

Hedonic and Utilitarian Consumption: A Systematic Literature Review

Megha Mary Michael*

Assistant Professor, Bharata Mata Institute of Management

Megha.3m@gmail.com

Dr. Uma Chandrasekaran,

Professor, Department of Management Studies, School of Management, Pondicherry University

Abstract

The article identifies the growing need to understand and differentiate hedonic and utilitarian attributes in consumer decision making. This is especially important in the emerging experience economy. This review systematically analyzes, consolidates and identifies gaps in literature pertaining to consumer choice between hedonic and utilitarian attributes. Based on the concept centric methodology, the current study identifies prior literature on the basis of (1) type of article (2) individual differences (3) product differences (4) consumption context and (5) consequences. The review identifies the need for more qualitative research in the field.

Keywords -Hedonic consumption, Utilitarian consumption, Consumer choice, Decision making

Introduction:

Until the 1950s, the focus of consumer behavior studies was largely on the information processing model that addressed consumers as rational decision makers and products as end benefits. This oldest approach assumes that each option in a choice set is evaluated in terms of 'its utility and subjective value'. (Luce, Bettman & Payne, 1998). The contrasting view of consumption as presented by Hirschman and Holbrook (1982) focused on its experiential nature. In their seminal article, they defined hedonic consumption as "those facets of consumer behavior that relate to the multisensory, fantasy and emotive aspects of one's experience with products". Since then a large body of literature has examined what they established as the experiential view of consumption that regards consumption as a primarily subjective state of consciousness with a variety of symbolic meanings, hedonic responses, and aesthetic criteria.

Thus, consumer choices are driven by utilitarian and hedonic consideration. While evaluating a product, consumers evaluate it in terms of the utilitarian and hedonic benefits. This paper attempts to look into the seminal studies in the domain, synthesize existing research and identify the research gaps.

We define utilitarian attributes as those that involve cognitively oriented benefits and possess rational appeal while hedonic attributes of a product relate to the multisensory, fantasy and emotive aspects of product usage experience.

The study focuses on exploring the different concepts centered on the hedonic aspects of consumption in comparison with the utilitarian. This is of great importance in today's experience economy. Consumers are increasingly willing to spend more on the quality of experiences or the hedonic dimensions of consumption. Marketing also views consumers as flesh and blood humans who day dream about pleasurable adventures, respond emotionally to consumption situations and use products in playful leisure activities. This carries implications to marketers concerned with shaping communication messages, designing retail outlets and orchestrating product meanings to accommodate experience oriented customers. (Holbrook, 2000)

This systematic literature review attempts to unveil the research gaps in relevant literature pertaining to hedonic consumption and to propose the future research agenda. Using the concept centric methodology, the literature review systematically identifies, analyzes and consolidates existing knowledge in the area and points to significant gaps in the literature related to hedonic consumption.

The study finds practical implications especially in Marketing and Product Development. Insights can be drawn from the study in areas of design thinking and marketing strategy development. A clear understanding of the concept

of hedonic consumption and the trade-offs customers make during decision making can orient marketers in developing products and services that suitably blend both hedonic and utilitarian attributes. Further, the knowledge about the hedonic nature of consumption supports marketers in developing marketing mix elements that balances the hedonic-utilitarian trade-offs. Thus, the present study contributes to both academics and practical managerial decisions.

The study is structured around the concept centric methodology as proposed by Webster & Watson (2002). A brief understanding of the concept centric method is presented followed by the different concepts of hedonic consumption. The academic, practical and managerial implications are also discussed.

2. Review Methodology

For the systematic synthesis of the literature, a concept centric methodology is used (Webster & Watson, 2002). In accordance with the method, our literature review is organized across the following five concepts - type of paper, individual differences, product differences, consumption context, and consequences.

In order to identify the relevant articles for the study, an initial search was conducted on standard databases SCOPUS, Google Scholar, EBSCO HOST, JSTOR and PROQUEST using the search terms hedonic, utilitarian, HED, UT, hedonic consumption, pleasure seeking consumption, etc. Broad terms were used instead of specific ones to ensure that maximum articles are listed. Thus, the literature review was not confined by the research methodology, set of journals or geographic locations. This also ensured that the articles were not merely from the Marketing/Management areas. Articles from multiple disciplines like Economics and Psychology have been used in the study. Further, standard journals Journal of Marketing and other AMA journals were specifically searched and articles identified. A citation search was conducted to yield more articles. No specific time frame was used in the study, ensuring that all the major published articles across different time periods are included in the study. An initial pool of 89 articles were identified. After carefully vetting the articles based on the interest of this literature review, a final list of 42 articles are used.

