping value will positively influence loyalty.

**Word-of-mouth communication**

Findings of studies in the retailing and tourism suggest that loyalty influences word-of-mouth (Yoon and Uysal, 2005). Previous research also identifies a link between satisfaction and word-of-mouth (Simpson and Siguaw, 2008). Moreover, Jones et al. (2006) report a direct link between hedonic shopping value and word-of-mouth. Therefore, the following three hypotheses are constructed:

**H4.** Loyalty will positively influence word-of-mouth.

**H5.** Satisfaction will positively influence word-of-mouth.

**H6.** Hedonic shopping value will positively influence word-of-mouth.

**METHOD**

The data were collected through a semi-structured, face-to-face interviews and a short survey instrument from tourists of a Mediterranean resort town of Antalya, Turkey. From a targeted 600 interviews, a total of 506 interviews were completed within a ten day period, with 383 respondents indicating they had shopped and made a purchase while in Antalya. Thirty-eight of the 383 surveys are unusable due to missing data, leaving a total of 345 completed surveys which constitute the final sample for the data analysis.

**RESULTS and DISCUSSION**

The dimensionality of the adapted measures was examined using exploratory factor analysis (EFA). Four scales were used: 1) word-of-mouth (explaining approximately 17% of the variance), 2) hedonic shopping value (16%), 3) satisfaction (15%) and 4) loyalty (13%).

**Confirmatory Factory Analysis & Structural Equation Model**

Anderson and Gerbing’s (1988) two-step approach is then followed using AMOS to further evaluate the measurement model in a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) prior to testing the full structural equation model (SEM). In order to cross-validate the EFA results, the initial run of the CFA includes the full scales and as expected, the model did not suggest acceptable fit; thus a modified measurement model was calculated with an acceptable fit ($\chi^2$/df=1.770; CFI=.960; GFI=.924; RMSEA=.047, $p_\alpha=.679$).
Table 1. Hypothesis Tests and Model Fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A priori</th>
<th>Rival 1 SAT→LOY Removed</th>
<th>Rival 2 SAT→WM Removed</th>
<th>Rival 3 SAT→LOY Removed SAT→WM Removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: HSV→SAT</td>
<td>β=.637</td>
<td>P&lt;.001</td>
<td>β=.643</td>
<td>P&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: SAT→LOY</td>
<td>β=.077</td>
<td>P=.321</td>
<td>β=.089</td>
<td>P=.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: HSV→LOY</td>
<td>β=.539</td>
<td>P&lt;.001</td>
<td>β=.529</td>
<td>P&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: LOY→WOM</td>
<td>β=.559</td>
<td>P&lt;.001</td>
<td>β=.560</td>
<td>P&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: SAT→WOM</td>
<td>β=.123</td>
<td>P=.069</td>
<td>β=.129</td>
<td>P=.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: HSV→WOM</td>
<td>β=.234</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
<td>β=.230</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χ²/df</td>
<td>1.770</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.765</td>
<td>1.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td></td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td></td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td></td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.=.679)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the acceptable fit of the measurement model, the analysis moves forward to test the structural equation model (SEM). The proposed structural model suggests acceptable fit ($\chi^2$/df=1.770; CFI=.960; GFI=.924; RMSEA=.047, p.=.679).

Hypothesis tests and rival models

The first hypothesis (H1) postulates that hedonic shopping value positively influences tourist satisfaction, and is supported ($\beta=.637$; $p<.001$). Hypothesis two (H2) postulates that tourist satisfaction positively influences destination loyalty, but is not supported ($\beta=.077$, $p=.321$). Support is found for hypothesis three (H3), which predicts that hedonic shopping value positively influences destination loyalty ($\beta=.539$, $p<.001$). Likewise, hypothesis four (H4) is supported, indicating that destination loyalty ($\beta=.559$, $p<.001$) positively influences word-of-mouth. Hypothesis five (H5), which postulates that tourist satisfaction positively influences word-of-mouth, was not supported ($\beta=.123$, $p=.069$). The final hypothesis (H6) predicting that hedonic shopping value positively influences word-of-mouth is supported ($\beta=.234$, $p<.01$).

Based on the non-significant test results for hypotheses two and four, a nested modeling technique is used to simultaneously test a priori model against rival models with the non-significant paths removed. The first rival model removes the path from satisfaction to loyalty, while the second rival model removes the path from satisfaction to word-of-mouth. The third and final rival model removes both paths. Comparison of the fit indices of the a priori and rival models indicates very similar fit. However, comparison of the Chi-Square/Degrees of freedom ratio, RMSEA and associated p-value among the models suggests that Rival 1 (SAT→LOY removed) is the best fitting model.
DISCUSSION

This research highlights the role of hedonic shopping value as an important component of tourists’ evaluation of a destination. Specifically, the results suggest that hedonic shopping value makes a significant contribution to tourists’ satisfaction, loyalty, and word-of-mouth communication associated with the destination. Perhaps the most interesting finding involves the lack of support for direct relationships between tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty as well as satisfaction and word-of-mouth. Instead, support for a direct link between hedonic shopping value and loyalty, as well as hedonic shopping value and word-of-mouth is found. These findings support those of Jones et al. (2006), suggesting that although hedonic shopping value impacts satisfaction with the shopping experience, perhaps in the presence of hedonic shopping value, the direct effects of satisfaction on loyalty and word-of-mouth are muted. Therefore, satisfaction alone may not be enough to induce loyalty to and word-of-mouth about the tourist destination.

Within the context of the current study, creating excitement and enjoyment with shopping appears to be a crucial for attracting and revisit intentions of German speaking tourists. Addressing the need for creating memorable shopping experiences for this group of travelers seems to be an important strategic marketing issue. Viewing the shopping experience as an incidental leisure activity may cause unintentional dissatisfaction among the travelers affecting brand loyalty to a destination and negatively impacting the word-of-mouth. Future studies should look into the efficacy of using not only hedonic shopping values but also the utilitarian-shopping values along with outcome variables such as satisfaction, loyalty and word of mouth.

The current study was delimited to the investigation of the effects of hedonic values; however, studies in retailing suggest that utilitarian-shopping values would add to additional explanation of error variation of experiential models; such inclusion into this study was deemed to be implausible as shopping seemed incidental for tourists to this particular destination. Enhancing models with destination images might improve explanatory power of experiential-shopping models.
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