3. Literature review

a. Article classification - Empirical or Conceptual

The articles used in the study are classified into empirical or conceptual. In our analysis, we identified 6 articles as conceptual and 36 articles as empirical in that it involves some data analysis. It was at almost the same time that the seminal article in hedonic consumption was published in 1982 that Zaltman (1983) called in for more quality of ideas. Yet, marketing literature has seen empirical and methodological advances outpacing the conceptual advances (McInnis, 2011). Thus, our uncovering of articles is in tune with the trends in marketing research. Among the six conceptual articles identified, three were conceptual propositions (Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982, Khan, Dhar & Wertenbroch, 2005 and Kaul, 2007), one being the seminal article introducing the concept of hedonic consumption in the marketing and consumer behaviour perspective (Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982). The other three articles were literature review synthesizing the ideas (Clement, Fabel & Stotling, 2009, Alba & Williams 2013 and Gilovich et al, 2014). A chronological list of the conceptual articles and their major finding is presented in Table 1 below:

Table 1 – Conceptual Articles and Key Findings

Authors	Type of article	Key findings
Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982	Propositions	Seminal article defining the concept of hedonic consumption, traces theoretical antecedents and proposes four relevant areas of study in the domain- Mental constructs, product classes, product usage and individual differences

Khan, Dhar & Wertenbroch (2005)	Propositions & Model Development	Provides an integrative perspective on different loosely connected theoretical frameworks on the distinctions between purchase and consumption of goods for pleasure and for more utilitarian and functional purposes; proposed a self-attribution model of hedonic choice, tying together the diverse theoretical views on experiential and instrumental consumption.
Kaul, 2007	Propositions	Explores existing literature in terms of shopping environment, socio cultural context and individual roles and motivation and proposes major research agenda and propositions
Clement, Fabel & Stotling, 2009	Review	Reviews literature on the adoption process in hedonic goods, and provides guidelines for estimating diffusion models
Alba & Williams 2013	Review	Synthesizes existing literature from the perspective of pleasure in hedonic consumption and the ways in which customers maximize pleasure in hedonic consumption
Gilovich et al, 2014	Review	Reviews researches that confirm that people derive satisfaction from material purchases and proposes the reasons for the same

We identified 36 empirical articles that use some kind of quantitative evaluation. Empirical articles have been classified in terms of the methodology used. 17 articles used survey method (Babin, Darden & Griffin, 1994, Eliashberg & Sawhney 1994, Dhar & Wertenbroch, 1999, Hopkins & Pujari (1999) Childers et al (2001) Hightower et al (2002), Okada (2005), Jones, Reynolds & Arnold (2006), Overby & Lee (2006), Lee et al (2009), Sarkar (2011), Shukla P (2012), Kumar et al (2014), Evanschitzky et al (2014), Chung (2015), Sirakaya-Turk, E., Ekinci, Y., & Martin, D. (2015) & Jha & Adikhari (2016). One of these, Eliashberg & Sawhney (1994) has developed a mathematical model and empirically tested the same using data from survey research. The other most commonly used research design is experimental. 19 of the articles reviewed used experimental research design (Holbrook et al (1984), Batra & Ahtola (1991), Crowley et al (1992), Lageat, Czellar & Laurent (2003), Chernev (2004), Lu & Gilmour (2006), Khan & Dhar (2006), Botti & McGill (2006), Lim & Ang (2008), Nelson & Meyvis (2008), Nicalo, Irwin & Goodman (2009), Zheng & Kivetz (2009), Xu & Schwarz (2009), Carter & Gilovich (2010), López & Ruiz (2011), Lopez & Maya (2012), Park & Kim (2012), Rosenzweig & Gilovich (2012) & Kumar & Kakar (2017). Of these, Kumar & Kakar (2017) uses a longitudinal experimental study. Two articles Dhar & Wertenbroch, 1999 & Okada (2005) uses an experimental method followed by a survey method to improve the robustness of the design. Of particular importance are the scale development articles Babin et al (1994) & Lu & Gilmour (2006) that developed the Hedonic - Utilitarian Shopping Value Scale, one of the most widely used in literature and the Individual Oriented and Socially Oriented Cultural Conceptions of Subjective Well Being Scales respectively.

The limited number of conceptual articles in the area of hedonic consumption, since the seminal article in 1982 calls for attention. Interestingly, it is only during the early 21st century that the conceptual articles are seeing light. This could be due to the emerging experience economy that focuses more on the consumption experience.

The methodologies used show a balanced approach as experimental and survey methods take almost equal shares in the articles reviewed. The qualitative method of depth interview is also sparsely used in literature. Kassarian (1977) calls attention towards the use of content analysis in consumer behaviour research. Content analysis can be used to study the message being used in Hedonic-Utilitarian communication. This would be of practical advantage for marketers developing products with distinct hedonic or utilitarian dimensions. Thus, with respect to the type of articles, the following research question emerged to be addressed:

RQ1: How can qualitative and theoretical understanding of hedonic consumption better the existing knowledge in the domain?

b. Differences in Product Contexts - Hedonic vs. Utilitarian

A hedonic- utilitarian difference can be seen in the product category used, which is evident in an analysis of the context under which the majority of the studies are conducted. Hirschman & Holbrook (1982), while introducing the concept of hedonic consumption draw attention to the product categories that were investigated in consumer research - packaged goods and durable goods, which is majorly utilitarian in nature while hedonic research identifies performing arts, plastic arts and the corollaries of these high culture products as its major investigation. Thus, while consumption is classified as hedonic and utilitarian, the literature sees this classification across product categories too. Khan, Dhar & Wertenbroch (2004) compares the distinction between hedonic and utilitarian in luxury vs. necessities and affect-rich vs. affect-poor goods.

Clement et al (2006) attempts to classify hedonic and utilitarian goods on different product specific characteristics: experience versus search characteristics, high-low quality uncertainty, subjective/symbolic vs objective/functional, seasonality dependent vs non-dependent, rapidly declining versus bell shaped life cycle respectively. Media products, according to them, are one of the clear, standout example of hedonic goods. Hopkinson & Pujari (1999) maintain that despite the blurred distinction between hedonic and utilitarian categories, some characteristics like the individual being part of the process and the association with special time and special place, as defining hedonic consumption; the emphasis being on experience and that hedonic consumption is not about economic exchange. Eliashberg & Sawhney (1994) attempts to look at hedonic consumption from the experience lens. They identify hedonic consumption as those situations where consumers engage in for fun, enjoyment and leisure that are suitable for product/service categories such as movies, music, concerts, amusement parks, novels and the performing arts. Dhar & Wertenbroch (1999) differentiates between hedonic goods and utilitarian goods based on their relative hedonic or utilitarian nature. Some goods such as designer clothing, sports cars, luxury watches are identified as hedonic owing to their predominant hedonic nature and goods such as microwave ovens, minivans, personal computers etc. are identified as utilitarian goods being primarily instrumental and functional.

However, most authors agree that the distinction between hedonic and utilitarian is a narrow one. They argue that hedonism and utilitarianism is not at two ends of a unidimensional scale. Authors identify the hedonic and utilitarian dimensions of the same product category and argue that a single product can have utilitarian and hedonic dimensions (Jha & Adhikari (2016), Kumar & Kakar (2017), Lee et al (2017))

Park & Kim (2012) in their study look at the differential effect of framing the same product as a hedonic and utilitarian product, thus arguing that the distinction is more in the mind of the customer. Okada (2005) argues that there is no clear differentiation between hedonic and utilitarian products and that within the same category one product (e.g., desserts) may be hedonic and another one utilitarian. Batra & Ahtola (1991) argue that the difference exists in the customer attitude. They attempted to test out semantic differential scales developed to measure the Hedonic and Utilitarian dimensions of customer attitude based on different product categories. This scale has been tested on 24 product categories by Crowley et al (1992). Lim & Ang (2008) study how utilitarian and hedonic products are differently perceived by different cultures, affirming the differentiation between hedonic and utilitarian product classification. However, most of the studies are limited to the hedonic and utilitarian attributes of products, thus maintaining the position that a product, as such, cannot be considered hedonic or utilitarian. At best, a product category can be considered relatively hedonic or relatively utilitarian.

Thus, different studies have explored the hedonic-utilitarian dimensions of products and consumer attitudes. Significant studies have been conducted in the domain. However, there is scope for further enhancement in the area. Further exploration into the antecedents of Hedonic vs. Utilitarian consumption can offer practical application to Marketers.

The study thus identifies the following research questions with respect to Hedonic –Utilitarian Product differences

RQ2: Can products be classified as purely hedonic or purely utilitarian?

RQ3: How can product categories marry form and function to offer hedonically and utility superior products?

c. Individual differences in Hedonic consumption

Hirschman & Holbrook (1982) identifies individual differences as an important variable to demarcate hedonic and utilitarian consumption. Subculture was identified as an important variable that differentiates the hedonic and utilitarian orientation to consume. The most widely used scale is the Hedonic - Utilitarian Shopping Value Scale (Babin et al, 1994). This scale assesses the consumers' evaluation of shopping experience along Hedonic and Utilitarian dimensions and propose Hedonic shopping value and Utilitarian shopping value as representing intrinsic and extrinsic shopping value respectively. Since then, this scale has been used as an individual difference variable in studying hedonic - utilitarian consumption in multiple contexts: predicting destination loyalty (Sirakaya-Turk, E., Ekinci, Y., & Martin, D. 2015), airport shopping behavior and patronage intention (Chung, 2015), defining retail outcomes (Jones, Reynolds & Arnold, 2006), e-shopping benefits and risks (Sarkar, 2011), internet retailer preference and intention to purchase (Overby & Lee, 2006) and in the cultural context of Eastern vs Western markets (Shukla P 2012). This scale can rightly be thought of as the most widely used in the context of hedonic consumption. However, other individual difference variables have also been studied in different hedonic contexts. Holbrook et al (1984), while studying visual and verbal games in the context of playful consumption identify game congruence as a major personality variable in the enjoyment of games.

Eliashberg & Sawhney (1994) identify an individual's preference for total emotional stimulation as a stable individual difference factor that influences hedonic consumption (movie) experience. Along with the stable factors, they also consider temporary moods and the emotional content of the experience in influencing the overall consumption experience. The individual's preference for total emotional stimulation is considered in similar terms as sensation seeking tendency, arousal seeking tendency or optimum stimulation level.

Chernev (2004) argues that goal orientation moderates attribute evaluations of consumers such that prevention-focused individuals are likely to over-weigh utilitarian attributes than promotion-focused individuals who are likely to over-weigh hedonic attributes in a consumption setting.

Thus, although Hedonic - Utilitarian Shopping value (Babin et al 1994) has been the predominant individual difference variable in the context of hedonic - utilitarian consumption, other variables have also been studied. However, there is a significant gap here. While Hedonic - Utilitarian shopping value assesses the individual's shopping experience, it does not really predict the propensity to consume hedonic or utilitarian products. It is rather, the experience of shopping that is identified here. Individual regulatory focus can be a significant variable that can predict the individual preference for hedonic or utilitarian consumption. However, studies need to address the gaps in this domain. Thus, the Research Question to be addressed is:

RQ4: What individual difference variables (Eg: Materialism, Lay rationalism can be used to predict the tendency to prefer hedonic vs. utilitarian products?

d. Consumption context

The studies on hedonic consumption have advanced to different consumption contexts. Hedonic consumption has always been studied against the backdrop of goal-oriented, utilitarian consumption. Hence, one of the major consumption contexts that has been studied is hedonic -utilitarian choice situations. Dhar & Wertenbroch (1999) considers how consumers choose between hedonic and utilitarian goods in a forfeiture versus acquisition choice situation. Kumar & Kakar (2017) explore software product consumption in a similar light; the implicit choice and the actual explicit choice in the acquisition - forfeiture situations. Okada (2005) studies the hedonic - utilitarian

alternative choice in cases of immediate purchase and the order in which they are presented with the choices. Rosenweig & Gilovich (2011), in the context of material and experiential purchase study how the regret of action differs from regrets of inaction. Many studies look at hedonic consumption from the lens of luxury and indulgence. Xu & Schwarz (2009) approach hedonic consumption with indulgence and regret as antecedents; Lageat, Czellar & Laurent (2003) approach hedonic dimensions from the angle of luxury perceptions. Khan & Dhar (2005) explore self-indulgent choice and relative luxury. Botti & Mc Gill (2006) while exploring the goal differences in Hedonic - Utilitarian consumption explore the goals in the context of self-chosen/ externally determined choice. Zheng & Kivetz (2009) explore purchase likelihood in the context of self-purchase/ gift. Nelson & Meyvis (2008) explores how positive and negative experiences differ in the ways in which breaks are sought out in consumption experience. Some of the studies have addressed the cultural difference in hedonic - utilitarian consumption. Evanschitzky et al (2014) compares hedonic consumption in individualistic and collectivist cultures; in collectivist culture, it is less associated with self-oriented gratification shopping and more oriented towards others-oriented shopping. Kumar et al (2004) explores the nature of anticipation while waiting for experiences versus waiting for possessions and found that the former tends to be more pleasurable than the latter. Okada (2005) studies justification effect on consumer choice of hedonic and utilitarian goods in the light of choice situation, immediacy of purchase and order of presentation.

While different aspects of hedonic consumption have been studied, the studies largely deal with the regret, luxury and justification elements of hedonic consumption, especially in choice situations. Also, hedonic consumption from dimensions like self-gifting, gifting for others, group vs self-consumption, spiritual consumption can also be explored as these contexts include experiential aspects that are unique to hedonic consumption.

Majority of the studies are conducted in the context of retailing and shopping (Babin et al (1994), Sirakaya-Turk, E., Ekinci, Y., & Martin, D. (2015), Chung (2015), Jones, Reynolds & Arnold (2006)) with some of them specifically in online retail (Sarkar (2011), Overby & Lee (2006), Childers et al (2001), López & Ruiz (2011) Okada (2005)). Sports and games have also been used as a major context of study (Holbrook et al (1984), Hopkins & Pujari (1999), Hightower et al (2002)). Eliashberg & Sawhney (1994) explore the context of the entertainment sector.

Understandably, majority of the studies have been conducted in the experience-rich sectors where hedonic consumption is assumed to be high. However, as discussed, no consumption can be considered purely hedonic or purely utilitarian. Hence, there is a need to understand the hedonic aspects of predominantly utilitarian industry segments like FMCG products, durables like furniture and household gadgets. The following Research questions are proposed:

RQ5: What other consumption contexts (Eg: Gift giving, Self-gift) can be explored in terms of hedonic – utilitarian divide apart from trade-offs, acquisition and forfeiture in specific industries?

e. Consequences

Here, we synthesize the consequences of hedonic consumption studied across literature. Hedonic consumption, as discussed, has been studied under numerous consumption contexts, often in stark contrast to utilitarian consumption. The consequences of hedonic consumption are discussed in this section. The hedonic shopping value scale developed by Babin et al, has been used in multiple settings, especially in its original retail context to predict customer destination loyalty, re-patronage interest and electronic word of mouth (Sirakaya-Turk, E., Ekinci, Y., & Martin, D. (2015), airport shopping re-patronage intention (Chung, 2015), satisfaction and retail outcomes (Jones, Reynolds & Arnold, 2006), perceived benefits and risk in online shopping (Sarkar, 2011), intention and preference towards internet retailers (Overby & Lee, 2006). Jha & Adhikari (2016) comparing the Assimilation Theory and Contrast Theory in the context of hedonic-utilitarian attributes of the product found that the utilitarian reasons for purchase are better explained by the assimilation theory while the hedonic reasons for purchase are better explained by the contrast theory. Lee et al (2009) found that a hedonic consumption significantly influenced group communication and in turn group norms and thereby, youths' customer loyalty towards mobile phones. Eliashberg & Sawhney (1994) identifies hedonic consumption to influence the overall movie experience. Lu & Gilmour (2006) explores hedonic consumption from a cultural perspective and uses it to predict individual social wellbeing and

subjective wellbeing. Chernev (2004) uses regulatory focus as an individual difference variable to predict hedonic product evaluation. Lim & Ang (2008) studies the influence of cultural conditioning and benefit claim type across hedonic - utilitarian consumption on attitude and brand personality perceptions. Lopez & Maya (2012) explores the role of hedonic - utilitarian product differences in improving the mood and thus intention to purchase.

While some studies from literature look at the positive consequences of hedonic consumption, a contrasting view is presented by some researchers. Chung (2015) argues that hedonic consumption involves more of multisensory decisions than of cognitive ones, providing it with some qualities of impulse purchase decisions. Acquisition of hedonic goods has been reported to evoke the positive affect of pleasure and the negative affect of guilt (Park and Kim, 2012). Thus, guilt surfaces as a negative effect of hedonic consumption. Park & Kim (2012) finds that anticipated guilt mediates the relationship between temporal distance and hedonically framed product evaluation. Okada (2005) finds that individuals are more willing to pay in time and not in terms of money in the case of hedonic as against utilitarian products. Rosenzweig & Gilovich (2012) while studying experiential purchases and material purchases find that material purchases (mostly utilitarian) generate buyers' remorse - regrets of action while experiential purchases (mostly hedonic) results in missed opportunities remorse - regrets of inaction. This makes it necessary for customers to justify their hedonic purchases. Xu & Schwarz (2009) argue that customers expect more negative feelings when they indulge in a hedonic consumption with reason than without reason. Hence, the need to justify hedonic purchases in comparison to utilitarian ones. Khan & Dhar (2006) studies the role of licensing and the attribution of the licensing. They found that the preference for an indulgent option (hedonic) diminishes if the licensing can be attributed to external motivation. Thus, across literature guilt emerges as a negative consequence of hedonic consumption and licensing and justification emerges as methods to cope with the working of guilt.

Despite literature exploring the different antecedents of hedonic consumption, the conceptualization of hedonic consumption in most literature is one of multisensory consumption in the pursuit of pleasure. Pleasure and guilt as consequences need more focus and attention. Besides, a thorough understanding of guilt-reduction strategies for hedonic products offer scope for strategic marketing decision making. Theory needs further advancement in understanding the way guilt functions in the hedonic consumption context. We propose the following research questions:

RQ6: Does hedonic consumption lead to happiness and overall wellbeing?

RQ7: Does happiness co-exist with guilt in a hedonic consumption setting?

RQ8: What are the long term consequences of hedonic consumption?

4. Discussion and research agenda

The literature on hedonic consumption has grown tremendously since the seminal article introducing the hedonic element in consumption studies. Until then, consumption was majorly looked at from the rational perspective and pleasure-oriented consumption was largely dormant as a research agenda. Using the concept centric methodology, we have made an attempt to collate the literature pertaining to hedonic consumption on five major concepts - types of articles, hedonic - utilitarian product differences, individual differences, consumption context and consequences. While research on hedonic consumption is growing, we identified gaps that could be addressed in future research. In comparison to the theoretical development that has happened to rational, utility-oriented consumption, the research on hedonic consumption is not substantial to the degree of importance it holds in the increasing trend of experience seekers.

While most of the research in hedonic consumption has been of empirical nature, qualitative, theory building research is lacking. An attempt to understand the hedonic - utilitarian product differences show another significant gap - despite the differences in hedonic and utilitarian consumption, it is argued that within product categories this difference is not clearly differentiable. Hedonic and utilitarian attributes co-exist in products. In this case, explanations pertaining to rational decision making may not be relevant for hedonically superior products. The research on how customers choose hedonically superior products needs attention. The customer journey might have to be redefined for hedonically superior products. Further, the most commonly used hedonic - utilitarian shopping

value scale may not sufficiently represent the individual orientation to hedonic - utilitarian consumption. This scale addresses shopping itself as the hedonic or utilitarian experience. Little attention is given to individual customer and his consumption journey. Hence, there is a need to identify how individual customers differ in their choice of hedonic vs. utilitarian products. Such understanding would help practitioners in segmentation decisions.

Further it was found that the consumption context under study has largely been the service sector, especially retail sector - specifically online and fashion retail. The consumption context needs to be expanded to include the growing domains like OTT platforms, online grocery shopping and even relatively utilitarian categories like FMCG goods. This discussion would help practitioners in designing products that marry form with function. An expanded context base can also include gifting behavior including self-gifting, and group consumption like travel or shopping to contribute to better strategic marketing planning.

The antecedents studied include loyalty, satisfaction, preference - much the same as the traditional models. It is important to expand this knowledge further by incorporating the differential influence of personality variables on the various consequences. Willingness to pay is also an important variable to be studied in this light owing to the luxury perception associated with hedonic consumption. Although there is some literature addressing these issues, there is a need for more.

Based on the literature review, we have identified and presented several areas of research that will help better the understanding of hedonic consumption. While existing literature addresses majority of the questions centered around the topic, we have identified some gaps and areas that may enrich theory. The proposed research agenda is not without its limitations and is not exhaustive. However, the proposed areas may bridge some of the existing gaps and bring in more practical and theoretical understanding.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

1. Alba, J. W., & Williams, E. F. (2013). Pleasure principles: A review of research on hedonic consumption. *Journal of consumer psychology*, 23(1), 2-18.
2. Batra, R., & Ahtola, O. T. (1991). Measuring the hedonic and utilitarian sources of consumer attitudes. *Marketing letters*, 2(2), 159-170.
3. Botti, S., & McGill, A. L. (2011). The locus of choice: Personal causality and satisfaction with hedonic and utilitarian decisions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(6), 1065-1078.
4. Carter, T. J., & Gilovich, T. (2010). The relative relativity of material and experiential purchases. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 98(1), 146.
5. Chernev, A. (2004). Goal-attribute compatibility in consumer choice. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 14(1-2), 141-150.
6. Childers, T. L., Carr, C. L., Peck, J., & Carson, S. (2001). Hedonic and utilitarian motivations for online retail shopping behavior. *Journal of retailing*, 77(4), 511-535.
7. Chung, Y. S. (2015). Hedonic and utilitarian shopping values in airport shopping behavior. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 49, 28-34.
8. Clement, M., Fabel, S., & Schmidt-Stolting, C. (2006). Diffusion of hedonic goods: A literature review. *The International Journal on Media Management*, 8(4), 155-163.
9. Crowley, A. E., Spangenberg, E. R., & Hughes, K. R. (1992). Measuring the hedonic and utilitarian dimensions of attitudes toward product categories. *Marketing letters*, 3(3), 239-249.
10. Eliashberg, J., & Sawhney, M. S. (1994). Modeling goes to Hollywood: Predicting individual differences in movie enjoyment. *Management science*, 40(9), 1151-1173.

11. Evanschitzky, H., Emrich, O., Sangtani, V., Ackfeldt, A. L., Reynolds, K. E., & Arnold, M. J. (2014). Hedonic shopping motivations in collectivistic and individualistic consumer cultures. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 31(3), 335-338.
12. Hightower Jr, R., Brady, M. K., & Baker, T. L. (2002). Investigating the role of the physical environment in hedonic service consumption: an exploratory study of sporting events. *Journal of Business research*, 55(9), 697-707.
13. Holbrook, M. B., & Hirschman, E. C. (1982). The experiential aspects of consumption: Consumer fantasies, feelings, and fun. *Journal of consumer research*, 9(2), 132-140.
14. Holbrook, M. B., Chestnut, R. W., Oliva, T. A., & Greenleaf, E. A. (1984). Play as a consumption experience: The roles of emotions, performance, and personality in the enjoyment of games. *Journal of consumer research*, 11(2), 728-739.
15. Holbrook, M. B. (2000). The millennial consumer in the texts of our times: Experience and entertainment. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 20(2), 178-192.
16. Hopkinson, G. C., & Pujari, D. (1999). A factor analytic study of the sources of meaning in hedonic consumption. *European Journal of Marketing*.
17. Jha, S., & Adhikari, A. (2016). Goal Congruence in Hedonistic and Utilitarian Reasons for Purchase and Features of a Product. *South Asian Journal of Management*, 23(2).
18. Jones, M. A., Reynolds, K. E., & Arnold, M. J. (2006). Hedonic and utilitarian shopping value: Investigating differential effects on retail outcomes. *Journal of business research*, 59(9), 974-981.
19. Kakar, A. K. S. (2017). Why do users prefer the hedonic but choose the Utilitarian? Investigating user dilemma of hedonicutilitarian choice. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 108(C), 50-61.
20. Kassarian, H. H. (1977). Content Analysis in Consumer Research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 4(1), 8–18. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2488631>
21. Khan, U., & Dhar, R. (2006). Licensing effect in consumer choice. *Journal of marketing research*, 43(2), 259-266.
22. Khan, U., Dhar, R., & Wertenbroch, K. A. (2005). Behavioral decision theoretic perspective on hedonic and utilitarian choice. *Inside consumption: Frontiers of research on consumer motives, goals, and desires. Working Paper Series*, 144-165.
23. Kumar, A., Killingsworth, M. A., & Gilovich, T. (2014). Waiting for merlot: Anticipatory consumption of experiential and material purchases. *Psychological science*, 25(10), 1924-1931.
24. Lageat, T., Czellar, S., & Laurent, G. (2003). Engineering hedonic attributes to generate perceptions of luxury: Consumer perception of an everyday sound. *Marketing Letters*, 14(2), 97-109.
25. Lee, Richard; Murphy, Jamie and Swilley, Esther (2009) "The Moderating Influence of Hedonic Consumption in an Extended Theory of Planned Behaviour," *Service Industries Journal*, 29(4): 539-555
26. Lim, E. A. C., & Ang, S. H. (2008). Hedonic vs. utilitarian consumption: A cross-cultural perspective based on cultural conditioning. *Journal of business research*, 61(3), 225-232.
27. López, I. L., & De Maya, S. R. (2012). When hedonic products help regulate my mood. *Marketing Letters*, 23(3), 701-717.
28. López, I., & Ruiz, S. (2011). Explaining website effectiveness: The hedonic–utilitarian dual mediation hypothesis. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 10(1), 49-58.
29. Lu, L., & Gilmour, R. (2006). Individual-oriented and socially oriented cultural conceptions of subjective well-being: Conceptual analysis and scale development. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 9(1), 36-49.
30. Nelson, L. D., & Meyvis, T. (2008). Interrupted consumption: Adaptation and the disruption of hedonic experience. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45(6), 654-64.
31. Nicolao, L., Irwin, J. R., & Goodman, J. K. (2009). Happiness for sale: Do experiential purchases make consumers happier than material purchases?. *Journal of consumer research*, 36(2), 188-198.

32. Okada, E. M. (2005). Justification effects on consumer choice of hedonic and utilitarian goods. *Journal of marketing research*, 42(1), 43-53.
33. Overby, J. W., & Lee, E. J. (2006). The effects of utilitarian and hedonic online shopping value on consumer preference and intentions. *Journal of Business research*, 59(10-11), 1160-1166.
34. Park, K., & Kim, Y. (2012). I will like it later but not now: the roles of temporal distance and guilt in hedonic product evaluation. *Seoul Journal of Business*, 18.
35. Patrick, V. M., MacInnis, D. J., Park, C. W., & Dawn Iacobucci served as editor and Mary Frances Luce served as associate editor for this article. (2007). Not as Happy as I Thought I'd Be? Affective Misforecasting and Product Evaluations. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33(4), 479-489. <https://doi.org/10.1086/510221>
36. Rosenzweig, E., & Gilovich, T. (2012). Buyer's remorse or missed opportunity? Differential regrets for material and experiential purchases. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 102(2), 215.
37. Sarkar, A. (2011). Impact of utilitarian and hedonic shopping values on individual's perceived benefits and risks in online shopping. *International management review*, 7(1), 58.
38. Schulze, C., Schöler, L., & Skiera, B. (2014). Not all fun and games: Viral marketing for utilitarian products. *Journal of Marketing*, 78(1), 1-19.
39. Shukla, P. (2012). The influence of value perceptions on luxury purchase intentions in developed and emerging markets. *International Marketing Review*.
40. Sirakaya-Turk, E., Ekinci, Y., & Martin, D. (2015). The efficacy of shopping value in predicting destination loyalty. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(9), 1878-1885.
41. Xu, J., & Schwarz, N. (2009). Do we really need a reason to indulge?. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 46(1), 25-36.
42. Zheng, Y., & Kivetz, R. (2009). The differential promotion effectiveness on hedonic versus utilitarian products. *ACR North American Advances*.